
A-LEVEL

History

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

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

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 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

June 2017

A-level

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 influence of the right-wing elites in Germany in the years 1919 to 1945. **[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 Fischer’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Fischer’s overall argument is that the right-wing elites aimed to maintain their power and influence throughout this period, which is why they entered into an alliance with Hitler. Following Hitler’s rise to power, the elites had a strong influence on the economic policy of the Third Reich
- Hitler entered into discussions with the traditional elites from 1930 in order win their support for his rise to power. He reassured them that there would be no significant changes to the economic system in Germany
- the policies pursued by the Nazi regime from 1933 were precisely in line with the wishes of the elites
- the rearmament programme was driven more by the army and industrialists than by the Nazis.

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

- through the Weimar period, opposition to democracy had been strong amongst the right-wing elites. The nature of Brüning’s government attests to their hostile attitude and limited commitment to social democracy
- as a result of his willingness to accommodate their views, Hitler secured funding and other assistance from right-wing nationalists such as Thyssen and Hugenberg
- from 1933, the Nazis quietly dropped a lot of their anti-capitalist programme in order to maintain the support of big business, e.g. the destruction of the trade unions led to longer hours for workers
- in opposition to Fischer, it could be argued that Hitler did not regard himself as the pawn of the right-wing elites. In 1933, he outmanoeuvred the right-wing politicians who had helped him into power and created a one-party dictatorship strengthening his grip on power, which became increasingly independent of the elites as the 1930s progressed.

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

- Fulbrook’s main argument is that the elites lacked influence during the Weimar period but felt that they had used Hitler in 1933, taking advantage of his mass support to bring down democracy. However, once in power Hitler outmanoeuvred them and took opportunities to reduce the influence of the right-wing elites
- the traditional elites had reduced influence during the Weimar years as they made concessions with the new democratic government, but they were waiting for an opportunity to restore their previous power and status
- although the traditional elites helped Hitler into power, the Enabling Law reduced Hitler’s reliance on the non-Nazis in his Cabinet and the political significance of President Hindenburg

- after 1936, the rift between the traditional elites and the Nazi regime widened as preparations for war became more of a priority.

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

- the traditional elites wanted to avoid blame for defeat in the war, hence the propagation of the ‘Stab-in-the-back’ myth. They did make concessions with the new Weimar government, for example the Ebert-Groener Pact and Hindenburg’s election as President
- using the Enabling Law, Hitler created a one-party dictatorship which reduced the ability of the traditional right-wing elites to influence the political leadership of Germany
- as the 1930s progressed, Hitler felt more confident and able to reduce his reliance on the traditional elites in economic policy. Hence, the Four Year Plan and preparations for war were often developed in opposition to the views of important industrialists and army leaders, some of whom were removed from their positions of influence as a result
- in opposition to Fulbrook, students may argue that in order to achieve rearmament Hitler needed the co-operation of the army and big business. Therefore, he was prepared to act in ways which won their support, e.g. the ‘Night of the Long Knives’ and the destruction of the trade unions.

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

- Kershaw’s main argument is that before 1933 the power of the traditional elites was under threat, however, with the rise to power of the Nazis, the social and economic dominance of the elites was re-established
- the ‘crisis of capitalism’ during the depression threatened the power of the elites as the political system was being destroyed by class conflict
- after the Nazis’ rise to power, however, the most important organisations in Germany, both Nazi (the SS) and non-Nazi (big business, the civil service and the army), continued to recruit from the same elite social strata as before 1933, thereby preserving the dominance of the traditional social elites
- the limited level of social mobility that did occur under the Nazis was only a small increase on changes that were already occurring during the Weimar period.

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

- the governments of Germany had been unable to cope with the economic and political impact of the Great Depression, which undermined the power and influence of the traditional elites as their initial attempts to resolve the situation through presidential decree were ineffective. Civil war was not an unrealistic possibility in Germany in 1932
- Hitler acted in several ways which bolstered the social and economic position of the elites. The ‘Night of the Long Knives’ neutered the more radical elements within the Nazi party and the labour movement was crushed enabling the elites to re-establish their dominance
- despite the liberal basis of the Weimar Republic, social mobility from 1919 to 1933 had been limited as the traditional elites retained their dominance. Although some leading Nazis were ‘upstarts’ (Hitler himself, Himmler, Heydrich) this did not represent a genuine commitment by the Nazis to challenge the old elites through increased social mobility
- in opposition to Kershaw, students may argue that the Four Year Plan and the changes to the leadership of the armed forces in 1938, including the establishment of the OKW, represent a significant shift in the balance of power between the Nazi leadership and the traditional elites within the economy and armed forces.

Section B

- 02** How significant was the role played by political parties in influencing government policy in the years 1871 to 1890? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments suggesting that the political parties had a significant influence on government policy in the years 1871 to 1890 could include:

- the National Liberals formed an alliance with Bismarck between 1871 and 1878 during which they were able to influence his policies of national unification and the *Kulturkampf*
- in 1874, the National Liberals led the Reichstag's resistance to Bismarck's proposal for a permanent arrangement for the military budget. In the end Bismarck was forced to compromise through the passing of the Septennial Law
- the success of the Catholic Centre Party in mobilising opposition to the *Kulturkampf* through the 1870s forced Bismarck to abandon the policy
- in order to form a new anti-socialist bloc within the Reichstag, Bismarck introduced protective tariffs in 1878/79 to gain the support of the Centre Party and to reinforce his natural alliance with the Conservatives
- Bismarck's proposed permanent anti-socialist bill of 1890 was rejected by the political parties in the Reichstag. This defeat, and the relative success of the parties opposed to Bismarck's policies in the subsequent election, contributed to his resignation.

Arguments suggesting that the political parties had a limited influence on government policy in the years 1871 to 1890 could include:

- it could be argued that, in the 1870s, Bismarck was using the National Liberals for his own ends and that when their demands were becoming too onerous he easily ditched them in 1878 and built a new political alignment with the Centre Party
- the introduction of protective tariffs in 1878/79 could be depicted as a decision taken by Bismarck independent of any influence from the political parties, e.g. Bismarck recognised that German agriculture and industry was in need of protection from foreign competition
- Bismarck was personally rather paranoid about the potential threat of socialism, which could explain the launch of his anti-socialist campaign in 1878, rather than any influence of the political parties
- Bismarck showed great independence and creativity through the introduction of social welfare legislation in the 1880s. This ran counter to the traditional ideology of his supporters in the conservative parties yet he was able to enact the legislation
- Bismarck used the prospect of war to influence the 1887 election and was able to manufacture a *Kartell* of right-wing parties which dominated the Reichstag. In this way, Bismarck was able to reassert his dominance over the political parties for a few years.

Overall, students may conclude that under the new German constitution of 1871, Bismarck had to take note of the views of the political parties and therefore they were able, to an extent, to influence his policies. However, Bismarck was not responsible to the Reichstag and was free to ignore the views of the parties whenever he wanted. Bismarck often regarded the parties with disdain and sought to manipulate them at every turn in order to manufacture support for his own policies. In this he was aided by the relative naivety and inexperience of the parties in using their potential influence under the constitution. Therefore, government policy in this period was dominated by Bismarck's priorities not those of the political parties.

- 03** 'Opposition in the Reichstag had little influence on the Kaiser's government in the years 1890 to 1918.'

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 suggesting that opposition in the Reichstag had little influence on the Kaiser's government in the years 1890 to 1918 could include:

- the Reichstag had no constitutional power to introduce or amend legislation. As a result, government policy was largely at the direction of the Kaiser and the ruling elites who pursued aims such as naval expansion despite some opposition in the Reichstag
- the Reichstag passed a vote of no confidence in the chancellor as a result of the Zabern Affair in 1913, however, the Kaiser simply ignored this and continued to support Bethmann Hollweg as chancellor
- the patriotic fervour of the years up to 1914 undermined the strength of opposition in the Reichstag, enabling the Kaiser to pursue his policy of preparing for war. In 1913, the SPD voted for the increased army budget and in 1914 voted for war credits
- during the war, increasing socialist opposition failed to have much impact on the government. In response, the Kaiser handed more power to the military under Hindenburg and Ludendorff. The Reichstag's 'peace resolution' of July 1917 had little impact
- the 'revolution from below', which forced the Kaiser to abdicate in November 1918, was not based on opposition from the Reichstag but rather on extra-parliamentary opposition from within the armed forces, the 'Spartacists' and trade unions.

Arguments challenging the view that opposition in the Reichstag had little influence on the Kaiser's government in the years 1890 to 1918 could include:

- the government responded to opposition demands by introducing social welfare reforms, notably during Caprivi's 'New Course' (1890–94) and under Bülow between 1900 and 1903. Further liberal and socialist pressure resulted in the introduction of the secret ballot in 1904 and payment for Reichstag deputies in 1906
- opposition in the Reichstag defeated the proposed Subversion Bill in 1894 and the Anti-Union Bill of 1899. This represented a defeat for the government's policy of 'concentration'
- opposition in the Reichstag defeated several finance bills put forward by both Bülow and Bethmann Hollweg between 1906 and 1912
- in the 1912 election the SPD became the largest party in the Reichstag. Together with the liberals, they could now block any proposed legislation put forward by the chancellor. In order to get their approval for the increased army budget in 1913, Bethmann Hollweg introduced a special defence tax on property
- the initial stages of the revolution of October 1918 involved representatives of the opposition parties in the Reichstag forming a new constitutional government under Prince Max von Baden.

Overall, students may conclude that, as much as they would have liked to, the Kaiser and his government could not ignore the views of the parties in the Reichstag which opposed his policies. In order to win over, or reduce the level of this opposition, some concessions were made such as social welfare reforms and the defence tax of 1913. However, the Kaiser's government also undermined the strength of opposition by successfully, at times, portraying opposition parties as unpatriotic and continued to pursue military expansion. This tactic succeeded in the run up to 1914 as the increasingly left-wing Reichstag approved an increased military budget and war credits.

- 04** How far was the economic growth of the 1950s and 1960s in West Germany due to the legacy of the Second World War?

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 suggesting that the economic growth of the 1950s and 1960s in West Germany was due to the legacy of the Second World War could include:

- the destruction of thousands of old factories due to the war enabled the building of new complexes using the latest technology
- the period of Allied occupation following the war, laid the foundations for the future economic growth due to policies such as the removal of wage controls, reduction of income tax, the establishment of credit schemes and the injection of Marshall Plan funds
- refugees escaping the Soviet zone of control flooded into West Germany after the war, which created deep labour resources for the FRG to exploit in the 1950s and 1960s
- Germany, uniquely amongst the major industrial powers after the war, did not have to lay aside huge sums of money for rearmament
- the Nazi wartime economy had developed expertise in communications, armaments, vehicle manufacture, chemicals and light engineering. Managers who had gained experience during the Nazi period later became the leaders of the West German economy.

Arguments challenging the view that the economic growth of the 1950s and 1960s in West Germany was due to the legacy of the Second World War could include:

- Erhard's policies to establish the 'social market economy', which included government aid to heavy manufacturing industry, reduction of protective tariffs, a strong currency and agricultural subsidies
- the idea of the 'social partnership' between employers and employees which helped to keep wages down and prevent strikes
- the international economic recovery which created strong export markets for German goods, which sold well due to a reputation for quality
- the Korean War created a sharp rise in demand for German exports especially mechanical equipment
- in the 1960s, the government encouraged foreign workers (*Gastarbeiter*) to come to work in West Germany in order to address the labour shortages that were emerging in certain industries. By 1966, 1.2 million *Gastarbeiter* worked in the FRG – 10% of the workforce.

Overall, students may conclude that the legacy of the Second World War certainly created the conditions for strong economic growth in West Germany. The Allies did not want to make the same mistakes as in 1919 and wanted a strong FRG as a partner in the developing Cold War. Therefore, help was on hand to lay the foundations for the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s and 1960s. The physical destruction of war also created the opportunity to create a modern economy making full use of new technology, which was to be run by managers who had cut their teeth in the Nazi wartime economy. The social market policies of Erhard certainly exploited these opportunities to the full but it is hard to envisage that he would have had such spectacular success without the favourable preconditions established by the legacy of the war.