



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative J Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2008

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848–c1956

A2 Unit 4: Totalitarian Ideologies, Economic, Social and Foreign Policies, 1848–1956

Section A: The Origins and Development of ‘Totalitarian Ideologies’, 1848–1956

Question 1

(a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

How fully does **Source B** support **Source A** in explaining the ideological basis of the Soviet foreign policy? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|
| L1: | Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Demonstrates explicit understanding of sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. | 3-5 |
| L3: | Draws conclusions about sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. | 6-8 |
| L4: | Uses material selected appropriately from both sources and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on sufficiency in relation to the issue. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

Weaker answers at Level 1 may simply describe the content of the sources. At Level 2, answers should recognise that Source B does not support Source A. Source A indicates that permanent revolution was the basis of ideology as it applied to Soviet foreign policy. Source B, however, shows Stalin’s pragmatic approach making ‘friendly contact’ with ‘fascist’ Germany, contemplated joining the anti-Comintern Pact and purged the leaders of the Comintern. Answers at Level 3 should also recognise that Source B does partly support Source A in that Stalin had previously attacked fascism which was the ideological enemy of Soviet communism. Own knowledge may be used to discuss the differing ideologies of World Revolution and Socialism in One Country, as well as Stalin’s personal objection to Socialism in One Country, his suspicion of the Comintern and his use of it to protect the USSR, for example in Spain. Judgement for Level 4 could be shown by demonstrating that, for example, both sources focus on the ideological goal of securing the revolution and achieving security (‘How was a revolutionary Russia to maintain itself in a hostile world?’), but that the methods to be used are ideological (Source A) and pragmatic (Source B).

(b) Use **Sources C** and **D** and your own knowledge.

‘Both Fascist and Nazi foreign policy ideology had their roots in nineteenth century ideas.’

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates’ responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Descriptions of the sources or of policy rather than ideology are likely at Level 1. At Level 2, analytical answers should be aware of some aspects of nineteenth century ideas as they relate to foreign policy for both regimes, and evidence of nineteenth century ideas and other factors for one regime.

At Level 3, answers should offer balance by using sources and own knowledge and by considering both regimes and by showing an appreciation that there were other influences on ideology.

At Level 4, synoptic understanding may involve identifying shared influences on the two regimes, for example Nietzsche.

At Level 5, sustained judgement may include an understanding of the extent to which Hitler and Mussolini were both influenced by the Paris Peace Treaties, as well as other nineteenth century ideas.

Evidence Nazi foreign policy ideas were motivated by C19 ideas

- concepts of national unity (**Source C**) come from the Romantic and nationalist movements of the C19 that had tried to create Germany in 1848 and had been dissatisfied in 1871
- Lebensraum (**Source C**) had its roots in the ideas of Ratzel and the Pan-German League.

Evidence of other influences

- the Treaty of Versailles was the thorn in the side of all C20 German nationalists (**Source C**)
- the work of Rosenberg introduced Hitler to the idea of the Jewish nature of Slavic Bolshevik Russia.

Evidence Italian foreign policy was influenced by C19 ideas

- influence of Social-Darwinism and the belief in struggle can be seen in Mussolini's militarism
- the nationalist movement of the C19 also influenced Mussolini's drive for Empire (**Source D**).

Evidence of other influences

- the Paris Treaties left Italy furious at the 'mutilated victory' (**Source D**)
- militarism was a personal obsession of Mussolini
- the desire to recreate the Roman Empire.

Section B: Policy and Practice in Totalitarian Regimes

Question 2

How far did Soviet economic policy succeed in spreading socialism within the USSR and in preparing the USSR for war in the years 1928 to 1941? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Answers should consider the extent of success of the first three Five Year Plans and collectivisation in achieving the two aims specified.

At Level 1, answers may describe economic policy. At Level 2, answers may cover success or failure, or only one of the two synoptic factors, or only industry or agriculture. By Level 3, answers should offer balance, covering success and failure in both spreading Bolshevism and preparing for war, with at least some reference to both agriculture and industry. At Level 4, synoptic understanding should be demonstrated, possibly by comparing the relative success of the two synoptic factors, or by showing the inter-relationship of the two factors, for example the successful development of class A industry provided the sinews of war and meant the increase of the urban proletariat. At Level 5, sustained judgement may involve arguing that economic policy was successful in achieving these aims because other aims were subservient (e.g. raising standards of living).

Evidence of success in spreading Bolshevism

- increase in the size of the urban proletariat – up to 12 million by 1941
- state ownership of all industry
- creation of state and collective farms
- purges of capitalist elements, e.g. Shakhty Trials and dekulakisation

Evidence of success in preparing for war

- Class A industry developed from 1928, e.g. coal production going from 34.3 million tonnes to 150 million tonnes
- 2nd Five Year Plan refocused on war production – 16.5% of GNP allocated
- 50% of GNP spent on war production in the 3rd Five Year Plan
- largest airforce in the world by 1939, including the Yak aircraft
- transfer of 1,500 industrial enterprises to the east of the Urals

Evidence of the failure to spread Bolshevism

- private peasants plots on collective farms
- differential wage rates in the cities

Evidence of the failure to prepare for war

- relative weakness in industry – gigantomania and the obsession with quantity over quality saw substandard goods produced; inefficiencies that saw equipment rust in the fields as it waited for the factory to be built etc.
- collectivisation created famine and opposition

Question 3

How far did Stalin's foreign policy succeed in protecting the USSR and in extending Soviet influence abroad in the years 1929 to 1941? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will be narratives of some events, often with errors.

Answers at Level 2 will be descriptions of foreign policy with some links or analysis that lacks balance in that it fails to cover synoptic factors and both success and failure.

Answers at Level 3 will be balanced in that there will be consideration of both protection and extending Soviet influence, with some reference to both success and failure.

Answers at Level 4 will offer synoptic understanding, perhaps by considering the relative success of the two factors compared to each other, or by showing understanding of the inter-relationship, for example the acquisition of eastern Poland provided a buffer zone as well as extending the borders of the USSR back to pre-revolution limits.

Answers at Level 5 will contain sustained judgement, perhaps considering the relative success of 'protection' and showing awareness of different levels of success across the years 1929 to 1941.

Success in protecting the USSR

- joined the League of Nations in 1934
- Mutual Assistance Pact with Czechoslovakia and France in 1935
- prolonged the Spanish Civil War to distract Italy and Germany
- avoided a Soviet victory in Spain that may have led to an anti-communist crusade
- 10 Year Non-Aggression Pact with Germany
- buffer zones – Vyborg, the Baltic States, eastern Poland

Success in extending Soviet Influence

- acquisition of territory lost in 1917–1918; eastern Poland, the Baltic States and Vyborg
- acquisition of Bessarabia from Rumania in 1940

Failure to protect the USSR

- Munich saw Czechoslovakia destroyed as a Soviet ally without a bullet being fired
- failure to gain an alliance with Britain and France
- Nazi Soviet Pact was a deal with the devil and lulled Stalin into a state where he failed to properly prepare for invasion

Failure to extend Soviet influence

- failure to engineer a victory for the Republic in Spain
- Pyrrhic victory in the Winter War

- the miscalculations and errors in June 1941 saw all Soviet gains wiped out in the first month of Barbarossa

Question 4

How successful was Nazi economic policy in solving domestic economic problems and in preparing Germany for war in the years 1933 to 1939? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

At Level 1, answers may describe economic policy or problems, for example unemployment.

At Level 2, answers may cover success or failure, or only one of the two synoptic factors.

At Level 3, answers should offer balance, covering success and failure in both solving domestic economic problems and in preparing Germany for war.

At Level 4, synoptic understanding should be demonstrated, possibly by comparing the relative success achieved in relation to each of the two synoptic factors, or by showing the inter-relationship of the two factors, e.g. part of preparation for war was improving living standards.

At Level 5, sustained judgement may involve arguing that success was superficial in both areas, but Blitzkrieg prevented Germany from facing reality until at least 1941.

Success in solving domestic economic problems

- work creation schemes reduced unemployment to a residuum of 400,000 by 1936
- inflation was controlled through the DAF
- standards of living increased through KDF, Winter Relief, increase in real wages, production of consumer goods
- use of deficit financing, MEFO Bills and bilateral trading agreements with eastern European countries to avoid a balance of payments deficit.

