



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative J Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – January 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.

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

Copyright © 2007 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.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848–c1956**AS Unit 1: The Origins and Consolidation of Totalitarian Regimes, 1918–1939****Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the importance of 'faction' (line 4) in the context of Stalin's accession to power in the years 1924 to 1929. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. a group of politicians supporting a different policy. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. Trotsky's and Zinoviev's support for Permanent World Revolution differed from Stalin's Socialism in One Country, enabling him to invoke Lenin's 1921 ban on faction and expel his rivals or any faction. References to the source might include 'the opposition' or 'united in our ideology'. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source A** differs from **either Source B or Source C** in relation to the reasons why leaders demanded complete obedience. (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: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. Source A refers to 'anti-Party', Source B to 'not German', Source C to 'severe measures against any opposition'. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. although all sources refer to the need for complete obedience: there are differences in the focus. Source A: 'broke the laws of the Party', Source B: 'press through the ideas it knows to be right', Source C: 'authority, direction and order'. Stalin demanded complete obedience for the Party to build a workers' state while Sources B and C demand complete obedience to fulfil anti-democratic or nationalist ambitions **3-5**

L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source A challenges either Source B or Source C, e.g. all the sources express similar demands for complete obedience. Source A comments darkly 'no-one would dare to touch them', while Source B refers to 'brutal ruthlessness', and Source C to 'authority, direction and order'. They differ because Source A is demanding complete obedience from within the Party, while Source B and Source C demand obedience from alternative viewpoints, e.g. the lack of authority, direction and order in a democratic system. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of political ideology, in relation to other factors, in the coming to power of totalitarian regimes.

You should refer in your answer to the USSR, 1924–1929 and **either** Germany, 1928–1933 **or** Italy, 1918–1922. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources: all the sources stress the importance of political ideology in the accession to power. Source A uses phrases, e.g. 'dictatorship of the proletariat' and 'socialism', suggesting

Leninist ideology underpinned Stalin's bid for power. In Source B, phrases e.g. 'Democracy is fundamentally not German' point to the anti-democratic strand of Nazi ideology, and refers to the role of the State and Volk – 'build up the State and community of the people'. Source C makes the same points – 'Fascism does not believe in democracy' and then refers to collectivism – 'State is the will and personality of the nation'.

Candidates may question how coherent the ideology was in practice. Stalin changed his ideological position to build his own power, e.g. he abandoned his earlier support for some capitalist economics (through NEP) to a command economy (collectivisation and Five Year Plans). Hitler's ideology expressed in 'Mein Kampf' lacked clarity, and the Nazis ideological message was often contradictory. Fascism was very diverse and localised, so much so that Mack Smith wrote 'Fascism was not ideology but really a means for winning power by a single man'.

From own knowledge: e.g. constructs a balanced answer considering other factors that also explain the coming to power of totalitarian regimes:

- This might include reference to mistakes made by the other leading politicians: in the USSR, Trotsky and the rest of the Politburo; in Germany, Hindenburg and von Papen; in Italy, the King, Giolitti and the Pope
- Economic conditions may offer an alternative explanation: in the USSR, the impact of the Civil War and the subsequent division over NEP; in Germany, the impact of the Depression after 1929; in Italy, the post-war economic crisis and the growth of socialism
- The use of terror by the emerging dictators: in the USSR Stalin built his own spy network; in Germany Hitler developed the roles of the SA and SS; in Italy Mussolini's Blackshirts played a key role in his coming to power
- Terror may be used less literally to include the 'removal' of political opponents, e.g. in the USSR, the defeats of Bukharin and the right wing; in Germany, Hitler's actions against the KPD after the Reichstag Fire; in Italy, d'Annunzio's mysterious fall from a balcony
- The use of propaganda to push the interests of each emerging dictator: in good answers this may well be linked to political ideology
- The importance of the actual leader and how he built his own power base as the foundation of dictatorship: the cult of the leader and Führerprinzip.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of unconnected points about political ideology; there will be greater range and selection of factors at Level 2. Candidates who make no reference to the sources cannot score higher than Level 2. Level 3 answers will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some links to the 'importance' of the factors identified, although this will not necessarily be sustained or may lack depth of understanding. By Level 4 the case will be argued more strongly, possibly arguing that political ideology was less important in practice than the sources suggest. Level 5 answers will engage in debate, cross-referencing sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the relationship between political ideology and other factors in the accession to power of totalitarian regimes.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'a god' (line 2) in the context of Stalin's leadership in the years 1929 to 1939. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. created a cult in which the people admired or worshipped him. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Stalin cultivated the image of father figure to the nation, as a role model for all to aspire to. It extended Party control into people's everyday lives. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why there was support for Communist policies in the USSR in the years 1929 to 1939. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. life was getting better for some workers/peasants. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. covers several reasons. Answers may give more specific detail to develop Level 1, e.g. the role of propaganda persuading Soviet citizens that they were better off under the Communists, the role of organisations like the Young Pioneers and Stakhanovites. There was real progress with education and opportunities in employment outside agriculture were also popular. **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. there were many Soviet citizens who gained from the regime. Party membership offered promotion opportunities. Public works created a sense of identity, for example the Moscow Metro. Sport was encouraged, and huge stadia were built. This might be balanced by the power of the state giving little alternative to supporting the regime. **6-7**

- (c) 'Stalin's dictatorship gave him total control over all aspects of life.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement in relation to Stalin's leadership of the USSR in the years 1929 to 1939. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

There is a lot of evidence that Stalin was a strong dictator who had control over all aspects of life:

- He had powerful terror state apparatus. He conducted the purges through the NKVD, a secret police force that reached through Soviet society including government and Party officials
- His propaganda image was equally powerful and far-reaching, e.g. Socialist realism
- He constructed the appearance of working with popular approval through the 1936 Constitution
- His government was centralised and had control over legislation and appointments.

The evidence that supports this interpretation tends to be based on contemporary accounts from within the Soviet Union, or from western visitors to the Soviet Union in the 1930s who were sympathisers, or who were only shown carefully selected evidence.

This needs to be balanced with understanding that other factors also question the nature of Stalin's dictatorship suggesting he had less control over all aspects of life. These might include:

- The purges are evidence that there was significant opposition to Stalin throughout the country (kulaks), Party (other Bolshevik leaders) and the army
- Stalin's propaganda image was constantly embellished suggesting that it was not strongly fixed in the national psyche

- It has become clearer recently that Stalin was responding to events as much as dictating to the regime. This can be seen through economic policies, the role of Party officials, and the peasants. The regime appears to be more disorganised than previously believed.

The evidence that supports this interpretation tends to be based on recent archive material made available since the fall of the USSR.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on the nature of Stalin's dictatorship. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways that he exercised his dictatorship, and may begin to develop a counter-argument. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad, paying attention to the whole time period in the question 1929–1939, perhaps seeing differences in the nature of his dictatorship over the time period. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on an understanding of the weak/strong debate over the nature of Stalin's personal dictatorship. Some candidates, often good ones, may underpin their whole answer with a definition of dictatorship and understanding of totalitarian rule.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Führer' (line 1) in the context of the Nazi regime in the years 1934 to 1939. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. he was the leader of the Nazi government and created a cult of leadership. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. identifies some of the powers that the position gave Hitler making his position so powerful – he was the supreme legislator, administrator and judge; he was the leader of the Party, Army and people. He had overwritten the Weimar constitution when he combined the posts of Chancellor and President on Hindenburg's death in August 1934. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Hitler 'did not play a leading part in day-to-day government' (line 3) in the years 1934 to 1939. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he was lazy and relied on others to do the work. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. covers several reasons. Answers may give more specific detail to develop Level 1, e.g. the laziness might be developed to consider why he was so removed from decision making for he certainly disliked paperwork, and the mental effort involved in making decisions, and he preferred to let events take their course. Other reasons might include Hitler's reliance on men he knew were experts in their field, e.g. Goebbels' control of the Ministry for Propaganda, and Schacht at Economics, both men were able to do the job. Besides, Hitler had

personal interest in his pet projects, and increasingly opted out of the day-to-day running of the government. **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. understands that the day to day running of the government was not the source of power in Hitler's personal dictatorship. The source of power was access to Hitler. **6-7**

(c) 'After 1934 Hitler was an all-powerful dictator.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement in relation to Hitler's leadership of Germany in the years 1934 to 1939. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

There is a lot of evidence that Hitler was a strong dictator:

- He had powerful terror state apparatus. He controlled the legal system by bringing in new laws and setting up new courts
- The SS became a separate organisation responsible for enforcing the will of the regime. The SS took over the Gestapo and the running of the concentration camps
- His propaganda image was equally powerful and far-reaching, e.g. Hitler and Goebbels were both aware of the power of radio to promote Hitler's dictatorship so Hitler's speeches reached a wide audience extended by loudspeakers
- His government was centralised and had control over legislation and appointments. This interpretation suggests Hitler deliberately allowed rivalry among his supporters as it safeguarded his own position.

The evidence that supports this interpretation tends to be based on contemporary accounts from within Germany, or from historians writing immediately after the horrors of World War II who were trying to explain the emergence of the regime as the will of an all-powerful, evil dictator.

This needs to be balanced with understanding that other factors also question the nature of Hitler's dictatorship suggesting he was, in fact, 'a weak dictator'. The evidence that supports this interpretation tends to be based on more recent historical research. These might include:

- The administration of the regime was chaotic and areas of responsibility overlapped rather than being systematically determined
- Hitler did not make his policies clear. Instead he gave hints, or relied on propaganda, but certainly did not give clear directives
- It has become clearer recently that Hitler was responding to events as much as dictating to the regime. He needed to play off the big power blocks in the regime – army, party, civil service and big business. His dependence on the old elites made his government anarchic
- Hitler himself was prone to pressure from below in decision making, e.g. various policies towards the Jews came from the grass roots of the Nazi party.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on the nature of Hitler's dictatorship. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways that he exercised his dictatorship, and may begin to develop a counter-argument. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad paying attention to the whole time period in the question, 1934–1939, perhaps seeing differences in the nature of his dictatorship over the time period. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on an understanding of the weak/strong debate over the nature of Hitler's personal dictatorship. Some candidates, often good ones, may underpin their whole answer with a definition of dictatorship and understanding of totalitarian rule.

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Il Duce' (line 1) in the context of Mussolini's leadership in the years 1922 to 1939. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. he was the leader of the Fascist government and created a cult of leadership. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. identifies some of the powers that the position gave Mussolini. By 1927 he was Duce of the Fascist Party, President of the Fascist Grand Council, Head of Government, and headed many ministries including Foreign Minister. Above all he presented himself as 'superman'. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Mussolini 'relied on the support of different interest groups' (line 2) in the years 1922 to 1939. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he had been appointed by the king and that support might be withdrawn. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. answers may give more specific detail to develop Level 1, about which interest groups supported Mussolini including the king, police, army, big business and the Catholic Church. They all continued to exist within his state and he relied on their continued support because of the limitations to his dictatorship, e.g. the army owed loyalty to the king who refused to allow the army to give the fascist salute. **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. understands that Mussolini's dictatorship was actually shared power, and that he had to consider these interest groups if he was to retain his share of power. **6-7**

- (c) 'Mussolini's dictatorship was strong in appearance but weak in action.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to Mussolini's leadership of Italy in the years 1922 to 1939. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

There is a lot of evidence that Mussolini was a dictator and gave the appearance of being strong. Candidates may well explain the steps by which the dictatorship was established in the years 1922–1927 including his appointment as Prime Minister October 1922, the emergency powers, setting up the Fascist Grand Council, Acerbo Election Law 1923, impact of the Matteotti murder 1924, Law on the Powers of Head of Government 1925, and the Exceptional Decrees 1926–1927:

- He did not tolerate criticism. This became more evident after 1931 when one of the few people prepared to tell the truth, his brother Arnaldo, died
- He appointed ministers who were less able and more submissive
- The Catholic Church backed the regime having won concessions from the Duce, e.g. 1923 concessions and the 1929 Lateran Treaty
- He dominated the key positions in government appointing himself to serve in many of the ministries
- He had the Blackshirts and legal powers, though he made less use of terror than either Stalin or Hitler
- His propaganda image was powerful. Mussolini had begun life as a journalist and understood the power of the press.

Candidates may well separate the ‘Mussolini’ from the ‘dictatorship’ possibly concluding his rule in Italy was more ‘personal’ than a total dictatorship:

- Mussolini was skilled at inspiring crowds. He presented himself as the saviour of Italy, the supreme patriot and a great thinker
- He appeared to take personal responsibility for the nation
- His propaganda was very personal. He presented himself as super-masculine through media, government pronouncement.

This needs to be balanced with understanding that other factors also question the nature of Mussolini’s dictatorship suggesting he was, in fact, not so powerful. It was in fact ‘weak in action’. These might include:

- The administration of the regime was not efficient
- He could always be dismissed by the King, and was answerable to the various interest groups
- There were two major disagreements with the Church over the role of Catholic Action. The Pope openly criticised the regime
- The Fascist Party itself was very disparate. He had to purge some 60,000 members in 1928–1929.

His propaganda was gradually established, and never as effective as that of Hitler. It has been described as ‘amateurish’. Indeed AJP Taylor concluded that Mussolini’s dictatorship was based more on propaganda myth than reality, a ‘sawdust Caesar’. Candidates may well conclude that there was little substance to this dictatorship.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on the nature of Mussolini’s dictatorship. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples of how he was weak and/or strong. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways that he exercised his dictatorship, and may begin to develop a counter-argument. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad paying attention to the whole time period in the question 1922–1939, perhaps seeing differences in the nature of his dictatorship over the time period with it weakening in the later years. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the

precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on an understanding of the debate over the nature of Mussolini's dictatorship. Some candidates, often good ones, may underpin their whole answer with a definition of dictatorship and what personal rule involves.