



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

A2 History 2041

HIS3L

Unit 3L

From Defeat to Unity: Germany, 1945–1991

Final

Mark Scheme

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, students will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a student's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a student has begun to *'think like a historian'* and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, students will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 students will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able students.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2012

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3L: From Defeat to Unity: Germany, 1945–1991

Question 1

- 01** 'Ulbricht's regime was remarkably successful in establishing a Communist society in East Germany in the years 1949 to 1971.'
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

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

Students will need to evaluate the ways in which Ulbricht and his associates tried to establish a Communist society in East Germany and balance the successes against the limitations. Additionally they should consider whether such successes as they had were 'remarkable' or not, in the circumstances.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the successful establishment of a Communist society:

- all the elements of a one-party state were present by the time of the declaration of the GDR in October 1949. Voters were given a single list of candidates and asked to declare their support for the new state; the people's police (KVP) had also been established. The favourable votes and absence of concerted protest suggest success
- changes to state-owned industry and collectivised agriculture were successfully carried through amidst much propaganda; after the 1953 troubles, workers largely got on with life, without complaint
- workers were supportive because they had reasonable security in employment. Housing food and transport were subsidised; education was free and welfare provision high. This gave security and stability
- positive discrimination helped those from poorer backgrounds to become upwardly socially mobile and increased support for Communism
- the GDR was the wealthiest country in Eastern bloc by 1955 – aiding stability and engendering some pride, reinforced by propaganda
- there were high levels of membership of the youth organisations – and less trouble was caused by GDR youth than by those in the West; suggesting a Communist society was emerging
- the growth of schools and universities helped create the Communist society of the future
- female equality was guaranteed and women were able to enjoy greater economic independence – increasing their communist support
- Socialist realism in culture, the censorship of politically incorrect materials and the ubiquity of propaganda helped reinforce the acceptance of the Communist state.

However, they should also consider some of the following limitations:

- riots in 1953 showed economic and political dissatisfaction and the GDR's reliance on soviet support. This led to political repression to maintain control
- the use of the Stasi – founded 1950 – would suggest the shallowness of Communist acceptance
- the continual drain of East Germans to the West until the building of the Berlin Wall 1961 is indicative of non-acceptance of the Communist system
- complaints about the loss of personal freedom – e.g. compulsory TU organisation; promotion dependent on political conformity – hostility to 'class enemies' – were never far below the surface and evidenced in some youth protests
- both the Catholic and Protestant Churches survived outside the Communist orbit – at least to 1969 when most protestant churches accepted their position within the state and by an agreement of 1958, the state had to accept freedom of conscience and belief. Even after 1969, some individuals still spoke out, e.g. Otto Dibelius, Bishop of Berlin.

Students will also need to comment on how 'remarkable' the successes were:

- the absence of protest after 1953 could be seen as remarkable, given the position of the GDR, adjacent to the highly successful FRG and suggests that citizens accepted a lower standard of living in return for basic security
- the continuation of the GDR as a separate state ran contrary to Western expectations in 1949 and was therefore 'remarkable'.

BUT

- acceptance and conformity are not particularly remarkable when the state controlled the instruments of repression and supported policies with propaganda
- the threat of USSR intervention was always present after 1953
- for most, their own personal life was more important than politics and acceptance easier than protest.

In conclusion, students may argue that the East German state was essentially successful in creating the trappings of a Communist society, but how far this permeated the outlook and beliefs of the East German people is almost impossible to measure. The most capable students will probably explore what is meant by a 'Communist society' and some may look ahead to the permanence of the regime until the 1980s, to suggest that solid foundations had been laid by 1971.

*Note that the building of the Wall can be seen as proof of failure – to stem the outflow of skills and energy away from the GDR – OR as a necessary action that DID succeed in its primary aim and stabilised the economic situation of the GDR (and stabilised the Cold War).

Question 2

- 02** To what extent, by 1989, had the political and economic problems resulting from Nazi Germany's defeat in World War II been resolved in West Germany? (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

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

Students will need to consider the political and economic problems resulting from Nazi Germany's defeat in World War II and evaluate the ways in which they had been addressed in West Germany by 1989. They will need to consider what the problems were and whether they had been solved or still remained. Students may choose to take a chronological or thematic approach, but an effective answer will need to be analytical, conveying a judgement as 'to what extent' problems had been addressed.

Economic

Problems left after defeat – economic destruction (towns, countryside and people); economic division of Germany.

Problems addressed by:

- bizonal/trizonal developments and, by 1948, the creation of the FRG; consideration of punitive economic controls by the western allies gave rise to emphasis on rebuilding with Marshall Plan and a new currency in 1948
- Adenauer's ministry laid the foundation for good labour relations
- Erhard's social market economy brought an 'economic miracle' with decartelisation and investment
- FRG did not have the support of large armed forces
- West Germany's natural economic resources and a commitment to the development of a strong state enabled the legacy to be addressed.

BUT

- new economic problems from 1965 (which gave rise to some more extremist politics – see below) and oil crisis of 1973 were setbacks along the way of economic growth.

Political

Problems left after defeat – former Nazism and subsequent occupation – need to create a new democratic government and destroy right-wing politics and gain acceptance in Europe:

- establishment of democracy in western zones and within FRG (Basic law) – with 're-education' in democratic ways and 'safeguards', e.g. 5% rule to prevent extremist parties – built into the governmental structure
- Nuremberg trials and subsequent denazification tribunals and trials penalised the most important ex-Nazis but avoided extensive persecution and allowed the able to continue in positions of authority
- established a German Citizens Army 1956
- Adenauer's success as Chancellor 1949–1966 underpinning revival (extremist parties outlawed); Communism seen as enemy rather than Nazism; Adenauer's 'keine experimente' in keeping with the need for stability and revival
- West German government sought rapprochement with West and became founding member of EEC 1957 and joined NATO, 1955. Ostpolitik helped breakdown East/West division
- by 1980s, democracy well established and political involvement strong.

