



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

*Alternative J Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes,
c1848–c1956*

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 J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848–c1956

AS Unit 1: The Origins and Consolidation of Totalitarian Regimes, 1918–1939

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of ‘unlimited authority’ (line 1) in the context of Stalin’s growing power within the Bolshevik Party before Lenin’s death in January 1924. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. Stalin’s post as General Secretary gave him immense power in the Party. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. as General Secretary he developed extensive powers of patronage, so that on Lenin’s death he would be able to use the Party machinery against his rivals. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Source A** and **either Source B or Source C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source A** differs from **either Source B or Source C** in relation to criticisms of other politicians. (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. Source A refers to the need to remove a politician within the Party: “I suggest that comrades think about a way of removing Stalin” because he is “too rude” or may cause future splits; whereas Source B and Source C refer to political opposition outside the Party, Source B refers to the Weimar Republic as an “unstable coalition of workers”, and Source C to the Italian liberal governments as “the present regime in Italy has failed”. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source A is personal in its criticism - “Stalin is too rude”, while Source B has a strong nationalist line – “national state” and Source C claims a pre-determined right to govern – “The right to power belongs to us”. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. the differences reflect the different time periods – the Bolsheviks are already in power in Source A but the Nazis and Fascists are opposition parties in Sources B and C. The answer may show awareness of the context of each source: Source A refers to “Comrade Trotsky” at a time when Lenin was trying to resolve the problems of the succession; Source B refers to the “will-power of a single movement” as the NSDAP is anti-democratic and at this time politically insignificant; and Source C refers to “our victory was due only to the virtues of the Italian people” as Mussolini tries to set up a trenchocracy. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the failures of political rivals, in relation to other factors, in the rise to power of Stalin and **either** Hitler **or** Mussolini.

You should refer in your answer to the USSR, 1924–1929 and **either** Germany 1928–1933 **or** Italy, 1918–1922. **(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: all the sources stress the importance of the failures of political rivals. Source A uses phrases such as “excessive self-confidence”; candidates may criticise the other Politburo leaders for not acting on Lenin’s advice to remove Stalin. In Source B, Hitler writes, “seeds of future failure” and “no really great lasting achievement” opposing coalition governments. Source C is more direct; “failed” and “weakness”. Totalitarian political ideology was intolerant of political rivals. Candidates might differentiate between the political rivals in Source A where Stalin’s opposition is within the Party while Sources B and C refer to political opposition to democratic government.

Own knowledge about the failures of political rivals might include reference to mistakes made by the other leading politicians: in the USSR, Trotsky and the rest of the Politburo; in Germany, Hindenburg and Papen; in Italy, the King, Giolitti and the Pope.

Candidates should construct a balanced answer considering other factors that also explain the accession to power of the dictators. There will be an understanding that failures of political rivals were important, but not the only step to dictatorship:

- economic conditions may offer an alternative explanation: in the USSR the division over NEP; in Germany, the impact of the Depression after 1929; in Italy, the post-War economic crisis and the growth of socialism
- the actual leadership and he built his own power base as the foundation of dictatorship: the cult of the leader and Führerprinzip
- internal control – the use of terror and propaganda.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of unconnected points about the leaders; there will be greater range and selection of factors at Level 2. Candidates who make no reference to the sources cannot score higher than Level 2. Level 3 answers will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some links to the “importance” of the factors identified, although this will not necessarily be sustained or may lack depth of understanding. By Level 4 the case will be argued more strongly, possibly arguing that the idea of removing political rivals was important but the dictators’ personal determination and political opportunism were needed to secure the accession to power. Opportunism will open up an examination of the conduct of other politicians and events like economic downturn. Level 5 answers will engage in debate, cross-referencing sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the relationship between the failures of political rivals and other factors that explain the dictators’ accession to power.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘traitors and spies’ (line 1) in relation to the show trials in the USSR in the years 1936 to 1938. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. real or imaginary opposition to Stalin was removed. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. such accusations were common in the years 1937-1938. Candidates may examine an aspect of “traitor” or “spy” such as being part of a Trotskyite plot, or refer to the main Show Trials. **2-3**

(b) Explain why there was so little effective opposition to Stalin in the USSR in the years 1934 to 1939. **(7 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the power of the terror machine. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. shows understanding that there are different explanations. Stalin presented himself as an omnipotent ruler discouraging opposition, and potential leaders were marginalized. **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. analyses the nature of USSR society to explain the difficulties opposition faced. **6-7**

