



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative E Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825 –1941

Mark Scheme

2005 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 revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

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

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

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in 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.

June 2005

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941

AS Unit 1: Germany and Russia before the First World War, 1870-1914

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of “the Fundamental Laws” in relation to political change in Russia after the 1905 Revolution. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. defining the precise powers of the Duma. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. shattered the hopes for parliamentary government and deprived the Duma of genuine legislative control, as ministers remained solely responsible to the Tsar; the Duma, which could be dismissed, had limited powers of debate, making it no more than consultative. 2-3

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

Explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A** with reference to the October Manifesto. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. provides a basic contrast, identifying the Tsar’s intention to reform in Source A, which is denied in Source B. 1-2
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source A seems to show the Tsar’s genuine concern for his people and the birth of political democracy in Russia, but facing strong opposition and on Witte’s advice, concessions from the Tsar seemed unavoidable. Source B shows some insight into the Tsar’s tactics, regarding the Manifesto as a façade and a sham;

the Soviet was now stormed and faced a five-day siege after which its leaders, including Trotsky, were arrested. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as above, but perhaps commenting on and showing insight on the Tsar's expediency, and the fear of the Soviet that the Revolution had not gone far enough, and that the Tsar made concessions only to retain control. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of political reforms, in relation to other factors, in maintaining the stability of the tsarist regime in the years 1905 to 1914. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *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, the appearance of genuine reform in Source A is largely a tactical move to divide the opposition before using troops. From Source B, later events confirm some truth in the Soviet's cynicism – the promise of reform was merely a ploy, and failed in any case to fulfil the more extremist demands of the Soviet. Despite the legislative restrictions of the Fundamental Laws, Source C sees the positive side of political reforms, given the centuries of autocracy in Russia, and regards the Dumas as ultimately progressive. Candidates might want to challenge this rosy view.

From own knowledge, the political reforms of the October Manifesto and the Dumas can be seen as a major political advance potentially stabilising the regime by marking the start of power sharing in a constitutional monarchy. However, the importance was undermined by the issuing of the Fundamental Laws, the dismissal of the early Dumas and by Stolypin's manipulation of the electoral system. Despite the constructive achievements of the Third Duma, there was little real evidence of Nicholas relinquishing any of his autocratic powers. In terms of providing stability, the use of repression was arguably of equal importance – loyal troops suppressed the workers and soviets in 1905, and 'Stolypin's Necktie' would lead to thousands of executions. Candidates should also consider the economic route to stability, with the end of redemption payments, Stolypin's land reforms and continued industrial expansion. Allow references to foreign policy if appropriately linked.

Level 1 answers might provide a limited and generalised summary, focused probably on 1905-1906. Level 2 will include more range over the period up to 1914, but will tend merely to describe the workings of the four Dumas. At Level 3, some source evidence must be included, and there should be some explicit debate on the importance of political reforms, but reference to other means of achieving stability will be limited. At Level 4, candidates should present a more balanced and developed response, with more explanation on other factors. In reaching conclusions at Level 5, there should be some sort of overview, effectively integrating a range of stabilising factors.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "war scare" in relation to the crisis of 1875. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a sudden military crisis bringing Europe to the brink of war. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a clumsy diplomatic move to warn off the French. The crisis, provoked by Bismarck himself, was in the form of a dramatic headline 'Is War In Sight?' in the Berlin Post. It largely backfired when Britain and Russia supported France. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bismarck was worried about the threat of French revenge in the years 1871 to 1875. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. fear of further military conflict may undermine Bismarck's hopes for peace. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. France, already aggrieved at the loss of Alsace-Lorraine and its industrial assets, successfully paid off the war indemnity six months early, and Germany had to withdraw the army of occupation from northern France. News of French army reforms increased worries, and the order of cavalry horses from Germany triggered Bismarck's press campaign. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as L2, but perhaps appreciating the broader perspective, with French revenge threatening Bismarck's diplomatic control of Europe, and increasing the vulnerability of the new state from Germany's defeated enemies. **6-7**

- (c) "Bismarck's success was limited and short-term." Explain why you agree or disagree with this judgement on German foreign policy in the years 1871 to 1890. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **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

To maintain peace and security for 20 years seems neither limited nor short-term as Bismarck successfully isolated France and prevented conflict in the Balkans between Austria-Hungary and Russia. Yet, was Bismarck's diplomacy consistent and effective, or complicated and contradictory? Despite his strong diplomatic control, highlighted at the Congress of Berlin, only the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary stood the test of time. To respond to the question, candidates should select from a broad range of evidence over the period, with the early contacts of the first Dreikaiserbund, the calculated bluff of the war scare, Bismarck as 'honest broker' at the Congress of Berlin, and the network of alliances from 1879 (Dual Alliance, second Dreikaiserbund, Triple Alliance, Reinsurance Treaty) establishing a comprehensive but perhaps increasingly contradictory diplomatic network which showed serious cracks after the Bulgarian Crisis from 1885. But by 1890, Bismarck's diplomatic system was clearly still workable – his successors dismantled it.

Level 1 will provide a generalised summary with limited precise evidence. Level 2 will include more range, but is likely to be a chronological narrative of the main alliances with little comment. There should be some explicit assessment of success by Level 3, but this may to accept or reject the proposition with little development. A more balanced and developed debate will be evident at Level 4 – overall, Bismarck did fulfil German policy aims, skilfully handling complex diplomatic issues; yet his alliance initiatives were often a series of temporary stop-gaps. Level 5 should provide an overview and reach conclusions.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “redemption payments” in relation to Russia after 1881. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. peasant payments for the land they received. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. peasants were forced to make annual payments like a mortgage over 49 years for the land acquired, and these dues were often greater than the productive value of the land. After 20 years, the burden remained, with the mir responsible for collecting payments. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Russia's economy remained so backward and undeveloped in the 1880s. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the majority of the population were poor peasants without adequate land. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the mir retarded economic change and placed restrictions upon the movement into towns for industry,

and agriculture itself remained antiquated with its strip system and communal farming. Hence, there was only a small urban workforce, as well as a lack of middle class private initiative with few entrepreneurs, a poor banking system, and no infrastructure for trade and investment, with untapped resources. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as L2, but perhaps commenting on the government's wrong priorities – autocratic political control and military efficiency, and, in the 1880s, still relatively limited state intervention – the trigger for change. **6-7**

(c) “From the appointment of Witte in 1892 until the outbreak of war in 1914, there was spectacular development in the growth of Russian industry, but little progress was made in agriculture.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this verdict. (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

With the start of the industrial upsurge, the government began to change its initially hostile attitude to industrialisation, and finally realised that Russia's great power status could not be upheld without economic modernisation. Real progress in industry started in the 1890s with Witte as Minister of Finance. During this ‘great spurt’ there was 8% growth per annum, with massive economic expansion especially in heavy industry and railways, and an industrial labour force of 3 million. Witte promoted large-scale state investment and established

monetary stability, placing the rouble on the Gold Standard. However, dependent on foreign loans, Russia became Europe's largest debtor nation. Meanwhile, the agricultural sector, in which over 80% of the population earned their living, remained neglected and backward, as the peasants remained controlled by the mir and tied to the countryside. Russia's poor internal market was further hindered by high taxes and tariffs – grain was exported while millions starved in the 1890s. The backwardness of Russian agriculture was preventing securely-based industrial development. However, after 1905, agriculture becomes the centre of government policy. Stolypin's reforms were designed to establish a prosperous peasantry by abolishing redemption dues, encouraging private ownership outside the mir and improving efficiency. These reforms, which were the most important attempt since emancipation to tackle agricultural backwardness and rural over-population, needed 20 years to work, and by 1914 only 10% of the land had been consolidated, with the strip system still prevailing as peasants became increasingly reluctant to leave the security of the mir. Stolypin's reforms remain controversial, but agricultural production reached record levels by 1913. After 1906, there was also further growth in heavy industry as Russia finally begins to develop her own consumer market. By 1914, Russia was ranked 5th in the world as an industrial state, yet, compared to other countries, this was still too limited an industrial base, dependent on foreign capital, and with more than 80% of Russians still peasant farmers.

Level 1 will only cover part of the period or be restricted to a generalised summary. Level 2 should include both aspects, though industry may dominate in a Witte based narrative with little sign of assessment. Some explicit focus will be evident at Level 3 on both areas, but may still not be balanced and will not be developed, perhaps just accepting the proposition. By Level 4, the inter-relationship of industry and agriculture should be clear, with some developed insight over most of the period. In reaching conclusions at Level 5, candidates should emphasise how both agricultural and industrial development are indispensable for economic progress.

June 2005

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941

A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

Question 1

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

How useful are these two sources as evidence of the extent of freedom and democracy in the Weimar Republic and in Stalin's USSR? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 might provide a summary of the sources, describing in only broad and general terms the political structure of both regimes. At Level 2, candidates might provide some contextual evidence on the creation of the Weimar Republic in 1919 and on the structure of Stalin's Communist state. However, answers at this level might still be restricted to a general context or to utility in general terms, largely accepting the sources at face value. From Level 3, candidates need to show some explicit insight into the utility of these formal constitutional sources beyond content, into the nature of both regimes and reach some conclusions, although coverage may not be developed or balanced for both sources. There should be comment on the democratic base of the new German republic, incorporating presidential emergency powers and even the temporary suspension of fundamental rights in order to restore public order and secure the democratic regime. In contrast, the appearance of freedom and democracy in the Soviet Union should be set against the reality of the purges and the nature of communist rule. Answers at Level 4 should be as above for Level 3, but with a fully developed insight into utility from both sources and from knowledge of the democratic realities of both regimes.

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

“More than a century of sustained autocracy with little genuine attempt to reform.”
Assess this view of governments in **both** Germany **and** Russia during the period 1825 to 1939. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates’ responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Candidates will not be expected to demonstrate knowledge of the whole period in the same depth, but should be able to distinguish between the different political contexts and select evidence over the period about the nature of autocratic rule and attempts to achieve reform in these states, achieving some element of balance in terms of coverage and use of own knowledge/sources, and some appreciation of the changes and developments over the period in relation to the question.

The nature of tsarist rule, with its hard-line divine right autocracy, should be considered with evidence from Source B. The motives behind the reforms of Alexander II and Nicholas II

(from 1905) should be harnessed effectively to the question. The promises of reform and the democratic expectations of the Provisional Government and the succeeding communist regimes of Lenin and Stalin (supported by Source D) provide contrasting contexts in terms of the nature of political rule. For Germany, Source A could be used to focus on the failure of 1848 and on the political structure of Bismarck's regime in terms of sham democracy and the nature of reform – with political continuity through to 1918. Higher level answers may develop the distinction made between authoritarian and autocratic governments. The Weimar Republic, apparently the most democratic and reformist government, incorporated inherent weaknesses, lacked public support, and inherited aspects of the earlier political structure (with evidence from Source C). The Nazi regime can be examined in terms of autocratic continuity, public expectations and the focus of reform.

Level 1 will include only a narrow range of evidence and will lack balance between the states (or only include one state), perhaps just briefly summarising the sources. Level 2 should provide a better balance, but the review of the period will still be limited, presenting only a generalised focus in terms of autocracy and reform; the content might also be restricted to the contexts of the sources. By Level 3, both sources and own knowledge must be included, and there should be some clear signs of assessment in terms of 'sustained' and 'genuine', but this will not be balanced nor developed, and there will only be limited appreciation of the changing contexts over the 100 years. Range, balance and development will all be evident at Level 4, with a clear insight into the changing nature of autocracy over the period and into the motives behind reforms. Judgement and conclusions at Level 5 will reveal an effective overview, highlighting the key changes and turning points in both states.

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

“Both Stalin and Hitler came to power because their political opponents underestimated the threat that they posed.”

Assess the validity of this verdict in comparing the reasons for the rise to power of Stalin in the USSR by 1928 and Hitler in Germany by January 1933. (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Stalin’s political opponents included Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev and the Right Communists, who not only underestimated Stalin but also virtually destroyed each other through their divisions, errors, tactics, policies and over-confidence. In particular, candidates are likely to single out Trotsky, who failed to take the opportunities to undermine Stalin before he became a threat and whose own over-confidence tended to isolate him. Yet Trotsky also had significant weaknesses with his lack of a power base, his persistent adherence to World Revolution and factional collusion with other opponents. However, Stalin’s own strengths and qualities are equally important in explaining his rise to power, as well as the lack of a clear power structure following Lenin’s death. He had a superb grasp of political tactics – his power base as General Secretary and within the politburo and triumvirate made him the indispensable link in the party and government network, with the

influential power of patronage. Stalin's 'Socialism in One Country' proved to be a skilful and pragmatic approach to future policy.

Hitler's political opponents believed that he could be tamed and controlled, but actually provided his pathway into power. Political intrigue, self-interest and underestimation after 1930 certainly played into Hitler's hands with the use of emergency powers under Article 48 and the effective end of true parliamentary government. The rivalry between Papen and Schleicher, and Hindenburg's vulnerability gave Hitler scope to use his political skills. The impact of this intrigue could also be broadened into the constitutional weaknesses of continued coalition government. Again, other factors also need to be considered. Hitler's own charisma and emotional appeal successfully pinpointed the frustrations of many Germans – he bided his time after 1930 and out-thought those who believed they could tame him. Hitler was also supported effectively by strong party organisation and ideology, financial backing and Goebbels's propaganda. Economic instability, peaking with the impact of the Wall St. Crash, provided Hitler with an electoral breakthrough, as the German people turned to political extremism and the conservative elites united around the Nazi alternative.

Level 1 might tackle only one dictator, or two in minimal detail, providing a condensed narrative summary of the rise to power. Level 2 will respond to both dictators with more range, but will provide mainly a general descriptive narrative, with little sign of comparison, except as broad links. At Level 3, candidates will respond explicitly to the question, start to compare and make synoptic links, appreciating a range of factors but lacking balance and development. These aspects will be evident at Level 4 with more integration – perhaps comparing the different political contexts for their opponents, with the conservative right in Germany believing they could use Hitler to secure their own political influence; whereas the rival communists in the USSR already had power in a one-party state. A full range of issues will be integrated at Level 5 with a sustained comparison.

Question 3

“Stalin's economic and political revolution in the years 1928 to 1939 was more of a myth than a reality.”

Assess the accuracy of this judgement.

(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 best answers will consider a range of interpretations. In economic terms – the creation of a planned centralised economy which transformed both agriculture and industry for the benefit of all, or merely a propaganda projection to disguise the repression and lack of achievement? In political terms – an effective totalitarian state subservient to Stalin's personal dictatorship, or merely institutionalised terror which gradually spiralled out of control? Candidates will need to consider the impact of the economic and political revolution for Stalin, for the country and for ordinary people.

Given the backwardness of the USSR, an economic revolution was certainly needed, and Stalin aimed to modernise the economy through collectivisation and industrialisation based on socialist values and centralised planning. Economic transformation was real enough given the pace of collectivisation and, for industry, increased production, better communications, new resources, and key developments in iron, oil and electricity. However, in terms of benefits for ordinary people, this economic revolution was largely a myth. It is difficult to see anything positive from collectivisation to the benefit either of the state or the people – decline in production, loss of livestock and a vast toll in human lives, with the elimination of the Kulaks and rural famine. Urban reality included living in over-crowded squalor and appalling working conditions – repression, coercion, workbooks, labour camps etc.

The reality of the political revolution was clear to all. For Stalin, it meant a total grip over personnel, party, government, armed forces and people, eliminating all actual and potential opposition at all levels. For ordinary people, this was a collective nightmare, reducing the state to total compliance and leaving a legacy of fear. Again, propaganda helped to create the myth of a personality cult and pinpoint the wreckers and saboteurs, while the political terror intensified at the local level, increasingly out of government control.

Level 1 will provide only a partial summary of both areas or concentrate on one. Level 2 will cover both aspects, but may be narrative in approach, with only restricted or generalised analytical links. Level 3 will provide better range and some balance, with some explicit focus on myth and reality, but may lack a broader analytical framework bringing the two areas together. Clear synoptic links should be evident at Level 4 – perhaps using Stalin’s consolidation of power as the central link, or contrasting Stalin’s perspective with that of the Soviet people. Level 5 should sustain this approach, providing a range of perspectives and interpretations, and presenting a convincing overview.

Question 4

“Once appointed Chancellor, Hitler used legal methods rather than terror and intimidation to create a one-party dictatorship.”

How accurate is this assessment of the methods Hitler used in 1933 and 1934 to consolidate his position in power? (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

Perhaps Hitler’s early moves had more to do with common sense caution and pragmatism than with legality. His options were limited initially by a cabinet in which there were only three Nazis, and by the authority of the President – Hitler had to avoid giving any reason for his dismissal or overthrow. Yet despite his professed aim of coming to power legally, the events of 1933 and 1934 reveal only a thinly disguised legality. Democratic elections were held at the very earliest opportunity, but in an atmosphere of terror, violence and intimidation, with the suspension of civil and political liberties by presidential decree, the arrest of political opponents, especially the Communists, a purge of the police and a politically convenient Reichstag Fire. Hitler skilfully increased his power legally from

above, whilst combining this with arbitrary violence from below. The Enabling Act achieved the necessary two-thirds majority but turned legality on its head by dismantling the Weimar constitution and setting up a one-party dictatorship – destroying the federal system, eliminating trade unions and political parties, and cleansing the ranks of the civil service, judiciary and other professions. This whole concept of *Gleichschaltung* was pushed through with at least a pretence of a legal basis. In 1934, Hitler claimed that the ‘Night of the Long Knives’ had saved the German people from potential civil war, when, in reality, this was state-promoted mass murder triggered by political expediency. The consolidation of power was completed with the death of Hindenburg and the merging of the posts of President and Chancellor within the title of Führer. After August 1934, there was no legal way to remove Hitler.

Level 1 might be restricted to a few factual highlights. Level 2 should cover both years but may adopt a mainly narrative approach. Level 3 will provide a range of detailed evidence with some balance over the two years, and some signs of analytical insight into the pressures Hitler faced in trying to consolidate his position in power. Level 4 will develop the debate, perhaps recognising the initial restraints on the Nazis and the central importance of the Enabling Act, making a mockery of the notion of legality. At this level, candidates should appreciate the deliberate and effective interplay of promoting legal changes from above while mobilising direct action and pressure from below. Level 5 will sustain a rounded analysis, perhaps commenting on the paradox of using legal methods to destroy democracy.

June 2005

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941

A2 Unit 6: Hitler and the Origins of the Second World War, 1933–1941

Question 1

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

Assess the validity of this interpretation of Hitler's hopes and ambitions in foreign policy. (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

Level 1 will tend to summarise the source content, stating that Hitler had no plans for *Lebensraum* but expected easy gains in eastern Europe and from Soviet Russia. Level 2 will show familiarity with this interpretation, and provide some supporting knowledge – Hitler was an opportunist not a planner, evident for example in remilitarising the Rhineland and annexing Austria and Czechoslovakia; he hoped to capitalise on anti-communist feeling in the west. Answers at this level will usually be undeveloped and may include general comment, tending to accept the source at face value. Responses may also suggest implicit agreement and/or disagreement with the interpretation. Level 3 will provide a broader interpretation with some signs of evaluation and insight – Taylor cannot believe that anyone would make racist doctrines the basis for national policy, and, instead, treats Hitler as if he were rational and practical. There is indeed much evidence of a reluctance in the west to work with the Soviet Union in 1938 and 1939, particularly on Chamberlain's part, and Stalin's USSR was clearly vulnerable after the military decimation following the purges. Alternatively, many historians accept *Lebensraum* as a fundamental long-term aim, with a clear intention of waging war based on the ideas of racial supremacy. Answers at this level will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2, but not necessarily full in terms of knowledge and/or comment. This will be more evident at Level 4, which will be as Level 3, but more balanced and/or fully developed, considering a range of interpretations and providing a well-supported assessment.

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

How useful is this source as evidence of Hitler's foreign policy aims? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

