

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative E Units 1 and 4 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

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 © 2005 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.

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 AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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.

January 2005**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 importance of the May Laws of 1872–73 in relation to Bismarck's policies against the Catholic Church. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. far-reaching repressive measures against the Church. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. provides details of the series of measures promoted by Falk to undermine the influence of the Catholic Church in education, religion and politics, which initiated the Kulturkampf and united the Protestants in the Reichstag. **2-3**

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

With reference to Bismarck's motives for the Kulturkampf, explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A**. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. provides a basic contrast in only general terms, referring to the political focus of Source A and the broader context of Source B. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge e.g. Source A comments on Bismarck's motives in terms of the immediate political context, needing the support of the National Liberals and concerned that the Centre Party was attracting his enemies. This was also a response to the significant growth of this new party and the size of the 40% Catholic minority in the new Germany. Source B, in contrast, focuses on broader religious and longer-term political issues, as another stage in the on-going struggle between Church and

State. His denial of a more immediate context could be countered by reference to Papal Infallibility. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as above, but perhaps recognising and commenting that this ‘Culture Struggle’ functioned on several levels, as Bismarck attempted to consolidate the influence of Protestant Prussia in the new Germany, and secure his own support in the Reichstag by appeasing the National Liberals. **6-7**

(c) Use **Source A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of repressive policies, in relation to other factors, in Bismarck’s attempts to retain political control in Germany between 1871 and 1890. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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 *either* on own knowledge *or* the 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 descriptions, 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 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* from own knowledge, 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 and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources, Source A identifies the first use of repressive measures against the Catholics – a test case for Bismarck’s political control of the Reichstag. In Source B, Bismarck defends the policy to the non-elected Bundesrat in more nationalist terms, as his

duty to defend the state. Source C focuses on the importance in terms of effectiveness, with plenty of evidence on the negative repercussions of repression. This source also raises alternative approaches to retaining political control.

From own knowledge, candidates should provide balanced evidence covering the Liberal Era and its termination in 1879, Bismarck's handling of the Kulturkampf and his response to the perceived threat of the Socialists. Repressive policies against the Catholics failed and had to be reversed – this was more political retreat than control; measures against the Socialists seemed equally miscalculated, revealing Bismarck's obsession with this threat, and merely slowed down the party's growth. Candidates should include alternative approaches to retain control, especially Bismarck's skilful manoeuvring between the parties to retain support, particularly evident in 1878–79; and also the concessions to the Liberals in the 1870s and welfare reforms in the 1880s, although the latter reflected pressure on Bismarck rather than his political control. The constitutional context is also relevant, providing strong executive control for Bismarck, although, in this context, the repressive anti-Socialist Laws led, in part, to his resignation. Bismarck's relationship with the Kaisers might also be included in terms of political control.

Level 1 will provide only partial coverage or a limited summary. More range will be evident at Level 2, but may describe measures against the Catholics and Socialists with little comment. By Level 3, some source evidence must be included, with some explicit focus on the question and attempt to assess, at least in terms of effectiveness. There should be more balance and development at Level 4, including other approaches and perhaps some constitutional context, commenting on Bismarck constantly having to change his tactics. Conclusions at Level 5 might debate whether conciliation might have been more effective than repression.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the “Socialist Revolutionary Party” in relation to political opposition in Russia before 1905. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. an extremist left-wing group wanting immediate revolution – the party of the peasants. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. developing from the Populist movement and principally focused on the peasantry, but more successful in goading the peasants into action, promising ownership of land without compensation. More feared by the authorities than the Marxists as a dangerous terrorist faction, carrying out more than 2000 assassinations up to 1905. 2-3

- (b) Explain why political opposition to the regime of Tsar Nicholas II grew in Russia in the years before 1905. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. reference to the growing population, increasing poverty, lack of reform etc.. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. at this level, candidates will tend to list a range of factors, including continuing land hunger in rural areas, bad housing and working conditions in towns and cities, government repression and incompetence, lack of political reform and the economic slump after 1900 creating unemployed, disillusioned workers. Candidates might also identify a range of opposition groups. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as L2, but perhaps pinpointing the different aims of a range of opposition groups, and distinguishing between the moderate reformist liberals and the extreme revolutionary parties. **6-7**

- (c) “In the years 1894 to 1914, governments in Russia actively promoted economic modernisation but remained opposed to any political change.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- 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. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some 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 relevant 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 and 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

Witte's achievements in the 1890s provide evidence of economic modernisation – 8% growth, with expansion in railways and heavy industry, an increasing industrial labour force, monetary stability etc. Yet how fully this was actively promoted by the government is debatable – agriculture remained backward and neglected, there was little development of an internal market in Russia, and Witte's policies seemed to be pursued in isolation with little coherent government support, and he was finally dismissed. There was further industrial expansion after 1905, and also Stolypin's important land reforms which also had a political context of aiming to 'derevolutionise the peasantry', but he too received a similar lack of support, and was already out of favour before his assassination. In terms of political change before 1905, government repression dominated, with the continued use of emergency state powers and the Okhrana, no legal political parties or trade unions, and parliamentary reforms regarded as 'senseless dreams'. However, from 1905, the October Manifesto and the Dumas can be seen as a major political advance marking the start of power sharing in a constitutional democracy. Yet, of course, the Fundamental Laws, the dismissal of the early Dumas and Stolypin's doctoring of the electoral system all undermined any expectations of genuine political change.

