



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1N

Totalitarian Ideology in Theory and Practice, c1848–c1941

Mark Scheme

2009 examination – January 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 © 2009 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.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2009

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1N: Totalitarian Ideology in Theory and Practice, c1848–c1941

Generic Mark Scheme

Question 1(a), Question 2(a) and Question 3(a)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Question 1(b), Question 2(b) and Question 3(b)

- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Question 1

(a) Explain why Lenin wanted a collective leadership to govern the USSR after his death. **(12 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

- Marxist ideology believed in the dictatorship of the proletariat rather than a single leader. Marxist-Leninism recognised that the party collectively would have to rule in place of the proletariat which was undeveloped in the USSR.
- Lenin did not believe that any of the leading Bolsheviks were suitable to rule the country. Trotsky was too arrogant and obsessed with administrative matters: Zinoviev and Kamenev were the 'October Deserters' and Bukharin's views were not fully Marxist, given his support for NEP.
- Lenin considered that the party was likely to split because of the conflict between Trotsky and Lenin. For this reason he favoured collective leadership through an enlarged Central Committee and the removal of Stalin as General Secretary.

Higher level answers will show the links between Lenin's desire for a collective leadership as a positive step towards realising Marxist ideology and the practical need to prevent the differences between Trotsky and Stalin destroying the party.

(b) How important was the fear of Trotsky becoming leader in explaining Stalin's victory in the power struggle in the years 1924 to 1929? **(24 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Fear of Trotsky:

- Trotsky was feared as an ambitious man with the backing of the Red Army of 5 million
- Trotsky was also disliked as an ex-Menshevik, Jewish, intellectual
- Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin therefore formed the Troika to defeat Trotsky in 1924, which was the first stage in Stalin's victory in the power struggle

- It was fear of Trotsky that led Zinoviev and Kamenev to argue that Stalin should not be removed as General Secretary, which had been Lenin's directive to his Political Testament.

However, there were other factors responsible for Stalin's victory:

- Stalin was the beneficiary of the Lenin Legacy: benefited from Lenin's 1921 Ban on Factionalism – no criticism once the Party Congress had voted for something or the leadership decreed it; this allowed Stalin to attack the United Opposition and the Right Opposition as acting contrary to the will of Lenin; Lenin Enrolment, funeral speech and 'Foundations of Leninism' all tied Stalin to Lenin
- powers as General Secretary: Linkman between politburo and government, access to party files, recorded and conveyed information, most crucially by ensuring Trotsky failed to attend Lenin's funeral, right to appoint, remove and transfer top 5 500 officials in USSR, including the regional secretaries meaning Stalin could make sure delegates to the Party Congress backed him. Stalin ensured the appointment of six Stalinists to the 1926 Politburo
- rivals errors and mistakes: Trotsky was an ex-Menshevik, Jew, feared as the 'Red Napoleon'. World Revolution made him appear to be a traitor, too intellectual and arrogant, failed to publish the Political Testament: Zinoviev and Kamenev were Jews and 'October', whilst their attack on Trotsky made them appear indecisive – a former ally; Bukharin fought in the party, though his strength lay with the peasants and the Trade Unions, commitment to NEP meant he lacked credibility as a Marxist.

Higher level answers will demonstrate judgement, perhaps arguing that Stalin was able to take advantage of the fear of Trotsky, or that Stalin's strengths made the fear of Trotsky irrelevant.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why, by October 1922, many Italians believed democracy had failed in Italy. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

- Weakness of the succession of coalition governments, which was the inevitable consequence of the system of PR.
- The threat of the left; socialists, communist, Trade Unions, strikes and revolutionary activities.
- The severe economic problems post-war; two million unemployed, inflation that destroyed savings, wages and pensions of state employees.
- The Liberal government was blamed for the 'mutilated victory' and the failures of democracy were contrasted with the dynamic actions of revolutionaries like D'Annunzio.

Higher level answers will demonstrate an understanding of the links between the factors, perhaps arguing that the threat of the left was intensified by the economic problems, and the failure of the Liberal government to address these issues was responsible for the belief that democracy had failed.

