
A-LEVEL History

7042/1L

Component 1L The quest for political stability: Germany, 1871-1991
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.

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

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the establishment of a stable democracy in West Germany.

[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 historical 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.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

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

- the main argument is that Adenauer was important to the success of democracy in West Germany after 1945 and, despite his authoritarian style, he left behind a well-functioning democracy
- Adenauer enabled former Nazis to reconcile themselves with democracy
- he strengthened links between West Germany and the western allies, which was a 'great achievement', especially in the face of 'fierce opposition'
- Adenauer was nearly 'invincible' in 1957 and the public responded favourably to the slogan 'No experiments' which summed up his pragmatic, conservative approach.

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

- Adenauer certainly accepted the need for former Nazis to serve in the new democratic administration. Even his chief aide – Gloske – was a well-known Nazi. This can be said to have enabled the smoother operation of democratic government after 1949
- Adenauer faced significant opposition to his policy of closer ties with the western allies at the expense of the goal of German reunification. He overcame these obstacles to ensure that the FRG became a member of the ECSC, NATO and the EEC, which brought greater security and economic prosperity to Germany thus strengthening the new democracy
- the 1957 election victory was a personal triumph for Adenauer with the CDU/CSU winning 50.2% of votes. His 'No experiments' slogan captured the moderate conservatism of voters who had confidence in his leadership to consolidate the new democracy
- to challenge the interpretation, it could be argued that Adenauer did not demonstrate good democratic credentials in his handling of the *Der Spiegel* Affair and the Schwabing Riots in 1962. He appeared to condone heavy-handed police tactics reminiscent of more authoritarian government, as did his constant denigration of the SPD as communists
- in further challenge to the interpretation, it could be argued that German democracy was still in its infancy. The continuation of personnel from the Nazi period, the 'ohne mich' attitude of apathy towards politics and the intolerance of dissent suggested that the system and the population still had work to do to become a 'well-functioning democracy'.

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

- the main argument is that Adenauer was fortunate that the democratic constitution of West Germany had already been established as an effective political system before he came to power in 1949
- the position of chancellor was much stronger than it had been in the Weimar Republic and it was difficult to remove a chancellor once he had been appointed
- the electoral system was effective at excluding minority parties and ensuring that proportional representation did not split the vote too many ways
- the ability of the government to ban anti-democratic parties strengthened the democratic system.

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

- it was much harder to remove a chancellor in the FRG than in the Weimar Republic. It required a constructive vote of no confidence, which was only done once in the whole period 1949–91. This worked in Adenauer's favour as he developed his 'Chancellor Democracy'
- the system combining proportional representation with constituency-based seats, and the '5 per cent rule', worked effectively to reduce the number of parties in the Bundestag, therefore making the formation of stable coalitions easier
- in 1952 the extreme right-wing Socialist Reich Party was banned, and in 1956 the KPD was also banned. In this way, anti-democratic forces found it difficult to gain a foothold in German politics
- to challenge the interpretation, it could be argued that despite the strengthening of the position of chancellor, Adenauer still had to perform well in elections and show skill in negotiating coalitions without which he would not have been able to govern effectively
- to further challenge the interpretation, it could be argued that the creation of a democratic constitution by the Parliamentary Council in 1949 was merely the beginning and there was no guarantee that a democratic system was going to take hold in West Germany.

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

- the main argument is that the new democratic system benefited from the economic growth of West Germany in this period and that many Germans simply accepted a system that seemed to be working
- the economic recovery of western Germany began before 1948 and continued due to the Marshall Plan and American backing leading to the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s
- rapid improvements in living conditions and prosperity meant many Germans were content with a regime that was 'delivering the goods'
- people were often passive in their acceptance of the new democratic system.

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

- prior to 1949, the Allies had reformed the currency, had restored the free market and had ended food rationing. In conjunction with the fiscal stimulus of the Marshall Plan, this meant that the West German economy was already well on the road to recovery by 1950
- due to the booming economy in the 1950s, the government was able to invest heavily in improvements to living conditions, such as the construction of 4m new dwellings by 1957 and the introduction of new 'dynamic pensions' in the same year. Many Germans were happy to support a system which delivered such progress in the standard of living
- non-involvement in politics – 'ohne mich' – was a feature of German society and politics commented on at the time. The ability of Adenauer to consolidate his political dominance through slogans such as 'No experiments' certainly points to a degree of passive assent to the system which appeared to be delivering economic prosperity
- to challenge the interpretation, it could be argued that Adenauer and Erhard deserve their share of the credit for the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s and for the subsequent level of support for the new democratic system.

