
AS HISTORY 7041/20

Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945
Component 20 The Weimar Republic, 1918–1933

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining Brüning's handling of the Great Depression in Germany?

[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 having 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 the German Communist Party and is aimed at working-class voters. Its purpose, therefore, is to attract these workers to their cause as opposed to the other Parties by portraying Brüning's policies in an extremely negative way
- it is a pamphlet so it is meant to be read as widely as possible. There is an underlying sense of frustration that opposition to Brüning's financially harsh policies is not increasing support for them as much as might be expected
- emotive language is used in this source to convey both their anger at Brüning and his austerity policies but also that the workers are being duped by the Nazis and Socialists who, in their view, are not genuinely on their side. The tone, as well as one of frustration, is an emotive appeal for workers to perceive and oppose Brüning as a stooge for the rich and big business, and therefore support the KPD.

Content and argument

- Source A argues that Brüning was seeking to hurt the poor by pointing out the cuts in wages and war pensions as well as help for the unemployed. Students may certainly support the argument of the severity of Brüning's measures as he was labelled the 'Hunger Chancellor' due to his tax rises as well as his cuts to benefits and wages
- Source A makes the argument that Brüning's strategy was motivated by class hatred, seeking to make the rich richer by hurting the poor. Students may point out the limited evidence of a strategy to protect the rich, seeing this instead as propaganda being used by the KPD to attract further support. Indeed, students may instead argue that Brüning was more interested in promoting the argument that Germany's dire situation should lead to an end to reparations
- Source A argues that the workers who vote for the SPD or the Nazis are being duped and manipulated and that their leaders sided with Brüning. Students may point out that this shows Communist frustration at not accessing more mass working-class support in the teeth of the deep economic depression and may also point out that this emphasises how effective the Nazi propaganda strategy was in terms of attracting workers to its cause as well as more direct Nazi intervention in terms of giving unemployed youth food and shelter as well as the opportunity to join the SA.

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 Daniel Binchy, the Irish Ambassador to Weimar Germany. He is anti-Nazi and is clearly seeking to justify the measures taken by Brüning from 1930 to deal with the Great Depression
- the tone is rather defensive, seeking to justify Brüning's cuts in spending and tax rises but also laying the blame for the political turmoil on the Socialists for rejecting Brüning's financial plans and forcing a reliance on Article 48
- Binchy uses emotive terms to emphasise the scale of the crisis facing Brüning, such as 'emergency', 'disastrous', 'wreck' and 'disaster'.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the scale of the crisis facing Brüning when he came to power in March 1930 was enormous. Students may refer to the economic and political fallout from the Great Depression with industrial production, agricultural prices falling and unemployment steeply rising to over 3 million as well as the political turmoil caused by the collapse of the Muller coalition
- the source argues that Hindenburg and Brüning worked closely together due to having shared political views. Students may point out that the two were indeed hostile to the Communists as well as distrustful of both the Socialists as well as the Nazis. However, students may point out that he lost the support of many of the Prussian elite close to Hindenburg with his plans to break up the landed estates in Prussia and eventually led to his removal in May 1932
- Binchy also points out the necessity of Brüning's austerity strategy of reducing wages and social services as well as raising taxes to restore financial order. Students may point out that Brüning had the option of inflating the economy to try to spend their way out of the Depression but that fears of re-igniting the inflation from 1923 stopped this
- the source also argues that Brüning guided Germany through the worst of the Depression and averted financial disaster. Students may show some agreement with this, given the scale of the crisis, but might also point out the devastation caused to the economy in terms of unemployment and production as well as the political radicalism that it provoked.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that both sources are valuable but for different reasons. Source B emphasises the scale of the crisis facing the Chancellor and that he did what was needed to be done, whereas Source A displays both the hostility towards the austerity imposed by Brüning but also the political fallout from the economic impact of the Depression. Students may view either source as more valuable as Source A shows the consequences of Brüning's austerity strategy whereas Source B is used to explain the necessity of that strategy and seek to justify it.

Section B

- 0 2** 'Government policy, in the years 1919 to 1923, was responsible for the hyperinflation of 1923.'

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 supporting the view that government policy, in the years 1919 to 1923, was responsible for the hyperinflation of 1923 might include:

- social welfare expansion, as set out in the Weimar Constitution, placed a huge demand on the government, e.g. the laws in 1919 to limit the working day to eight hours and also to extend the state health insurance system to wives, daughters and the disabled
- government refusal to raise taxes or cut spending in the post-war years to reduce the 1.44 billion marks debt or to cut the number of government employees to keep unemployment low for fear of alienating support for the new Republic
- evidence of governments allowing inflation to continue unchecked in order to benefit powerful industrialists who could take out short-term loans to expand their businesses. By the time these loans had to be repaid, inflation had significantly reduced their value
- the handling of the Ruhr Crisis, in terms of supporting passive resistance and agreeing to pay the striking workers' wages, fuelled the inflation crisis.

Arguments challenging the view that government policy, in the years 1919 to 1923, was responsible for the hyperinflation of 1923 might include:

- the Weimar Governments between 1919 and 1923 were faced with huge debt from the war years of 1.44 billion marks so there was already considerable inflationary pressure in Germany
- the burden of reparations – set at £6.6 billion in 1921 – made the German economic plight even more severe, especially in terms of further reducing any chance of Germany reducing her national debt. Having to pay some of this in coal whilst taking away a large amount of Germany's coal capacity in the Versailles Treaty, made this even more difficult for Germany and led to the German government resorting to printing money
- the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr led to the German economic situation spiralling out of control, forcing the government, through their support of passive resistance and due to the collapse of output in the Ruhr, to print money so fuelling the problem of hyperinflation
- the radical and extremist atmosphere in the early years of the Weimar Republic following defeat necessitated economic and political policies that would aim to mitigate this feeling of anger and extremism as much as possible.

Students might conclude that government policy certainly did not seek to tackle with any vigour, nor determination, the inflationary pressures inherited from the Kaiserian and war years and indeed the policies followed enhanced these pressures further. However, they may also argue that the context of defeat, reparations, the Versailles Treaty and the occupation of the Ruhr gave the governments very little choice or room to manoeuvre.

0 3 'There was political 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 supporting the view that there was political stability in Germany in the years 1924 to 1928 might include:

- the two elections of 1924 suggested a return to more support for the moderate parties in the Weimar Republic with 67% voting for pro-republican parties in December 1924
- Nazi support fell to 3% in December 1924 and to 2.6% in 1928 suggesting that the fortunes of the more extremist parties was ebbing
- with greater economic stability following the tumultuous year of 1923 and the Dawes Plan of 1924, political violence was reduced and there were no further attempted revolts against the Weimar Democracy in this period
- the election of Hindenburg made the democratic republic more tolerable in the eyes of many, including those on the right. The DNVP, for example, joined a coalition for the first time in 1925.

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

- there were still unstable governments in this period with six governments between 1924 and 1928, suggesting no real progress in achieving more stability due to proportional representation and the need for coalitions to be formed
- the election of the ultra-conservative Hindenburg as President in 1925 put someone who was uncommitted to democracy at the apex of the Weimar political system. He increasingly became the focus of powerful groups who wanted a more authoritarian system, such as the military and industry
- political consensus remained very difficult to achieve, as shown by the apparently minor matter of the new Weimar flag, with the Luther government collapsing in 1926 over whether the old imperial flag should be flown alongside the new republican one
- political parties still found it extremely difficult to see beyond their own sectional class or religious based interests with the largest party in Germany, the SPD, for example, participating in only one of the six coalition governments in this period.

Students may conclude that, on the surface, the situation in Weimar Germany between 1924 and 1928 was certainly more stable, especially compared to the years that both preceded and succeeded them. Students may also argue that this so-called 'stability' was rather superficial and dependent on economic stability for its continuation. Students may also argue that a lot of the problems which had led to an unstable beginning of the Weimar Republic had not really been resolved, especially with reference to the voting system which necessitated coalitions as well as the divisive issue of Versailles.