

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS1N: Totalitarian Ideology in Theory and Practice, c1848–c1941



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS1N Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

## **AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers**

### **General Introduction by the Chief Examiner**

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

### **Unit 1**

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

## Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

## GCE History HIS1N: Totalitarian Ideology in Theory and Practice, c1848-c1941

### Responses to June 2009 Questions

#### Candidate 1

1 (a) Explain why the cult of Stalin developed after 1929. (12 marks)

There are many reasons why the cult of Stalin started to develop after 1929. The first and most important point is that the Russian people had really only ever known a single individual leader as there has only been 12 years of parliamentary democracy by this point in the whole of Russian history. This meant that the Russian people needed to look up to a leader as they had previously done in the time of the Tsars and under Lenin. Under the Tsars, the peasants in their homes would have a crucifix and a tribute to the Tsar. This need for a leader meant that the cult of Stalin started to develop after 1929.

Another reason why Stalin's cult of personality grew is that some people were genuinely grateful for what Stalin had done. When he ended rationing in 1935, he was seen as a hero of the people. He also created a state where education was important, and by the 1930s there were 35 million children in education, and the Stalin regime claimed over 90% literacy rate (even though this was defined as being able to sign your name).

Another reason why Stalin's cult developed was that it was thought by some historians that Stalin allowed the cult to grow (even though this was un-Marxist). The use of propaganda about Stalin was massive with pictures of Stalin in schools and massive posters on the side of buildings in the cities. Youth organisations like the Pioneers, set up for boys under 14, glorified the work of Stalin and the Party, and creating a new generation of people who believed that Stalin was almost a god.

In conclusion, the cult happened for many different reasons, but some say, including Stalin's daughter, that her father was a victim of the growing cult and hated the way that it was un-Marxist. It is hard to believe, however, this side of the story, when Stalin so obviously employed massive propaganda to boost his position.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The answer is clearly and cogently expressed, with a good range of reasons, supported by secure evidence, and there is a sustained focus on explanation. The brief conclusion provides some depth of comment and evaluation.*

*Overall, the answer merited a mark in the middle of Level 4 – 11 marks.*

**Candidate 2**

- 1 (a) Explain why the cult of Stalin developed after 1929. (12 marks)

The cult of Stalin was developed after 1929 because this was the time in which Stalin had started to gain most of his power and support. In Russia the leader before Stalin was Lenin, and Stalin followed in Lenin's footsteps after he died in 1928. After Lenin died, Stalin was obsessed with trying to make Russia an independent state, so they could run off their own state without having to rely on other countries. As they were 50-100 years behind other countries in development of technologies, for example, Stalin feared that within 10 years they would be crushed.

After Lenin's brutal force with gaining respect and power (Leninism), Stalin followed with extreme brutality of gaining and keeping his established power. The cult of Stalin would help in his direction of maintaining authority in Russia with his own followers and those who dared to disobey and not support him, which would lead to people being sent to gulags, purging and terror being used.

**Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The first part of the answer is very indirect to the question, with loosely expressed description of the transition from Lenin to Stalin – which has little to do with 'after 1929'. The final brief paragraph has better relevance, though still rather implicit. Overall, the answer just merited a mark in Level 2, though at the bottom of the range – 3 marks.*

**Candidate 3**

- 1 (b) How important was Stalin's desire for personal political power in explaining why the Soviet Union became intolerant of diversity in the 1930s? (24 marks)

Stalin's desire for personal political power was important to explaining why the Soviet Union became intolerant of diversity in the 1930s because Stalin's desire was an obsession. He wanted his power to be dominant over any other power that exist including over monarchs may have had in Russia. The Soviet Union became intolerant of the diversity because things were too varied under Stalin's command, things were open to change whenever Stalin wished it to, and therefore the Soviet Union didn't want this to be happening any more so they decided to tolerate it. Putting up barriers and rules that needed to be followed first, before any decision or changes were to be made. Stalin didn't like it if anyone who followed him began to show signs of having more authority than him. In some cases people could be purged for it.

