



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

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 2022 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.

Marking guidance for examiners

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:

- An assessment grid advising the bands and marks that should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.
- Advice on the specific question that outlines indicative content which may 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 must credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.

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 band are displayed. Thirdly, a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 2

Question 2 assesses assessment objective 3. This assessment objective is a single element focussed 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:

- An assessment grid advising the bands and marks that should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2
- 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.

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.

AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

		Value of the sources	Analysis and evaluation of the sources in their historical context	Focus on the question set
Band 6	26–30 marks	The learner shows clear understanding of the strengths and limitations of the sources.	The sources are clearly analysed and evaluated in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner will make a sustained and developed attempt to utilise the sources to directly answer the question set.
Band 5	21–25 marks	The learner considers the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources appropriately to support the judgement reached about the question set.
Band 4	16–20 marks	The learner develops a response which begins to discuss the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources with an awareness of the wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources to support the judgement reached about the question set.
Band 3	11–15 marks	The learner uses most of the source material to develop a response.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources.	The learner begins to discuss the sources' use in the context of the question set.
Band 2	6–10 marks	The learner uses some of the source material to develop a response.	The learner begins to analyse and evaluate the sources but it is largely mechanical.	The learner attempts to comment on the sources' use but lacks context.
Band 1	1–5 marks	There is limited evidence of the use of the sources.	Sources are used for their content only.	
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.				

Using the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying political developments in the Weimar Republic between 1920 and 1932?

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying political developments in the Weimar Republic between 1920 and 1932. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations may be made in the analysis and evaluation of the sources including the following.

Source A The general context of the source is wider right-wing discontent and the desire to reject democracy in favour of a return to some kind of nationalist authoritarian regime, while the specific context may focus on the Putsch of March 1920, which was an attempted coup triggered by the government's attempts to disband a Freikorps unit under Captain Ehrhardt. At the point of the Proclamation, Ebert had fled and Kapp was announcing the establishment of a new authoritarian government in "the best German tradition". The source reveals that the early years of the Republic were a political battlefield marked by crisis and instability. The tone of the proclamation is typically right wing, and is a political justification for the overthrow of the Republic and should be treated with caution. The language used reveals the right-wing journalist and civil servant Kapp's skilled use of words.

Source B The general context of the source is aftermath of the Wall Street crash and the fall of the Grand coalition, with its specific context relating to the Reichstag election of 1930. From a left-wing British periodical, the article is an expose of the campaign violence that characterised the election of 1930 in Germany. However, it may have sensationalised the facts. The fall of the Grand Coalition was a highly significant moment in that from that point on no government of the Weimar Republic had a majority in the Reichstag. Instead of passing laws in the Reichstag, governments increasingly relied upon Presidential decrees. There was, therefore, a transfer from parliamentary government to presidential power. It is also of value because it reveals the political violence that underpinned Nazi electoral success in 1930 increasing their representation in the Reichstag to 107 from 12, and leading to a growth in Nazi Party membership.

Source C The general context of the source is the ongoing political developments in Germany, with its specific historical context relating to the presidential election of April 1932, and the decree (of the same month) that banned the SA and the SS. The source, a memorandum written by a former Minister of the Interior to the German Democratic Party (one of the declining "bourgeoise parties" of the Weimar Republic that was in favour of maintaining a democratic, republican Germany), should be treated with caution as it is a pessimistic view of the political developments taking place inside Germany. It demonstrates the Kultz's grave concerns for the future of Germany's democratic institutions: it reveals the political extremism that was affecting the stability of the Weimar Republic and, while it is an emotional response to the election result of July 1932, it is an honest reflection on the political realities of Germany in July 1932.

AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

		Focus on the question set	Analysis of the interpretation
Band 6	26–30 marks	The learner discusses clearly the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner considers the validity of the interpretations in the development of the historiographical context. They demonstrate an understanding of how and why this issue has been interpreted in different ways. They discuss why a particular historian or school of history would form an interpretation based on the evidence available to the historian.
Band 5	21–25 marks	The learner discusses the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner discusses the work of different historians and/or schools of history to show an understanding of the development of the historical debate. The learner analyses and explains the key issues in the question set when considering the interpretation in the question.
Band 4	16–20 marks	The learner discusses the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is some attempt to explain why different interpretations have been formed. The learner considers a counterargument to that presented in the question.
Band 3	11–15 marks	The learner attempts to discuss the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is a limited attempt to explain why different interpretations have been formed.
Band 2	6–10 marks	The learner is able to show understanding of the question set. There is an attempt to reach a judgement but it is not firmly supported or balanced.	The learner's discussion of the interpretation is valid, with reference to alternate interpretations.
Band 1	1–5 marks	Any judgement reached is limited and unsupported.	The learner attempts to discuss the interpretation by tending to agree or disagree with it.
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.			

How valid is the view that the foreign policy of the Weimar Republic was successful in the period from 1924 to 1929?

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Candidates will consider the provided material 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 foreign policy of the Weimar Republic was mainly successful in the period from 1924 to 1929. Some of the issues to consider may include the following.

Interpretation 1

This argues that between 1924 and 1929 Weimar foreign policy was unsuccessful. Stresemann may have constructed an ingenious system but unfortunately he was unable to make it work. This is a revisionist viewpoint of Weimar foreign policy in the years 1924–1929, which argues that Stresemann could not find a solution to the problems he faced in international relations and so Weimar Foreign policy was mainly unsuccessful. This view challenged the idea of seeing Stresemann as a positive force that achieved major successes in foreign policy by influencing the development of several initiatives and was formulated following closer examination of Stresemann's diaries rather than on edited extracts. Clearly the author of the extract—an academic historian and specialist on Weimar Germany—will add to the veracity of the interpretation, but it may be contended that he should have considered the political and economic influences upon Weimar Foreign policy in general and Stresemann in particular.

Interpretation 2

This argues that a considerable amount had been achieved in foreign policy by 1929 so that Weimar foreign policy was mainly successful and German foreign relations had regularised with its former enemies, note, for example, Germany's acceptance into the League of Nations. Stresemann had adopted a gradual approach to the restoration of Germany's diplomatic influence. It seems that Fulbrook adopts a post revisionist stance by accepting the orthodox and largely traditionalist explanation of Weimar foreign policy between 1924 and 1929. This suggests that Weimar Foreign policy was mainly successful in the period and much of the credit for this was due to Stresemann. While, like many of his contemporaries, he desired to see an alteration to the terms of the Versailles settlement, his methods were not typical, in that he worked towards that end through constructive diplomacy. The lack of military options at the disposal of the Weimar Republic meant that there were few other options available other than to follow a peaceful diplomatic process.

Wider debate

For some historians, such was the penalty of Versailles that Stresemann did not get full credit for his work as foreign minister; the balance between revisionism and rapprochement was always unclear; foreign policy was developed on a pragmatic and ad hoc basis and he achieved considerable success given the difficult international situation that Germany found itself in.