Level 1 will provide only a partial coverage of this content or a limited general summary. Level 2 should show more range and will include both aspects, but may be narrative based, perhaps concentrating on Witte or on the political reforms after 1905, but with little comment. Some signs of explicit assessment on both areas should be evident at Level 3, but this will not be balanced or developed. By Level 4, there should be some clear insight into both the economic and political aspects, and into the connections between them. In reaching conclusions at Level 5, candidates might explain how political change could not be divorced from economic progress.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the "Reinsurance Treaty" in relation to German foreign policy. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a final desperate bid to remain on good terms with Russia. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. following the breakdown of the Dreikaiserbund, Bismarck feared a Franco-Russian Alliance and took the initiative to reassure Russia, recognising her claims in Bulgaria and promising neutrality in a war with Austria. The treaty was secret since it contravened the spirit of the Dual Alliance. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Germany allowed the Reinsurance Treaty to lapse in 1890. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. commenting on the fall of Bismarck and the end of his alliance network. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. this treaty was one area of disagreement that led to Bismarck's resignation. Despite Russia's request for renewal, Germany was already losing touch with Russia, as French loans instead of German money now helped to finance Russian industrial development. The treaty had been a desperate last throw in Bismarck's alliance system and was incompatible with the Dual Alliance. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as L2, the new Kaiser Wilhelm II was looking for a change of direction and a more assertive approach, and saw little benefit for Germany from an alliance with Russia. **6-7**

- (c) "The main aim of German foreign policy after 1890 was to distract attention away from domestic problems."
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- 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. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some 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 relevant 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 and 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

Clearly a range of foreign policy aims needs to be considered. From the government's perspective, domestic problems reflected a fear of working class dominance as a consequence of increased industrialisation, with a growth of socialism and social divisions, and increasing criticism of strong executive rule with little democratic accountability. A more assertive foreign policy would promote a new strident nationalism to distract the working classes away from social and economic issues, and buttress the position of the ruling and traditional elites. This *Sammlungspolitik* would rally the country and the political parties, with the navy and colonial gains becoming new objects of patriotic pride, and the Navy Laws encouraging political support for the government. The growth in the number of seats for the SPD from 35 in 1890 to 110 in 1912 would seem to confirm the government's worst fears, and some historians consider the military push for war in 1914 as the ultimate distraction.

Candidates, of course, should consider other foreign policy aims. The New Course and Weltpolitik can be seen as ends in themselves in terms of military and naval dominance, with colonial expansion as a threat to Britain and France, and naval development perhaps intended to unnerve Britain into making an alliance. Foreign policy can also be seen as a drive for new markets and raw materials, as well as national status and prestige, perhaps even 'a bid for world power' (Fischer). The role of the ambitious, impetuous and unpredictable Kaiser Wilhelm II can also be made central to the debate. Frustrated with meagre gains under Bismarck, and jealous of Britain's empire and navy, foreign policy for the Kaiser represented a bid for personal control of Germany.

Level 1 will provide only a partial coverage or a generalised summary. Level 2 will have more range but may be unbalanced – possibly accepting or rejecting the proposition, and perhaps concentrating on Weltpolitik and the Kaiser. Level 3 should provide some explicit focus, beginning to assess a range of aims and motives, but still without balance or development. Such development at Level 4 should focus on the question of 'main aim' and consider whether such distraction was the primary purpose or a desirable side-effect. Judgement at Level 5 should show some integration of domestic and foreign policy issues.

January 2005**Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941****A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries****Question 1**

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

How fully does the view put forward in **Source A** of the reasons for the failure of popular uprisings in the Germany states in 1848 agree with the view put forward in **Source B** of the reasons for the failure of those in Russia in 1905? (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 utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 might provide a summary of the sources in broad and general terms, describing some reasons for failure. Responses at Level 2 may also be source-led and may still be restricted to a general context, with only limited supporting own knowledge to develop the precise contexts, and limited development in terms of 'how fully'. Candidates might focus on the key role of the liberal middle classes in both sources, and the use of the military in Source B. Both range of knowledge and evaluation should be explicit at Level 3, with some conclusions reached. Candidates might emphasise the broad similarities in the patterns of events for 1848 and 1905, including the differing expectations of different social groups, the significance of the concessions made by governments, and the use of loyal forces in both states to regain control. In 1848, the issue of German unification was a further complication, and the drawn-out debates of the elected Frankfurt Parliament on constitutional monarchy and fundamental rights missed the opportunity for national unity. In Russia, the scale of opposition by October made concessions inevitable, and the government's timely reforms divided the opposition and enabled the regime to use military force. At this level, candidates must show some explicit insight beyond source content, but coverage will either be 'thin' for both sources, or developed for one. Answers at Level 4 should be as above for Level 3, but with a more developed insight into the differing contexts of 1848 and 1905 from both sources.

