



## General Certificate of Education

# History 5041/6041

*Alternative E Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825–1941*

## Mark Scheme

*2006 examination – June series*

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

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

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners**

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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 C** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of ‘her place in the sun’ (line 4) in the context of the foreign policy of Kaiser Wilhelm II. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. some reference to colonial possessions. 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the search for an empire, having fallen behind in the race under Bismarck, along with the status and prestige as befitting a nation of Germany’s rank. This bold expansionist policy would result in Germany meddling almost at random in colonial issues. Candidates might also comment on the attempt to promote nationalism and patriotism in Germany in order to divert public attention away from difficulties at home 2-3

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

Explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A** about German foreign policy. (7 marks)

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. provides a basic contrast as a source summary, identifying the aggressive aims in Source A, and the less abrasive more diplomatic approach in Source B. 1-2

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. at the start of the expansionist phase of German foreign policy, Muller focuses on the core aspirations of colonies and naval growth. Weltpolitik, announced the following year, would concentrate on imperial expansion and military dominance. He also highlighted the belligerent tone behind the aims, being prepared from the start to risk war, enabling the Kaiser to play a key role in decision making. Bethmann Hollweg, in Source B, does accept the same broad aims

but, more than 10 years later, promotes a far less aggressive approach, seeing the risks for Germany in these aims. In aiming to regain the trust of other states, candidates might use their own knowledge to provide context, by referring to recent events in Morocco or Bosnia. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information for both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as above, with Source A encapsulating the rash, unthinking and unpredictable approach in the years to come. Source B is far more realistic in terms of achieving policy aims, but Bethmann Hollweg's experience and strengths did not lie in foreign affairs, and his appointment allowed the Kaiser and the military to take the initiative. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of Weltpolitik, in relation to other factors, in causing international tension in the years up to 1914. **(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 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* 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 C is a good starting point, providing key leads and links for candidates, e.g. the scale of German ambitions, the provocative and unthinking approach, and the reactions of other powers. Candidates should have little difficulty in exemplifying from their own knowledge the ruthless and risky approach shown in Source A. Source B shows the common-sense approach to foreign policy that some of the other powers wanted from Germany, but Bethmann Hollweg was not in a position to deliver.

From own knowledge, candidates should assess the impact of Weltpolitik on international relations. Details should be included of the naval rivalry with Britain. German expansion posed an unmistakable threat to British naval domination, and proved a serious misjudgement and miscalculation, starting a naval arms race which ultimately helped to force Britain into the Franco-Russian camp. The two Morocco crises of 1905 and 1911 could be used to exemplify the impact of colonial rivalry. The mentality of bluster and brinkmanship depicted by Weltpolitik, and highlighted in Germany's calculated risk-taking is also important in generating international tension and suspicion up to 1914. The sources can be used effectively here to assess this. In terms of other factors, a virtual diplomatic revolution occurred in the years around 1900 creating the two competing alliances which would go to war in 1914. However, this in turn marked the failure of German diplomacy, emphasising Germany's own encirclement. Events in the Balkans are also crucial in explaining the escalating international tensions, especially between Austria-Hungary, Russia and Serbia, and candidates might provide evidence of various crises from Bosnia in 1908 to the July crisis of 1914, including Germany's role.

Level 1 will provide only partial coverage, perhaps restricted to naval rivalry. Level 2 will include more range over the period up to 1914, but may tend to describe events rather than assess the impact of Weltpolitik. There should be some explicit focus at Level 3 in relation to international tension, with both sources and knowledge included. There should be evidence both of balance over the period and of development by Level 4, including some other factors, and perhaps commenting on the impact of Weltpolitik and of German diplomacy as the integrating factor. This sort of overview, reaching some conclusions, would be indicative of Level 5.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Russification' (line 3) in the context of tsarist Russia after 1881. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. a policy promoting Russian culture. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. trying to suppress the language, culture and characteristics of non-Russian nationalities (esp. Ukrainians, Poles and Jews), and to spread Russian culture in order to emphasise tsarist autocracy – Russians made up 55% of the empire. The policy awakened a dormant national consciousness among the minority states. **2-3**
-