He wanted things to be the same how he liked it, how he wanted them to be. Stalin had seen how power and authority could work in other countries, for example Germany under Adolf Hitler's control, therefore he knew it could work. People who disrespected or refused to support Stalin could be punished by being sent to gulags.

The \*\*\*\*\* and Stalin came up with a set of economic plans which were brought about to help improve the industrial side of Russia. They were set up for businesses big and small to follow. The plans were said to be unrealistic to what

Stalin wanted done. Therefore workers were worked tirelessly, sometimes night and daytime, some were even killed as they tried to escape. The first plan was 1928 to 1932. The second plan was 1933 to 1937, and the third plan was 1938 to 1941. Also the Soviet Union became intolerant because they took away privately-owned land – the majority of this land was owned by kulaks.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The answer has direct relevance but lacks depth and definition. The assessments made are often expressed in very generalised terms. Some attempt is made to exemplify policies from the 1930s but the evidence selected lacks either substance or depth. Overall, the answer merited Level 2 – 9 marks.*

### **Candidate 4**

- 1 (b) How important was Stalin's desire for personal political power in explaining why the Soviet Union became intolerant of diversity in the 1930s? (24 marks)

Throughout the 1920s, Stalin had fought off his competitors and rivals within the Bolshevik Party to replace Lenin as undisputed leader of the Bolsheviks and the Soviet Union. One of the key aspects of Stalin's totalitarian rule was that the Soviet Union was intolerant of diversity. Many reasons have been put forward as to why they were intolerant of diversity.

Firstly, it can be argued that Stalin's desire for personal political power was one of the main reasons why the Soviet Union was intolerant of diversity. Stalin personally could not accept personal criticism and therefore wanted all opposition eliminated in order for him to remain supreme leader of the Soviet Union. Unlike Lenin, who ruled through the Politburo and Central Committee, Stalin wanted political power to himself. He argued that it was the best way for the Soviet Union to be in line with Marxism and he saw himself as the man to lead the Soviet Union to Utopia.

Therefore he used the 1921 decree against factionalism to eliminate opponents and many complied since it was passed by Lenin. Therefore Stalin's desire for personal power was seen as a separate ideology, Stalinism, where he was a dictator, and may be a reason why the Soviet Union was intolerant of diversity.

On the other hand, it can be argued that Stalin wanted to portray the Soviet Union as a unified nation after there was a war scare. Britain broke off diplomatic relations, while France broke off trade links and the Japanese were threatening on the Far East. The Nazis under Hitler were a potential threat, as was the capitalist threat of the USA, therefore, in order for the Soviet Union to be strong and to make it a unified country at times of crisis, Stalin may have been intolerant of diversity.

Also, many historians would argue that the Soviet Union was intolerant of diversity because they wanted to create Utopia. This was Karl Marx's final stage in Communism where all class was banished and there wasn't a State. Therefore, Stalin and the Politburo may have seen that in order for Utopia to be realised, rival ideologies had to be defeated or eliminated, such as Trotskyism, which would have hindered the Soviet Union's progress creating utopia according to the State.

Added to these, and also on a related note to the last point, in Marx's stage theory of Communism, the stage of Socialism states that those of the bourgeoisie who don't comply with the dictatorship of the proletariat had to be re-educated or exterminated. Therefore, the Soviet Union may have been intolerant of diversity.