- (b) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

“In both states, there was more support for strong autocratic governments than for democratic reform movements.”

Assess the accuracy of this view with reference to **both Russia and Germany** during the period 1825 to 1939. (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.

Candidates will not be expected to demonstrate knowledge of the whole period in the same depth, but should be able to distinguish between the different political contexts and select evidence over the period about the nature of support in these states, achieving some element of balance in terms of coverage and use of own knowledge/sources, and some appreciation of the changes and developments over the period in relation to the question. Candidates will need to identify the varied aims of different social groups in terms of support. The upper-class elites in government and the civil service, the judiciary, military and economic development, had a vested interest in resisting change and supporting autocratic regimes.

The middle classes wanted constitutional change to increase their political influence but fear of mob violence frightened this group into supporting the status quo. The majority peasants and the growing numbers of factory workers were more interested in economic issues than political reform. The minority who supported reform movements were regarded as extremists before the 20th century, with the majority of people deferentially accepting autocratic governments.

Governments in Russia before 1905 seemed almost feudal in nature, with divine right autocracy largely accepted with unquestioned loyalty – there was no parliament, and no legal political parties or trade unions. Source B can be used to begin focusing on the first turning point of the 1905 Revolution, and the parliamentary experiment which followed. The political upheaval of 1917 resulted mainly from the scale of economic problems and government incompetence brought on by the war. The ‘democratic’ Provisional Government was overthrown before it could call an election and provoked little support. Source C can be linked to this, and to the Bolshevik Revolution. The regimes of Lenin and Stalin, although claiming power in the name of the people, merely became dictatorships of the proletariat. Source A can be used as a starting point for political consciousness in Germany. Following unification, Bismarck’s popular authoritarian regime was also conversely one of the most democratic in Europe, although support for liberal reforms and socialism gradually increased. As in Russia, the abdication of the monarchy was more closely related to the problems of war than demands for democratic change. Source D begins to highlight the attitude of Germans to the democratic Weimar Republic and the circumstances which led to increasing support for Hitler and the Nazis.

Level 1 will include only a narrow range of evidence and will lack balance between the states (or only include one state), perhaps just briefly summarising the sources. Level 2 should provide a better balance, but the review of the period will still be limited, presenting only a generalised focus in terms of support; the content might also be restricted to the context of the sources. By Level 3, both sources and own knowledge must be included, and there should be some clear signs of assessment and some appreciation of the different motives of various groups; but there will only be limited appreciation of the changing contexts over the 100 years. This should be more evident at Level 4 and include a range of evidence beyond the source contexts, with signs of an effective overview, highlighting the key changes and turning points in both states. This approach will be more developed and sustained at Level 5.

Section B

Question 2 onward

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)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- 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 to almost 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

How successful was Stalin in transforming the USSR from a predominantly agricultural country into a modern industrial state in the years 1928 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

The economic target was set by the 1926 Party Congress. Given the Soviet Union's backwardness, drastic action was needed, and the peasant base had to be changed if the economy was to be modernised. Candidates will need to appreciate the relationship between

agriculture and industry. Agriculture needed to be mechanised to provide more food for the growing towns and cities while transferring a large part of the rural population to urban industrial employment. Agriculture also had to produce a grain surplus to earn foreign currency to buy industrial capital equipment. Collectivisation was the solution. The role of Stalin in all this should be assessed – propaganda projected the leader as the creator of the modern economy, but did he achieve ruthless centralised efficiency or have only a limited understanding of the economic forces, losing the initiative to local managers? Stalin aimed to modernise the economy through collectivisation and industrialisation based on socialist values and centralised planning. Candidates will need to analyse the Five Year Plans in terms of the question.

Apart from the speed of the process of forced collectivisation, it is difficult to see anything positive in terms of agricultural success – 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, and agriculture arguably impeded the rate of industrial growth. For industry, the scale of transformation was impressive, generating capital, subordinating agriculture and effectively sealing off the USSR from the West. The Five Year Plans brought increased production, better communications, new resources, and key development in the iron, oil and electricity industries. However, for the Soviet people, this success meant a starved consumer sector, and daily repression with appalling working conditions and living in over-crowded squalor. Industrial development seemed at the expense of agriculture, with a clear lack of harmony between the different sectors – the perceived transformation seemed largely a propaganda projection. However, given the state of the economy in 1928, this was a massive step forward, even if the process was crude and chaotic – without such drastic measures, the Soviet Union could not have successfully mobilised for war.

