



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme January 2003

---

## GCE

### History

## Alternative E: Units 1 and 4

---

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334  
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ  
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

## General Guidance for Examiners: AS and A2 examination papers

### A: Introduction

The AQA's revised AS/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 specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

The revised 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 new 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 AS and 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 and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

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 for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

**B: Exemplification of AS Level descriptors****Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

**Level 2:**

*Either*

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

*Or*

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

**Level 5:**

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**C: 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.

**D: 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.



**Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941****AS Unit 1: Germany and Russia before the First World War, 1870-1914****Question 1****(a) Use Source A and your own knowledge.**

**Explain briefly the significance of Pan-Slavism in relation to the aims of Russian foreign policy.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. Russia's aim, as a Slav nation, to protect the Christian states in the Balkans such as Bulgaria and Serbia from Turkish oppression. **1**

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. a nationalist movement promoting Russia's mission to create independent Slav states under her protection; but also appreciating Pan-Slavism as a cloak for Russia's broader political and military ambitions in the Balkans. Also conflict with Austria-Hungary in the Balkans. **2-3**

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

**With reference to the Franco-Russian Alliance, explain how the views in Source C differ from the views put forward in Source B.**

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the Sources differ, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full effective answers which do not explicitly contain 'own knowledge'. The effectiveness of the comparison will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to 'pieces' of factual content.

*Target: AO1.2, AO2*

L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. briefly summarising the points in common with Source B, and the differences in Source C. **1-2**

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source B emphasises the context around 1890 with a common fear of Germany, diplomatic isolation and economic links, despite cultural barriers; C focuses on the unnatural union between a democratic republic and an autocratic state and emphasises the broader diplomatic repercussions. Germany's failure to renew the Reinsurance Treaty made it easier. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge of the issue and draws conclusions, e.g. as above, but perhaps commenting on the end of Bismarck's network of alliances, and a Europe split diplomatically into two, as the common needs of Russia and France override cultural barriers. **6-7**

- (c) **Use Sources A, B and C, and your own knowledge.**  
**Explain why Russian foreign policy in the years 1890 to 1914 caused international tension in Europe.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO3*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based on *either* own knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*  
Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or*  
Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description but will have valid links.
- Or*  
Demonstrates by limited selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

From the sources, candidates should identify in Source A the context and direction of Russian ambitions, her isolation and existing international tensions. Source B provides some details of existing tensions around 1890 and reasons for the alliance with France – lengthy negotiations perhaps indicating some Russian reluctance, and France had to wait until 1894 for the Tsar's confirmation of the alliance. The military commitment arguably had limited bearing on international relations until 1914. Source C emphasises the fundamental diplomatic revolution and split within Europe, which caused international tension.

From own knowledge, the Franco-Russian Alliance ominously divided Europe into the two sides which would fight the First World War, with Britain's position remaining unclear. For Russia and France, fear of German belligerence outweighed national differences and traditional enmity as economic co-operation led to a full-blown military alliance. However, after 1890 Russia diverted herself to the Far East for the next 15 years without allied support, leading to defeat by Japan. Arguably, during this period, the initiatives of Germany and France had more bearing on international tension. German *Weltpolitik* also helped to polarise international relations with aggressive diplomacy, e.g. in Morocco. The Entente Cordiale resulted mainly from French initiative, with the Anglo-Russian agreement as a remaining loose-end, settling colonial differences. Russian defeat in the Far East redirected her foreign policy to the Balkans and intensified the need for protective allies. This was crucial in heightening tension in the years 1908-14, as Russia developed relations with Serbia. The Bosnian crisis was to be an ominous turning point, yet Russia tried to negotiate with Austria-Hungary and received no help from France or Britain. From 1909, Russia became increasingly

involved in the growing Balkan conflict – the Balkan Wars favoured Serb/Russian interests and increased the likelihood of European war. In 1914, France was obliged to stand by her defensive alliance with Russia.

