



# General Certificate of Education

## History 5041/6041

### *Alternative G Germany From Unification to Re- Unification, 1871–1990*

# Mark Scheme

## *2005 examination – June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners**

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

**B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**

**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

**Level 2:**

***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

**Level 5:**

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS**

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

**Level 1:**

*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

*Or*

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

**Level 2:***Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

*Or*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

#### **Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

#### **Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

#### **Level 5:**

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

#### **Exemplification/guidance**

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

**D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

*These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.*

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**  
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.



## Alternative G: Germany from Unification to Re-unification, 1871-1990

### AS Unit 1: Imperial and Weimar Germany 1871-1925

#### Question 1

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of “the Spartacist rising” in the context of political unrest in Germany in 1919. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. the Spartacist rising was a sign of the disorder in Germany when Ebert came to power and he was able to crush this with the help of the army. Basic comment that it was a communist or left-wing rising should be placed in this level. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. reference may be made to some of the following points – in January 1919 there was a revolt of left wing radicals in Berlin. The USPD and KPD led demonstrations calling for the overthrow of the government. The action received little support from the working class in Berlin and was put down by the defence minister, Noske, with the help of the right wing Freikorps. The two leading members of the Communist Party, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, were shot. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source B** challenges the views put forward in **Source A** about the leadership of Ebert and his colleagues in the establishment of a new government in Germany in 1918-1919. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.2, AO2*

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- 
- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. makes reference to at least one appropriate point in each source. These are: Source B says “most of the new leaders were embarrassed...overcome to find power suddenly thrust into their hands”. It also describes Ebert and Noske as men who had betrayed their own cause. Source A, on the other hand, says “Ebert was a fine organiser and clear-headed leader” and “it is hard to condemn him”. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. explains the references as above, showing an appreciation of the circumstances in which Ebert had to operate at the end of the war and with a fledgling republic, and explaining how and/or why he appeared to betray some of his Socialist principles. **3-5**
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. a candidate might develop the information above and explain more fully the dilemma with which Ebert was faced and provide some supported judgement on his decision. Candidates may also refer to the sources themselves and appreciate that someone living through the events like Haffner was likely to see them in a different light. Reward any attempts at an effective and evaluative overall appraisal of the sources as pieces of evidence as well as those whose wider understanding of Ebert’s actions (and the performance of the Freikorps) enables them to make some convincing overall comment on the different views of the sources. **6-7**

(c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of political extremism, in relation to other factors, in weakening the government of Germany in the years 1918 to 1923. *(15 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Or**

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

**Indicative content**

From the sources. The sources all provide material on political extremism. Source A explains the need to end disorder, speaks of “Germany’s desperate situation” and refers to the Spartacist revolt. Source B speaks of the Freikorps fighting for the government, referring to their actions as “loathsome” and “brutal” and Source C comments on the political opposition from the extreme left and right and the “atmosphere of continual political crisis” to 1923. This source also offers some “other factors” which weakened the Republic – coalition government and economic difficulties.

From own knowledge. There should be some awareness of the range of extremism and its effects. Ebert’s co-operative pact with Groener should also be evaluated with reference to the destruction of the Spartacists and the left wing, but its failure when the army refused to help against the Kapp Putsch. The Freikorps of demobilised soldiers and officers might be discussed and shown as a destabilising right wing “extremist” force, despite their part in preserving the Republic. Candidates should also assess the effects of the political assassinations and the Munich Putsch (1923).

For a balanced answer, candidates will need to examine other factors weakening the Republic. These are likely to include: the problems posed by the Weimar constitution, the Treaty of Versailles and the “stab in the back” myth, and economic problems – particularly reparations and hyperinflation.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points about the difficulties of the Weimar Republic, either from own knowledge or the sources alone. They may be excessively generalised and assertive.

Level 2 answers will show a better use of the sources or some relevant own knowledge but answers will be unbalanced (paying little if any heed to “other factors” or covering only a small section of this period), very descriptive or limited in relevant comment.

Level 3 responses will have a greater range of material and drawing on both sources and own knowledge to show some understanding of the demands of the question. However there may be an imbalance of treatment or limited depth to the knowledge or understanding of the effects (as opposed to manifestations) of extremism.

