

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2012 series

9697 HISTORY

9697/13

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2012 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular level to qualify for a Mark Band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18–20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8–10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0–7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870–1914

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

‘Austria was acting in self-defence in 1914’. Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
A	Message from an Austrian diplomat in Belgrade, Serbia to his Foreign Minister.	There is strong anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia. Serbs were delighted at the news of the Sarajevo assassination.	Y – There was considerable anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia. Y – The outcome of the earlier Bosnian crisis exacerbated relations between Austria and Serbia. N – The message ignores more peaceful sentiments in Serbia. The writer generalises about Serbian public opinion.	Y – B agrees that Austria was defending its interests against a Pan-Slav threat headed by Serbia and Russia, its powerful ally. Y – D: Austria had a responsibility for the war but believed that it was defending its best interests. It was justified because of the dangers it faced. N – C: states that Austria’s demands in the ultimatum were unreasonable. N – E: claims that the Austrian ultimatum was designed in order to avoid peace with Serbia. It was also a challenge to Russia. Austria was willing to risk a general European war.	Candidates can explain the background to and responsibility for the Sarajevo assassination. Revenge for Bosnia can be examined.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

B	Message from the Austrian Emperor to the Kaiser.	There is an anti-Austrian conspiracy by Russia and Serbia. Austria must act to end the Pan-Slav threat. Austria is acting on behalf of other European monarchies.	Y – Russia and Serbia were sympathetic to a Pan-Slav movement. Y/N – The Emperor’s horror at the assassination can be understood but it is possible that the event was used as an excuse for anti-Serbian action. N – Was it feasible to eliminate Serbia as a political factor in the Balkans?	Y – A: Austria is the injured party. Public opinion in Serbia adds to the significance of the assassination. Y – D: Austria believed that it was acting in self defence. Most of the extract gives reasons to justify Austria. N – B: Austria’s reaction to Sarajevo was unreasonable. Serbia was much weaker than Austria. N – E: Austria was determined on war after Sarajevo.	Pan-Slavism and possible effects on Austrian empire can be explained. The role of Russia in terms of this topic can be examined. Alternative solutions can be explored.
C	Message from the King of Serbia to the Tsar.	The Austrian ultimatum humiliates Serbia. Serbia promises to deal with anybody involved in Sarajevo. There is an imminent danger of an attack on Serbia by Austria.	Y – The Austrian ultimatum was very extreme. Y – Militarily, Serbia was weaker than Austria. N – The message to Russia is very one-sided.	Y – E: Austria used the ultimatum as a device and was determined to crush Serbia. N – A: Austria suffered a grave injury at Sarajevo, compounded by continuing Serbian hostility. N – B: Serbia, with its Russian ally, was the aggressor. Austria was defending itself, and also defending the interests of other European monarchies (although these are not specified). N – D: Most (but not the first sentence) is a defence of Austria. Her policies were justified because of past action by Serbia and fears for future developments.	The terms of the Austrian ultimatum and Serbia’s response can be explained.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

D	From a post-war American history.	Austria was most responsible for World War I. However, Austria was acting in self-defence to protect its vital interests.	Y – Austria did regard itself as acting in self-defence. Y – Serbia, and the rest of the Balkans, represented vital interests for Austria. N – Russian support for Serbia increased the danger to Austria. N – Most of the extract does not consider both sides.	Y – A: Austria was the political victim of the Sarajevo assassination. The Serbian public was excessively hostile. Y – B: Action against Serbia was justified in view of Serbia's continuing policies against Austria. The long-term peace of Europe was at stake. N – C: Austria made unreasonable demands on small Serbia. N – E: The Austrian ultimatum introduced the danger of a wider European war.	The condition as a great power explained. The links between Sarajevo and Serbia can be elaborated. Briefly – was Austria's responsibility for war greater than other countries?
E	From a modern French history.	Austria was responsible for the war. The ultimatum was a facade or an excuse to deal decisively with Serbia.	Y – It is a balanced source which considers both sides of the issue. Y – It makes the valid point that Austria accepted the danger of a general war.	Y – C: Agrees that Austrian demands were excessive. But it goes beyond other sources in claiming that Austria deliberately risked a general war. N – A: Austria was reacting to the Sarajevo assassination and provocative public opinion in Serbia. N – B: Austria was threatened by a hostile alliance of Serbia and Austria to promote Pan-Slavism, a considerable threat to the Austrian empire. N – D: Most of the source is a defence of Austria. War was necessary to defend its interests.	Candidates might explain why Austria was determined to go to war with Serbia in 1914. Did Austria envisage a general European war?

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

1 Source-Based Question

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES

These answers write generally about 1914 but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss 'Austria was acting in self-defence in 1914' but will describe events very generally. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation / interpretation in context.

For example, 'The claim that Austria was acting in self-defence in 1914 is correct. Source A shows that Austria regarded the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo as a terrible event but its calm attitude was a contrast to the excitement which the murder caused in Serbia. Source B gives the reasons for Austria's concerns. It was on the defensive against Serbia and Russia, who were leading a Pan-Slav movement that would endanger Austria. Serbia's policy threatened not only Austria but other European monarchies. Source D explains that Austria acted in self-defence because its future as a great power was at stake.'

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS.

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example, 'On the other hand, Austria was not acting in self-defence in 1914. Source C described Serbia as a weak country when compared to Austria. The Austrian ultimatum was unnecessarily severe and involved an unreasonable time-schedule for a response. Serbia sought protection by Russia against a war that Austria threatened. Source E sees Austria throwing out a challenge to Russia as well as to Serbia. It did not expect or want a peaceful resolution of its quarrel with Serbia. Austria was even willing to risk a wider European war.'

L4 BY INTERPRETING / EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, 'The claim that Austria was acting in self-defence in 1914 is justified. Although Sources A and B are one-sided, written by Austrians, their claims can be proved from an evaluation of the sources. The crucial crisis in 1914 was the murder at Sarajevo. Its importance can be shown from contextual knowledge and Austria was the injured party. Although it is possible that not all Serbians were delighted by the deed, as Source A claims, there was considerable support in Serbia for the anti-Austrian opinions that led to the event. Source B is correct to describe the Pan-Slav movement, headed by Serbia and supported by Russia, as a considerable threat to the multi-cultural Austrian empire. As the writer of Source B points out, it would probably not be possible to localise the conflict. Source D is an interesting secondary source because it was written by an American historian whose country was Austria's enemy by the end of World War I. This gives the source some objectivity. The writer sees Austria on the defensive against Serbia and Russia. Strong action was needed after Sarajevo if Austria was to retain its place as a major power.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS.

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) ‘...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that Austria was not acting in self-defence in 1914. Although Sources A and B agree that Austria was in the right, it is possible to argue that it over-reacted to the Sarajevo assassination. Source C is written from the Serbian point of view but the contrast between the powers of Austria and Serbia is valid, as is the claim that the time-scale imposed by Austria’s ultimatum was unreasonable. Source E is a considered view of the international situation in 1914. It concludes that Austria did not seek peace. Although most of Source D is a defence of Austria, it begins with the interesting statement that Austria was most responsible for the war.’

L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE / SUPPORT IS BETTER / PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES / EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED.

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, ‘Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that Austria was acting in self-defence in 1914, the stronger case is that the claim is correct. The situation in 1914 and after Sarajevo in particular, was that Austria saw itself as threatened by a growing Pan-Slav movement, led by Serbia and supported by Russia. This is shown clearly in Sources A and B. Source D supports this, arguing that although Austrian policy was the immediate cause of the war, longer-term issues made it defensive.’

OR

‘Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that Austria was acting in self-defence in 1914, the more convincing case is that Austrian policy was not reasonable in 1914. Austria did have grievances against Serbia but the annexation of Bosnia, referred to in Source A, was an unnecessary alienation of Serbia. While Serbia bore a major responsibility for the assassination at Sarajevo, Austria’s reaction was extreme. The ultimatum, referred to in Sources B and E, was a pretext to justify a war against Russia. Austria knew that war would probably draw in Russia and then other European countries.’

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support / contradict) in order to improve it.

For example, ‘An alternative explanation is that Austria and Serbia were equally responsible and that Austrian policy was an excessive reaction to the Sarajevo assassination, justified to Austria but unjustified to many other countries. The ultimatum, rather than the assassination itself, proved decisive. In the short-term, Austria was on the defensive against Serbia but in the longer term, Austria was determined to crush Serbia. Its long-term decline, referred to indirectly in Sources D and E, and its problems in the Balkans, which the Bosnian annexation mentioned in Source A made worse rather than alleviated, made another war with Serbia highly likely. Austria itself was responsible for widening the crisis, urged on by Germany.’

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

SECTION B

2 How far was Napoleon an absolute ruler in France from 1799 to 1815?

A strong case can be made that Napoleon was completely absolute. However alternative explanations might be presented, although candidates might argue for absolutism overall. After the coup of Brumaire (1799), Napoleon became First Consul - the Second and Third were unimportant. In 1804, he became Emperor. As Consul, then Emperor, Napoleon made domestic and foreign policies and controlled appointments at a national and most local levels. The Code Napoleon showed how he shaped the systems that governed France; he took a decided interest in the details. He made reforms to the system of government so that councils were advisory. Plebiscites concealed authoritarianism in a cloak of democracy and participative government. A combination of propaganda, for example through the use of controlled newspapers, art and buildings, and police headed by Fouché, added to his power. On the other hand, counter-movements continued. Most royalists in France conformed but he was unable to crush completely counter-revolutionary movements. He had to handle radicalism carefully. The Concordat with the Papacy (1801) is often seen as a demonstration of his power but it represented recognition of the need to compromise with the Church and many Catholics and anti-clericals continued to oppose him. Foreign policy is usually seen in terms of his complete authoritarianism but it can also be argued that he was forced to engage in continuous wars in order to maintain the support of the army. War gave Napoleon power but it also broke him in the end. Answers need to combine arguments with appropriate knowledge.

3 Analyse the most important differences between pre-industrial and industrial societies. (You should refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

Candidates are asked to refer to at least two countries as examples but marks will depend essentially on arguments with examples providing supporting evidence. It will be reasonable to expect a balance between the two sorts of societies. Pre-industrial societies in the three specified countries tended to be very hierarchical. There was little movement between classes. While industrial societies were still hierarchical, there was more movement. Marriage became an important means of moving into the aristocracy. The lower classes were still restricted in scope but there were opportunities for some to become relatively more wealthy. Formerly, the middle class was small but it became larger in industrial societies as opportunities for ownership and investment increased. In pre-industrial societies, people usually lived their lives near their birth places but there was more movement and internal migration later. Towns grew as places of work and as markets for producers. On the other hand, there tended to be more separation between the classes. In pre-industrial societies, the poor lived near the well-to-do. Industrial towns saw them live very separate lives. Some candidates might claim that living conditions worsened. The conditions of housing and sanitation in new urban areas should be familiar. However, some might note that conditions were arguably not worse than in pre-industrial societies. By the end of the nineteenth century, considerable advances had been made to contain the worst epidemic diseases. More education was available and travel opportunities increased through the railways. Some answers might claim, as do some textbooks, that conditions worsened for women and children. Again this is dubious. Women worked alongside men in pre-industrial societies although not in large factories. Children worked in large factories but they had laboured in pre-industrial societies. Laws were introduced to ameliorate their conditions to some extent. The question is not about inventions and technology and candidates need to be careful to link such descriptions with the key issue.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

- 4 'The most important turning point in the process of Italian unification was Cavour's appointment as Prime Minister of Piedmont in 1852.' How far do you agree with this claim?

The question invites candidates to assess the importance of Cavour's appointment and to compare it with other turning points. Cavour helped to strengthen Piedmont internally, making it the leading independent Italian state. He improved the economy, agreeing treaties with foreign countries, invested in the infrastructure, for example railways, curbed the power of the Roman Catholic Church, was seen as a force for conservatism, and strengthened the army. He was a firm monarchist, reassuring foreign countries. This also appealed to those Italians who were not attracted by Mazzini's republicanism. Largely through diplomatic agreements with France, he secured foreign assistance that led to gains in Lombardy and the central Duchies. Cavour was a realist, willing to cede Nice and Savoy as the necessary price for French aid. He accepted Garibaldi's gains in the south although they went further than his original intentions. By his death in 1861, the Kingdom of Italy had been founded - effectively the kingdom of an enlarged Piedmont. However, it was incomplete; Venetia and Rome were still to be incorporated. Other turning points might include the accession of Victor Emmanuel II (1849). He succeeded the well-meaning but largely ineffective Charles Albert. Once dismissed as a figurehead, Victor Emmanuel is now widely seen as playing a vital role. Cases can be made for Mazzini and Garibaldi respectively. The former laid the foundations of the *Risorgimento* although the shape of the unified Italy was very different from his hopes. In spite of their short-term failure, the 1848-49 revolutions changed the perception of the movement for Italian unification. Garibaldi was instrumental in transforming the idea of a united Italy to one that embraced the entire peninsula. To achieve the highest bands, answers will explain convincingly why Cavour's appointment was the 'most important' turning point.

- 5 Why was there a rapid increase in imperialism by European countries during the period from c.1870 to c.1900? (You should refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

Candidates need to note two requirements: the relevant dates and the need to refer to at least two countries. 1870 is a generally accepted date for the renewed interest in overseas expansion while 1900 provides a convenient end point. The question is based on the causes of Imperialism (or New Imperialism if applied to this period). Candidates are asked to refer to at least two countries to encourage them to use specific examples. Answers might be structured in one of two ways. They might consider countries in turn, but this will need some cross-references, or they can look at issues using the countries to provide examples. Britain already had a large overseas empire in 1870 and it is possible to argue that further expansion was a reaction to growing competition from other European countries, such as France in Africa. The period also saw Britain seeking to expand its trade and other interests in Asia beyond India and especially in China. Both economic and political factors were important. 1870 was a turning point for France and Germany. The former suffered a severe military defeat and its position as a major European power was threatened. Hence its eagerness to use empire as proof of continuing eminence. Immediately after unification, Germany under Bismarck was more concerned with securing its position on the continent but the new Kaiser William II, supported by some elements in the governing body and public opinion, changed the direction of foreign policy to seek world power. This led to imperialism being seen as a form of international competition. Public opinion was significant. In Britain, imperialism became popular, especially among the middle classes. The lower classes had other priorities. French public opinion was willing to embrace overseas expansion. It was a factor that pushed Bismarck and was eagerly embraced by Kaiser William II. Britain and France, more than Germany, were motivated by religion and/or Social Darwinism.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

6 Assess the claim that opposition was not a major threat to Nicholas II during the period from 1905 to 1914.

The end point of this question is clear and references to the period from 1914 to the February Revolution will not be given credit unless they are included briefly as part of an introduction or conclusion. Candidates might begin with the 1905 Revolution. However, some very good essays might consider the situation from the beginning of Nicholas II's reign in 1899. The 1905 Revolution might be interpreted in two ways. On the one hand, it was the most serious uprising before 1917. Peasants, facing higher prices and increased taxes rose up in some key regions such as the Ukraine. Urban workers protested against worsening social and economic conditions. Defeat in the war against Japan stirred up trouble. Bloody Sunday in St. Petersburg saw a protest turn into a violent uprising, partly because of the excessive reaction of the army. Violence spread to other cities and regions. Some of the middle classes were involved. The Potemkin incident at Odessa might be considered as pointing to a very serious problem for Nicholas II, confirmed by the concessions such as the October Manifesto that were forced from a reluctant Tsar. On the other hand, the opposition was not organised but spontaneous. The combination of a loyal army, an effective police and some insincere concessions restored order relatively quickly and by 1907 it seemed as if the regime was as strong as ever. The economy saw some improvement, especially when Stolypin was Prime Minister although his success was mixed and there were popular protests against the harshness of some of his policies. While Nicholas II ignored the Dumas, dissolving three by 1912, he counted it as an achievement that he was not forced into more reforms. The radicals were divided. The Bolsheviks were one of a number of radical groups that seemed ineffective. Many of their leaders were in prison, in internal or in external exile. Different opposition groups suspected, even hated, others. But problems were apparent in continuing strikes and popular disorder. Radical groups continued to spread their ideas and retain support in spite of the efforts of the authorities. The most effective answers will discuss both strengths and weaknesses.

7 How far did Stalin achieve his aims in economic policy during the period from 1928 to 1939?

The simple but valid explanation is that Stalin aimed to bring about an economic revolution in order to modernise a backward Russia. He feared that, unless Russia's economic was changed drastically, the country would fall to the more powerful capitalist countries: 'Those who fall behind get beaten.' There are other aims that might be explored. Stalin wished to show himself as a greater leader than Lenin who had to compromise his ideas through the New Economic Policy (NEP). Stalin allowed no compromise. Society could be transformed through economic change. For example, the Kulaks could be reduced to obedience. The best responses can be expected to link aims, policies and success clearly. Soon after he came to power but when he was not yet dictatorial, Stalin's Russia saw a high degree of private ownership. There were few state farms or state industries. In agriculture, this was seen as an impediment to modernisation and increased production. The key was the Five-Years Plans (1928–32, 1933–37, 1938–1942). Central government, that is Stalin, set priorities and targets. The first Plan's priorities were heavy industry such as iron and steel, hydro-electric schemes and armaments. There have been arguments about the accuracy of official figures. Statistics were first inflated by local managers and party officials and then published with little objectivity by the government propaganda machine. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that industrial production increased significantly. In agriculture, the emphasis was on collectivisation. Large state farms replaced smaller private holdings. The policy was successful inasmuch as private enterprise virtually disappeared (as in industry and commerce) but the economic results were much more problematic. Production fell. There was widespread starvation in a country that had potentially large agricultural resources. Ruthless methods failed to solve the problem.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9697

8 How different were the ideas of Marxism and Fascism?

The key issue is the difference between the ideas of Marxism and Fascism. Candidates consider how far the ideas were carried out in practice but the practical application needs to be linked to ideas for the highest marks to be awarded. It will be possible to structure answers sequentially as long as they contain comparison. Marxism, as stated by Karl Marx, developed economic, social and political aspects based on the belief that economic forces drove change. The ultimate aim was to end class systems and a capitalism that exploited the many in favour of the few. States themselves would ultimately disappear although the subsequent political structures were unclear. Fascism did not depend on the ideas of a single individual but emerged when the opinions of several writers were put together. It can be argued that, while the practices of Fascist rulers seemed quite clear-cut, Fascism itself lacked a distinct identity. Elements of Fascism included the primacy of the state and the authority of the rulers, in opposition to the tenets of Marxism. Individual citizens' rights were subordinate. The paramount nature of the state or nation meant that some Fascists, especially the Nazis in Germany, believed that citizenship should be limited to a particular racial group. Racialism was not a major part of Fascism in Italy until Mussolini adopted it, but more for practical than ideological reasons. Marxism was internationalist. Fascism, unlike Marxism, saw the state dominating the economy. It promoted the single leader who would embody its ideas. With this sort of basis, candidates can use Lenin and Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini as examples of Marxist or Fascist (or non-Marxist and non-Fascist) ideas.