- (b) Explain why tsarist governments wanted to promote industrial change. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements e.g. some broad reference to improving Russia or commenting on the backward economy. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through appropriately selected material. At this level, candidates might tend to include a list of factors. Given the lack of private initiative within Russia, with few entrepreneurs to provide capital and the majority of peasants tied to the mir, the state had to take the initiative. The government's motive for growth were more military than economic – in order to increase state power, status and prestige. With foreign loans, industrial change would utilise Russia's undeveloped resources and improve the infrastructure with the emphasis on heavy industry. Agriculture would be used as a source of revenue to finance industrialisation, with exorbitant taxation extracted at the cost of starvation. **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 significance, e.g. as Level 2, but perhaps commenting on the government's priorities of buttressing autocracy, political control and military efficiency. **6-7**

- (c) 'Dismissed as Finance Minister in 1903, and then dismissed as Prime Minister in 1906, Witte clearly failed to serve the needs of the tsarist regime.'  
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 relevant 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 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**

Higher level answers will show some clear insight into the question of ‘the needs of the tsarist regime’, contrasting the aims of Witte and the Tsar and his government in the appropriate economic and political context. Witte wanted to modernise Russia with progressive economic policies in order to sustain autocracy and retain Russia’s position as a great power. By 1905, however, he realised that autocracy had to be changed into a more constitutional regime. Both Alexander III and Nicholas II were staunch conservatives who feared the repercussions of economic change at too great a speed, and wanted to avoid political change altogether. Witte’s dismissals therefore need to be seen in context.

With Witte as Finance Minister from 1892, there followed a decade of remarkable economic achievement, clearly fulfilling the needs of the regime. During the ‘great spurt’ of the 1890s, there was 8% growth per annum, with massive economic expansion especially in heavy industry. Witte injected a new imaginative energy and urgency into economic affairs. Railway development doubled during this period, with the building of the Trans-Siberian Railway as the prestige project stimulating overall industrial development. He also established monetary stability, placing the rouble on the Gold Standard in 1897. Critics expressed concern at the dependence on foreign money and Russia became Europe’s largest debtor nation. The agricultural sector also remained backward and neglected, and Russia’s poor internal market was further hindered by high taxes and tariffs. However, Witte’s policies received significantly little government support. His dismissal in 1903 was mainly a reaction to the growing unrest and discontent in Russia caused by the European economic slump, as the Tsar was persuaded to dispense with Witte.

As Prime Minister in 1905, Witte played a key role in the survival of the regime by advising the Tsar to make concessions leading to the October Manifesto and the end of the 1905 Revolution. However, following the use of military force to eliminate remaining pockets of unrest, the Fundamental Laws (retaining wide powers for the Tsar), and a substantial loan from France, Witte was no longer needed by a Tsar determined to remain autocratic. Witte owed his position to Nicholas’s goodwill, and once again the weak Tsar was influenced by others to dismiss the Prime Minister in April 1906, undermining any realistic chances of the constitutional progress which the regime needed to make it survive.

Level 1 will provide a brief and limited summary, probably of economic changes in the 1890s. Level 2 will have more range, but may be over descriptive, accepting the question at face-value with little insight. Some explicit insight into ‘needs’ should be evident at Level 3, but assessment may focus predominantly on only one of the periods in question. There should be some developed assessment for both ministries at Level 4, perhaps seeing Witte’s policies as the best route for survival for the regime, as Russia started to fulfil her economic needs and potential. This sort of overview, with an attempt to offer judgement, would be indicative of Level 5.

