



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

---

# Mark scheme January 2004

## GCE

# History

## Alternative E: Units 1 and 4

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

---

**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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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.

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

### Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of “new German state” in the context of Bismarck’s aims in foreign policy after 1871. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. Bismarck’s overall priority of bringing security to the newly unified Germany. 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. awareness of the fragility and vulnerability of the new Germany – as the potential target of a coalition of defeated nations aiming to reverse Germany’s recent gains; the formerly aggressive and warlike Bismarck now sought peace to secure the new state. 2-3

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

Explain how the views in Source C differ from the views put forward in Source B about the Dual Alliance of 1879. (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 or general contrast, identifying, perhaps, the central importance of the Dual Alliance to Bismarck’s foreign policy in Source B, and the limitations of the Alliance in Source C. 1-2

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source B emphasises relations with Russia, while Source C emphasises Austria-Hungary and the implications for Germany. Source B recognises the Alliance as a positive turning point in Bismarck’s diplomacy, while Source C questions such an asset for Germany. The Alliance certainly represents a change of direction – it was secret, anti-Russian, to keep Austria-Hungary in check, and turned out to be permanent in the end, despite the short-term reservations expressed in both Sources. 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 that after the Congress of Berlin, Bismarck had the choice of accepting Russian hostility or trying to ally with her, and recognising that the Dual Alliance triggered a whole network of alliances – and ultimately two opposing alliance systems. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of formal alliances, in relation to other factors, in Bismarck's attempts to preserve the peace of Europe 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, 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, Source A provides most scope with an array of flexible diplomatic approaches, including formal alliances, and candidates should have little difficulty integrating their own knowledge of the 20 year period. Sources B and C on the Dual Alliance show evidence of Bismarck's attempts to seize the initiative in international relations, especially in relation to Russia and Austria-Hungary in the Balkans, and the Dual Alliance can be seen as part of a much larger network of alliances and agreements.

From own knowledge, candidates should select from a broad range of evidence over the period, including the early personal contacts of the first Dreikaiserbund, the calculated bluff of the 'War Scare', Bismarck as 'honest broker' at the Congress of Berlin, the network of alliances after 1879 (Dual Alliance, second Dreikaiserbund, Triple Alliance, Reinsurance Treaty) establishing a comprehensive but perhaps increasingly contradictory diplomatic network, highlighted in the Bulgarian Crisis from 1885, etc. Candidates might also comment on Bismarck's efforts to reassure other European leaders that Germany wanted no further expansion, but aimed to maintain the international status quo by becoming the focal point of European diplomacy, trying to neutralise existing antagonisms. Bismarck's performance in *Realpolitik* was a flexible and delicate balancing act, constantly adjusted to changing circumstances, and aiming both to provide security for a newly unified Germany and maintain peace in Europe. Specifically, Bismarck's methods focused on the twin problems of trying to isolate a vengeful France and also to reduce friction between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans.

L1 might provide a partial or general summary, with restricted evidence. L2 will include more range over the period, but may tend to provide a chronological narrative of alliances within Bismarck's foreign policy. At Level 3, evidence from the sources as well as own knowledge must be included, and, at this level, candidates should begin to appreciate the range of Bismarck's variable and flexible diplomacy, with signs of an explicit response to the question. However, assessment might still be dominated by alliances at this level. Level 4 will develop this broader analytical approach, perhaps questioning Bismarck's degree of control in merely reacting to events. Level 5 should debate a range of methods and reach some conclusions.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "economic modernisation" in relation to the Russian economy in the 1890s. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. describing in vague or general terms improvements in industry or agriculture. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. rapid industrialisation using modern methods and techniques, to promote industrial production, development of railways etc. There is no equivalent change in agriculture in the 1890s. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Witte wanted to achieve economic modernisation in Russia in the 1890s. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. commenting on the agrarian and backward economy, or to improve Russia. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. catch up with the West using Russia's undeveloped resources, and improve the infrastructure increasing trade and investment, encouraging the movement of workers to the towns and cities; while presenting a more forward-looking regime to the Russian people and other governments, also improving military efficiency, political control and potential government revenue. **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 Level 2, but including a range of motives designed to emulate the industrial revolutions in western Europe and match the economic development of Russia's rivals, but also to buttress tsarism and maintain Russia's position as a great power. **6-7**

- (c) "Stolypin is chiefly remembered for his successful land reforms after 1906."

Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (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 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**

Stolypin as Prime Minister is remembered both for his ambitious land reforms and also his severe political repression which ran in tandem.

Agrarian reforms between 1906 and 1911 aimed to encourage private ownership, consolidate land and improve efficiency to create a more prosperous and loyal peasantry. Redemption payments were abolished and peasants were free to leave the village mir, with assistance to migrate and buy land. These reforms were the only serious attempt to tackle agricultural backwardness and rural over-population, and large numbers of peasants initially left the commune. However, these reforms needed 20 years to work and by 1914 only 10% of the land had been consolidated and the strip system still prevailed as peasants became increasingly reluctant to leave the security of the mir.

The land reforms were intended to de-revolutionise Russia and Stolypin's political repression ran parallel. He agreed to the dismissal of the first 2 Dumas and then in 1907 significantly doctored the electoral system to reduce the franchise and produce a more right-wing and less critical assembly ('Stolypin's coup'). Martial law was proclaimed with wide-reaching powers and used to quell any disturbances. 'Stolypin's necktie' executed 2500 people between 1906 and 1911, with hundreds of trade unions and newspapers closed down. Stolypin might also be remembered for his assassination in 1911 – he never enjoyed the full support of the Tsar and was probably on the verge of being dismissed.

Level 1 might be a brief assertive summary of the land reforms. Level 2 will include more range of evidence but is likely still to describe the land reforms and accept the proposition. Level 3 should show some explicit signs of assessment, in terms of success or in relation to political repression. Both of these aspects should be included at Level 4, with some judgement at Level 5, perhaps making some connections between the economic and political aspects.

### **Question 3**

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “strong personal ruler” in relation to Kaiser Wilhelm II.

*(3 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. powerful monarch rather than a political figurehead. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. seeing Wilhelm as a semi-autocratic Emperor with considerable personal influence in executive decision making and ministerial appointments, involved with and able to dictate policy making. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why, as Kaiser, Wilhelm II was able to exercise enormous political power. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. as Emperor of Germany, the Kaiser automatically enjoyed great authority. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the Constitution provided dominant executive power to Wilhelm – head of government, control of foreign policy, armed forces, used patronage to appoint personal favourites, could dissolve the Reichstag. The executive was not accountable to the Reichstag but was in the hands of a small ruling elite appointed by the Kaiser. As King of Prussia, he enjoyed virtual autocratic powers. **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 Level 2, but perhaps commenting that the Constitution was drawn up by Bismarck in an attempt to secure his own and Prussia's dominant influence within the façade of a parliamentary democracy; and questioning whether Wilhelm, as hereditary monarch with substantial political powers, actually had the skill to exert them. **6-7**

- (c) “Kaiser Wilhelm II played a central role in governing Germany in the years 1888 to 1914.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (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 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**

Wilhelm II's personality impressed itself on the German executive, as Bismarck soon discovered. No major decision could be taken without his concurrence, and Wilhelm increasingly tried to dictate policy after 1897, especially *Weltpolitik* and naval expansion. Ministers, without support in the Reichstag or among the people, depended on being able to "manage" the Kaiser. The Emperor also led a separate military hierarchy, and the army remained the monarch's personal weapon. After 1908, the influence of his military entourage was unrivalled. He was able to block any political initiatives to reform or democratise the constitutional structure.

However, perhaps he merely meddled rather than directed affairs (e.g. the Daily Telegraph interview in 1908) and was himself manipulated by the political, industrial and military elites, becoming increasingly isolated and out of touch. Wilhelm lacked political experience and was more interested in court ceremonies and parades than day to day business. An additional layer and possibly the key issue is the Kaiser's complex personality – volatile, unpredictable and contradictory. Wilhelm did have executive power in theory, but perhaps lacked political ability and personal stability in practice.

Level 1 is likely to be partial, providing generalised assertion with little evidence, perhaps simply accepting or dismissing the proposition. Level 2 will include more range but will lack balance over the period and may be mainly description, possibly concentrating on foreign policy. By Level 3, there should be some signs of assessment, with at least a mention of the Kaiser's theoretical powers in relation to some political developments over the period, though this will be undeveloped and unbalanced. L4 will begin to develop the analysis, with perhaps some insight into the Kaiser's personality. Level 5 should reach some conclusions and a more balanced assessment.

## A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries

### Question 1

- (a) Use Source D and your knowledge.

Explain what is meant by “the forces of the left” in the context of Weimar Germany.  
(5 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. extremists or Communists wanting full-scale revolution. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. groups wanting ‘revolution from below’ – the Communist or Spartacists (KPD) hoping to seize power and enact a soviet-style revolution, and the Independent Socialists (USPD) promoting a radical programme of revolutionary change, as opposed to Ebert and the SPD wanting peaceful, moderate parliamentary change. **2-3**
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. perhaps commenting on Ebert’s fear of Bolshevism, being prepared to use the forces of the right to prevent uncontrolled revolution from below which would jeopardise democratic change. **4-5**

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

How useful are these two sources in explaining why Trotsky and Lenin believed that the Revolutions of 1905 and March 1917 achieved little success? (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 just provide a source summary describing the failure of 1905 and the Bolshevik refusal to co-operate with the Provisional Government in 1917. At Level 2, candidates should begin to appreciate and explain the broader context of the revolutions, and comment on utility at least in general terms, using own knowledge to emphasise in 1905 the loyalty of the armed forces and the lack of unity of the opposition, and Lenin's return in April 1917 to comment on the March Revolution. By Level 3, candidates should begin to reach some conclusions on the utility of the sources, commenting directly on the provenance, in relation to Trotsky's direct involvement in 1905 especially as Chairman of the St. Petersburg Soviet and Lenin's ideologically Marxist appraisal of the March Revolution. This should be developed and perhaps integrated at Level 4 appreciating both the insight and the limitations of the sources, emphasising the clear propagandist elements, but also perhaps recognising the limited Bolshevik influence on both revolutions, and Trotsky's Menshevik initiative in 1905.

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

“Reform movements were unable to achieve significant change because they were deeply divided.”

Consider the accuracy of this verdict on both Germany and Russia during the period 1825 to 1939. (15 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. 1-4
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. 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. 5-8
- 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. 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 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. 12-13

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. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

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

For both countries, candidates should distinguish between the different social and political contexts and select evidence over the period about reform movements 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 debate focuses essentially on two areas – the main theme of divisions within reform movements is supported at face value by all the extracts, though candidates should qualify some of the source evidence from their own knowledge. There is also the other issue of failing to achieve significant change, and this should certainly be challenged. The backward nature of 19<sup>th</sup> century tsarist Russia restricted the development of reform movements; emerging political parties around 1900, the Revolution of 1905 and the Duma period which followed, and the two Revolutions of 1917 allow detailed analysis of both aspects of the question. For Germany, candidates could concentrate on the failure of liberals in 1848, the pressures for reform during the Second Reich, and the creation of the Weimar Republic. In both states, later totalitarian regimes smothered any potential reform movements. Level 1 will include only a narrow range of evidence and will lack balance between the states (or only include one state), perhaps just summarising the sources. Level 2 should provide a better balance, but the review of the period will still be limited, presenting a mainly generalised focus; the content might be restricted to the context of the sources. By Level 3, there should be some clear signs of assessment in terms of deep divisions and significant change, but perhaps largely the former with little mention of the latter, and also some limited appreciation of the changing context over the 100 years. Both issues should show some signs of development by Level 4 perhaps with some integration between the countries and coverage of most of the period. At Level 5, judgement and conclusions will reveal a thorough understanding and overview of a range of issues over the whole period and between the two states.

**Section B: European Dictatorships in the Inter-War Years**

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 almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

**L2: *Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

**L3:** Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

**L4:** Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

**L5:** As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

**Question 2**

“The attraction of Nazi policies rather than the mistakes of his political opponents enabled Hitler to come to power in Germany in 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**

Candidates will have little difficulty providing evidence on these two aspects or making connections between them, as well as appreciating other reasons for Hitler coming to power, especially the economic crisis. Nazi policies undoubtedly appealed to many groups as people turned to political extremism after 1929, especially the unemployed, the lower middle class, small farmers, young voters, big business etc – but mainly because of economic promises rather than Nazi ideology or political beliefs. Arguably, Nazi policies were the same in 1932 (gaining 230 MPs) as in 1928 (only 12 MPs), but the political and economic context had dramatically changed. Candidates might also consider whether Nazi strengths lay not in policies but more in propaganda and in Hitler’s leadership qualities. Once Hitler could no longer be ignored politically from 1930, the mistakes of his political opponents complemented Nazi progress, as self interest and fatal under estimation played into Hitler’s hands and provided the actual pathway into power. The impact of this political intrigue could also be broadened into the constitutional weaknesses of continued coalition government, proportional representation and Article 48, although candidates should emphasise the economic context as perhaps the main synoptic link. L1 will provide little of this range, dealing superficially with these issues, or perhaps concentrating on one aspect. Level 2 will include some evidence on both areas, but with little assessment or reference to other issues. Level 3 will include signs of this sort of range and show some appreciation of the connections across the issues, especially the economic context. The analysis should be developed at Level 4 in terms of range and balance with clear synoptic grasp of the question, attempting to prioritise the issues and reach conclusions. This would be sustained at Level 5.

**Question 3**

Assess the results for Stalin’s regime and for the Soviet people of the purges of the 1930s. (20 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

**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 purges resulted from the need to snuff out any pockets of political opposition, and dampen and deflect criticism of the pace of economic reform, especially in terms of collectivisation and dekulakisation. In finding scapegoats, Stalin aimed to build an efficient Soviet state subservient to his personal dictatorship and secure the state's total control over the populace and society. For Stalin and his regime, the purges confirmed his total grip over personnel, Party, government, armed forces and people, eliminating all actual and potential opposition at all levels. He developed a personality cult and created a new class of 'apparatchiks' who owed everything to him – some have, however, questioned his rationality. The purge of the Party revealed the clever propaganda theatre of the public show trials as the old Bolsheviks denounced themselves. The self-destruction of Soviet military leadership, replaced by mediocre talent seen as no threat, seemed madness in the light of the increased Nazi threat. For the Soviet people, institutionalised terror became a collective nightmare, reducing the state to total compliance and leaving a legacy of fear. The process of denunciation, punishment and persecution took on a life of its own, as personal relations became hazardous and openness a thing of the past. Some, however, benefited from the improved changes of self promotion. Overall, Stalin's personality was responsible for the terror, but the purges spiralled out of control as the machinery of terror regenerated itself from below as well as from above – descending into chaos as local groups implemented the purges in their own way. Level 1 will be limited in scope, perhaps just concentrating on Stalin himself or on the show trials. Level 2 will present more range but may be dependent on description with little sign of assessment in terms of the specifics of the question. Level 3 will explicitly start to assess the results of the purges and begin to make synoptic links and connections – e.g. Stalin's continued personal popularity. Level 4 will develop this overview, perhaps commenting on the disputed statistical evidence, or the blurring of the results of the purges as the momentum of terror became less centrally controlled. Level 5 will sustain this approach and convincingly place the results of the purges into perspective.

**Question 4**

Compare the appropriateness of the term "totalitarian" as a description of the regimes of Hitler in Germany and Stalin in the USSR. (20 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

**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**

In a totalitarian state, power is concentrated in the hands of one man or small group, denying basic civil liberties and trying to control all aspects of individuals' lives. The essential features of such a regime might include – a one-party state led by one leader imposing an official ideology; government control of all key institutions, including the media, legal system and armed forces; extensive forces of state security; control of the economy etc. There is much evidence for a totalitarian regime under Stalin with the imposition of communist ideology in a state-run dictatorship, controlling all state institutions and enforcing popular allegiance. The Five Year Plans enforced centralised economic control over the nation, the purges eliminated all effective opposition and established control over the armed forces, and propaganda and indoctrination projected the cult of Stalinism. However, decisions needed implementing at the local level where officials had their own priorities and agendas. In Germany, a less rational racist ideology is evident yet state control seems equally fundamental with a single-party terroristic regime without civil liberties, trade unions and federal authority, intolerant of any opposition, and particularly effective in terms of propaganda and state security. Yet the formulation and implementation of policy seems fragmented and inefficient, with internal divisions and rivalries, and the Nazis never established the same degree of central economic control or coherence with the different expectations of the Nazis themselves, economic ministers, big business, German public etc. Hitler himself had unlimited power in theory, yet he remained remote from day-to-day government. Level 1 will only tackle one regime or provide condensed coverage of both. Descriptive narrative can be predicted at Level 2, accepting the totalitarian label without reservation. At Level 3, there should be some limited attempt to assess the appropriateness of the term, beginning to draw out some comparative aspects. The analysis should be broadened and developed at Level 4 with a more detailed and integrated comparison. Level 5 should sustain the assessment in terms of development, integration and judgement.