L1 will focus on a limited range of points, perhaps concentrating on the Franco-Russian Alliance through the sources, or on the crisis of 1914. L2 will provide more of a range of evidence but may still be unbalanced, and over most of the period will tend to describe events up to 1914 with limited specific reference to the question. L3 should make some clear response to Russian foreign policy in relation to international tension – some use of sources must be included. This approach should be developed and be more balanced at L4, with some explanation of Russia's impact on the broader picture, e.g. the effect of the Franco-Russian Alliance on Germany military planning in the form of the Schlieffen Plan. Such an overview would be developed at L5, effectively slotting Russia into the broader perspective, e.g. examining the repercussions of 1908 on the 1914 crisis.

**Question 2**

- (a) **What is meant by “anti-socialist legislation” in relation to German domestic policy in the late 1870s?**

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. repressive measures taken against the SPD. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. emergency measures banning Socialist meetings, publications, outlawing trade unions etc, but did not ban the party directly or in parliament. Exceptional Laws. **2-3**

- (b) **Explain why Bismarck introduced anti-socialist legislation in the late 1870s.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. two assassination attempts, fear of socialism and revolution. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. working-class organisation with a Marxist tone, a fast growing party in 1877 with almost half a million votes, 9% of the electorate and 12 MPs. The Junkers were appalled at the long-term plans for a socialist state with international links, which would undermine the constitution, the economic structure of Germany and the dominance of the Junker elite. 1878 political context valid. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. as above, but perhaps also commenting on the almost obsessive over-reaction of the German leadership. **6-7**

- (c) “German governments between 1878 and 1914 failed to control the growth of the Social Democratic Party.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion.

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*  
Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

With many arrests, there was an initial drop in support but the party itself was not banned and support grew again in the 1880s. Bismarck failed in his political purpose but formed the foundations of a paternalist state through state socialism and the most progressive welfare reforms in the world at this time in an attempt to outbid the SPD for workers' support. Arguably, Bismarck defused the threat of large-scale working class opposition for the moment, but the attempt to impose new anti-socialist laws in 1890 was perhaps an admission of defeat and in part led to his resignation. There was more integration than confrontation after 1890, and with less repression the party went from strength to strength, including a cultural and education network, and was largely law abiding. In spite of William II's hysterical outbursts that socialists could not be good Germans, there was further social legislation from Caprivi and Posadowsky. Sammlungs politik can be regarded as an attempt to limit the appeal of the Social Democrats, and to rally the masses away from social and political reform. This nationalistic platform halved SPD seats in 1907 from 81 to 43, but with a rising cost of living, this rebounded in 1912 as one in three Germans voted SPD; with 4.25m votes and 110 out of 397 seats, the SPD were the largest party. Yet in 1914, the SPD loyally supported the government and millions of workers did their patriotic duty.

L1 will provide a restricted narrative, perhaps limited to Bismarck's regime. L2 will have more range, but might be mainly descriptive with only general or implicit links to the question and may still concentrate on the early part of the period. L3 should include evidence both pre- and post 1890, and at least signs of some qualified explanation beyond a bland acceptance of the proposition but may still be unbalanced. L4 might develop the explanation to consider the changes in approach of the government over the period, and whether the SPD was reformist or revolutionary. L5 should reach some judgement on such issues.

**Question 3**

- (a) **What is meant by “a Duma” in relation to the concessions made by Tsar Nicholas II in October 1905?**

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. an elected assembly or parliament. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. the lower house of a two-chamber National Assembly with legislative (not consultative) powers, elected on a broad franchise with the promise of civil rights. **2-3**

- (b) **Explain why Tsar Nicholas II agreed to the creation of a Duma in October 1905.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to stem the tide of Revolution. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. on Witte’s advice, against such extensive opposition, an opportunity to regroup; military dictatorship was the only alternative to making concessions. This would satisfy the liberals and divide the opposition forces. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and priorities, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. as above, but perhaps commenting more cynically on a short-term emergency measure to split the opposition and end the Revolution before taking repressive measures against the workers. Not seen as a limit on autocracy, as the Fundamental Laws would confirm. **6-7**

- (c) “In the years 1905 to 1914, a skilful blend of repression and reform stabilised the tsarist regime.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement.