At Level 4 there will be a better balance between the effects of extremism and other factors and the answer will show good use of both sources and own judgement in support of its arguments.

Level 5 responses will show greater analysis and judgement and a sophisticated understanding of political extremism and the difficulties of the Weimar Republic throughout the 1918-1923 period.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the Centre Party” in the context of Germany in 1871. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. reference to it as a political party representing the interests of Catholics which appeared to be increasing in support. 1

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. explaining the establishment of the party, under Windthorst, in 1870 (the year of Pius IX’s declaration of papal infallibility) to protect the interest of Catholics which, in 1871 made up a third of the population of the newly unified state. The Centre opposed Prussian, protestant domination and supported the Poles of East Germany. Their election success in 1871 won them the second largest number of seats, showed their strength and alarmed Bismarck. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Bismarck went on to the offensive against the Catholic Church in the years 1871-1878. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Bismarck disliked any challenge to his own position and regarded the Catholic Church, with its allegiance to the Pope, as a potential enemy to his newly created state. 1-2

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Bismarck saw the Centre Party as his enemy because it attracted support from his opponents within the Empire, not simply Catholics (e.g. Poles, Alsatians, Hanoverians); there was a genuine fear of disloyalty from Catholics given the recent papal decrees (Syllabus of Errors/Papal infallibility); Catholics made up a third of the population of the newly unified state held influential positions within it (particularly the Jesuits, in education); the liberals also saw the Catholics as enemies of “progress” and it suited Bismarck to work with the National Liberals at this stage. 3-5

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. balances points stressing that the Kulturkampf had no one single cause, but that political motives are likely to have been more important to Bismarck than religious ones. Reward any attempts to link the factors given in Level 2 effectively and answers which show a good conceptual understanding of the positions of Bismarck/the Centre Party and the Catholics. **6-7**

(c) “Bismarck was unsuccessful in his campaigns against both the Catholics and the Socialists.”

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view, with reference to the period 1871-1890. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

**Indicative content**

Answers should focus on the extent to which Bismarck failed in his campaigns against the Catholics and Socialists.

Evidence that he failed against the Catholics might include: He had to call off the campaign against the Catholics from 1878. The attack had strengthened, rather than weakened, the Catholics, in defence of their position; it had proved divisive, it had failed to prevent the growth of the Centre and had offended Prussian Conservatives (who disliked laws hostile to churches, and local interference) and the royal family.

Evidence that he failed against the Socialists might include: The Socialists increased in number despite the anti-Socialist law of 1878. In 1884 they won 24 seats and by 1890, 35. They caused difficulties for Bismarck in the Reichstag (hence his anti-Socialist Kartell of 1887), thrived on the grant of State welfare legislation (the reverse of what Bismarck had intended) and were responsible for Bismarck's own dismissal (following the dispute with the Kaiser over a new anti-Socialist law).

To balance the answer, candidates will also need to comment on the limits to this “failure”, perhaps pointing out that, despite all, Bismarck retained the upper hand. It could be said that he deliberately manipulated political forces to his own advantage. He abandoned the anti-Catholic measures when he saw fit and it may have been that he was happier to work with the Catholics once Leo XIII replaced Pius IX anyway. The campaign was not a total failure – some of the laws (civil marriage, state supervision of schools and laws against the Jesuits) were retained. The anti-Socialist legislation can also be said to have severely reduced the Socialist “threat”, curbed more explicit activities, maintained Bismarck in power to 1890 and prevented the sort of opposition and disruption that was to follow under the Kaiser, Wilhelm II.

Answers at Level 1 will either contain a few generalised points or offer a brief and poorly focused account of some of Bismarck's measures against the Catholics and/or Socialists.

Most Level 2 answers will be largely descriptive although some will try to respond to the question but will be very thin or unbalanced, e.g. concentrating on the Catholics or Socialists only.

Level 3 answers will attempt to “agree or disagree” and although the analysis may be slim in places will try to respond to the question showing a reasonable grasp of material and some understanding of both the anti-Catholic and anti-Socialist campaigns.

Level 4 answers will contain more precise evidence and a better balance and understanding. Candidates may argue whichever way they please but they must provide some assessment of the extent of Bismarck's failure.