-
- (b) How far was the Italian Fascist state intolerant of diversity in the years 1923 to 1940? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Evidence of intolerance:

- Political: The One Party State was achieved effectively through the Acerbo Laws and other legislation of the 1920s, attacks on Socialists, including the murder of Matteotti; the Cult of *Il Duce* stressed Mussolini over the party.
- Economic: The Corporate State gave the state a monopoly of control of the economy.
- Religion: The Lateran Treaties with the Vatican guaranteed the position of the Catholic Church; it may therefore be argued that there was intolerance of other religions.
- Culture: The Cult of *Il Duce*; propaganda that stressed fascist values of militarism, nationalism, anti-communism etc; anti-Semitic legislation introduced in 1938 and ill-treatment of Africans in Italian colonies.

However, there were examples of diversity:

- Political: The monarchy also continued and the King was a rival to Mussolini; the King removed Mussolini in 1943.
- Economic: In practice, Corporatism meant businesses bribed fascist officials to continue a liberal capitalist economic system; the state did not have control of the economic system.
- Religion: The Lateran Treaties emphasised that Catholicism existed as a rival ideology and the Pope was a rival to Mussolini.
- Culture: Anti-Semitism was not rigorously enforced due to the tolerance of the Italian people and Mussolini's lack of real commitment to the legislation; intellectual opposition allowed, e.g. Benedetto Croce.

Higher level answers will demonstrate judgement, perhaps by arguing that Italy politically was intolerant of diversity but that beyond the suppression of opposition, intolerance was part of the sham of Fascism.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Nazi ideology was anti-communist. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

- Nazism was nationalistic, viewing other races as the enemy. Communism was internationalist.
- Nazism believed in struggle (competition), rather than state intervention to create unnatural equality.
- Communist revolutionaries were blamed for undermining the war effort in 1918 and the Nazi Party was a party of First World War veterans.

-
- Hitler Nazism was anti-Semitic and communism was seen as being Jewish; Marx, Trotsky and the leaders of the Red Republic in Bavaria in 1918 were Jewish.

Higher level answers will make links between the importance of Hitler and his beliefs and the general nationalist climate in Germany following the First World War.

- (b) How important was fear of communism in explaining the rise to power of Hitler and the Nazi Party between 1928 and March 1933? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

- The growth of the KPD (54; 77; 89; 100; 121 seats) terrified the middle-class who feared revolution.
- The Communists were seen as traitors with a loyalty to the USSR.
- The Nazis and the SA offered protection from the KPD.
- Hindenburg offered Hitler the Chancellorship because he was the only alternative, other than the communists who were beyond the pale.
- The KPD was blamed for the Reichstag Fire and banned by the Emergency Decree. This helped the Nazis win 288 seats in the March 1933 election.

However, there were clearly other factors.

- The Nazi Party had a modern, dynamic, charismatic leadership offering a rebirth of a great Germany. Enhanced by propaganda (Hugenberg's media empire used to give exposure, 'Führer over Germany' campaign) and Hitler's personality (young, charismatic, brilliant orator)
- they offered an end to democracy and weak government (15 Chancellors in 14 years would be replaced by the Führer and dictatorship), as well as jobs for the unemployed and school-leavers
- agricultural depression – foot and mouth 1927, collapse in grain prices following removal of protective tariffs, poor harvest in 1927. Nazis promised to restore tariffs, tackle the (Jewish owned) banks and restore lost land
- Wall St Crash, October 1929: 2 million unemployed in 1930 rose to 5.9 million in 1932. *Mittelstad* feared loss of status and slipping into the lower classes.
- Successive governments failed to solve the economic and political problems – Muller's coalition collapsed over disagreements about cutting expenditure. Brüning waited for unemployed to blow itself out, von Papen and von Schleicher failed to form workable coalitions and control street violence
- the role of Hindenburg, and how he was influenced by the army, von Papen and Schacht.

Higher level answers will demonstrate judgement by recognising the connection between the anti-communist message and the effectiveness of Nazi propaganda, or between the economic circumstances and the growth of communism after 1929.