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range or precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

#### **Indicative content**

Reform: the October Manifesto and the Dumas can be seen as a major political advance potentially stabilising the regime by marking the end of absolutism and the start of power sharing in a constitutional monarchy, skilfully restoring political control after the 1905 Revolution. The end of redemption payments and Stolypin’s land reforms would promote a class of independent loyal peasant farmers. Education and health services were also extended. Repression: loyal troops suppressed the workers and soviets in 1905; using the Okhrana, ‘Stolypin’s Necktie’ would lead to thousands of executions in rural areas; the Lena Goldfields incident in 1912 in response to increasing strike action. Politically, the Fundamental Laws, the dismissal of the early Dumas and Stolypin’s doctoring of the electoral system undermined the prospects of stability. Skilful blend: could be applied to Witte in 1905 and later Stolypin, but not Nicholas II whose dismissal of Witte and lack of support for Stolypin confirmed his stubborn belief in autocracy and his short-sighted political double-dealing. Stability: short-term after 1905, but very debatable by 1914.

L1 will provide only partial or generalised coverage, probably on 1905 or the Dumas. L2 will include more range, but will tend to be a narrative of events from 1905-14. L3 should provide some focused explanation in context for repression and reform, but this will not be balanced. Responses at L4 should relate the explanation and analysis to the theme of stability. Judgement at L5 might integrate all the key components of the Key Questions.

**AS Unit 4: Germany, Russia and Soviet Union, in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries****Section A: Autocracy and Reform in Germany and Russia, 1825-1939****Question 1**

- (a) **Use Source A and your own knowledge.**  
**Explain what is meant by “conservatism” in the context of reforms in Russia in the 1860s.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. opposed to change, not committed to reform. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn from either the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. to preserve existing institutions and traditions, to strengthen the Tsar’s authority and retain autocracy; commenting on the inadequacy of reforms which were not followed through and only brought about by defeat in the Crimea. **2-3**
- L3: As Level 2, with developed references to both source and own knowledge. The reforms were determined by expediency and not by principle, trying to preserve a perhaps doomed political system, and failing to appreciate the political context and the repercussions of any changes. **4-5**

- (b) **Use Sources C and D and your own knowledge.**  
**Comment on the usefulness of these two sources in explaining how Stalin and Hitler sought to justify the reasons for dictatorship in the USSR and Germany.**

*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 some explicit understanding of utility with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue, or tackles utility in general terms or broad context. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility in relation to the issue, with reference to both source and to own knowledge, with development on one source, or limited conclusions for both. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility in relation to the issue. Developed response for both sources. **9-10**

**Indicative content**

Answers at L1 might identify from these sources the fear of foreign nations (C) and the fear of left-wing extremism (D) to justify future policies. At L2, candidates should begin to appreciate and explain the broader context of these sources, perhaps recognising their propaganda value, as both leaders seek to justify the major changes ahead. C emphasises a central theme of Stalinist indoctrination – the need for national survival as a justification for extreme measures: economic overhaul and centralised control to consolidate Stalin’s political authority. Hitler in (D) blames the state of Germany on the failed Weimar Republic and on Communist terror, to promote an election victory for the Nazis and a two-thirds majority to be able to destroy the constitution. By L3, candidates should show a clear insight into the utility of the sources as propaganda, appreciating their importance in trying to galvanise these nations into supporting the new regimes. At L4, conclusions should be developed, perhaps with signs of integration. Comment could be



made on the timing of the sources. With parts of Soviet Russia in a virtual state of civil war in the struggle with the Kulaks, Stalin is under pressure to ‘slow down the tempo’; but to promote ‘Socialism in One Country’ through the Five Year Plans, Stalin argues that the very survival of the Revolution depends on turning the USSR into a modern industrial state in the shortest possible time. Hitler’s speech in Source D is made on his first full day as Chancellor, effectively setting the tone for the forthcoming election, as he plays on the inner feelings of many Germans in the context of political and economic turmoil.

