



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS1N

Unit 1N

Totalitarian Ideologies in

Theory and Practice, c1848–c1941

Final

Mark Scheme

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

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

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

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

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

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

June 2011

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1N: Totalitarian Ideologies in Theory and Practice c1848–c1941

Question 1

01 Explain why the New Economic Policy (NEP) was ended by Stalin. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Stalin ended NEP (the role of ideology as it relates to the Soviet economy)

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- NEP was always a temporary expedient as it was capitalist and an adaptation of Marxism. The Bolsheviks had seized power at a time when 80% of the population were peasants. Ending NEP would finally create socialism
- NEP was no longer working by 1927/8 as grain procurements were falling

- rapid industrialisation could be adopted as a policy as Trotsky and the United Opposition had been defeated
- ending NEP allowed Stalin's policies to create a distinction between his policies and those of Bukharin, and defeat the right in the power struggle
- 1927 War scare – Britain had broken off diplomatic relations, France trade links and Japan threatened war. Stalin believed rapid industrialisation was needed to defend the USSR which influenced the ending of NEP.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that ideologically collectivisation and rapid industrialisation were more consistent with socialism, but that Stalin also recognised that ending NEP would secure him the support of the majority of the party, including left-wingers like Kirov and Kaganovich.

Question 1

- 02** How successful was Stalin's regime in crushing diversity in the Soviet Union in the 1930s? (24 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting Stalin's regime did successfully crush diversity might include:

- political opposition and alternative ideologies were crushed; Ryutin criticised collectivisation and was expelled in 1932 along with 1 million Ryutinists, Kirov defended comrades and called for a reduction in the speed of collectivisation and was assassinated in 1934, the 1934 Congress which supported Kirov was purged, the left and the right who challenged Stalin in the 1920s were purged in the 1930s, Trotsky was assassinated in 1940. By 1940 only Stalin remained from Lenin's original government.
- religion offered an alternative to communism and was crushed; buildings were demolished or converted, priests were arrested and executed, anti-religious museums were opened
- economic diversity was destroyed when NEP was ended. A fierce labour discipline ensured loyalty to the State as employer
- radio, film, newspapers and the arts were all brought under State control. The Union of Russian Writers, the imposition of Socialist Realism, the banning of foreign films and Stalin personally supervising film scripts all removed cultural and artistic diversity
- ethnic heroes were removed from history as Stalin imposed Russian chauvinism
- education, the Pioneers and Komsomol all ensured that the young and the youth received only one view of the world.

Factors suggesting some diversity existed and therefore the regime was not wholly successful in crushing diversity might include:

- differentiated wage rates on collective farms and in industry, with higher wages paid to more skilled workers
- the Stakhanovite movement created an elite class (as did the existence of privileged party members)
- private peasant plots existed in the countryside, producing the majority of milk by 1937
- religion retained its grip on the population with 57% of the population describing themselves as having a religion in the census of 1937
- the 1936 Constitution guaranteed freedom of speech and association.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that diversity was very limited in a society where there was no alternative to the State, or that some theoretical diversity did not exist in practice.

Question 2

03 Explain why Mussolini was able to create a one-party state by 1926. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the one-party state was created in October 1926 with so little opposition

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the role of the King. Although he refused to pass an electoral rule giving the Fascists a majority by decree, he allowed Mussolini to rule by decree and refused to act after the Matteotti crisis; he allowed decrees banning other parties and establishing the one-party state
- the use of violence removed the will to resist the one-party state; the MSVN took orders from Mussolini, the murder of Matteotti removed an outspoken critic and strengthened Mussolini's position and when it failed to lead to anti-Fascist action, political opponents were beaten up, arrested and murdered
- the role of parliament; granted the power to rule by decree for 12 months in 1922, voted for the Acerbo Law which following the April 1924 Chamber of Deputies elections gave

the Fascists 2/3 of the seats; the Aventine Secession allowed the deputies to be denied their seats; passed the Legge Fascistissima in December 1925.

Candidates may also refer to the following long-term factors:

- the failures of Liberal Italy undermined democracy and meant that the King, Church, aristocracy and middle-class were predisposed towards a one-party state that protected their interests.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that the creation of a one-party state was more dependant on the attitude of the King and élites than the actions of Mussolini.

Question 2

- 04** How far was Mussolini's desire for personal power responsible for the intolerance of diversity in Italy in the years 1923 to 1940? (24 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views.

Factors suggesting Mussolini's desire for total power was responsible for the intolerance of diversity might include:

- Mussolini made clear his view that he alone should govern. His belief in 'everything within the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state' needs to be considered alongside his statement in January 1925 that he was the State!
- Mussolini therefore acted to ensure that his powers were not challenged – the independence of the judiciary during the first investigation into the Matteotti murder was ended by sacking dozens of judges, he held multiple government posts, chose the party secretary and from October 1926 all party appointments were his responsibility alone
- the regional parties were brought under central control and Mussolini removed those Ras and party officials that challenged him, for example, Farinacci.