Success in preparing for war

- work creation schemes included autobahns which would be used to transport troops
- 2/3 of investment went into arms 1936–1939
- Four Year Plan introduced in 1936
- companies switched production to manufacture equipment, e.g. IG Farben & Krupps
- companies that would not switch production were successfully nationalised, e.g. Junker
- 1939+ increased control of industry to increase war production – huge programme of weapons, submarines, aircraft and explosives
- 1939–1941 consumer consumption fell by 20%

Failure to solve domestic economic problems

- balance of payments deficits were only solved short-term with bilateral trading agreements
- MEFO Bills were also limited in their effectiveness

- low productivity caused by the need to avoid increasing working hours

Failure to prepare for war

- public spending 1933–1936 was used to reduce unemployment
- the targets of the Four Year Plan were not met because of the need to continue a high standard of living
- only 17% of GNP on arms by 1938, and only 47% in 1941 (Britain 60%)
- production of consumer goods (e.g. textiles and furniture) increased in 1932 to 1938
- 40% steel still used for civilian needs in 1939
- No increase in working hours for industrial workers
- Nature of Nazi rule meant that polycratic structures prevented effective focus on war production, e.g. struggles between Goring and Schacht

Question 5

How far was Nazi foreign policy motivated by ideology rather than by pragmatic factors in the years 1933 to 1941? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Candidates are likely to see this as a question on planning vs. opportunism.

Answers at Level 1 may describe some foreign policy events, often with errors.

At Level 2, answers should consider the role of either ideology or practical considerations, or both in very limited detail.

At Level 3, balance will involve consideration of both synoptic factors, though conceptualisation of Nazi ideology may be limited or insecure.

At Level 4, synoptic understanding may involve understanding of the inter-relationship between pragmatics and ideology, for example the need to sign a Non-Aggression Pact with the USSR to destroy Slavic Poland and acquire lebensraum. There will also be clear conceptual understanding of ideology (race, space, anti-communism).

At Level 5, independent judgement may involve answering the question precisely, rather than adapting pre-prepared material on planning vs. opportunism.

Evidence of ideological motives

- uniting German speaking people can be seen in the Anschluss, acquisition of the Sudetenland and Memel
- desire for alliance with Britain
- the Anglo-German Naval Agreement, where Hitler ordered von Ribbentrop to renegotiate a lower ratio to avoid upsetting the nation he admired as fellow Aryan Imperialists
- the Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936 and the invasion of the USSR to crush communism
- agreements with Fascist Italy; Rome-Berlin Axis (1936), Anti-Comintern Pact joined by Italy (1937) and the Pact of Steel (1939)
- invasion of Poland and the USSR to acquire Lebensraum.

Evidence of pragmatism

- non-Aggression Pact with Slav Poland, 1934
- backed down from invading Austria in 1934 in the face of Italian support for Austria
- tried out weapons in the Spanish Civil War, having only been encouraged to provide aid by German industrialists seeking economic benefits
- backed down from war over Czechoslovakia in May 1938 and autumn 1938
- Imperialist takeover of Bohemia and Moravia in March 1939
- Hitler was at war with Britain in 1939, allied to the non-Aryan Japanese and Germany had signed a non-Aggression Pact with the USSR
- war with France to secure the western flank before turning against the USSR; invasion of North Africa and Yugoslavia to secure flanks in 1940.

Question 6

How successful was Fascist economic policy in solving domestic problems and in preparing Italy for war by 1940? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

At Level 1, answers may describe economic policy or problems, for example post-war unemployment, or the weak currency, lack of land, limited population growth.

At Level 2, answers may cover success or failure, or only one of the two synoptic factors.

At Level 3, answers should offer balance, covering success and failure in both solving domestic economic problems and in preparing Italy for war.

At Level 4, synoptic understanding should be demonstrated, possibly by comparing the relative success achieved in relation to each of the synoptic factors, or by showing the inter-relationship of the two factors, e.g. part of preparation for war was improving living standards.

At Level 5, sustained judgement may involve arguing that success was superficial in both areas, but that the perception was that Mussolini had solved many of Italy's problems.