- (c) **Use Sources A, B, C and D, and use your own knowledge.**  
**With reference to these four sources and your own knowledge, assess the reasons why, despite radical changes in government, autocratic rule was able to survive in Russia and Germany during the period 1825 to 1939.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-4**
- 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. **5-8**
- 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. **9-11**
- 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. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

This is a synoptic question and candidates’ responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over the period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content. Candidates will not be expected to demonstrate knowledge of the whole period in the same depth, but they should be able to identify the main turning points in terms of changes in government in both Russia and Germany over the period in question and comment, using both sources and knowledge, on the survival of autocratic regimes, showing some understanding of the changing political context in each state. For Russia, candidates should use the context and content of Source A to assess the tsarist attitude to political change, considering in particular the motives of Alexander II for reform and his later retraction, and the attitude of Nicholas II to the Dumas after the 1905 Revolution. The events of 1917 arguably mark the most radical changes in government in Russia, and candidates should provide some evidence to explain the failure of the Provisional Government after the

abdication of the monarchy, and the emergence of a Bolshevik dictatorship. Following the Civil War, the death of Lenin and the less prescriptive NEP, Source C should be harnessed to assess the reasons for the development of Stalin's totalitarian regime. In a similar way for Germany, Source B could be used to focus on the attitudes to change in the period up to 1914, with reference to the failure of the 1848 Revolution, and particularly to Bismarck's semi-autocratic rule, continued under Kaiser William II. Once again, the end of World War One marks a radical change in government, and Source D can be used to assess the reasons for the failure of the Weimar regime, and the emergence of a Nazi dictatorship under Hitler.

L1 will only include a narrow range of evidence and will lack balance between the states. L2 should provide a better balance, but the review of the period will be limited, presenting a mainly generalised focus. By L3, there will be a clear grasp of autocratic rule in relation to radical changes in government, with more balance in terms of the range and use of sources and own knowledge, with some appreciation of the changing contexts over the 100 years. Signs of integration might be evident at L4, drawing out the parallels between the two states. At L5, judgement and conclusions will reveal an effective overview and thorough understanding of the issues over most of the period and between the two states.

**Section B: European Dictatorships in the Inter-War Years**

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

Answers 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**

**Question 2**

**“The successful rise to power of the Nazi and Communist dictators was more the result of the personal strengths and qualities of Hitler and Stalin, than the weaknesses of their political opponents.”**

**Assess the validity of this verdict in comparing the reasons for the rise to power of Hitler and Stalin.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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**

In comparing the rise to power of the two dictators, candidates will need to assess a range of issues: leadership skills, opponents' weaknesses and also other appropriate factors. Hitler was extremely talented as an orator, with charisma and emotional appeal, successfully pinpointing the frustrations of many Germans. He skilfully bided his time after 1930 and out-thought those who believed they could tame him. Hitler's personal authority, however, was ensured and complemented by the party organisation and ideology, and he was ably supported by Goebbels' propaganda and financial backing. Hitler's own strengths did not extend to party administration. As for Hitler's opponents, political intrigue, self-interest and fatal under-estimation after 1930 certainly played into his hands with the use of emergency powers under Article 48 and the effective end of true parliamentary government. The rivalry between Papen and Schleicher and Hindenburg's vulnerability gave Hitler scope to use his political skills, as did the broader political and economic context of Weimar Germany – constitutional weakness with continued coalition government under proportional representation; economic instability peaking with the impact of the Wall St Crash on Germany, providing Hitler with an electoral breakthrough, as the German people turned to political extremism and the conservative elites united around the Nazi alternative.

Stalin's strengths and qualities were, in contrast, far less extrovert and much more manipulative with a superb grasp of political tactics. His power base as General Secretary and within the politburo and triumvirate made Stalin the indispensable link in the party and government network, with the influential power of patronage. His personal ruthlessness would serve him well in his 'divide and rule' tactics against Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev and the Right Communists. His 'Socialism in One Country' proved to be a skilful and pragmatic approach to future policy. Against all this are the divisions, errors, tactics, policies and over-confidence of his opponents, who virtually destroyed each other in fatally under-estimating Stalin. In particular, candidates might single out Trotsky's mistakes and weaknesses, his lack of a power base, his persistent adherence to World Revolution and factional collusion with other opponents. Stalin's success also included some element of good fortune, with no clear power structure handed down from Lenin, and over the Testament and the 1926 harvest.

L1 might only tackle one dictator, or two in minimal detail, providing a condensed narrative summary of the rise to power. L2 will respond to both dictators but will be mainly a general descriptive narrative, with little sign of comparison except as broad links. At L3, candidates will respond explicitly to the question and start to compare. This should be effectively integrated by L4, perhaps comparing the different political contexts and opposition, and the contrasting personalities – the extrovert talents of Hitler with the more introspective machinations of Stalin. L5 will sustain this approach and present a convincing comparison.

