



GCE MARK SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

HISTORY - UNIT 2  
DEPTH STUDY 8: GERMANY: DEMOCRACY TO  
DICTATORSHIP, c. 1918-1945

PART 1: WEIMAR AND ITS CHALLENGES,  
c. 1918-1933

2100U80-1

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

## **UNIT 2**

### **DEPTH STUDY 8**

#### **GERMANY: DEMOCRACY TO DICTATORSHIP, c.1918-45**

##### **PART 1: WEIMAR AND ITS CHALLENGES, c.1918-33**

### **MARK SCHEME**

#### **Marking guidance for examiners for Question 1**

##### **Summary of assessment objectives for Question 1**

Question 1 assesses assessment objective 2. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate contemporary source material in its historical context. The mark awarded to Question 1 is 30.

##### **The structure of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme for Question 1 has two parts:

- advice on the specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- an assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.

##### **Deciding on the mark awarded within a band**

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

## INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 1

*NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.*

### **With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying opposition to the Weimar Republic between 1920 and 1932.**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of primary source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the primary sources in their historical context. To judge value to an historian, there should also be analysis and evaluation of the content and the authorship of the primary sources.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying opposition to the Weimar Republic between 1920 and 1932. Understanding of the historical context should be demonstrated to analyse and evaluate the value of the sources to the particular enquiry. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include:

- Source A is from a pamphlet by the government in response to the Kapp Putsch. The pamphlet was issued by members of the SPD and probably sanctioned by Ebert. The pamphlet shows the first major crisis caused by right wing opposition to the Weimar Republic in 1920 because Ebert and the government were forced to flee. The Putsch was led by disgruntled right wing army officers and Freikorps men who had become angered by the reduction of the army under the terms of the Versailles Treaty and the ordered disbanding of the Freikorps. The Putsch was amateurish in design and execution and had little chance of ultimate success but it revealed the ambiguous attitude of the army who had protected the Republic from the Spartacists but had refused to fire on the putschists: 'the army does not fire on the army'. It also revealed the lack of support from the right for the Republic in the wake of the Spartacist revolt. The tone of the source is bigotted left wing reaction to the right wing who they saw as attempting to restore the Kaiser and the 'old order' to Germany and so should be treated with caution. This was another illustration of the negative propaganda campaign that was being launched by the left wing inside Germany. It is a typically pessimistic interpretation of Germany's future and an attempt to end the counter revolution by appealing to the population of Berlin to defend the values of the Republic which had been hard fought for. The source is valuable evidence to an historian studying opposition to the Weimar Republic and is evidence of the fact that the threat posed by the right had the potential to destroy the Republic in 1920. It also reveals to an historian that a right wing overthrow of the Republic would need more popular backing since the general strike called for by the left was effective and led to the failure of the Putsch.
- Source B is from a speech by Hitler at his trial in 1924 following the Munich Putsch. In November 1923 the little known Nazi Party tried to seize power in Munich. Throughout the Ruhr crisis of 1923, and the beginnings of the economic crisis, Hitler and the Nazi press kept up its barrage against the Republic but the right wing opposition lacked support and unity. In this speech Hitler revealed himself as master of the political art of presenting a message to his immediate audience. Hitler took the initiative and transformed the trial into a propaganda triumph. He took advantage of the fact that the trial was public and that the judges were sympathetic to his cause. In this speech Hitler achieved a moral victory whilst the Republic received a stunning rebuke: 'we wanted to

create order' 'to throw out the idlers' was designed to present him as a hero and a man of action and all this was relayed to millions of Germans through the press. Up until this point Hitler was a little known figure and this right wing group was only a fringe party. The speech should be treated with caution because Hitler is engaged in a patriotic defence of his Putsch. This is all part of his scheming. He already knew that his sentence would be light and merited only a 'slap on the wrist'. The political right was presented as the patriotic party of Germany as opposed to the un-German Weimar republic. The source is valuable evidence to an historian studying opposition facing the Weimar Republic because the speech revealed that there still existed disgruntled German nationalists in 1924. However, despite the content of the speech the Putsch was still only a minor event. Just as with Source A until the political right received popular backing the triumph of the right in Germany looked unlikely. The significance of the Munich Putsch lies in the lessons Hitler learnt in relation to his strategy. He would need to come to power legally as seizing power by force was not feasible as had been shown in Sources A and B.