Level 5 answers will have a sustained argument and a good conceptual grasp of the both the failure (or otherwise) of the campaigns and the context – with reference to Bismarck's position, aims and achievements.

### Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the “New Course” in the context of Caprivi’s Chancellorship in Germany in the years 1890 to 1894. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a policy pursued by Caprivi designed to appease the left. It involved relaxing the laws against the Socialists. Candidates who explain the repeal of the anti-socialist law with reference to earlier developments under Bismarck only, should also be placed in this level. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. in 1890 Bismarck was dismissed by the new Emperor, Wilhelm II, who believed he could win over the workers with welfare benefits. General Caprivi allowed the anti-socialist laws to lapse and launched the “new course” which extended the social welfare system with progressive income tax, regulation of working conditions, including limited working hours for all women and boys under 16, and industrial courts. He also reduced tariffs and made a series of new commercial treaties. The results disappointed Wilhelm II, the Socialist Party grew (more votes, although not seats, than any other party in 1893), Wilhelm changed course and Caprivi resigned in 1894. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why right-wing opposition groups such as the Agrarian League developed and grew in the years c1890 to 1914. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. that the Agrarian League and other right wing groups grew to defend the interests of the Prussian Junkers (landowners). They were initially opposed to the policies of the apparently “pro-socialist” Caprivi. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. The Agrarian League was founded in 1893 to act as a pressure group on behalf of the landowners. It developed in response to Caprivi’s free trade policies (which hit the Prussian landowners by allowing imports of cheap foreign grain) and campaigned against the way the needs of industry were being placed before agriculture. Other right-wing groups included the Pan-German League (founded 1891) and the Colonial League, both of which were encouraged by the growing militarism in Germany and the Kaiser’s policies of colonial expansion and *weltpolitik*. **3-5**

- 
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. understands that the growth of right wing groups was a reaction to the growth of Socialism and the impact of economic change and also embraced anti-semitism, as Jews were seen as the scapegoats. Candidates might also be placed in this level for showing a good conceptual understanding of the nature of imperial government. They might comment that the Kaiser himself increasingly encouraged right-wing attitudes, particularly patriotic values and the growth of right-wing extremism may be linked to the lack of a strong “middle group” in politics. **6-7**
- (c) “The governments of Kaiser Wilhelm II proved incapable of dealing effectively with the domestic problems they faced between 1890 and 1914.”  
 Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(15 marks)*
- Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*
- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**
-



## **Indicative content**

The focus of this question is on Kaiser Wilhelm II's governments and requires an assessment of their attempts to deal with domestic problems.

Candidates will need to identify the domestic problems, which were mostly the product of economic and social change. Issues such as the growth of Socialism, the needs of the working man and the new tensions in society which resulted from the growth of the urban working class should be assessed and the governments' varying responses under 4 different chancellors examined. Candidates may look at particular incidents of governmental struggles in the Reichstag e.g. Hohenlohe's failure to get laws passed which would have made it a crime to stir up class hatred (anti-socialist) or to force others to join a union. The Daily Telegraph affair and the Zabern incident could also be used as examples of the Kaiser's sidelining of parliament and failure to address domestic concerns.

The government "incapability" might be explained by referring to Wilhelm II's own, inconsistent views, the weaknesses of his Chancellors, the influence of the army, the power of the Socialists and the distraction of foreign policy.

A balanced answer should also contain some material to suggest the governments were, at least in part, successful and this might include reference to the spread of social welfare (under Bülow) and to the tremendous economic progress made in Germany in this period.

Level 1 answers will make generalised, simplistic and undeveloped statements about Kaiser Wilhelm II, his chancellors or some of his policies, or will describe without clear reference to the question.

Level 2 answers will be largely descriptive but they will contain at least some implicit links showing some awareness of domestic problems under Wilhelm II. These answers may cover only a small part of his reign and will almost invariably agree or disagree with the statement.

Level 3 answers will be aware of the need to "agree or disagree" and will make more comment on material presented. These answers will show a reasonable grasp of the whole reign although the detail may be better in some areas than others.

At Level 4 there will be greater analysis, a more effective use of evidence and the answer will be more balanced, putting success against failure.

Level 5 responses will argue throughout and make reasoned, but not necessarily extensive, judgements based on a developed conceptual understanding of the nature of, and the governments' response to, problems under Wilhelm II.

---

## Alternative G: Germany from Unification to Re- Unification, 1871 – 1990

### A2 Unit 4: Germany c1880-c1980

#### Question 1

- (a) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Comment on the usefulness of **Sources B** and **C** in explaining the impact of the economic troubles experienced under the Weimar Republic on the lives of the ordinary people of Germany. (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. 3-5
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. 6-8
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. 9-10

#### Indicative content

Level 1 primarily refers to the source content. At this level candidates are likely to make some simple observations about each source, perhaps quoting a few key sections. From Source B they might refer to the mixed “anxiety and excitement” experienced by those who followed the fall in the value of the mark in the newspapers. This “devastated the fabric of our daily lives”. From Source C they might refer to the queues of unemployed at the labour exchanges, the needs of many who had to resort to charity soup kitchens and the reduction of wages, hitting even the middle classes. Those providing a full account of the sources or a thinner description with some comment or concluding sentence can appropriately be placed at the top of this level.

Answers at Level 2 will look at the question with reference to the economic problems experienced in the Weimar years, but, as at Level 1, answers will be still largely dependent on what the sources say, or fail to, say. These answers will develop the points at Level 1 above using some own knowledge, e.g. they may explain (using Source B) the government response to the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 and, by linking this to the economic troubles, show how ordinary men and women were affected. They may attempt to differentiate by class or type of employment and may suggest that the source is limited in its description of how people were actually affected. Source C provides a picture of the depression following the effects of the Wall Street Crash of 1929 on Germany (and this should be distinguished from the 1923 hyper-inflation crisis), but it is again limited to three witnesses and lacking specific factual support or explanation.

Level 3 answers will attempt some direct evaluation of the sources, probably referring to their provenance – Haffner (Source B) a Nazi exile, but with no particular reason (except perhaps for the purposes of sensationalism) to exaggerate the picture of 1923, and the men and women mentioned in Source C, who later became Nazis, and might therefore have reason to paint a black picture of the Republic’s final years. The value and limitations of both sources should be alluded to and candidates should understand that both sources provide witnesses from the period concerned, but both were written at a much later period and for specific purposes.

Answers at Level 4 will reach a sustained judgement about the utility of the sources in relation to the impact of the economic troubles experienced under the Weimar Republic on the lives of the ordinary people of Germany. Such answers will acknowledge that both sources are useful, but that for a full picture further corroboration and a picture from a broader spectrum of individuals would be needed. They might, for example, point out that Haffner was clearly not a working class man (he read papers and did not appreciate the calamity of what was happening immediately). Similarly the three witnesses in Source C are hardly representative of the broad spectrum of opinion. At this level candidates should be precise about the limitations of the sources as evidence. Candidates might also make some links or comparisons between the sources, for example, how both crises hit hardest at the working men, but both also affected the middle class “savers”. Answers should demonstrate supported judgement and show good contextual understanding.

(b) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

“In the years 1880 to 1980 the development of the German economy was hindered more by financial disasters than by the impact of war.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### **Indicative content**

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Candidates will need to examine the development of the Germany economy between 1880 and 1980 examining the extent to which financial disasters and the impact of war were each responsible for impeding its growth.

There is plenty of material provided in the sources on the financial disasters which interrupted development e.g. Source A provides detail on the financial collapse and the cyclical depression 1873-1895, Source B illustrates the effects of the 1923 invasion of the Ruhr, Source C provides information on the impact of the depression in the 1930s and Source D on the collapse of the Reichsmarck. Candidates can also link the source material to the impact of war – particularly Sources B and D.

From their own knowledge candidates may refer to: 1873-1895 when the expansion of the railways slowed down and investment fell; the circumstances surrounding the Ruhr invasion, 1923; the impact of Wall Street Crash and decline of international trade 1929-1933; the effect of the Nazi economic policies; the post-war divergence of East/West Germany; the effects of the world oil crisis from 1973.

They will need to balance these financial disasters against the impact of war (which can be interpreted broadly to include preparation for war and the waging of war as well as its legacy) and arrive at a supported judgement as to which was the greater hindrance.

Candidates might see the financial downswings as only temporary bleeps in an overall success story that would have proceeded faster but for the impact of war. Alternatively war might be viewed as an indirect stimulus to the economy. This could be effectively linked to West Germany's growth after 1945.

At Level 1 answers may be very limited in timescale, or be based on unsupported general assertions. Alternatively they may be very descriptive, with no explicit attempt to address the question, or relevant but limited to a few source references.

Level 2 answers may lack any source reference but will otherwise try to address the question, or they may use the sources but produce an answer which only makes limited links to the question. Alternatively the answer may be assertive in type and very unbalanced.

For Level 3 there should be some awareness of the 100 year period although there may be considerable unevenness and lack of balance. These answers will display use of sources and own knowledge and will try to respond to the question, although the understanding may not be entirely convincing.

For an award at Level 4 there should be reasonable coverage of the whole time scale, and a clear analytical approach showing understanding and some balance of the two given factors.

Level 5 answers will balance factors effectively revealing a high level of understanding and displaying sustained judgement.

---

## Section B

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

### Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without reference to sources*)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

**L1: *Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

***Or***

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

**L2: *Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

**L3:** Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

**L4:** Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

**L5:** As Level 4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

## Question 2

“Hitler was always the master in the Third Reich.”

“A weak dictator, unable to control the ambitions and rivalries of powerful Nazi leaders.”

Which of these two statements provides the more convincing view of the operation of government in Nazi Germany? *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

### Indicative content

Answers should focus on the government of Nazi Germany and try to assess the influence wielded by Hitler as opposed to that displayed by the Nazi leaders or “barons”. They will need to examine whether the Nazi political system was dependent on Hitler as a “strong” dictator, with his ministers as his “servants” or whether Hitler was a “weak” dictator and but for the efforts of his ministers, government would have collapsed in chaos. Candidates might consider whether the rivalry of Nazi ministers for influence (e.g. Himmler and Goering), and the fact that no minister dared question policies Hitler was known to favour – “working towards the Fuhrer” – indicates that Hitler’s position was carefully calculated and that the ministers themselves had little personal power. On the other hand, there is a good deal of evidence to support the view that Hitler leaned heavily on them, and whatever their personal vulnerability, his dislike of day to day policy making and decisions gave them considerable scope to influence government. The powerful Nazi leaders candidates are likely to address would include Goering (who was able to wield considerable influence in the economic sphere) Goebbels (control of the media), Himmler (the police state) and Bormann (the all-seeing secretary). Candidates might well refer to historiographical debate on the topic, but it is more important that they are able to provide supported judgements of their own rather than merely reproduce the views of others.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, backed by very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the government of Nazi Germany but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced, perhaps looking only at Hitler.

At Level 3 answers will show greater understanding of the part of Hitler and other powerful individuals in Nazi government, although the detail may be thin and the analysis limited.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis, examining both the broad structure of government and the part of individuals within this. Such answers will show a good contextual understanding with reasonable supporting detail.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness of the workings of Nazi government and the power wielded by the Führer and the powerful Nazi leaders.

### Question 3

“Propaganda and indoctrination, rather than terror and repression, ensured the loyalty of the German people to the Nazi regime in the years 1933 to 1939.”

To what extent do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

### Indicative content

Answers should focus on the effects of Nazi propaganda and indoctrination and the extent to which these alone ensured loyalty. The place of terror and repression within the regime will also need analysis, and there must be some measured consideration of its importance. Most will probably conclude that terror and repression were not responsible for ‘loyalty’ but that they did help prevent disobedience, while propaganda and indoctrination did have a more positive effect encouraging the loyalty of many, but not all.

Candidates may refer to the effect of propaganda in creating loyalty to the Führer and in gaining acceptance for Nazi policies. Indoctrination through education and youth and workers’ movements might also be deemed to have helped create a loyal support base. Against the positive effects, reference will need to be made to those sectors of the population least affected by these influences – elements within the Church, the army and groups among the dissident youth all of whom rebelled against the pressure to conform.

The use of terror and repression will involve reference to the activities of the SS, Gestapo, Nazi judicial system and the pre-war concentration camps. Candidates may provide examples of how such measures did enforce obedience, if not loyalty, but they should also be aware of the limitations of the “terror state”, perhaps referring to recent work (particularly Gellately) which suggests the Gestapo was actually quite limited in its power. It is generally accepted today that while there was fear and repression in Nazi Germany, for the most part the majority did not have to be coerced into submission. This may lead better candidates to consider whether it was just the propaganda and terror that prevented opposition or whether there was genuine support for successful Nazi policies.

Level 1 answers will probably describe rather than evaluate some of the Nazi policies, or will be over-reliant on unsupported generalisations about loyalty and/or the police state.

Level 2 answers will show more direction but will be very thin, perhaps only addressing one of the two areas presented for comparison in the question.

---



Level 3 answers will show greater understanding of attitudes within the state and make some attempt to balance the two areas. Candidates are likely to show some awareness of how different groups reacted in different ways.

Level 4 answers will show a greater sense of balanced evaluation and a more developed understanding of concepts such as “loyalty”.

Level 5 answers will be well argued throughout, offering a clear and well supported judgement on the importance of both propaganda and terror within the regime.

#### **Question 4**

“The division of Germany in 1949 and the separate development of the two Germanies in the 1950s were the result of the political and economic changes that took place in the years of allied occupation after 1945.”

How justified is this claim? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### **Indicative content**

Answers should assess the extent to which political and economic developments between 1945 and 1949 laid down the pattern for the division of 1949 and the future development of East and West Germany.

Candidates will need to consider the Potsdam Conference, the division of Germany into zones of occupation, the re-establishment of democracy in the western zones and the development of Communist centralism in the east. The differing attitudes of the occupying powers to economic development must also be assessed.

There should be some consideration of the situation in 1949 and candidates may question whether the western powers were more responsible than the USSR for the division, having created Bizonia (1947), introduced Marshall Aid (refused by the Soviet zone) and having so far advanced their plans for the economic development of the west, in association with western Europe, that they were not prepared to accept a united but weak and neutral Germany, which some believe the Russians would have been prepared to concede. By 1947, when the London Conference broke up without agreement, the West had virtually completed its plans for a separate state, cemented by the introduction of the new Deutschmark into West Germany in June 1948. Reference to developments in the Soviet zone might include the establishment of the German Economic Commission and Cominform (to counter the Marshall Plan) in 1947 and the relevance of the “German People’s Congresses for Unity and Just Peace” 1947-1948.

Candidates are likely to argue that the developments of the 1950s were largely a product of the differing ideologies established in the East and West. Capitalism and the social market economy bolstered by western support will need to be set against Communism, centralism and control. There is, however, some scope for reference to “other factors”, such as differences in natural resources and labour supplies and candidates might argue that leadership post-1949 was at least as important as what had gone before.

At Level 1 answers are likely to agree that division was inevitable and may write in general terms, backed by very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the differing developments during the period of occupation, but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced or largely descriptive of developments with only a few, perhaps implicit, links.

At Level 3 answers should show a greater understanding of the changes and offer some limited analysis of the “effect of the allied occupation” on subsequent developments.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis, examining the position by 1949 and providing a balanced assessment of the legacy of the early years on development in the 1950s.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness, challenging, or at least questioning, the extent to which later developments were predetermined by 1949.

## **Alternative G: Germany from Unification to Re- unification, 1871 – 1990**

### **A2 Unit 6W: The Re-unification of Germany, c1969-1990**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about attitudes of East German people to their state before 1989. (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. 3-5
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. 6-8
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. 9-10

#### **Indicative content**

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the extract, e.g. observe that the regime did not rely on repression but was constructed with the support or acquiescence of the vast majority of the population. People may have grumbled, but they did not necessarily oppose.

At Level 2 candidates will introduce elements of own knowledge as well as showing some understanding of the given interpretation. While they will probably acknowledge that the source provides only one individual view, by providing corroborative own knowledge of the GDR's "niche society", they are likely to show support for Fulbrook's view that most East Germans accepted the state and that repression alone would not have allowed the state to continue for so long. A candidate showing implicit disagreement with the interpretation – suggesting that the East German state was repressive, dependent on the Stasi, and only accepted out of fear, but without clear support for these views, might also be placed in this level.

Level 3 answers will contain more extensive own knowledge and will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2. They are likely to examine both support and dissent in the GDR – perhaps with reference to the situation in 1989, and make a critical appraisal of Fulbrook's stance.

At Level 4 answers will offer a more balanced and sustained argument, perhaps with reference to the set reading material. At this level candidates are more likely to question the given interpretation.

(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the spread of opposition in the GDR in the early months of 1989? (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. 3-5
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. 6-8
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. 9-10

### Indicative content

Level 1 answers will make simple statements related to the content of the extract, e.g. will refer to the opposition march of January 1989 and the distribution of leaflets. The complaints of the protesters – against controls on free speech, association with the press and censorship of magazines and films – may also be mentioned as evidence of growing demands.

Level 2 answers will explore utility at a general level, demonstrating appreciation either of some of the strengths and/or some of the limitations of the content of the source. The strength of the source lies in its comments about the nature of the march, and the arguments of its protesters. It reveals a good deal about the difficulties protesters faced. The march was silent, its demands spread in leaflets were comparatively limited and uncritical. The limitations of the source, with respect to the spread of opposition in the early months of 1989, are in its concern with only one march, and one occasion, and that it was a fairly small event of only up to 200 people. Without hindsight and other evidence from the period, it would be hard to credit this incident with a great deal of value.

At Level 3 answers will give more careful consideration to both strengths and limitations (as given in Level 2 above) demonstrating a reasoned understanding of the source in context.

Level 4 answers will provide a clear evaluation of the source as a piece of evidence and offer sustained judgement. At this level candidates will certainly question the utility of the source and might refer to other useful material which might act as corroboration and broaden the picture to provide a better understanding of the extent to which opposition spread in these months.

(c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

“The re-unification of Germany in October 1990 was due, above all, to the years of misgovernment and repression within the GDR.”

Assess the validity of this opinion, with reference to the years 1969-1990. (20 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

**Indicative content**

The focus of the answer should be on the collapse of the GDR in 1990, and debate should centre on whether this was due to long term misgovernment and reliance on repression (with reference to the period 1969-1990) or came about through other factors.

Candidates will find support for the quotation in Source C although even this alludes to the belated moves to greater moderation within the GDR. However, this source is challenged by Source A. Whereas Geiss (Source C) believes that outward conformism was deceptive and that there was a growing alienation between rulers and ruled in the state, which led to government reliance on the Stasi, Fulbrook (Source A) claims that despite the grumbling, there was not an incipient opposition and most people accepted the state. Source B provides an example of opposition in early 1989 and also provides an example of continuing repression.

Candidates will have to develop and explain these ideas with reference to their own knowledge. Candidates will be expected to examine the political and economic structure of the state and refer to the dire financial weakness of the GDR and the growth of its dependence on western money for survival. This may lead candidates to balance their argument by looking at other factors which contributed to the re-unification in 1990 – the attitude of the USSR – and events in eastern Europe, 1989-1990; the attitude of the west; the part of *ostpolitik* and Chancellor Kohl's involvement.

Knowledge of relevant ideas, issues, arguments and differing interpretations should also be expected (in addition to the judicious use of specific factual material) for answers reaching Levels 4 and 5. Candidates should have plenty of ideas provided by the set reading material. Garton Ash has stressed the importance of the attitude of the USSR, Mary Fulbrook the general "content" in the East until the borders were open. Kettenacker believes (in agreement with the quotation) that the GDR was doomed and that after the collapse of the SED in the autumn of 1989, it merely took the involvement of the USA and USSR to provide the momentum for re-unification a year later. Jarausch has laid more specific stress on Kohl's contribution.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to restrict themselves to describing and defining what the sources say, with limited explanation in response to the question.

At Level 2 answers will either provide some comment on the statement but have only limited information in support, or they will be primarily narrative/descriptive of the development of the GDR and/ or the process of re-unification, with limited comment.

By Level 3 there will be a genuine attempt to debate the validity of the given opinion, with some range of evidence. Candidates are likely to consider a number of factors, and provide some effective comment on these.

Level 4 answers will integrate argument and evidence and provide a fuller and more balanced picture, with some criticism of the quotation. Answers will show a reasonable understanding of differing interpretations.

Level 5 answers will provide a more sustained argument, with supported evaluation throughout the essay. Answers will combine clear understanding with good factual support and make supported judgement about the differing interpretations.