**Question 3**

**“The Nazi state provided clear leadership and a well-ordered system of government.”**

**“The Third Reich was a mixture of rival hierarchies, competing centres of power and ambiguous chains of command.”**

**Which of these two statements is the more appropriate in assessing the nature of political power and control in Nazi Germany in the years 1933 to 1939? Refer to both statements in your answer.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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 have to consider these issues from a number of perspectives – the political structure of the Nazi state, the process of decision making, and the role of Hitler and the Nazi Party. At first sight, the power structure of the Nazi state seems simple and efficient, with Germany dominated by a single political party and the authority of one man. The alternative view, however, identifies a hotchpotch of overlapping institutions. Hitler had no blueprint in 1933 for constructing a specifically Nazi state and most existing officials kept their posts. Candidates will need to assess Hitler’s own role. The ‘leadership principle’ (Führerprinzip) ensured his personal authority and unquestioning obedience at all levels, yet he remained remote from day-to-day government, bored by administrative detail and organisation. Goebbels’ propaganda carefully cultivated an image of self-confident and charismatic leadership, a powerful Hitler myth. In 1933, the Nazis simply took over the existing state structure and constructed another on top of it, resulting in administrative duplication and conflict between officials in central and local government. The old ministerial hierarchies and a range of new party bodies competed for political power and control instead of developing a consensus for future action. The confusion was compounded by an array of ad hoc agencies and individual power bases, such as the Office of the Deputy Führer and Himmler’s SS/Gestapo/SD complex. Candidates might consider whether this organised chaos was Hitler’s way of maintaining his own position, or merely unintended confusion (intentionalist/structuralist).

L1 might simply accept one viewpoint and concentrate solely on Hitler. L2 will respond to both but may not be balanced, and will tend to be descriptive narrative mainly focusing on leadership. L3 should focus specifically on the two quotations with a clear attempt at assessment and a more balanced range of evidence. At L4, candidates might make some response to ‘nature’ and discuss a range of interpretations in assessing political power and control. This sort of overview would be developed at L5.

**Question 4**

**“The costs far outweighed the benefits.”**

**How accurate is this assessment of the economic and social impact of Stalin’s dictatorship in the years 1928 to 1939?**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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**

For the government and party, the benefits seemed clear – the true dawn of Socialism, the end of the class struggle with the transformation of Soviet society, and a planned, centralised economy to consolidate political power and bring national survival. The peasant base of the USSR had to be changed if the economy and society were to be modernised, but the means led to brutality and death. It is difficult to see anything positive from collectivisation to benefit either the state or the people – decline in production, loss of livestock and a vast toll in human lives, with the elimination of the Kulaks and rural famine. The much-heralded mechanisation was slow to arrive. The meagre gain of a surplus peasant labour force would benefit industrialisation and shift the balance of the workforce. The Five Year Plans brought to industry the benefits of increased production, better communications, new resources, and key developments in the iron, oil and electricity industries. For the majority, the cost included living in over-crowded squalor and appalling working conditions – repression, coercion, workbooks, labour camps etc – which undermined the social fabric through fear and alienation. The costs of administrative inefficiency and a lack of realism with unrealistic production quotas were paid by ‘saboteurs’ and ‘wreckers’, and those who placed selfish material gain above benefits for the nation. The fracturing of society by enforced collectivisation and industrialisation was predominantly negative, but this was a social revolution of massive proportions which did bring upward mobility for many. Candidates might include comment on such issues as urbanisation, education, literacy and training, women and the family, religion, health services etc. Many of the perceived benefits seemed no more than propaganda projections.

L1 may only provide a narrow focus, with sweeping assertion on the costs. L2 might concentrate on a review of the Five Year Plans with only general analytical links. By L3, there should be some appreciation of the full scope of the question, although the response may be predominantly economic. Social aspects should show some development at L4 with a broadening of the analysis – what choices did Stalin have in trying to industrialise an agrarian society in the shortest possible time? L5 should analyse a full range of issues and reach some conclusions.