- Source C is from a letter written by leading German industrialists to President Hindenburg who were concerned about the lack of effective government following the result of November 1932 election. They were never committed to parliamentary government and now believed that their fears were confirmed. Some saw the possibility of using the popular support for the right wing Nazi movement to channel the political system into a more authoritarian direction. The tone of the source tries to present a neutral political stance and yet tries to direct the President into appointing Hitler as Chancellor on the premise that he was the leader of the most popular party in the Reichstag. However, this neutrality should be treated with caution as Hitler's campaign against the Young Plan had given his right wing movement access to big business and provided a degree of respectability. Furthermore the letter calls for a rebirth for the economy which would suit their interests. The source remains valuable evidence to an historian studying the opposition to the Weimar Republic in that it reveals that by 1932 'the nationalist movement was sweeping through the country'. Opposition on the right was now a mass phenomenon and not represented by a minority of extremists. However, whilst the source reveals a massive growth in support for the right and in particular the Nazis, it is important that despite the fact that the right were on the verge of power it does not mean that the path to government was going to be smooth. The Nazis for example never won more than 50% of the vote in a Reich election and it peaked in the July 1932 election. Support for the Nazis actually fell in the November 1932 election which is not discussed in the source. Furthermore there was distrust and opposition to the Nazis from other right wing politicians and revealed disunity within the ranks of the right wing opposition to the Weimar republic in general. Moreover there is no reference to the divisions within the Nazi movement itself.

Overall, candidates will assess the value of the sources to an historian studying opposition to the Weimar Republic between 1920 and 1932. They are able to demonstrate that value through consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the presented sources with appropriate reference to the historical context linked to the sources.

## ASSESSMENT GRID FOR QUESTION 1

Target: AO2

Total mark: 30

Focus: *Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and / or contemporary to the period, within its historical context*

<b>Band 6 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the given sources involving full and valid consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the sources; full understanding shown of the correct historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a full and substantiated judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying a particular issue.</i>
B6H	30	The response shows accurate and sustained source evaluation using the content and attributions to deal with the strengths and limitations of each of the three sources, setting the response in the correct historical context and covering all of the period set in the enquiry. There will be a sustained and fully substantiated judgement on both the individual and collective values of all three sources to an historian studying the particular issue.
B6L	26	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 6.
<b>Band 5 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Meaningful analysis and evaluation of the given sources involving valid consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the sources; understanding shown of the correct historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a valid judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying a particular issue.</i>
B5H	25	The response shows accurate source evaluation using the content and attributions to deal with the strengths and limitations of each of the three sources, setting the response in the correct historical context and covering most of the period set in the enquiry. There will be a valid judgement on the value of all three sources to an historian studying the particular issue.
B5L	23	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 5.
<b>Band 4 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Clearly attempts an analysis and evaluation of the given sources in relation to the historical context of the set enquiry with some consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the sources; a sound judgement is seen regarding the value of all or some of the three sources.</i>
B4H	20	The response is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and the historical context. The judgement on value will be clear and supported on all three sources.
B4M	18	The response is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and the historical context. There will be some issues with imbalance in the treatment of the sources. The judgement on value will be clear on some or all of the three sources but with some general comments.
B4L	16	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 4. Value to the historian is seen here but the reference will be limited and not sustained.