(c) ‘The purges were solely intended to eliminate Stalin’s rivals.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to the years 1934 to 1939. **(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

The answers will examine which rivals were removed in the purges probably naming some, e.g. Bukharin, Kamenev, Zinoviev, and how this consolidated Stalin's hold on power. This needs to be balanced with understanding that the purges after 1934 were not just about removing rivals but there were other motives:

- to remove the perceived growing threat of German/Japanese spies
- to punish rivals who had, or were said to have, failed to implement economic policies, e.g. Ordzhonikidze
- to control the growing power of rivals in charge of terror, e.g. Yezhov.

Some answers will investigate whether Stalin actually started the purges, (this may develop from analysis of Kirov); and the radicalisation of the purges over the period in question. Such answers may examine the role of local officials who thought they were helping Stalin and the Party.

Answers may well give a perspective on the purges before 1934, and this can be relevant, but the balance of the essay must be focused on the years in the question. Long term opposition from the Kulaks and various nationalities would be a focus here.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on the purges. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples of the personalities who were removed with some understanding of how it aided Stalin's hold on power. By Level 3, answers will identify particular reasons for the purges after 1934, and may begin to develop a counter-argument that Stalin alone was not responsible, and/or that he had other motives. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad, paying attention to the whole time period in the question 1934–1939. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on an analysis of the reasons for the purges and/or Stalin's role in the process.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'dictatorship' (line 1) in relation to **either** the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, 1934–1939 **or** the Fascist dictatorship in Italy, 1925–1939. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the power of one man within the state. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the role of terror, intolerance of any alternative opinions, the power of the one-party state linked to the dictatorship. **2-3**
-

- (b) Explain why dictatorship was established in **either** Germany **or** Italy. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the Fuhrer/Duce wanted power. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. shows understanding that there are different explanations. Hitler/Mussolini opposed democratic multi-party rule and believed a single leader was a more effective way to govern. The answer will show some understanding of the nature of dictatorship. **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. explains that the previous democratic governments allowed dictatorship in, but that the dictators were committed to seizing power. **6-7**

- (c) ‘There was little effective opposition to dictatorship because of the use of terror.’ Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to **either** Germany in the years 1933 to 1939 **or** Italy in the years 1922 to 1939. (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

Answers should identify ways that the dictatorship developed and used terror to keep power in the identified years. Answers may refer to some of these:

- control of the judiciary and use of political prisons – concentration camps and “confine” on islands like Lipari
- use of secret police – SS or OVRA
- intimidation on the streets – Brownshirts and Blackshirts
- reliance on informers.

The answer should have some balance with reference to other issues that supported the dictatorships:

- the role of propaganda
- the skills of the political leader
- positive support for the regime and its policies.

The answer needs to be aware of the different opposition groups that proved to be of little effect.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on the use of terror. At Level 2 answers will be largely descriptive or relevant examples without clear links to the actual dictatorship. By Level 3 answers will identify particular ways the dictatorship was maintained, and may begin to develop a counter-argument identifying other reasons for the maintenance of the dictatorship. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad, paying attention to the whole time period in the question showing understanding of the nature of dictatorship. There may be some attempt to consider how much opposition there was, and whether it was ever effective. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on a conceptual understanding of the dictatorship.

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848–c1956**A2 Unit 4: Totalitarian Ideologies, Economic, Social and Foreign Policies, 1848–1956****Question 1**

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

How useful are **Sources A** and **B** in explaining Soviet totalitarianism? (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 sources and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will make simple statements on utility, for example Source A is by Marx, Source B by Stalin. Answers at Level 2 will provide evidence of explicit understanding of both sources.

Source A is useful as it is an extract from the Communist Manifesto, the ideological doctrine of Soviet Communism. Furthermore, it describes the civil war between proletariat and bourgeoisie, which would become a revolution. The need to hold a successful revolution and remove the bourgeoisie from Russia was the ideological basis of Soviet totalitarianism. Although Source A does not directly explain that Marx argued that the bourgeoisie needed to be re-educated or eliminated, it does draw attention to the Marxist revolution the Bolsheviks believed they were carrying out, which explains the propaganda and terror of the regime.