Success in solving domestic economic problems

- corporatism ended the threat of trade unions that had been prevalent 1919–1921
- corporate boards brought industrial harmony and the Vidoni Pact of 1925 forbade strikes
- Lira saved from devaluation after the Wall Street Crash by state control and cuts in wages
- the Corporate state required bureaucrats, helping reduce unemployment
- wheat production increased and imports fell
- backwardness was tackled, with 5,000 kilometres of track electrified. Inflation was controlled through the DAF
- population increased

Success in preparing for war

- iron and steel output more than doubled
- Italy defeated Abyssinia and sent 60,000 troops to Spain

Failure to solve domestic economic problems

- North/South divide was not addressed
- imports of industrial goods continued
- land used for wheat could have been better utilised for other produce
- the Corporate state was bureaucratic and corrupt
- live births fell

Failure to prepare for war

- the invasion of Abyssinia failed to secure the resources Mussolini claimed would be found in North Africa
- involvement in the Spanish Civil War crippled the Italian economy and the army needed scraps of metal donated for the war effort
- Italy had to be released from the Pact of Steel in September 1939 as Mussolini lacked the raw materials to go to war
- Italian tank divisions existed only on paper

Question 7

How far was Fascist foreign policy motivated by ideology rather than by pragmatic factors in the years 1922 to 1940? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will describe some aspects of foreign policy, possibly with errors.

At Level 2, answers will consider either ideology or pragmatic motives.

At Level 3, answers will show explicit understanding of motives and will demonstrate balance by discussing evidence of ideological motives and evidence of pragmatic motives.

At Level 4, synoptic understanding may involve considering the inter-relationship between pragmatics and ideology, for example the strategic need to conquer Abyssinia as well as the desire to gain revenge for Adowa were as significant as the desire for a new Roman Empire.

At Level 5, independent judgement may involve arguing that as Fascism was not a coherent set of ideas, Mussolini was motivated by no more than the desire for great power status.

Evidence of ideological motivation

- gained Fiume, territory that nationalists desired from the 'mutilated victory'.
- expansion of the Italian Empire through the conquest of Abyssinia and the annexation of Albania.

- commitment to violence, a key Fascist belief: Abyssinia, Spain, Albania, Greece. A guarantor of the Locarno Pacts and a signatory to the Kellogg-Briand Pact
- ally of Nazi Germany in the Rome-Berlin Axis, Anti-Comintern Pact and the Pact of Steel
- opposed communism in the Spanish Civil War and Anti-Comintern Pact.

Evidence of pragmatic motivation

- Pacific actions were inconsistent with the belief in violence; Locarno Pacts, Kellogg-Briand Pact, Stresa Front, broker of the Munich Agreement
- forced to withdraw from the Pact of Steel in August 1939 because of military limitations.
- declared war in 1940 as France was about to fall to avoid being left out of the territorial settlement.

Question 8

'Ideological consistency was more important in economic policy than in foreign policy.'
Assess the validity of this view with reference to **any one** of the totalitarian regimes you have studied.

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 may assert economic ideas or foreign policy ideas.

At Level 2, answers may focus on economic or foreign ideas and consider evidence of consistency.

For balance at Level 3, answers should consider the relative importance of ideas in the economy and foreign policy, though the inter-relationship of the factors may not be considered.

Synoptic understanding at Level 4 should be demonstrated explicitly by considering the inter-relationship of the economic ideas and foreign policy ideas and how they may have been followed or ignored.

At Level 5, a sustained judgement may involve consideration of the changing priorities for economic and foreign policy across the period.

Reaching a judgement on the relative importance will involve consideration of some of the following:

USSR

- industrialisation was about developing the proletarian base of the USSR; state control was introduced and those who argued against the socialist reconstruction were purged
- collectivisation spread socialism to the countryside and dekulakisation destroyed remaining bourgeois elements
- foreign policy paid some lip service to the goals of world revolution, but the Comintern became an agency for the protection of the USSR and Stalin purged the leadership. Post 1945 communism was spread to Eastern Europe, but this was mainly to create a buffer zone.

Italy

- economic policy followed the idea of corporatism, though this was ill-defined, articulated after the policy was put into practice and was undermined by Fascist corruption
- foreign policy was motivated by anti-communism in the 1930s and nationalist desires for revision and expansion. The 1920s were far more pragmatic and peaceful.

Germany

- economic policy aimed to exclude Jews and women from the economy, develop agriculture and create a war economy. Balancing these demands with pragmatic imperatives like the need to end unemployment and maintain living standards meant that ideology was frequently ignored
- foreign policy was clearly motivated by the desire to unite German-speaking people, create lebensraum, destroy communism, always in a racial context. Economic considerations did limit the appreciation of ideology, hence the Nazi-Soviet Pact for example.