**Question 3**

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘Junker’ (line 1) in the context of Bismarck’s domestic policy. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

L1: Basic or partial explanation of the term based largely on the extract, e.g. some reference to the privileged position of wealthy landowners. **1**

L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. like Bismarck, members of the Prussian aristocracy whose power rested on the ownership of large landed estates, and on their traditional role as members of the judiciary, army and civil service. Their position came increasingly under threat after 1871 as a result of industrialisation and economic growth, but, with Bismarck, they fought hard to safeguard their privileges and power. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bismarck and the National Liberal Party formed a political alliance in the years 1871 to 1878. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. Bismarck needed support in the Reichstag and had much common ground with the Liberals. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. from Bismarck’s perspective, this ‘Liberal Era’ stemmed, in practical terms, from the fact that the National Liberals were the largest party in the Reichstag (with 155 seats in 1874) and, with no party of his own, Bismarck could then form a majority with his other allies. As the party of big business, representing the Protestant middle-classes, the Liberals were also advocates of German unity, and supported Bismarck’s attempts to consolidate and centralise the administration of the Reich – e.g. new criminal codes, central bank, national currency, Gold Standard etc. The National Liberals also supported the anti-clerical laws of the Kulturkampf, against what they regarded as the regressive influences of the Catholic Church. In economic terms, they were wholehearted supporters of Bismarck’s free trade policies. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation, e.g. as Level 2, but making a clear distinction between Bismarck and the National Liberals, and perhaps commenting that Bismarck was clearly not a true liberal and relations between them were never easy – very much ‘a marriage of convenience’. The relationship was also on Bismarck’s terms, and he granted no political concessions. **6-7**

- (c) ‘In 1878–1879, Bismarck’s domestic policy changed direction as a result of economic rather than political pressures’.  
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 relevant issues. **5-8**
- 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 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 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**

Most candidates will display a range of knowledge to confirm the influence of both economic and political pressures, the higher-level answers should integrate these factors in their overall assessment.

Economic pressures must be seen in the context of the ‘Great Depression’ of the 1870s. After experiencing a rapid boom, the German economy suffered a serious financial crisis in 1873, followed by several years of much slower growth. After 20 years of uninterrupted economic growth, the psychological impact of the slump was considerable. In the 1870s, Russia, Austria-Hungary and France all set up highly protective tariffs and German manufacturers, facing stiff competition, agitated for protection. The Junker landowning interest also clamoured Bismarck for tariffs as the German agrarian sector had lost its markets in Britain and France because of cheap American wheat, and the home market itself was flooded by imported grain from the United States, Russia and Hungary. There were financial incentives too – tariffs would make Bismarck less reliant on imports and more independent of the individual states at a time of increasing expenditure on defence and welfare. However, the impact of the depression also undermined the political basis upon which Bismarck had founded his power in the early 1870s. Bismarck now wished to free himself from all dependence on the National Liberals (traditionally a free-trade party) and ingratiate himself with the Conservative groups in the Reichstag. The Catholic Centre Party might also be persuaded to support tariffs, but only if the Kulturkampf was ended.

In terms of political pressures, the Kulturkampf was proving futile and dangerous, with Germany dividing along denominational lines and mounting opposition from the royal family. Bismarck's persecution had clearly failed to weaken the Catholic Church, and he now wanted the Centre Party on his side against a potentially worse enemy, socialism. His retreat over the Kulturkampf also coincided with a change in his attitude to the National Liberals. Having wrangled with them over the military budget and with their leader, von Bennigsen, over ministerial appointments, Bismarck's annoyance increased when they voted against his anti-socialist legislation. There was also the emerging political pressure from the Social Democratic Party, which in 1877 gained ½ million votes and 12 seats, polling almost 10% of the votes. Bismarck became convinced of the need to suppress the socialist movement in Germany.

However, the change in direction in 1878–1879 actually resulted from unforeseen circumstances. The death of Pope Pius IX gave Bismarck the opportunity to negotiate his way out of the Kulturkampf with the more conciliatory Pope Leo XIII, and to improve relations with the Centre Party. Two attempts to assassinate the Kaiser also opened the way for Bismarck to gain majority support for his Anti-Socialist Law. The crisis of 1878–1879 solidified the 'alliance of steel and rye' and split the National Liberals.

Only a condensed summary will be evident at Level 1, with narrow focus. Level 2 will provide more range but may be over-descriptive, and may concentrate on either economic or political pressures, or only briefly on both. By Level 3, there should be some explicit signs of assessment, but this will be undeveloped and/or unbalanced. Development at Level 4 should recognise the clear relationship between economic and political pressures, and some integration should be evident. Level 5 should confirm a broad and balanced insight and include some judgement.



## **Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825–1941**

### **A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union in the 19th 20th Centuries**

#### **Section A: Autocracy and Reform in Germany and Russia, 1825–1939**

##### **Question 1**

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

How fully do these two sources explain the motives behind the reforming policies of Alexander II in Russia and Bismarck in Germany? (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 limited summary of the sources in broad and general terms, describing some motives for reform. Responses at Level 2 may also be source-led and may still be restricted to a broad context, with only limited supporting own knowledge to develop the precise contexts, and limited development in terms of ‘how fully’. For Alexander II, it was the trigger of defeat in war, and the need for a serf-free army to improve Russia’s military and defence capability. Military defeat highlighted Russia’s backwardness when compared with the West, and social change, economic progress and a higher world status would only occur if serfdom was abolished. Bismarck depicts the apparent concern of the state for the welfare of German workers in terms of employment and pension provision. Both range of knowledge and some evaluation should be explicit at Level 3, with some conclusions reached in terms of ‘how fully’. For Alexander II, the phrase “full weight of his autocratic powers” should provide candidates with some insight into his motives of making tsarist rule more effective and Russia more efficient, as well as responding to the growing unrest among serfs, with fears of revolution from below. Serfs drafted into the army expected that the end of the Crimean War would bring them freedom. The accession of a new Tsar also provided the opportunity for change. The mention in Source B of “more content” and “soften the anxiety” provides an equivalent insight. This state socialism needs to be seen in the context of Bismarck’s fear of socialism, the growth of the SPD and the failure of the anti-socialist legislation. Essentially, this was ‘conservatism through reform’ in order to buttress Bismarck’s political dominance. At this level, candidates must show some explicit insight beyond source content, but coverage will 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 for both sources, perhaps recognising the parallels between the states in resisting change from below and reinforcing control from above.

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

“Despite revolutions and attempts to achieve reforms, autocratic rule was strengthened in **both** Russia **and** Germany in the years 1825 to 1939.”

Assess the validity of this view. (20 marks)

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

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### **Indicative content**

This is a synoptic question and candidates’ responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over 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 should be able to distinguish between the different political contexts and selective evidence over the period to identify the main focal points in both Russia and Germany, and

comment on the strength and survival of autocratic rule in relation to revolutions and attempts to achieve reforms, appreciating changes and developments over the 100 years in response to the question. Autocratic rule remained strong because of military and political control, and the support of elite groups who had a vested interest in resisting change. At different times, a combination of unquestioned loyalty, deferential acceptance and popular support strengthened and reinforced autocratic governments. Why did revolutions, despite overthrowing the monarchy in both states, ultimately fail to put an end to autocracy? Candidates should also consider the impact of the concessions made by some autocratic rulers, and the reasons for the failure of reform movements.

