



AS History

7041/1L-The quest for political stability: Germany, 1871–1991

Component 1L Empire to democracy, 1871–1929

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

The quest for political stability: Germany, 1871–1991**Component 1L Empire to democracy, 1871–1929****Section A**

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the strength of democracy in Germany in the years 1918 to 1929? **[25 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:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

Extract A: In their identification of Peukert's argument, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument is that the problems facing the Weimar government in the years 1918 to 1924 were not fully resolved, and these carried on into the period 1924–29, during which democracy was unstable and under threat especially from right-wing opposition
- the problems created by the Treaty of Versailles, the constitution and the hyperinflation of 1923 had not been resolved by 1924
- after 1924, there was talk about the abandonment of parliamentary democracy in favour of a more authoritarian state, which was reflected in the election of Hindenburg as President in 1925.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- opposition to the Treaty of Versailles was still strong after 1924, for example the Anti-Young Plan campaign co-ordinated by Hugenberg in 1929. Likewise, many in the middle-classes never forgot the impact of hyperinflation in wiping out their savings
- Hindenburg had made many statements expressing his opposition to the democratic constitution of 1919 and attacking the 'November Criminals' for stabbing the German Army in the back. Many on the right-wing regarded him as a 'substitute Kaiser' who could restore authoritarian government
- in opposition to the interpretation it could be argued that up to 1929, Hindenburg did nothing to undermine the constitution and in the 1928 election 73% of seats were won by parties committed to democracy. Müller's new 'Grand Coalition' had the support of a clear majority in the Reichstag and marked the return of the SPD to government.

Extract B: In their identification of Scheck's argument, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument is that Ebert used the constitution effectively in the years 1918–24 to ensure the survival of democracy, and that from 1924 to 1929 there was a period of stability and recovery during which right-wing opinion became reconciled with the democratic constitution
- the Weimar Republic faced many 'political storms' in its early years which were overcome by Ebert's judicious use of Article 48 of the constitution
- Hindenburg's election was a sign that right-wing opposition to the democratic constitution was weakening and this continued to decline as the economy improved.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Ebert overcame the threats posed by the Spartacists (1919), the Kapp Putsch (1920), Communist insurrections (1920–23) and the Munich Putsch (1923), amongst other examples of political violence, through using Article 48 to declare an emergency. The Weimar constitution survived intact from these threats
- the economy improved after 1924 with the help of American loans which came in following the Dawes Plan. In addition, the introduction of a new currency helped economic stability. Hindenburg did not threaten the constitution between 1925 and 1929, and the Nazis did very badly in the 1928 election suggesting that right-wing opposition was in decline
- in opposition to the interpretation it could be argued that the German economy was still precariously balanced by 1929 – unemployment was rising and Germany was dangerously dependent on American money. In addition, the growth in membership of the Nazi party and the shift to the right of Hugenburg's DNVP could be considered 'storm warnings'.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might argue that from the perspective of 1929 it appeared to the majority of commentators that Germany was politically stable and was enjoying a period of economic prosperity. Hindenburg had acted entirely in line with the constitution since his election in 1925 and there was no reason to believe that the noises coming from the right-wing were anything more than fringe views of a political group in decline. Clearly there were underlying tensions and weaknesses, as expressed in Extract A, however, the significance of these in 1929 was limited and they only became important after the catastrophic impact of the Wall Street Crash on the German economy. Therefore, overall Extract B could provide the more convincing interpretation from the perspective of the years up to and including 1929.

Section B

02 'There was consistent economic growth in industry and agriculture in the years 1871 to 1890.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**

L4: 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**

L3: The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**

L2: The answer will be 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.

Arguments suggesting that there was consistent economic growth in industry and agriculture in the years 1871 to 1890 might include:

- between 1871 and 1873, the economy experienced significant growth due to the impact of the French indemnity paid after the war of 1871, the introduction of a common currency and the removal of internal trade barriers
- the development of the German railway network continued throughout this period which had a positive impact on economic growth and demand for coal, iron and steel
- by 1890, German companies were the world leaders in newer industries such as synthetic dyes, medicines, plastics, electrical goods. This was partly the result of the excellence of technical and scientific education within Germany
- Bismarck's protective tariffs introduced in 1878–79 enabled German agriculture and industry to weather the effects of the worldwide economic downturn.

Arguments challenging the view that there was consistent economic growth in industry and agriculture in the years 1871 to 1890 might include:

- the worldwide economic downturn after 1873 did have an impact on Germany and growth rates up to 1890 fluctuated
- industrialists established the 'Central Association of German Manufacturers' to put pressure on Bismarck to introduce protective tariffs in the late 1870s because German industry was suffering from slow growth and foreign competition
- agriculture suffered in the 1870s due to a series of bad harvests and competition from cheap American and Russian grain, hence the formation of the 'Alliance of Steel and Rye' with the manufacturers to put pressure on Bismarck to introduce protective tariffs
- agriculture also suffered from the impact of railways which exposed farmers to more competition and stimulated the movement of people from the countryside to the towns.

Overall, students may conclude that the period 1871 to 1890 was one of economic success in Germany as the country enjoyed a period of economic growth which saw it emerge as a genuine challenger to the dominance of Britain. The period after 1873 was more unstable and growth rates were unpredictable, however, the overall pattern was one of progress. This economic growth and success was more marked in industry than in agriculture, which experienced more problems during the 1870s, however, Bismarck's introduction of tariffs in 1878–79 made a significant difference to German landowners and farmers and there was progress in agriculture as well although not as marked.

03 'Kaiser Wilhelm II successfully maintained his political authority in the years 1890 to 1914.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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.

Arguments suggesting that Kaiser Wilhelm II successfully maintained his political authority in the years 1890 to 1914 might include:

- the Kaiser appointed Caprivi as someone who he could control. Caprivi's 'New Course' was launched in response to the Kaiser's desire to be the 'people's Kaiser' and 'kill socialism with kindness'. The Kaiser changed his mind over the strategy to undermine socialism in 1894 and dismissed Caprivi when the two disagreed over the issue
- the Kaiser appointed Hohenlohe as someone he could dominate. The ineffective policy of 'concentration' pursued by Hohenlohe against the socialists was the result of the Kaiser's wishes. In 1897, the Kaiser became frustrated with this approach and began to appoint his own ministers, bypassing the chancellor, in pursuit of the new priority of Weltpolitik
- Bülow was known as the 'Eel' for his sycophantic approach to the Kaiser, thus indicating that the Kaiser maintained his political authority over the chancellor from 1900 to 1909. Bülow's difficulties in securing Reichstag approval for military funding stemmed from the Kaiser's demands
- in 1913, the Kaiser publicly backed the army over their actions in Zabern and was able to ignore the outcry and opposition from the press and in the Reichstag. His constitutional authority to appoint and dismiss ministers and determine government policy remained intact by 1914.

Arguments challenging the view that Kaiser Wilhelm II successfully maintained his political authority in the years 1890 to 1914 might include:

- the rise of the SPD and the increasing opposition to the government from the Reichstag undermined the Kaiser's political authority. By 1914, there was almost a constitutional deadlock between a Reichstag unwilling to support government policy and the Kaiser's government unwilling to listen to opposition views
- some historians have argued that Wilhelm was merely a 'shadow emperor' in this period. They argue that the traditional right-wing elites held far greater influence over government policy than the Kaiser, and he acted simply as a public face and mouthpiece for their interests
- the Daily Telegraph Affair in 1908 undermined the Kaiser's political authority. He was roundly criticised in the press and in the Reichstag for his clumsy, unilateral approach to foreign policy and was forced to give undertakings to respect the constitution in future
- some historians have argued that after 1908 the Kaiser stood back from his previous role as the 'personal ruler' of Germany. Shaken by the scandals that engulfed his inner circle, such as Eulenburg, Von Moltke and Bülow, and by The Daily Telegraph Affair, he grew less interested in domestic affairs.

Overall, students may conclude that the Kaiser thought of himself as a 'personal ruler' in this period and he certainly had the constitutional authority to influence the conduct of German politics, such as through the appointment and dismissal of the chancellors and his role as head of the armed forces. However, there were many other power blocs within Germany in these years which sought to influence government policy and the Kaiser, and it may be the case that he was increasingly influenced by the powerful elites who had strong vested interests in pursuing policies such as Weltpolitik. In addition, this was a period of dramatic social and economic change in Germany leading to the rise of the SPD. As a result, opposition to the Kaiser and his government, both within and outwith the Reichstag, made it increasingly difficult for him to maintain his political authority.