Source B is useful because it picks up on Marxist language, talking of the need to avoid betraying the working class and the revolution. Stalin always purported to be a good Marxist, and his use of such language in 1929 would seem to suggest that Source A is useful, as the Communist Manifesto was the basis for the Stalinist/Soviet totalitarianism.

For Level 3 and above, however, the two sources limitations must be considered. The Bolshevik revolution was not the result of a civil war between the bourgeoisie and proletariat. The Bolsheviks imposed their rule on the predominantly rural population of Russia, skipping from the Marxist stage of feudalism to the Marxist stage of socialism. The source and Marxism in general does not explain this. Equally, Source B reflects Stalin's desire to crush opposition – this was the basis of Stalinist totalitarianism, rather than any ideological basis. Judgement at Level 4 might take the form of deciding which source is of more use, or seek to identify comparisons and contrasts between the sources.

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

‘The intolerance of diversity was based on nineteenth-century ideas.’
Assess the validity of this view of the ideological basis of Hitler’s and Mussolini’s totalitarianism. (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

The intolerance of diversity should be explained for Level 2 or above. In Nazi Germany this may include reference to anti-communist and democratic ideas, as well as anti-Semitism and the belief in Aryan supremacy. In Fascist Italy this may include reference to anti-Communism, and liberalism and the belief in national unity and militarism.

In **Nazi Germany**, anti-Semitic ideas were based on the work of Chamberlain (Source C), as well as Volkish writer like Julius Langbehn. Anti-communism was part of the nationalists’ creed from the nineteenth century.

Mussolini’s intolerance may be said to have been influenced by nineteenth century ideas, in that he rejected liberal ideas, which he believed had weakened Italy. However, balance for Level 3 and above should involve recognition of other influences. **Hitler’s** obsession with the Soviet Union was due to Alfred Rosenberg making him aware of the Jewish nature of Bolshevism around 1920. The multi-ethnic Austro-Hungarian Empire was partly responsible for Hitler’s racial ideas, defeat in the First World War helped inoculate

Hitler's anti-communism and his Aryan worldview. Furthermore Hitler's intolerance of Jews went far beyond any nineteenth century ideologues. **Mussolini** makes clear that his ideological basis of Fascism is in response to Italy's current needs, e.g. the need for unity to create an Empire, and that he rejects nineteenth century ideas as 'outworn ideology' (Source D).

Explicit judgement for Level 4 and Level 5 may take the form of arguing which regime was most influenced by nineteenth century ideas. Hitler developed existing ideas that he found appealing; Fascism was a doctrine written to justify existing policies. This is not, however, the only route to explicit judgement.

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

‘The purpose of Soviet economic policy was to spread Bolshevik ideas, rather than to develop the economy.’

Assess the validity of this view of the years 1929 to 1941. (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Answers should consider the two synoptic factors, spreading Bolshevik ideas and developing the economy. Answers should assess which of the two factors was of more importance and/or consider the inter-relationship between the two factors to reach Level 4 and beyond.

Economic development was the aim according to Stalin in 1928 when the First Five Year Plan was launched. Gosplan set targets for development, with the three Five Year Plans giving structure. The state targeted primary industry in the first plan, followed by consumer goods in the second and war production in the third. Collectivisation was introduced to increase grain yields and collection, and therefore enable exports to pay for industrial development. In so far as results reveal motives, 90% of land was collectivised by 1936, grain procurements doubled, coal production increased from 34 million tonnes to 150 million tonnes, bread rationing ended in 1935, prestige projects like the Moscow underground were completed, along with the production of sophisticated manufactured goods like machine tools and the creation of the world’s largest air force by 1938.

Bolshevik ideas might be said to include the desire to spread socialism/communism, and to destroy capitalism. Collectivisation aimed to create a rural proletariat spirit and create grain factories in the countryside, replacing the private enterprise of the economy under NEP. Machine Tractor Stations became proletarian bases in the countryside. Dekulakisation removed a class enemy of the Bolsheviks, and helped foster rural socialism. In industry, state direction and planning replaced private enterprise and a demand led economy. Initially wage differentiation disappeared and a revolutionary élan did develop, for example $\frac{3}{4}$ of the 250,000 workers who built Magnitogorsk were volunteers.

Judgement and synoptic understanding at Levels 4 and 5 might include arguing that Bolshevik ideas were more important in the countryside than development as the famine was revenge on the separatist Ukraine, whilst Kulaks were enemies of the state. In the cities however, wage differentials reappeared, along with harsh working conditions to ensure development at the expense of a workers’ state.

Question 3

‘The methods employed by the Soviet Union in foreign policy were a total failure in the years 1929 to 1941.’

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the Comintern and international alliances. (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

An assessment of success should include some understanding of aims. The Comintern was a success in that it variously sought to promote international communism (denouncing non-communist left-wing parties as social fascists in the period to 1933) and it helped promote the establishment of Popular Front governments in Spain and France. It also protected Soviet/Stalinist interests in Spain during the Civil War. The USSR did have some success in forging alliances with France and the Czechs in 1935. The Nazi-Soviet Pact is ripe ground for arguing that the USSR’s diplomatic methods brought great success, with the territorial and industrial gains in the eighteenth months of peace brought by Molotov. This would all suggest that ‘total failure’ was an exaggeration.

However, there is plenty of evidence of failure, which could offer balance in an answer at Level 3 and above. The Comintern’s work in preventing alliances between socialists and communists allowed the accession of Hitler in Germany, whilst Blum never forgave being labelled a social fascist. The Franco-Czech alliance was destroyed at Munich, and was undermined by British suspicion of the Soviets. This mistrust made an Anglo-Soviet alliance nigh impossible. Furthermore, the USSR’s benefits from Munich were minimal given Nazi Panzers invaded the USSR at 50km a day in June 1941, fuelled by Russian oil, and were able to wipe out the newly built Soviet Air Force before it left the ground.

Synoptic understanding and judgement for Levels 4 and 5 may be provided by considering the relative success of the two aims; building alliances was more important than the work of the Comintern, whose relative insignificance is indicated by the fact it was run by a Bulgarian émigré Dimitrov, from 1928 (Stalin was notoriously racist).

Question 4

‘Productivity was more important than ideology.’

Assess the validity of this view of the Nazi economic policy in the years 1933 to 1939. (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

There was a clear ideological basis to Nazi economic policy, from Darre’s ‘Blood and Soil’ laws to protect German farmers, to incentives for women to leave the workplace, Aryanisation and autarky.

However, Hitler’s attitude towards economics was essentially pragmatic. Answers should show appreciation of both factors for balance at Levels 3 and above. The economy had to produce for war, whilst also maintaining a high level of consumer production to prevent the collapse of civilian morale. Therefore, agriculture was increasingly ignored, Jews were protected by Schacht until 1936 and the number of women employed rose once war began. Hitler argued that he placed orders for war materials, but who filled them was irrelevant to him. Hence Junker was nationalised because they would not switch production to military aircraft, whilst Krupps remained in private hands and made huge profits because they did produce for war.

Synoptic understanding and judgement for Levels 4 and 5 may take the form of suggesting that the ideological goal of war required practical approaches, hence the two factors were merged anyway.

Question 5

‘Hitler’s foreign policy was successful, but Nazi ideology was ignored.’

Assess the validity of this view of Nazi foreign policy in the years 1933 to 1939. (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Assessment of success should include some explicit focus on aims. Possible aims include overturning the Treaty of Versailles (conscription and remilitarising the Rhineland), rearming (conscription, air force, Anglo-German Naval Agreement), uniting German speaking people (Anschluss and Munich) and Lebensraum (the invasion of Poland). Evidence that ideology

was ignored might include dealing with racialist enemies (1934 Nazi-Polish Non-Aggression Pact, Anti-Comintern Pact with Japan and the Nazi-Soviet Pact).

Balance and judgement for Level 3 and above might include arguing that Hitler was broadly ideological in his approach, favouring deals with the British whom he admired, and granting them favourable terms (Anglo-German Naval Agreement), and siding with fellow Fascist Italy against communism in Spain and generally in the Anti-Comintern Pact, the Rome-Berlin Axis and the Pact of Steel.

There may also be reference to failure – the abortive Anschluss of 1934, no war in 1938 over the Sudetenland, the wrong war in 1939. This may be evidence of judgement for Levels 4 and 5.

Synoptic understanding may be demonstrated by discussing the fact that Hitler's ultimate aims were ideological, therefore other foreign successes served to achieve these ideological aims.

Question 6

‘Italian economic policy had successfully achieved Mussolini’s ideological and practical aims by 1940.’

Assess the validity of this view.

(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 creation of the Corporate State brought unity and harmony with the corporate boards providing a forum for input from employers, employee and Fascist officials in a new ‘third way’. Practically, the corporate state had some success in solving industrial disputes and ensuring that the economy could be focused on war production. The Battle for the Lira and Land were won. Wheat production doubled. Balanced answers for Level 3 and above should be aware of the failures though – the corporate state never really created harmony, as fascist officials were frequently in the pay of large companies, though Fascist terror did keep the workers in check. Wheat remained the third biggest import. The army needed scraps of steel donated for the war effort in the mid 1930s and could not join Hitler in September 1939 because of inadequate supplies.

Judgement and synoptic understanding for Levels 4 and 5 may take the form of arguing that aims also clearly included the need for the perception to be created that economic policy was successful even if it was not. The success of propaganda in relation to ideological and practical economics was much greater than the reality. The army divisions did exist on paper! It might also be argued that aims like stable currency were achieved; even if the methods undermined other aims (Mussolini ordered wage cuts to prevent inflation after the Wall Street Crash).

Question 7

‘Success in the 1920s, failure in the 1930s.’

Assess the validity of this view of Italian foreign policy in the years 1922 to 1940.

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Assessment of success should include some explicit focus on aims. Aims may be seen in Mussolini’s guiding statement that he sought to make Italy ‘great, respected and feared’ or in the militaristic nature of Fascism, or in its anti-communist ideology. The 1920s brought success as Mussolini bullied the Greeks over Corfu, gained Fiume, was a guarantor of the Locarno Pacts and a signatory to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, all of which raised his profile. The 1930s brought failure – Mussolini was compelled to allow the Anschluss in 1938 against Italian interests, appeared to be a cipher of Hitler at Munich, wasted resources in Spain fighting a war no Italian cared about, and was ultimately humiliated by failing to join the war in September 1939.

Balance for Level 3 and above would be provided by identifying failure in the 1920s (bullying Greece and Yugoslavia was hardly the action of a great militaristic power, and the militaristic nature of fascism was undermined in this ‘decade of good behaviour’). Equally, the 1930s were hardly an unmitigated failure, given the creation of the new Roman Empire (Abyssinia and Albania) and the victory over communism in Spain.

Synoptic understanding for Levels 4 and 5 may involve assessment of the achievable goals rather than the fantastical ideological goals, regardless of the decade.

Question 8

‘The failure to develop the economy meant failure in foreign policy.’
Assess the validity of this view on any **one** of the totalitarian regimes you have studied. (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Answers may agree that the weaknesses of the economy of the economy undermined foreign policy. Stalin had to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact to buy time, and could not have defended the Spanish Republic if he had wanted to for fear of precipitating a general European war before the USSR was ready. Hitler was forced to develop the armed forces slowly because of the weakness of the German economy and eventually had to fight wars of conquest to maintain a floundering economy. Mussolini failed to dramatically crush Spanish communism because of the economy’s inability to cope with a further war after Abyssinia and had to withdraw from the Pact of Steel, in 1939 because of the lack of war materials.

Balance for Level 3 and above may be provided by arguing other factors caused foreign policy to fail – Stalin’s misjudgements (social fascists, relying on the Franco-Czech alliance, trusting Hitler), Hitler’s obsession with war, Mussolini tying himself to Hitler after Abyssinia and entering the war in 1940.

Synoptic understanding for Levels 4 and 5 should be demonstrated explicitly by considering the inter-relationship of the economy and foreign policy, and/or by considering the relative importance of the economy and other factors responsible for failure.

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848–c1956

A2 Unit 6: The Holocaust, 1938–1945

Question 1

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about the reasons why the Holocaust developed. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

Kershaw, one of the specified texts, argues that genocide was the responsibility of more than just Hitler; rather it was the result of a range of sections of society's desire to please Hitler, and therefore take forward a policy he was known to favour. A Level 1 answer would identify the interpretation.

For Level 2 own knowledge is required and could include reference to: the nature of the polycratic Hitler state; the actions by certain sections of society including the SS Einsatzgruppen, Han Frank as Governor of the General Government, the East, the German people as civil servants, policemen, railway workers etc. (Goldhagen). The Holocaust often ran ahead of Hitler, who rubber-stamped decisions that had already been made.

However, evaluation of these arguments should be made for Level 3 and above. The sections of society referred to above rarely advocated genocide; they instead argued for more and more extreme discriminatory measures, or they simply responded to requests and orders from above. Hitler had set the visionary goals, in *Mein Kampf* and his speeches in the 1920s and 1930s, culminating in his threat to the Jews in January 1939 that war would bring their destruction.

Very strong answers may show full evaluation by pointing out that Kershaw is advocating that Hitler was of primary importance, as it was he alone who was unrestrained legally or constitutionally and therefore in a position to make the Holocaust happen.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of how anti-Semitism developed in Nazi Germany after *Kristallnacht*? (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

The source is useful because of its provenance, content and reliability. The source was an internal, secret report; therefore it has no need to cover-up actions that the outside world might find objectionable. It was produced following *Krystallnacht*, which was the critical turning point in the history of Nazi anti-Semitic policy, with state sponsored violence and ghettoisation replacing simple marginalisation. The source is useful as it makes clear the role of Goebbels in making clear the Nazi intention to make thousands of Jews ‘see the point’, and his scant regard for Jewish lives. The reference to the failure to prevent the killings with an order is also valuable evidence of the development of a new, more extreme policy, that can be seen as the beginning of the journey to Auschwitz.

To reach Level 3 answers will need to consider the weaknesses of the source as evidence for how anti-Semitism developed in Nazi Germany. It is a response to *Krystallnacht*, rather than an explanation of the causes of the pogrom. The purpose of the report is unclear, as is the identity of those who expressed ‘the opinion’. Furthermore, the source is limited in explaining why the post pogrom developed into the more brutal policy, as we learn that the later killings took place because of a lack of an order, rather than because of a clear instruction.

Judgement at Level 4 and above might take the form of arguing that the very nature of the action by omission of instruction that the last two lines referred to, is very typical of evidence that relates to the Holocaust, as Hitler was not a man who recorded decisions.

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

‘The Holocaust was the result of Hitler’s desire for genocide.’

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 engages directly with the intentionalist versus structuralist/functionalist debate with which all the prescribed sources engage.

Hitler’s desire for genocide might be supported by tracing a direct line from the anti-Semitism of the *25 Point Programme*, *Mein Kampf*, anti-Semitic propaganda in election campaigns, the increasingly discriminatory measures of the years before 1939, the speeches of Hitler in 1939 (warning the Jews of their fate if they caused another war) and 1941 (Garden of Eden). Reference to the genocide dating from as early as July 1941 might be seen. **Source D** argues that no Hitler would have meant no genocide, as his ‘impetus with deep roots’ was responsible. The specified source by **Farmer** illustrates this argument, as does **Kershaw** to an extent. **Source A** might therefore be used to show the impact of thousands of acolytes working towards the Fuhrer who made Hitler’s desires reality, a variation on the intentionalist argument.

Arguments against Hitler's desire being critical are necessary for balance for Level 3 and above. They might include arguing that the Holocaust was a result of the social and economic structural pressures in Nazi Europe after the summer of 1941. The failure of the Russian campaign left the Nazis with millions of Jews under their control, who could not be resettled in the East. SS units began an ad-hoc holocaust as they lacked the resources to hold the huge Jewish population. The Madagascar Plan may also be mentioned as evidence of Hitler's intention to remove the Jewish population from Europe though not to exterminate it. **Source C** mentions deportation, and that extermination was 'impossible'.

Alternatively, the role of other individuals and agencies might be mentioned, picking up from **Source A**. The actions of the SS in taking the law into their own hands with shootings and mobile gas vans might be mentioned, with Wannsee being mentioned as the formalisation of a policy active from the autumn of 1941. Local hatred of Jews might be mentioned, including the massacres in Lithuania. **Source B** might be used to argue that Goebbels and his propaganda machine were partly responsible, creating the climate in which SS units could take such decisions. The work of **Goldhagen** might be linked to **Source A** to discuss the endemic anti-Semitism and shared responsibility for moving Germany to genocide. Answers that consider both circumstance and the role of other individuals and agencies may offer a wide range of evidence for Level 4 and above, though this is not prescriptive.

Judgement at Level 4 and Level 5 may attempt synthesis between the two views, showing understanding that though many worked towards the Fuhrer they did so in the knowledge that extreme anti-Semitic measures would never be misplaced and lose them their Fuhrer's favour. Clearly this is not the only way of achieving explicit judgement.