Level 1 may only provide a narrow focus, with sweeping assertion on the question of transformation. Level 2 might concentrate on a review of the Five Year Plans with only general analytical links on success. There will be better range and balance at Level 3, with some attempt to assess transformation and some appreciation of the connections between agriculture and industry. These aspects will be developed at Level 4, with perhaps some response to Stalin's role. There will be an effective overview at Level 5, with balanced judgement on a full range of issues.

Question 3

How accurate is the view that the support of the German people for Hitler's regime from 1933 was more the result of propaganda than of the success of Nazi policies?

(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

In terms of support, the Nazis embodied many of the basic attitudes of a large section of the German people – there was an ideological consensus, based on national community, recalling a glorious past and strong leadership in a society where law and order were present and crime reduced to a minimum. The Nazis were already the most popular party by 1933, and successfully extended this support in the initial period through the atmosphere of national euphoria, and the early stages of the Nazification of German society and elimination of all opposition. Long-term indoctrination of the population involved regular exposure to official propaganda, effectively used especially via the radio, but the regime was never able to use the press to generate support, and bland journalism produced a decline of interest and sales. The most effective propaganda focus was of course Hitler himself – he used monopoly control of the media to good effect. If at times there was some general unease about the Nazi regime, Hitler struck a chord with the German people. The effectiveness of propaganda is difficult to assess in terms of genuine support – anti-church propaganda was arguably counter-productive. Perhaps propaganda mainly reinforced existing attitudes, or made people toe the line out of fear. However, for all Germans, life was punctuated by officially decreed festivals, rallies and mass demonstrations – such manipulation would surely not have worked without some solid foundation.

Successful policy achievements might also explain popular support – especially related to economic recovery, foreign policy, national pride and law and order. Such organisations as the DAF (Strength through Joy) had some success in making the German working class feel that there was now greater equality of opportunity in the Nazi *volksgemeinschaft*. Hopefully, candidates will want to distinguish between open enthusiastic support and begrudging more negative support – organised resistance was of course impossible and there no alternatives to Nazism; but not all groups of Germans supported the regime, and incidents such as ‘Kristallnacht’ were not popular among the order-loving German public.

Level 1 might produce limited examples of support. The same sort of approach is likely at Level 2 but in more detail, tending to describe support rather than assess the reasons for it. At Level 3, there should be some explicit focus on both central issues with some clear attempt to assess. More balance and development can be expected at Level 4, perhaps with some consideration of the different levels of support, distinguishing between Hitler and his regime, and considering any other factors. Overall judgement at Level 5 should present a convincing insight into these speculative issues.

Question 4

Compare the importance of the role of terror in securing Stalin’s dictatorship in the USSR from 1928 and Hitler’s dictatorship in Germany from 1933. (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

In Germany, terror and the threat of violence pervaded the whole Nazi state, with brutal and repressive policies preserving the regime and targeting enemies. Opponents were clear on the fate awaiting them, and fear encouraged public compliance and conformity. The forces of repression (SS/Gestapo/SD) were the driving force of Nazi ideology and racism, assailing all levels of society, eclipsing the SA and penetrating the army. However, in terms of securing control, propaganda and indoctrination seem equally important elements, directed especially towards education, youth and Hitler himself. The degree of popular support for the Nazis, the national consensus in terms of policies, and public denunciations to the Gestapo, all play down the role of terror.

In the USSR, Stalin's regime is associated with terror even more, on an unparalleled scale, with a complete purging of Soviet society. However, as well as being the central focus for consolidating political power, terror provides the impetus in pursuit of economic objectives. Paranoia spreads through society as terror gains a momentum of its own to maintain political control and cover over economic inefficiency and errors. As in Germany, the terror works in tandem with propaganda, complementing Stalin's personality cult, and identifying the real threat from saboteurs and external enemies. Most significantly, terror stimulated regional initiatives, and perhaps the state actually lost control to local Party officials.

Level 1 will provide limited examples of state terror. Answers covering only one state will be placed within this level. Level 2 will present more range, tackling both states, but the emphasis may tend towards factual narrative, with restricted analytical links and no real comparison. Some signs of comparison will be evident at Level 3, with some attempt to assess the importance of terror in relation to other factors. This will be more developed at Level 4 with some integration between the states – perhaps the forces of repression in the USSR were more effective than those in Hitler's Germany, but the Soviet Union had no equivalent to the SS – arguably the most ruthless aspect of state terror. Level 5 will provide a fully developed and integrated comparison covering a broad range of issues.