BUT

- only democracy proved only possible at the expense of maintaining a divided Germany; and was initially one-sided as Socialism was blackened and Communist party outlawed. Socialists were brought into government in 1966
- student protest of 1968 was partly fuelled by the failure of their parents' generation – they had allowed Nazis to come to power – as supporters or by failing to oppose
- controversy over German Army followed determination not to become a military power again
- Nazi past remained and an 'amnesia' set in. Ex-Nazis found their way into government; amnesties allowed war criminals back into civilian life and Kiesinger (Chancellor 1966–9) had been a member of Nazi party
- emergence of neo-Nazi National Democratic Party in 1964 – with unexpected successes during recession
- introspection and recriminations in 1980s and made it difficult for Germans to come to terms with the past
- political division remained in 1989. There was no reunification (Border was sealed 1952; Hallstein doctrine adopted to 1972).

In conclusion, students are likely to argue that the problems left after defeat had been largely addressed by 1989, (when Germany was on the eve of reunification, although that would not have been predicted at the end of that year) but that lingering fears of Nazism and difficulties which stood in the way of FRG's relationship with other European states had not been fully resolved and, above all, Germany was still divided.

Question 3

- 03** How far, by the end of 1991, did the situation in the re-unified Germany match the high expectations that had accompanied the fall of the Berlin Wall? (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

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

Students will need to address the 'high expectations' of November 1989 and contrast the attitude at that time with the situation in the reunified Germany by the end of 1991. By contrasting the mood and reality at these two different times, they should be able to make a valid judgement as to how far the hopes of 1989 were fulfilled. They may choose to look at the position sequentially or thematically. Either approach is acceptable provided there is analysis and argument.

Political

The East German reform movement organised marches (1989) and undermined the East German political establishment, ultimately forcing Honecker's resignation and the opening of the Berlin Wall amidst euphoric scenes of newly-won 'freedom'. This led to new cries for reunification – which was seen as promising a better future and political liberty:

- the reunification that occurred took place on the terms of the West and was dictated by Kohl; East German political parties were absorbed by western parties; the reform movement was swept aside
- reunification strengthened Kohl's CDU party (which won the election of December 1990) but weakened socialism and the Green Party – altering the party balance and creating some disillusionment
- there were fears of a new German nationalism by 1991 and the future of democracy was called into question with the economic and social problems emerging in the East – and the appearance of greater racism and discrimination in the West.

BUT

- a new sense of national identity emerged as GDR criminals were put on trial and Germany assumed greater confidence on the European stage
- the decision to revert to Berlin as capital in 1991 (although not fully carried out until 1999) helped to reinforce the idea of unification (rather than take-over) and was generally welcomed.

Economic

In 1989, there were hopes that the merger of East and West would herald an 'economic miracle' in the East, similar to that experienced by the FRG in the 1950s and early 60s. It was believed that West German investment would work wonders, bringing profits for both sides:

- no 'economic miracle' took place in the East. The currency union weakened the East German economy and the imposition of FRG's economic, social and labour laws – and a banking system controlled by the Bundesbank worsened, rather than helped the economy. East Germany was suddenly exposed to West German and EEC competition and the results were disappointing to Germans in both halves of Germany
- investment was initially left to private enterprise and Kohl only launched the state-backed 'Eastern recovery programme' in March 1991, by which time some enterprises had collapsed bringing unemployment
- East-West division remained as Westerners complained about the burden of supporting Easterners and resented the 'solidarity tax' levied on all Germans to support Eastern economic development.

BUT

- some enterprising individuals and companies did well out of the merger; some factories taken over by Western companies were modernised and new conditions of work and rates of pay could be high.

Social

As Easterners crossed from East to West Berlin in November 1989 – they were greeted with kisses and Western gifts! There was much talk of ‘brotherhood’ between East and West Germans and Easterners looked to enjoy the high standards of living seen in the West.

- Reunification in practice meant huge readjustments as Easterners lost their former security and were forced to take new jobs, learn new skills – or retire early
- there were soon divisions within the East as some areas suffered structural long-term unemployment
- there were rising crime rates and youth delinquency as Eastern youth organisations collapsed, unemployment grew and greater freedoms allowed for behaviour unknown under Communist rule; this affected Western attitudes to the reunification also
- Western values took time to be inculcated and years of propaganda proved harder to destroy than anticipated. In particular the economic values of drive, competition and acceptance of responsibility proved hard to establish among Easterners, so that the fruits of profit tended to accrue to Westerners
- former Communist supporters lost their positions as education, the judiciary and government offices were changed, causing social dislocation
- some ‘ostalgie’ i.e. nostalgia for the old GDR already emerging by 1991 – because of the loss of security and cohesion which communism had given.

BUT

- some new opportunities for young and enterprising
- degrees of cohesion and living standards varied according to area.

In conclusion, students are likely to point out that the immediate aftermath of the collapse of the GDR and the reunification of 1990 brought some understandable disillusionment to the Germans living in both East and West. They may explain this by pointing out that the high expectations that accompanied the fall of the wall were linked with excitement following the collapse of Communism, which had for so long had divided Germany. They were not a reaction to reunification, which still lay in the future, nor a considered response to what might lie ahead. The reality of the situation by 1991, was somewhat different, with practical issues over-riding emotional ones.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion