
A-level **HISTORY**

Paper 1L The Quest for Political Stability: Germany, 1871–1991

Mark scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

GCE A Level History Unit 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

1L The Quest for Political Stability: Germany, 1871–1991

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the economic and political strength of the Weimar Republic before 1929. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | Either shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only or addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |

Nothing worthy of credit.

0

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Note: in responding to this question, students may choose to analyse and evaluate each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach of individual arguments. For example, they may look separately at what is said about the state of the economy and the political stability of the Weimar Republic. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

Extract A

In their analysis of Carr's argument students should identify the following:

- the overall claim that despite the appearance of a boom, especially in heavier industries such as coal and iron, that the economic reality was not nearly so positive in Germany
- references to unsteady growth, falling investment and rising unemployment in support of the view
- the claim that the appearance of political stability was an illusion that masked the reality of a political system incapable of functioning effectively
- references to the problems of proportional representation, the multi-party system and the difficulty of forming stable coalitions in support of the view.

In their evaluation of his argument, students could refer to the following:

- underlying problems still existed in the German economy by 1929, such as rising unemployment; falling agricultural prices which were harming farmers; and the cost of the extensive welfare system which was causing a budget deficit
- whilst there were weaknesses in the German economy in this period, there was also cause for optimism in 1929, such as the fact that after the Dawes Plan (1924) more money was entering Germany in foreign loans than was leaving in reparations payments. Inflation was no longer an issue after 1923
- the May 1928 election could certainly be depicted as a cause for optimism regarding the strength of democracy in Germany. The KPD and Nazis performed poorly and the clear majority of seats (73%) were won by parties committed to the democratic constitution
- the 'Great Coalition' formed by Müller in 1928 saw the return of the SPD to government for the first time since 1923 and the coalition parties controlled 61% of the seats in the Reichstag. This may lead students to question whether it was 'immensely difficult to form coalitions with majority support in the Reichstag'.

Extract B

In their analysis of Fischer's arguments students should refer to the following:

- the overall claim that the years 1924–1929 were the 'Golden Twenties' which experienced an 'impressive boom'

- references to investment in public works, the modernisation of industry and the increase in industrial output in support of the overall view
- references to a lowering of international tension based on greater economic cooperation and integration
- the assessment that political tension within Germany was significantly lower in these years, with the example of the election of Hindenburg as president offered in support.

In their evaluation of his argument, students could refer to the following:

- the existence of an ‘impressive boom’ could be questioned, along with the reference to overall increases in industrial output. Growth rates in Germany were unsteady with dips in 1926 and 1928. Germany was falling behind its international competitors and its share of world production was in decline
- modernisation of industry was achieved to a degree but this was as much due to government subsidy and support as to capital investment from private business. The formation of cartels also reduced the incentive for private companies to innovate and improve efficiency. Tensions remained high between employers and workers
- the Dawes and Young Plans both reflected Germany’s improving relations with other powers and the ‘lowering of international tension’, however, they also created an over-reliance on short-term foreign loans to sustain the economic recovery. Even Stresemann admitted in 1928 that ‘Germany is dancing on a volcano’
- political tension had declined by 1929. There were no more attempted coups after 1923 and the election of Hindenburg can be portrayed as the reconciling of nationalist opinion to the democratic constitution. However, Hindenburg also became the focus of those on the right who wanted a more authoritarian system.

Extract C

In their analysis of Kitchen’s arguments students should refer to the following:

- in 1927, there was moderate unemployment which the new insurance bill could cope with adequately
- Depression started in Germany in 1928 and by the spring of 1929 the government was unable to meet its reparations obligations under the terms of the Dawes Plan
- by February 1929, unemployment had reached 3 million, suggesting that the German economy was in trouble months before the Wall Street Crash and that the government could not fund the new unemployment insurance commitments
- the Anti-Young Plan campaign gave Hitler and the Nazis the opportunity to gain respectability and publicity which led to greater levels of funding and votes in state elections, especially from the middle classes
- the government in Berlin was oblivious to the rising success of the Nazis.

In their evaluation of his argument, students could refer to the following:

- the moderate levels of unemployment in 1927 would seem to tally with the recovery in the economy which had started in 1924, after the introduction of the new currency and the loans from abroad, which led to a recovery particularly in heavy industry
- there was an economic downturn which began in 1928 which caused unemployment to rise and the Young Commission to be set up. However, the extent of the threat to the stability of the Weimar Republic is hard to judge. It could well be that this would

have turned out to be a temporary downturn which Germany could have survived, especially since relations with other countries had improved, e.g. willingness to negotiate the Young Plan

- Hitler and the Nazis gained significantly from the exposure they had access to, through Hugenburg's media empire in the Anti-Young campaign, yet their influence on the national stage was still limited and this could easily have turned out to be a 'flash in the pan' as the Munich Putsch was in 1923
- to suggest that the government in Berlin was blind to the increasing success of the Nazis seems to be over-using the benefit of hindsight in anticipating future events. From the perspective of mid-1929, the Nazis were still a small, extremist party with little national significance having achieved less than 3% of the vote in the 1928 general election.

In summary, students may conclude that it is difficult to judge whether the optimistic or pessimistic interpretations of the Weimar Republic by 1929 are more accurate because the severity of the crisis after 1929 was far too great for the economic and political structures of Germany to cope with. Whether the Weimar Republic would have evolved into a stronger, more stable state without the Wall Street Crash is difficult to ascertain.

Section B

0	2	How successful was Bismarck in preserving his political authority in the years 1871 to 1890?	[25 marks]
----------	----------	--	-------------------

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5:	Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement.	21-25
L4:	Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated.	16-20
L3:	Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist.	11-15
L2:	The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist.	6-10
L1:	The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment.	1-5
	Nothing worthy of credit.	0

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Points suggesting that Bismarck was successful in preserving his political authority might include:

- the constitution which Bismarck masterminded in 1871 ensured the Chancellor retained extensive power
- Bismarck always maintained a strong political grouping in the Reichstag to ensure his will was carried out. From 1871–1878, he worked in alliance with the National Liberals; thereafter he maintained a conservative grouping to back his policies
- he resisted Socialism successfully (anti-Socialist laws) and got his own way over army bills
- Bismarck was able to use police, judiciary and army to implement and maintain anti-socialist laws against the German working-class movement between 1878 and 1890 – playing on fear of ‘revolution’
- Bismarck worked effectively with Kaiser Wilhelm I, whose reliance on the Chancellor ensured his position of authority.

Points suggesting Bismarck was not successful in preserving his political authority might include:

- having to work with a Kaiser and Reichstag meant that Bismarck never had unlimited freedom of action; his authority was limited from the outset
- Bismarck’s policies brought challenges to his political authority. The *Kulturkampf* turned Catholics into opponents. He was forced into a change of policy by outside pressures rather than internal conviction
- Bismarck’s anti-Socialism and the anti-socialist laws polarised opinion between left and right and hampered his authority in government, making Reichstags increasingly difficult to control. Socialism thrived and grew under persecution and social/liberal ideas threatened Bismarck’s freedom of action
- Bismarck’s need to refer to the Reichstag for money (taxes) enabled a questioning of his policies and weakened his authority
- Bismarck’s relationship with Wilhelm I was personal and his political authority could not survive a change of Kaiser. Wilhelm II destroyed Bismarck’s authority, forcing his resignation.

Higher level answers will provide judgement in response to the question, perhaps arguing that Bismarck never had absolute political authority and that his twists and turns in policy-making, far from reflecting a weakening of authority, actually reinforced his position, ensuring he never gave too much away. Equally, students might argue that Bismarck’s authority waned during the course of his Chancellorship as he found himself battling with forces (Socialism primarily) with which he had little sympathy and of which he perhaps, possessed limited understanding. In-depth examination of what constitutes ‘political authority’, of the difficulties of measuring ‘success’ and of Bismarck’s leadership style should be rewarded.

0 3 'Political change in Germany, in the years 1919 to 1949, was driven by economic factors.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Factors suggesting that political change in Germany, in the years 1919 to 1949, was driven by economic factors might include:

- the economic condition of Germany in 1919 produced the new moderate socialist-driven Weimar constitution – written in response to workers' economic power but also reflecting the desire for a democratic constitution which would bring the nation together to enable recovery from wartime (economic problems) and prevent an economically-driven Communism undermining stability
- political changes of government within the Weimar era were frequently the product of economic circumstance – most obviously Stresemann's dominance following the hyperinflation of 1923
- the economic depression from 1929 brought political extremism and change – notably the collapse of Weimar democracy and Hitler's establishment as Chancellor
- Nazi support and political strength to 1941 was largely dependent on economic recovery; political change at the top (e.g. promotion of Goering and Speer) also linked to need for economic growth
- economic collapse in war brought demise of Nazi regime and period of occupation
- differing attitudes to economic recovery – ideological and practical brought the division of Germany in 1949.

Factors suggesting that political change in Germany, in the years 1919 to 1949, was not driven by economic factors might include:

- the establishment of the Weimar republic was driven by political dissatisfaction and the need to provide checks and balances to curb political extremism; it can also be seen as a reaction to the war, the Kaiser and the militarism of the Kaiserreich
- Weimar politics were dominated by political/ideological issues and outside influences such as the Treaty of Versailles
- the economic problems of the immediate post-war, the announcement of the Reparations Bill in 1921 and the hyperinflation of 1923 produced political challenges but none was strong enough to effect political change
- the collapse of the Weimar Republic could be variously attributed to its inadequate constitution ('doomed from the start'), the challenge posed by extremists (and the Nazis in particular), the personalities involved, e.g. Hindenburg, German ambition and the stranglehold of the Versailles demands
- Nazism appealed because of its ideology, its leader and its nationalism; economic issues could be considered subsidiary to these
- political change in 1945 was due to military collapse and a deluded leader
- political change in 1949 was a product of the Cold War and clash of ideologies.

Higher level answers will offer some judgement in response to the question. Some students will try to see similarities and difference in change across the period looking at economic and other factors, perhaps thematically, while others may adopt a more chronological approach with reference to the causes of political change. Either is acceptable provided there is a convincing weighing-up of the causes of change and an appreciation of the

interrelationship of factors. Better answers may be characterised by more in-depth examination of 'political change' within regimes as well as between regimes or between external and internal economic pressures.

0 4 'The years between the chancellorships of Adenauer and Kohl were marked by extensive political and social instability.'

Assess the validity of this view in the years 1963 to 1983.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Evidence which supports the view that there was extensive political and social instability in the years 1963 to 1983 might include:

- following Adenauer there were two chancellors in six years; Erhard was brought down by recession, Kiesinger struggled to control inner tensions within his government and was marred by accusations of Nazi associations in the past
- Willi Brandt's chancellorship faced student protests from 1968 and the activities of Rudi Dutschke
- inflation brought working class unrest and strikes, made worse by the oil crisis from November 1973
- political scandals rocked the government, e.g. the spying activities of Gunter Guillaume brought down Brandt
- 1970s saw growth in terrorism threats (activities of the PLO) and the escalation of the student protest movement, most prominently the Baader-Meinhof gang
- Schmidt faced a continuing oil crisis and depression bringing working class unrest
- The Mogadishu Incident of 1977 caused social unease
- pressure groups developed in 1970s, especially environmental groups, e.g. challenging airport runways and nuclear power stations (leading to 1980 Green Party).

Evidence which challenges the view that there was extensive political and social instability in the years 1963 to 1983 might include:

- democratic processes remained safe and the changes of chancellor and political party were a normal part of this process (i.e. not affecting underlying stability)
- only a minority of extremists wanted to break up the Republic and they were handled effectively
- pressure groups are the sign of a healthy democracy and not of instability
- inflation in 1970s was lower than elsewhere in Europe and growth rates remained high; standards of living increased throughout the period and unemployment was never above 8% of labour force. Strikes should therefore be put into perspective; most middle class families were socially content and only a minority of workers went on strike
- Brandt was a successful chancellor whose work in foreign relations helped Germany evolve politically, contributing to stability as relations with the East were improved
- Schmidt was also successful with policies to control the recession and the increasing oil prices in the early 1980s and stood firm on the Mogadishu incident
- terrorism was defeated and the protest movements crushed.

Candidates may conclude that there was a good deal of instability in these years, particularly in comparison with Adenauer's long and successful chancellorship, but that the pressures faced in Germany were little worse than those experienced elsewhere in Europe and were all dealt with. The crucial point here is that West Germany's political democracy was never in danger of collapse and the social instability was limited to a minority of the

population. Kohl was highly successful as chancellor, holding the position from 1983, and this may influence any assessment of the previous chancellorships.