Factors suggesting Mussolini's desire for total power was not responsible might include:

- the need for national unity because of the aim of war meant that there was intolerance. Clearly at a time of war there was no room for argument or opposition, or Italy's drive to be a great power would be undermined
- the nationalism of Fascism led to racial intolerance in Africa and after 1938 in Italy in relation to the Jews. Anti-Semitism developed after 1936 following closer relations with Hitler
- there was an ideological justification for the intolerance of diversity. Fascism stressed the subordination of the individual to the state. The Fascist belief in duty and sacrifice in pursuit of a common goal was crucial and precluded any alternative, individual beliefs. The common goal was the utopian state. Mussolini wanted to create a new heroic Italy. To do this he believed he would have to create new Italians. All other beliefs were wrong and threatened to undermine the creation of a perfect state
- socialism/communism was inherently wrong as men were not equal and the nation state, not the international movement was what mattered. Liberal democracy had created Italy's problems from 1861 to 1922
- economic intolerance was because of the weakness of both capitalism (allowed exploitation) and socialism (provided no incentive).

Good answers are likely to show awareness that although there was an ideological justification for intolerance, Mussolini created fascist ideology and much of it was articulated retrospectively, therefore the doctrine could have been to justify his desire for total power.

Question 3**05** Explain why Nazi ideology was nationalist. (12 marks)*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)***Generic Mark Scheme**Nothing written worthy of credit. **0****L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2****L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6****L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9****L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12****Indicative content****Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Nazi ideology was nationalist

Candidates may include some of the following factors:

- because as the strong Nationalist feeling that remained in Germany after the First World War – encouraged by the apparent injustice of the Treaty of Versailles (1919)
- because of the desire of the Nazi leadership to win over right wing élites who wanted to 'right the wrongs' of Versailles
- because of the acceptance of the 'stab in the back myth' which encouraged Nationalist reaction within Germany
- because Hitler's past had led him to develop strange Nationalist (and racist) views. Hitler was a staunch German nationalist who had left multi-racial Austria-Hungary and fought for Germany in the First World War. He personally felt the betrayal of Versailles. Hitler and Drexler were responsible for the NSDAP 25 Point Programme which is a clear statement of nationalist ideas

- Nationalism was the national accompaniment to Hitler's belief in the superior German, Aryan race.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might recognise that nationalism was widespread and that it was an essential part of any political programme that aimed to win votes, but that Hitler consistently expressed nationalist ideas as they were as central to his psyche as anti-Semitic ideas.

Question 3

- 06** How far was Hitler's rise to power from 1928 to January 1933 due to the support he received from the German elites? (24 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views.

Factors suggesting Hitler won power because of the support he received from the German elites other might include:

- the backing of Hugenberg, Chairman of the DNVP, through his media empire, which gave the NSDAP exposure before the 1930 election when they made a breakthrough
- Von Papen lifted the ban on the SA in the summer of 1932 which allowed the NSDAP to intimidate opponents and become the largest party in the July 1932 election. He also intrigued with Hindenburg's son to have Hitler made chancellor in the belief he could be controlled
- both the army and influential businessmen and financiers, for example Schacht, informed Hindenburg that he should appoint Hitler; both feared the rise of communism and the army were attracted by Hitler's commitment to rearmament
- President Hindenburg appointed Hitler Chancellor in January 1933 at a time when the NSDAP were losing support and members and Hitler personally faced bankruptcy.

Factors suggesting Hitler won power for other reasons might include:

- Hindenburg actually prevented Hitler's rise to power before January 1933 as he was reluctant to appoint a known enemy of democracy who was also an Austrian ex-lance corporal
- the economic depression was critical in creating the climate in which the NSDAP could gain support on a national level. Before the Wall St Crash they were a minor party who had won 12 seats in 1928. In 1930 they won 107 and became the second largest party. The middle-classes feared unemployment, farmers suffered from harvest failure, foot and mouth and faced mortgage foreclosure, in addition to the six million who were unemployed by 1932
- Nazi strengths were also critical. Hitler and the party had a modern, youthful image as a result of the propaganda of Goebbels and were able to appeal to all classes
- fear of communism. The upper and middle classes feared the rise in support of socialism/communism – the KPD won 100 seats by November 1932 – so they turned to the Nazis who promised to crush communism.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that factors are inter-linked, for example, the economic crisis created a situation where the Nazi message found receptive ears, the propaganda ensured the message was heard, and the support the party won in 1930 and 1932 convinced the German elites that they were the only bulwark against the left.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion