
AS History

7041/20-Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Component 20 The Weimar Republic, 1918–1933

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.

Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Component 20 The Weimar Republic, 1918–1933

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the response of Germany to the Versailles Treaty? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. 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.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- the source comes from Philipp Scheidemann who was a Social Democrat Chancellor at the time of the terms of the Versailles Treaty being given to the German delegation. His resignation shows how strongly he felt about the terms being imposed
- the tone is one of frustration, bitterness and some anger as well as some evidence of a feeling of betrayal due to extremity of the terms compared to the Fourteen Points of Wilson
- emotive language is used such as 'wicked', 'blind hatred', 'senseless fury', 'mad' and 'enslaved' which clearly illustrate the tone of the source.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Treaty given was vastly different from the assurances given by Wilson following the November 1918 armistice. Students may refer to the Fourteen Points which called for a just and lasting peace
- it argues that despite the end of the Kaiser as well as the formation of democratically representative Parliaments and Government, 'blind hatred' and 'senseless fury' have motivated the Entente Powers in the terms given. Students may surmise that Scheidemann may also be trying to deflect blame for the Treaty away from the democratic Weimar Republic and onto the vengeful allies
- it argues that this 'mad, dictated Treaty' will have severe consequences on Germany in terms of being 'enslaved' and that the democracy which is forced to sign this Treaty may well 'wither' as a result. Students may refer here to the political as well as economic consequences of this Treaty.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- the source comes from a journalist for an SPD newspaper so supported a Party which was the major mainstay of the Weimar Republic politically
- the tone is far more positive and defiant than Source A, with Schiff keen to point out the resilience of the Republic and its achievements despite the Versailles Treaty, such as the French leaving the Ruhr, the Treaty of Locarno as well as Germany being accepted as a full member of the League of Nations
- the language used reflects this more positive and proud tone with phrases such as 'raised herself up' and 'spirit of Versailles has been conquered'.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Republic has shown great resilience and has effectively shouldered 'the terrific burden' after Versailles. Students may support this view with evidence of the Republic surviving the treacherous period of 1919–23 and then entering a period of economic and political recovery under Stresemann
- the source argues that the 'spirit of Versailles has been conquered' and speaks of recovery as shown by Stresemann's foreign policy successes. Support could be given to the improvement in Germany's international position with Locarno and the League but may also cast doubt over how strong this recovery really was
- Schiff does recognise that the Republic had 'a very long road to go' in 1929 which suggests that he recognises that the recovery is not assured. Reliance on American money after the hyperinflation crisis and the bulk of Versailles still intact could be used as examples.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that both sources represent valid views concerning different aspects of the German response to Versailles with Scheidemann emphasising the anger and feeling of betrayal of many in Germany at the harshness of the Treaty's terms and the political damage that may result, whereas Schiff downplays the severity of this impact and argues that the Republic has made significant progress, more than 'we should have ever thought possible'.

Section B

02 'There was economic stability in Germany in the years 1924 to 1928.'

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 economic stability in Germany in the years 1924 to 1928 might include:

- German recovery after the 1923 crisis with the help of American finance was significant with industrial output rising, although it did not reach pre-war levels until 1929 and economic growth evident until 1927
- industries such as the chemical, aeroplane and car sectors developed and advanced with the help of foreign investment, encouraged by high interest rates
- inflation was brought under control by the new currency, with the help of Hjalmar Schacht, as well as the Dawes Plan and wages rose so living standards improved
- the improved economy led to growth in house building and social welfare schemes were improved and extended.

Arguments challenging the view that there was economic stability in Germany in the years 1924 to 1928 might include:

- the economic recovery and ensuing stability was largely financed by American loans through the 1924 Dawes Plan. Even Stresemann, in 1929, warned that the economy was only flourishing superficially and Germany 'was dancing on a volcano'
- unemployment remained a persistent problem, rising to three million by 1926 and never falling below one million in this period and the economy shrank in 1928 and 1929
- agriculture benefited little in this period with growing debt, falling prices and increased bankruptcies. By 1929, German agricultural production was less than three quarters of pre-war figures
- Mittelstand gained little and were still struggling from the effects of the 1923 hyperinflation crisis.

Students may conclude that there was indeed economic stability following the severe hyperinflation crisis of 1923 but that this was only partly due to Germany's own efforts and was more the result of the Dawes Plan which facilitated currency reform and bred confidence. However, students may conclude that the stability were always precarious because of the reliance on American loans and also that the scale of this stability can be questioned. Any balanced and sustained argument should be seen as valid.

- 03** 'The key reason for Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933 was Brüning's failures in the years 1930 to 1932.' **[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 the key reason for Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933 was Brüning's failures in the years 1930 to 1932 might include:

- Brüning, known as 'the Hunger Chancellor', focused on deflationary policies to deal with the Depression, cutting government expenditure and increasing taxes. These policies were seen as worsening unemployment – surpassed 6 million under his government – and drove voters towards the Nazis
- Brüning had no Reichstag majority and had to rely on Article 48, e.g. to pass his finance bill in 1930. He relied on Hindenburg for his political survival and on other members of the elite such as von Schleicher. Once this was removed, it brought Hitler closer to power
- Brüning's disastrous decision to persuade Hindenburg to call an election in September 1930 in the hope of gaining stronger electoral support backfired leading instead to the Nazis making their key electoral breakthrough and becoming the 2nd largest party in Germany.

Arguments challenging the view that the key reason for Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933 was Brüning's failures in the years 1930 to 1932 might include:

- Hitler did not follow Brüning and there were two more Chancellors before Hitler was appointed. Therefore, the wider issue of political intrigue and backstairs intrigue was a more direct cause of Hitler achieving power with the roles of figures such as Schleicher, Papen and Hindenburg himself perhaps deserving of greater scrutiny
- labelling Brüning's policies as 'failures' could be seen as harsh. He was in charge during the worst phase of the Depression and he did try to deal with the spiralling violence by banning the SA in April 1932
- blaming Brüning also fails to recognise wider factors such as Hitler's appeal, ideas, personality and propaganda as well as the severity of the economic and political crisis that faced Brüning
- Brüning was also hampered by the Weimar Constitution in that he had to rely on Hindenburg and Article 48 because it was impossible for him to form a majority government.

Students may conclude that Brüning's failures were key in explaining Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933 as the situation worsened under his Chancellorship. However, his role in enabling Hitler to achieve power can be viewed as being limited and wider factors such as the weaknesses of the Weimar Republic, Hitler's own qualities and ideas as well as the severity of the crisis itself may be stronger and more persuasive factors, but any sustained and balanced argument should be given credit.