<b>Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic use of the content and attributions of the given sources to discuss their utility; begins to show some general awareness of the historical context relating to the set enquiry; limited judgement on the utility of all or some of the sources.</i>
B3H	15	The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions and content. Any reference to the historical context will be limited. There will be a judgement on the utility of all of the sources.
B3M	13	The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing on their attributions and/or content. Any reference to the historical context will be limited. There will be a limited judgement on the utility of some of the three sources.
B3L	11	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 3. Also use if only one attribution is attempted to show utility.
<b>Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content of the given sources to show their utility; little understanding of the historical context is seen.</i>
B2H	10	The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing on their content mostly; any references to the historical context will be general and vague. There will be a limited judgement on the utility of at least one of the sources.
B2M	8	The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing on their content and omissions with some imbalance; any references to the historical context will be very general and vague.
B2L	6	The response trawls through the sources only.
<b>Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Copies or paraphrases from content or attributions of the given sources.</i>
B1H	5	Paraphrases from all of the three sources and/or attributions or plain narrative.
B1L	3	Copies from one or two of the sources and/or attributions.
	0	Use for incorrect answers.

## **Marking guidance for examiners for Question 2**

### **Summary of assessment objectives for Question 2**

Question 2 assesses assessment objective 3. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate how and why different historical interpretations have been made. The mark awarded to Question 2 is 30.

### **The structure of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme for Question 2 has two parts:

- advice on the specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- an assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 3.

### **Deciding on the mark awarded within a band**

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.



## INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 2

*NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.*

### **How valid is the view that the years 1924-1929 were mainly a period of domestic success for the Weimar Republic?**

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Answers will consider the provided extracts and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view that the years 1924-1929 were mainly a period of domestic success for the Weimar Republic

Candidates are invited to enter into a debate about the domestic stability of Germany between 1924-1929. Learners will consider different interpretations of this issue within the wider historical debate about the extent of domestic success for the Weimar Republic between 1924-1929. Some of the issues to consider may include:

- Interpretation 1 argues that between 1924-1929 the system functioned successfully and the Republic would have been capable of maintaining the permanent support of the people if it hadn't been for the Wall Street Crash. According to Mann there was political and economic stability as 'political violence subsided' and the 'economic achievements were considerable'. This resulted in a period of domestic success for the Weimar Republic.
- In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 1 answers might argue that this is a rather traditionalist viewpoint of the years 1924-1929 which are seen as a kind of 'golden age' of Weimar. The years 1924-1929 have been seen by one school of historians as years of domestic success with economic growth and political stability. There was a growth in prosperity, new production, management techniques and industrial planning. There was a decline in political violence and the constitution functioned normally. This is a rather simplistic and optimistic view of the years 1924-1929 which does not take into account the overall reliance on foreign investment or the high turnover of governments as coalition after coalition collapsed. This is the opinion of an historian who may have been swayed by the veneer of 'stabilisation' under which there were many cracks both political and economic. The fact that this is written in a general history of Germany in 1968 means that the author may not have considered that the destabilisation which had set in after the First World War had not really been overcome. Mann may be too easily swayed by the exaggerated extent of domestic success and he has ignored the notion of continuity of history. He has a more generalised understanding of the period so the veracity of this interpretation in terms of the rigour of the historical research should be questioned.
- Interpretation 2 argues that there was only an illusion of domestic success. Peukert argues that the political and economic problems had not been solved and that furthermore, 'the problems which emerged in the period 1930-1933 can be said to have been brewing in the period 1924-1929'. The decline of the Weimar political system was underway in the period 1924-1929 and so this was not a period of domestic success.

- In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 2 it seems that Peukert adopts a more revisionist approach to the period 1924-1929 which suggests that, whilst compared relatively to the period 1919-1923, there appeared to be greater domestic success, in reality it was in the the period 1924-1929 that the seeds of domestic crisis later were sown. He argues that the electoral decline of the liberal parties was the decisive event of the Weimar Republic which happened in the period 1924-1929 and not the Wall Street Crash. This is a revisionist view which argues that there is continuity and not discontinuity within the history of the Weimar Republic. Clearly the author of the source, an academic historian and specialist in Nazi Germany, will add to the veracity of the interpretation. He would have considered the traditionalist interpretation in the formation of his own. However, in evaluating these interpretations learners should consider that the two interpretations differ in terms of the timescale of the period 1924-1929 and in the process of history. One sees it as a more long term development whilst the other seems to argue that the history of Weimar was more easily isolated into different and independent periods.
- Candidates may show awareness of the wider historical debate surrounding this issue of the extent of domestic success. In particular candidates should be aware of other interpretations such as the view that the years 1924-1929 were superficially promising but marred by major weaknesses; that any domestic success was only temporary or that success was patchy and Germany suffered from regional differences in the mid-1920s.

Overall candidates will analyse both interpretations using their own understanding of the debate over this issue, offer an evaluation of the validity of the given interpretations and provide a judgement on the issue in the question that the years 1924-1929 were mainly a period of domestic success for the Weimar Republic.

## ASSESSMENT GRID FOR QUESTION 2

Target: AO3

Total mark: 30

Focus: *Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted*

<b>Band 6 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the provided extracts which is used effectively to show understanding of how and why different interpretations have been formed in relation to the set enquiry; sustained judgement seen regarding validity.</i>
B6H	30	The response fully integrates discussion of the content and authorship of both extracts together with knowledge and understanding of other possible interpretations of the set issue to reach a valid and substantiated judgement regarding the interpretation set in the question. The response should show a firm grasp of the wider debate and how interpretations have been formed in relation to context and authorship.
B6M	28	The response accurately discusses the content and authorship of both extracts together with understanding of other possible interpretations of the set issue to offer a substantiated judgement in relation to the interpretation set in the question.
B6L	26	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 6.
<b>Band 5 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Meaningful analysis and evaluation of the provided extracts to show how and why different interpretations have been formed in relation to the set enquiry; clear judgement seen regarding validity.</i>
B5H	25	The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a clear judgement on the validity of the given interpretation; shows clear understanding of other possible interpretations of the issue. The response will show a clear grasp of the wider debate regarding the issue.
B5M	23	The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a clear judgement on the validity of the given interpretation; shows clear understanding of other possible interpretations of the issue. The response needs to indicate how and why interpretations are formed based on the content and especially the authorship of the extracts.
B5L	21	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 5.
<b>Band 4 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Some valid analysis and evaluation of the provided extracts with some knowledge of other possible interpretations to reach a judgement on the specific enquiry.</i>
B4H	20	The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a valid judgement on the given interpretation and shows understanding of other possible interpretations of this issue. The response needs some reference to both interpretations and discussion of why the authorship of at least one extract helps to explain any differences in interpretations.
B4M	18	The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a valid judgement on the given interpretation and shows awareness of other possible interpretations of the issue. The response will have some general reference to the authorship.
B4L	16	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 4.

<b>Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic focus on the content and authorship of the extracts to identify and compare interpretations; should show awareness of other possible interpretations; any judgement will be limited.</i>
B3H	15	The response attempts to compare the content and authorship of both extracts to identify different interpretations; will show some awareness of other possible interpretations; will offer a limited judgement on validity in relation to the interpretation set.
B3M	13	The response attempts to compare the content and authorship of both extracts to identify different interpretations; will offer a 'bolt-on' judgement on validity in relation to the interpretation set.
B3L	11	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 3.
<b>Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content of the given extracts only.</i>
B2H	10	The response attempts to consider the content of both extracts to show differences between interpretations and provides a judgement.
B2M	8	The response either begins to use the content of both extracts to identify some of the differences between the presented interpretations.
B2L	6	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 2 such as considering the content of only one of the extracts.
<b>Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Copies or paraphrases from the content of the extracts.</i>
B1H	5	Basic comprehension and paraphrasing from the content of both extracts.
B1L	3	Basic comprehension or copying from the content of one of the extracts.
	0	Use for incorrect answers.