Responses should consider 3 phases in both states over the period – the rule of the monarchist autocracies up to the revolutions at the end of World War One, the unsuccessful reformist governments which replaced the monarchies, and ultimately the return of autocracy with dictatorship in both states. In Russia, before 1905, tsarism was strong and faced little challenge to its authority. Source A could be used to show attempts to bolster autocratic rule and strengthen Russia through reform. From 1905, candidates should assess whether the 1905 Revolution and resulting reforms undermined or actually strengthened tsarism; and then, using Source C, explain how and why, after the revolution of February 1917, the Provisional Government was itself overthrown, leading to the emergence of a Communist dictatorship and the swift return of autocratic rule, fully secure by the time of Lenin's death. For Germany, there might be reference to the failure of the 1848 Revolution to undermine autocratic rule, and to the importance of Bismarck's reforms in trying to strengthen the regime (using Source B). Candidates should assess the public response in Germany to the Weimar Republic after the 1918 Revolution, leading to the emergence of a Nazi dictatorship (making reference to Source D), with popular support for Hitler's policies after post-war economic chaos.

Level 1 responses will include only a narrow range of evidence and will lack balance between the states (or include only one state), perhaps just briefly summarising some of the source points. Level 2 should provide more range and some balance, but the review of the period will still be limited, presenting only a generalised focus in terms of the specifics of the question. 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 explicit focus on revolutions and reforms in relation to continuing autocratic rule, but there will only be limited appreciation of the changing contexts over the 100 years. This should be more evident at Level 4, and responses may draw out some similarities and parallels between the two states, perhaps with signs of integration and of an overview, highlighting the key changes and turning points – e.g. commenting on the attitudes to strong leadership in both states over the period in relation to the economic and political turmoil at the end of the First World War. This sort of approach will be more developed and sustained for Level 5.

---

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

### Question 2

‘The appeal of Hitler’s charismatic leadership, rather than the economic problems of Weimar Germany, explains why the Nazis came to power in January 1933.’  
Assess the validity of this judgement (20 marks)

*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

Hitler was undoubtedly extremely talented as a leader, with personal magnetism and charisma, emotional appeal, drive and self-belief, successfully pinpointing the frustrations of many Germans. His great ability as an orator provided inspiration and a clear sense of direction. He skilfully bided his time after 1930 and out-thought those who believed they could tame him. Hitler’s personal authority within the party was tantamount and he knew which policies would have widespread appeal – economic promises for a brighter future rather than Nazi ideology or political beliefs. The attractions of Hitler’s leadership were developed through effective propaganda, party organisation and financial backing.

Economic problems for Weimar Germany had been evident from the start back in 1919, and were heightened by the hyperinflation of 1923, finally peaking with the impact of the Wall Street Crash on Germany and the collapse of world trade, leading to financial crisis, uncontrolled unemployment and economic depression. The German people lost faith in the Weimar governments and turned to political extremism. The new economic and political context started a Nazi electoral breakthrough, with the conservative elites uniting around the Nazi alternative. Responses may also assess the importance of other factors in explaining why the Nazis came to power. The political intrigue among Hitler’s opponents after 1930, and their self-interest and fatal under-estimation, certainly played into his hands with the use of emergency powers under Article 48 and the effective end of true parliamentary government. Candidates could broaden this perspective to include the ongoing constitutional weaknesses of continued coalition government and proportional representation, as well as the lack of popular support for the Weimar regime.

Level 1 will provide little of this range, dealing superficially with these issues, or perhaps concentrating solely on Hitler. Level 2 will include some evidence from both specified areas but with little assessment or reference to other issues. Answers at Level 3 will be explicit but may be more of a general ‘rise to power’ response. There should be signs of some appreciation of the connections across the issues by the top of this level, but such synoptic links will be limited. This sort of overview, with more balance and development especially in relation to the economic and political contexts, should be evident at Level 4, with a clear synoptic grasp of the question, attempting to prioritise the issues and reach some conclusions. For example, although Hitler’s leadership was indispensable to the success of the Nazis, people voted for them for mainly economic reasons; and yet Hitler actually came to power in

the end as a result of his skilful negotiation of the political intrigue rather than direct electoral support. This sort of approach would be sustained for Level 5.