Section B

- 02** ‘The aristocratic elites successfully maintained their dominance in Germany in the years 1871 to 1900.’

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.

Arguments supporting the view that the aristocratic elites successfully maintained their dominance in Germany in the years 1871 to 1900 might include:

- the Junkers and other aristocratic landowners were able to persuade Bismarck to introduce protective tariffs in 1878 to defend their economic interests. When Caprivi reduced these tariffs in 1893, the Agrarian League successfully lobbied for his dismissal
- the aristocratic elites were represented politically by the conservative parties. They were staunch supporters of the government throughout most of the period, winning a majority of seats in 1887 and increasingly influencing government policy after 1894, especially through the emergence of pressure groups such as the Navy League and Pan-German League
- the officer class of the Army was dominated by men of an aristocratic background. The military continued to exert a huge influence on German society. Wilhelm II's enthusiasm for the military merely served to deepen their influence as shown in the pursuit of *Weltpolitik* after 1897
- when members of the new, emerging class of rich industrialists wanted to enhance their social status they tried to copy the lifestyle of the aristocratic elite, for example through buying landed estates. In this way, the social dominance of the aristocrats, in a period of economic change, was not challenged but merely copied.

Arguments challenging the view that the aristocratic elites successfully maintained their dominance in Germany in the years 1871 to 1900 might include:

- in the 1870s, Bismarck's political alliance with the National Liberals caused some disquiet amongst the aristocratic elite who were uneasy with the *Kulturkampf* and with concessions to the Reichstag such as the Septennial Law of 1874 which gave the Reichstag some influence over the military budget
- economically, many landed estates were struggling in this period as agricultural prices fell. A number of prominent Junker families had to sell up. The share of Germany's GNP made up by agriculture fell from 40% to nearer 25% in this period
- the rapid industrialisation of Germany in this period gave rise to a significant number of rich industrialists and businessmen who could be seen as a threat to the aristocrats' traditional dominance of Germany
- the rise of socialism and left-wing political groups came to present a significant challenge to the conservatives' dominance of politics. In 1894 a 'Subversion Bill' was rejected by the Reichstag, and in 1899 an 'Anti-Union Bill' suffered the same fate. These were serious blows to the ability of the right-wing to resist the rise of social democracy.

Overall, students may conclude that the aristocratic elites were able to maintain their social dominance of Germany fairly easily in this period as the social influence of the military continued and the newly enriched industrialists wanted to ape the aristocracy rather than usurp them. Economically, this was a tougher period for the aristocratic elites as their wealth largely depended on agriculture on their great landed estates. German agriculture struggled in this period in the face of foreign competition and the shift towards industrialisation within Germany. Politically, the aristocratic elites were still hugely influential and Kaiser Wilhelm's policies were largely framed in their interests, especially after 1894. However, the Kaiser and the aristocratic elites were both struggling to come to terms with the emergence of new forces in German politics such as socialism and parliamentary democracy, which were challenging their traditional dominance.

-
- 03 To what extent was the German economy stronger at the beginning of 1929 than it had been in 1900? **[25 marks]**

Target: A01

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.

Arguments supporting the view that the German economy was stronger at the beginning of 1929 than it had been in 1900 might include:

- heavy industry, such as coal, iron and steel production, expanded significantly in the years 1900 to 1914. By 1929, production had nearly recovered to pre-war levels, therefore the scale of German heavy industry was greater in 1929 than it had been in 1900
- technological advances (some made during the war including the development of ersatz materials) and rationalisation led to improvements in productivity and efficiency. The impact of hyperinflation also led to inefficient firms disappearing. Therefore, German industry was more efficient compared to 1900
- the expansion of industries involved in newer technologies continued after the war. Germany continued to be a world leader in chemicals, electrical goods, and the automotive industry. Therefore, the scale of these industries was also greater in 1929 than in 1900
- the cartelisation of German industry in the 1920s also created strength in that sector of the economy. In 1900 there were 300 industrial cartels, by 1929 there were 3000. Cartels created greater economic stability and gave manufacturers control over costs and prices
- foreign investment was coming into Germany at record levels. The Dawes Plan stimulated economic growth in Germany through the influx of American loans and this encouraged investment from other countries and banks.

Arguments challenging the view that the German economy was stronger at the beginning of 1929 than it had been in 1900 might include:

- the reliance on foreign credit, particularly the loans from America, was a structural weakness in the German economy that made it very vulnerable to fluctuations on the world economy, which was obviously to prove the case after 1929
- small businesses were worse off relatively in 1929 compared to 1900. Investment after 1919 had been directed primarily at larger industries and the cartelisation of German industry harmed the interests of smaller businesses
- unemployment was on the rise after 1925 and was to reach 3 million by February 1929. The generous welfare state created by the Weimar Republic meant that the government's finances were already under huge strain from the rise in unemployment by 1929
- falling prices, foreign competition and industrialisation had all contributed to a decline in agriculture before 1914. The war exacerbated the problems and agriculture did not benefit from the general economic recovery after 1919. Farmers suffered from low prices, high taxation and rents, as well as high interest payments on mortgages
- Germany's share of world trade fell between 1919 and 1929, especially in competition with America. In 1900, Germany enjoyed a much higher share of production and export in all industries compared to 1929.

Overall, students may conclude that the more convincing argument appears to be that the German economy was in a weaker position in 1929 compared to 1900. Germany was dangerously reliant on foreign loans to support an economy which had high levels of unemployment and of government spending. Furthermore, Germany's share of world production and trade had decreased significantly from 1900 to 1929. However, some of the difficulties faced by the German economy at the start of 1929 could be seen as fairly short-term problems in a country still recovering from the ravages of war; and, in absolute terms, the German economy was larger and more efficient than it had been in 1900.

- 04** ‘Communist opposition posed a serious threat to the governments of Germany in the years 1919 to 1939.’

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.

Arguments supporting the view that Communist opposition posed a serious threat to the governments of Germany in the years 1919 to 1939 might include:

- in 1919, the new democratic government was forced to convene in Weimar because the streets of Berlin were too dangerous due to the Spartacist Rising. The level of violence employed by the Freikorps, such as the murders of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, suggest that the Communist threat was considered serious
- the ‘Red Rising’ in the Ruhr in 1920 raised a force of over 50,000 workers. The Communists were able to seize control of the industrial plants of the Ruhr. Following the merger of the USPD with the KPD in December 1920, the Communists now had nearly half a million members
- in the November 1932 election the KPD increased its share of the vote unlike the Nazis and the SPD. The fortunes of the Communists seemed to be on the rise. Ironically, this became a factor which worked in Hitler’s favour as the elites saw the Nazis as the best defence of their interests against the rising Communist threat
- the seriousness with which the Communist threat was taken is evident from Hindenburg’s readiness to grant Hitler ‘Emergency Powers’ after the Reichstag Fire. The possibility of a Communist revolution was considered to be a very real danger.

Arguments challenging the view that Communist opposition posed a serious threat to the governments of Germany in the years 1919 to 1939 might include:

- Communist political violence in the years 1919–23 was put down easily as President Ebert had the support of the Freikorps. He also used Article 48 of the constitution to mobilise the army against threats to the government. The army were supportive due to the Ebert-Groener Pact
- the spate of Communist risings between 1919–23 had little chance of success as the majority of workers remained loyal to the SPD-led government. In addition, the Communist groups had few leaders of outstanding ability who could lead a successful revolution
- between 1924 and 1928, the KPD’s share of the vote declined as the Weimar Republic enjoyed a period of economic growth and political stability. Although the KPD nearly doubled its number of seats in the Reichstag between 1928 and 1932, support for the Communists could not expand beyond their traditional working-class base
- following the Reichstag Fire, Hitler used the Emergency Powers granted him by Hindenburg to arrest thousands of Communists, close down their newspapers and ban their meetings. This was compounded by the shutting down of the trade unions and the creation of the DAF in May 1933
- underground Communist resistance to the Nazi regime continued between 1933 and 1939, but it was seriously limited in its ability to challenge the government. There were plots to assassinate Hitler and resistance networks in major cities but invariably these were broken up by the Gestapo.

Overall, students may conclude that the potential threat of Communism was taken very seriously at the time. Events in Russia clearly made the prospect of a Communist revolution a very real and present danger in Germany. The significant actions taken by the governments between 1919 and 1923, and again in 1933, indicate that the threat of Communism was considered to be very serious indeed. However, looking back with the benefit of hindsight, it is possible to argue that the Communist threat was not as severe as it appeared. The support of the army and of the majority of workers for the SPD-led government in the early years of the Weimar Republic meant that a Communist revolution was unlikely to succeed. Later, the strength of the capitalist classes ensured that the party to benefit the most from

the economic crisis after 1929 was not the Communists but the Nazis. Once in power, Hitler was able to crush the Communist threat decisively.