Level 1 will summarise the source, or provide only vague or brief comment on Hitler's broad tirade against Bolshevism and Germany's preparation for war. At Level 2, in terms of utility, candidates will comment either on the strengths or limitations of the source, or briefly on both, or may only comment in general terms or in a broad context in relation to utility, largely accepting the source at face value, e.g. as Hitler now embarks on an active foreign policy, and despite increasing economic troubles, he justifies his future actions and provides a timescale to be ready for war in four years. Level 3 will respond to both strengths and limitations in a more balanced and developed way, showing some insight or at least broader assessment – the struggle against Bolshevism gives insight into ideological aspects and Germany's 'destiny', and gives focus to economic developments. Evidence of Hitler's own writing is sparse and tends to give an unbalanced view – this is one of the few documents written as Chancellor. However, it reveals Hitler's blinkered historical perspective and his blinkered insight into the state of the economy. The Plan was a response to the economic crisis of 1935–36, and it locked Germany into a rearmament programme which would create a serious balance of payments problem. Level 4 will broaden the argument and make a judgement on the utility of the source – despite Hitler's wide-ranging speculation and ideological rambling, the Plan was an important turning point giving priority to the ideological imperative of rearmament. In the end, Hitler had to settle for a more pragmatic course, given the precarious position over raw materials, and develop a strategy of short wars, which would not significantly reduce the production of consumer goods.

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

“Everything I undertake is directed against the Russians.”

With reference to German foreign policy up to 1941, assess the validity of Hitler’s statement. (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

To focus on ‘everything I undertake’, candidates must assess the aims and methods of foreign policy, including Hitler’s role, and the events leading to war, which, before 1939, hardly seemed to involve the Soviet Union. Responses will need to analyse the nature of German foreign policy: long-term objectives and a master-plan for war directed at the USSR, or a broader opportunistic approach arising from the initiatives of others and events as they happened, evidently focusing before 1939 on Versailles revisionism and appeasement. Hitler’s unorthodox and unpredictable personality is also relevant. Was his fanatical will the driving force behind an ideological programme of aggression directed at Soviet Russia, or was he less decisive and merely responding to events? It seems that Hitler all along adhered to his major objective of acquiring ‘Lebensraum in the East’, though he was not committed to any specific policies for achieving it, and throughout flexibility characterised his approach. Bell, in Source C, would make a good starting point for the debate, presenting the choice of an ideological grand design pointing at Soviet Russia, with all earlier events related to this; or seeing the attack on the USSR as a short-term practical move, not explicitly related to earlier

events. In Source A, Taylor can see no ideological plan but anticipated easy gains from a weak Bolshevik state. He sees Hitler as flexible and open-minded, accepting any opportunities which would benefit Germany. In *Origins Reconsidered*, Uldricks criticises Taylor's neglect of Soviet Russia, leading, he believes, to an incomplete and distorted account of Europe's descent into war. Source B sees the attack on the Soviet Union as inevitable and part of Germany's destiny, and prepares Germany for the task by setting an economic and military timetable.

Candidates must also use the events to analyse these issues. For example, is the remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936 a bold tentative gamble testing the international waters, or a carefully planned move to provide a shield behind which Hitler can now turn to eastern Europe and the USSR? The Czech crisis of 1938 almost led to war, but largely excluded Soviet Russia. The march into Prague in March 1939 marks an important turning point, with no justification for either revisionism or appeasement. Candidates should have little difficulty in drawing the Nazi-Soviet Pact (effectively lasting until 1941) into the debate, and some will even identify and date the quote in the title as two weeks before this controversial agreement. Arguably, Hitler, partly through his misjudgement, started 'the wrong war' in 1939. After 'the phoney war' and with no preconceived blueprint, Hitler took swift action in 1939–40 to eliminate the West before turning to the USSR. 'Operation Barbarossa' seemed to be his ultimate goal – the carefully calculated plan and the scale of the preparations placed this in a different category to all Hitler's other operations. This would also supply Germany with great economic resources and might convince Britain of the impossibility of her position. Overy accepts that Russia was the promised land of German Lebensraum, opening up the real prospect of world domination to a dangerously over-confident leader. Lee, however, considers the attack as more of a pre-emptive strike following the failure to invade Britain, with Hitler perceiving the Soviet Union less as an ideological enemy than as a looming military threat. Did the real war begin in 1939 or in 1941?

Level 1 will be restricted to perhaps a brief source-led summary, or the events of 1939 or 1941. Level 2 might accept the proposition without reservation, with only limited supporting evidence from the sources, knowledge of events or reading. Some source evidence must be included from Level 3, with some attempt to broaden the debate beyond the proposition, but this may be general and will not be developed, with limited historiography. At Level 4, there should be a more developed and balanced debate reaching as far as 1941, with views from a range of historians. Level 5 will present a full range of evidence and a convincing evaluation.