It is evident that Stalin's desire for personal political power certainly played a part in the Soviet Union becoming intolerant of diversity. Nevertheless, historians have put forward many other reasons. Overall, it appears that the most important reason as to why the Soviet Union was intolerant of diversity seems to be that of Stalin's desire for personal political power. This is because Stalin also had a personal desire to eliminate potential threats to him and also personally could not take criticism so the most effective way of suppressing this seemed to be by being intolerant of diversity.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The answer is fluently expressed and well organised. There is a clear, balanced awareness of the issues, placing precise evidence in a concise framework and showing some synoptic understanding (for example in the explanation of the impact of the international situation). The penultimate paragraph shows conceptual depth of Marxist ideology and this leads into a confident conclusion. Although the introduction is rather perfunctory, the answer merited a mark in Level 5 rather than Level 4 – 22 marks.*

### **Candidate 5**

3 (a) Explain why Nazi ideology was anti-Semitic. (12 marks)

No one actually knows why the Nazis were anti-Semitic, particularly as in Germany there was a very small population of Jews. Some say that it was because Hitler wanted to blame an 'outsider' for the loss of the war.

Also at the time there was high rates of unemployment, meaning that Hitler could claim that the Jews are taking all of the Germans' jobs.

The most important reason is that Nazi ideology was very strongly based on 'pure German' blood where Germany would be full of Germans only. This meant that they did not want Germans to marry or have children with Jews. This anti-Semitism just grew gradually, and it eventually got worse where Jewish children could not even go to the same school as German children to the point where Jews were blamed for being criminals etc and were sent to be exterminated.

Jews, as well as other groups such as gypsies, asocials and homosexuals were seen to threaten the 'volksgemeinschaft', which means the people's community.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The answer is concise and direct, showing a range of three relevant reasons. There is some valid development of the explanation of race theory. Thus, the answer merited a mark in Level 3. It is, however, lacking in clarity and depth of expression and was placed at below mid-Level – 7 marks.*



**Candidate 6**

- 3 (b) How far was the Nazi regime successful in marginalising German Jews in the years 1933 to 1939? (24 marks)

The Nazis did many things to marginalise the Jews in the years of 1933 –1939.

Firstly, in 1935, the Nuremberg Laws on Citizenship and on the Protection of German Blood meant that no Jew or German could be together. It made the Jewish population untouchable for people of the true German race. Jews became enemies. The people who were affected by the laws were not protected by the state. The Jews were marginalised dramatically.

When the Anschluss with Austria happened, these laws were enforced by the Austrian people also. Many Jews lost their businesses and Jews had 'J' put in their passports. Furthermore, from 1933 laws were set up to cleanse the civil service of all civil servants who were Jewish or communist enemies of the state, most of all the Jews. This was successful. By 1939 the majority of Jews were not anything to do with the government or civil service anymore.

Kristalnacht in 1938 (The Night of Broken Glass) was another success in the marginalising of German Jews. The SA, after a Nazi official was shot by a Jew, destroyed 117 synagogues in 15 hours. A lot of Jewish shops were broken into.

The Nazis also indoctrinated children on how bad the Jews were, with many Jewish children sent out of school and forced into their own Jewish schools.

However the Nazi regime did not go all that far in 1933–39. The first boycott of Jewish shops was taken by activists and local people were shocked. They even stocked up on food from Jewish shops because they thought there was going to be a shortage of food. The marginalising of German Jews was done mainly by the local SA men and it was the Nazi government who had to say no to it because it was unpopular with the people.

Many people wouldn't associate the Jews to the Nazi propaganda against the Jewish shop owner. The Nuremberg Laws also didn't apply to the Jews who fought in the war, or whose parents had. Many Germans took pity towards neighbours who were Jews. Also, many Germans didn't leave Germany through emigration because they thought it would all blow over.

Overall, the Nazi regime did go far in marginalising German Jews who were there during 1933–39.

**Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The answer is concise and keeps a clear focus on the question. There is also an attempt to provide a balanced assessment, weighing a number of exceptions and restraining factors against the main argument about discrimination, legal pressures and intimidation. There is a range of specific supporting evidence, covering the whole period from 1933 to 1939, although the chronological sequence is somewhat disordered and the written communication lacks fluency and control. Despite its uneven quality, the answer merited a mark at the bottom of Level 4 rather than the top of Level 3 – 17 marks.*