### Question 3

To what extent, politically and economically, was Stalin successful in creating a totalitarian regime in the USSR in the years 1928 to 1939? *(20 marks)*

*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

There is much evidence across the board for a totalitarian regime under Stalin, with the imposition of communist ideology in a state-run dictatorship, controlling all state institutions, and enforcing popular allegiance from a compliant society. The Five Year Plans enforced centralised economic control over the nation, the purges eliminated all effective opposition and established control over the armed forces, and propaganda and indoctrination successfully projected the cult of Stalinism. Political dictatorship and economic transformation through institutionalised terror were certainly established in theory, with decisions presumed to be taken by Stalin, then cascading down through the chain of command – but was all this successful in practice?

Decisions needed implementing at the local level, where officials had their own priorities and agendas, and where there was often conflict and dissent, inhibiting centralised control, as blame for any failure or underachievement was directed at factory managers or collective farm chairmen. The local parties were no threat to the centre, but limited the implementation of a fully totalitarian regime, as did other factions and rivalries within the Party, and the chaotic and confused layers of administration, with limited effective planning. Candidates might also challenge the very idea of a one-man dictatorship. Politically, Stalin's regime was fully secure, with little scope for opposition, but the threat he felt from actual or imagined political enemies would necessitate an all-pervading terror against millions of people, who were alienated and subdued through fear. Economically, the USSR was quickly and effectively collectivised, but production was poor and there was resistance from all levels of the peasantry. Industry was more impressive, but, arguably, slower enforcement would have been more successful, and the resulting fracturing of society was predominantly negative. Stalin's regime had a profound effect, as Stalin himself took the initiative developing his personality cult; but when, once again, the centre lost the initiative to local forces, the case for fully effective totalitarianism does appear to have been discredited.

Level 1 answers will provide only a condensed or general summary, or be restricted in scope and evidence in relation to the specifics of the question. Level 2 will present more range and balance, but will tend to accept and describe the totalitarian regime without reservation. Responses at Level 3 will begin to assess the successful implementation, perhaps observing

that ruthlessness does not equal success; but any synoptic links will be limited, and the political and economic aspects will be unbalanced or undeveloped. There should be signs at Level 4 of a more effective overview, emphasising the connections between the political and economic aspects, and perhaps linking totalitarian control with propaganda, indoctrination and the cult of Stalin, and providing the pretext for the purges. Level 5 should sustain the assessment in terms of development, integration and judgement.

#### **Question 4**

Compare the success of the economic policies followed by Stalin in the USSR in the years 1928 to 1939 with those followed by Hitler in Germany in the years 1933 to 1939. (20 marks)

*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**

Stalin's economic aims provided an ideological focus – to bring the true dawn of Socialism and end the class struggle with the transformation of Soviet society. A planned and centralised economy would also consolidate his political power and bring national security and survival. The peasant base of the USSR had to be changed if the economy was to be successfully modernised, but the means to achieve this led to brutality and death. Candidates should analyse the Five Year Plans in detail in terms of effective economic transformation or disastrous human costs, distinguishing between agriculture and industry. It is difficult to see anything positive from collectivisation either for the state or for 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 successfully shift the balance of the workforce. In industry, the Five Year Plans were successful in increasing production, with improved communications, new resources, and key development in the iron, oil and electricity industries. Questionable statistics and effective propaganda would help to consolidate political power and provide the pretext for the purges. However, this projected success was not shared by the Soviet people who faced low living standards in over-crowded squalor and appalling working conditions. Yet without such economic enforcement, the USSR could not have been successfully mobilised for war.

Hitler's initial economic aim was to tackle the Depression and restore Germany to full employment, which would also consolidate the regime politically. Economic recovery would also be used to rebuild Germany's military might, and gear the country to the needs of future war, and Hitler aimed to make the economy as self-sufficient as possible. With German economic recovery already underway by 1933, candidates should consider the extent and coherence of Nazi economic planning, and the degree of economic transformation. Content could include the public work schemes, the management of workers (labour service/front), Schacht's policies up to 1936 which achieved some economic equilibrium, and the Four Year Plan moving towards a war footing and aiming at economic self-sufficiency. Success can be

assessed in terms of employment and standard of living, but should also consider the different economic motives and expectations of the Nazis, economic ministers, and big business as well as the German public. Hitler's priorities meant that the mass of the German people failed to benefit greatly from any economic success, and by 1939, the economy was under great strain from the pressures of rearmament, and still importing one-third of its raw materials. The workforce was certainly better off than in the Soviet Union, with benefits in wages, employment and general prosperity; but in real terms, the wage earner was actually worse off, and workers were exploited and strictly regulated, though without the crude terror of the Soviet system.

Answers at Level 1 will be restricted to a brief or condensed summary, or respond only to one state. Both states will be included at Level 2, but factual economic detail might dominate, with limited balance, assessment or sign of comparison. Some similarities and differences in the economic policies should be drawn out by Level 3, with some broad attempt to gauge success from various viewpoints, but any such comparison will be uneven and undeveloped. More range, balance and development should be evident at Level 4, with more effective synoptic links commenting on the appropriate political, military, ideological or propaganda perspectives behind economic policies. Level 5 would sustain this sort of overview in assessing success, with an effectively integrated comparison.

---

**Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941****A2 Unit 6: Hitler and the origins of the Second World War, 1933-1941****Question 1**

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

Assess the validity of the views expressed in **Source A** about the issues and events which led to the outbreak of war in 1939. *(10 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- |     |  |             |
|-----|--|-------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains.  | <b>1-2</b>  |
| L2: | Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge.   | <b>3-5</b>  |
| L3: | As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial.  | <b>6-8</b>  |
| L4: | Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. | <b>9-10</b> |

**Indicative content**

Level 1 will tend to summarise the source content, describing briefly the circumstances which led to war in 1939. Level 2 will show familiarity with these views and provide some supporting knowledge – evidence from the Versailles Settlement to justify German claims for revision; seeing Hitler as a ‘normal’ rational German merely trying to achieve change through negotiation, with some success in the two crises of 1938 over Austria and Sudeten Czechoslovakia; and the Polish issue of 1939 leading to an unnecessary ultimatum, and needlessly and unwittingly leading to war. Answers at this level will usually be undeveloped and may include general comment, tending to accept the source at face value. Responses may also suggest implicit agreement and/or disagreement with the views. Level 3 will provide a broader interpretation with some signs of evaluation and insight. Some candidates will recognise that this source is taken from the prescribed text which “reconsidered” Taylor’s standpoint. The views given here are essentially Taylor’s, and candidates will have little difficulty in providing alternative interpretations – commenting on the scope, focus and degree of planning behind Hitler’s foreign policy, with Versailles as a convenient smokescreen. Events leading to war stemmed not from “the appeasers bungling things”, but from the unjustified annexation of the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 which rendered appeasement redundant and led to British and French frontier guarantees for Poland. Answers at this level will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2, but not necessarily full in terms of knowledge and/or comment. This will be more evident at Level 4, which will be as Level 3, but more balanced and/or developed, considering a full range of views and providing a well-supported assessment.



(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of Hitler's aims and methods in foreign policy?  
(10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

### **Indicative content**

Level 1 will summarise the source, or provide only vague or brief comments about Hitler's aims and methods. At Level 2, in terms of utility, candidates will comment either on the strengths or limitations of the source, or briefly on both, or may only comment in general terms or in a broad context in relation to utility, largely accepting the source at face value. For example, whatever the scale of Hitler's aims, successful revision through reasoned negotiation would never be rejected, nor would positive, if meaningless, statements of intent – declarations never to go to war and to use consultation to remove any remaining areas of difference and to preserve peace. These negotiations did solve a major German grievance without a major European war. Level 3 will respond to both the strengths and limitations in a more balanced and developed way, showing a clear insight into the specific context of the Anglo-German Declaration which followed the signing of the Munich Agreement. For Chamberlain, this slip of paper would become 'peace in our time' and he successfully persuaded Hitler to actually sign it – for Hitler, it was a worthless piece of paper which could be easily torn up, with little bearing on his aims or future methods, and these optimistic hopes did not last long. Level 4 will broaden the argument and make a judgement on the utility of the source – the Declaration was simply concocted and stage-managed by Chamberlain; Hitler was eager to push ahead with the occupation of the rest of Czechoslovakia at the earliest opportunity.

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

‘In the years up to 1939, Britain had underestimated German foreign policy aims, but war finally broke out because of Hitler’s miscalculation of British foreign policy.’

Assess the validity of this view. (20 marks)

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

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### Indicative content

The question raises two clear-cut but closely connected debates. Firstly, on the scale and development of German foreign policy aims – from justified revisionism to cold-blooded *Lebensraum* and inevitable war; and on Britain’s response to these aims, mainly through appeasement – a misguided policy of missed opportunities and ‘peace at any price’ which failed to recognise Hitler’s ruthless expansionism, or the only feasible way to slow up the pace of German expansion. The second debate focuses more explicitly on Hitler, whether diplomatic relations in the years up to 1939 were no more than a means to an end in his ideologically driven foreign policy – Hitler would do or say anything to defuse potentially dangerous situations and then discard agreements and promises as circumstances dictated – or whether Hitler misjudged or misunderstood the shift in British policy in 1938 and 1939, and went to war before Germany was fully ready.

Candidates will need to refer to some of the key events up to 1939 in order to focus, analyse and assess these issues – the remilitarisation of the Rhineland as a missed opportunity to stop

Hitler; whether Chamberlain or Hitler pulled back from the brink at Munich; the turning point for appeasement in March 1939 with the invasion of Czechoslovakia which Hitler perhaps failed to recognise; and the Polish crisis which led to Britain and France declaring war. If Chamberlain had misjudged Hitler in the past, then Hitler misjudged Chamberlain at this point. While events ran to Hitler's timetable, especially after the Nazi-Soviet Pact, most historians agree that he did not believe that Britain would defend Poland or declare war, although he would take the risk anyway and perhaps discounted British influence. Hitler misunderstood British foreign policy – the problem was not Poland but Germany – and failed to appreciate British global concerns and great power status. In 1939, from the British perspective, the military balance was not unfavourable – by 1940, and certainly by 1942, Germany might be too powerful.

Candidates will have little difficulty in integrating the sources into the debate and harnessing the views of other historians. Source A (to mirror Taylor's views) emphasises realistic revisionism and the outbreak of war as an unfortunate mistake. Source B recognises the high watermark of appeasement in 1938, and Source C expresses Hitler's surprise at the declaration of war, given the context of events. Taylor's views on Hitler and *Lebensraum* will be well known, and his emphasis on the mistakes and inconsistencies of others, believing that Hitler was not contemplating war in 1939. Henig too describes Britain lurching from crisis to crisis unsure where to draw the line, but suggests that firmer action before 1939 might merely have precipitated war. Both Overy and Bell accept that, once Hitler's real aims for the dominance of Europe became clear, Britain was bound to fight to preserve her vital interests, whatever Hitler expected.

Level 1 might concentrate solely on the sources in answer to the question, or on the Polish crisis of 1939. Responses at Level 2 are likely to describe events in support of the propositions, but with only limited supporting evidence from the sources, knowledge or reading. Some source evidence must be included at Level 3, with some attempt to debate the issues, but this may be general and will not be developed, with limited historiography, and candidates are likely to accept the propositions posed in the question, with only few reservations. By Level 4, there should be a more developed and balanced debate beyond the given propositions from both the German and British perspectives, with clear signs of an effective analytical overview and synoptic assessment. Level 5 will sustain this approach.