



# General Certificate of Education

## History 5041/6041

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

# Mark Scheme

## *2006 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 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 specification. 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 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 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.

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 ‘Social Democracy’ (line 1) in the context of Germany in the 1880s. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that ‘Social Democracy’ was in part “a movement for social reform”. Candidates may also pick up, but not explain, that it was “a new view of the world”. Credit general comments such as ‘a growing movement’ or ‘was feared by Bismarck’. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. aware of the growth of organised socialism in response to the growth of German industry, urbanisation and the working class; makes reference to the birth of the Social Democratic Party 1875 and its commitment to social and political reform. Aware of Socialist electoral success leading to Bismarck’s anti-Socialist laws 1897, and of its continuing “underground” existence and growth in the 1880s despite the repression. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source C** challenges the views put forward in **Source B** about Bismarck’s motives for introducing ‘state socialism’ in the 1880s. (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. Source C suggests Bismarck was sincere in his motives. He believed in state responsibility “for the welfare of its more deprived subjects”. This is supported by reference to his earlier attempts to introduce state welfare schemes when he was Minister President of Prussia. It mentions the desire to “benefit” the working class and speaks of his “concern”. Source B, on the other hand suggests his motives were to continue the fight against social democracy and a means of “tying the working classes to the state”. He was more concerned about the political

situation than the policies themselves. He wanted to “weaken the Socialists” and the National Liberals. Bismarck’s opposition to an extension of factory legislation also contrasts with the caring image of Source C. **1-2**

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. explains some of the source references given above, and provides appropriate contextual information on Bismarck’s conservative views, his alliance with the right wing from 1878, his attitude and actions against Liberals and Socialists and his political cunning. A candidate whose answer shows understanding of the contrast should be placed in this level. **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 Bismarck’s political position more fully providing some supported judgement on his motivation. Candidates may also suggest that although Bismarck had previously considered schemes of social welfare, this does not necessarily mean that he did not have political motives – then as well as in the 1880s. Reward any attempts at an effective and evaluative overall appraisal of the views put forward in these sources. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of ‘state socialism’, in relation to other factors, in maintaining Bismarck’s political power within Germany in the years 1878 to 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, 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 – **Sources B** and **C** refer to Bismarck’s state socialism, the former showing how Bismarck used the measures to weaken the appeal of Socialism and also to attack the National Liberals. **Source C** also suggests that Bismarck might have enhanced his own power through the respect earned by his concern for his workers’ well being. **Source A** refers to the perceived threat of Socialism to Bismarck and the nation, and the way in which their concern for social welfare was increasing their hold in Germany.

From own knowledge – candidates should be aware that Bismarck moved from a liberal alliance to a more conservative one in 1878–1879 and that he maintained his power to 1890 by repressing/isolating his enemies (Anti-Socialist Law; protection, distancing himself from the National Liberals, tough line against the minorities), controlling the Reichstag and working with the elites and the Kaiser. For a balanced answer, candidates will need to weigh such points against the effect of Bismarck’s state socialism in placating the working class and weaning them away from political socialism.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points about state socialism or Bismarck’s policies, 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 the period, e.g. 1878–1879. Alternatively they may be very descriptive or limited in relevant comment or ignore state socialism and talk about other factors only. Level 3 responses will have a greater range of material and draw on the sources and own knowledge to make a reasonably explicit response to the question. However, there may be an imbalance of treatment or limited depth to the knowledge and understanding of ‘state socialism’. At Level 4 there will be better balance between the “carrot and stick” nature of Bismarck’s rule. By this level candidates should show a reasonable understanding of state socialism and its importance. Level 5 responses will show greater analysis and judgement and a sophisticated understanding of Bismarckian politics. Some may suggest an alternative key factor in the maintenance of Bismarck’s power, e.g. his relationship with the Kaiser and argue accordingly.

### Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘the personal unreliability of the Kaiser’ in the context of Wilhelmine Germany in the years 1890 to 1914. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a simplistic comment about Kaiser Wilhelm II whose influence had weakened the position of his chancellors and/or who ruled in an authoritarian manner which limited the influence of the Reichstag. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. explaining the personality and aims of Wilhelm II – his obsession with travel, the military, his
-

interference (e.g. *Daily Telegraph* Affair/Zabern incident), and ignorance (boasted that he never read the constitution). **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the power of the chancellors declined in the years 1890 to 1914. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Wilhelm II appointed unsuitable chancellors and none were as capable as Bismarck had been. A little narrative on one or more of the chancellor(s) should be placed in this level. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the chancellors were appointed to suit Wilhelm II's attitude at different times and dispensed with accordingly – (Caprivi, for his readiness to adopt a “new course”; Hohenlohe as a conservative stopgap with no coherent policies; Bulow as a flattering supporter; and Bethmann-Hollweg, an upholder of traditional conservative views). Wilhelm had ambitions of personal government and persistently failed to consult his chancellors on important matters (e.g. the *Daily Telegraph* interview). The power of the chancellors was also eroded from a loss of control over the military and navy, by the influence of pressure groups and the increasing radicalisation of politics. Note that candidates at this level are only likely to refer to two or three of these points and may tend to go through a list of Chancellors with links. **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. develops some of the points made above showing their interrelationship or balances the erosion of the chancellors' powers from 'above' with their erosion from 'below'. Candidates may conclude that it was impossible for any subsequent chancellor to match the position adopted by Bismarck, or they may draw some other relevant conclusion based on a good conceptual understanding of the nature of politics in the Kaiserreich. Answers are likely to be thematic and offer a relevant overview. **6-7**

- (c) 'In the years 1890 to 1914, Germany was a modern and progressive state.'  
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**

Answers should focus on the factors which have led to Germany being described as “modern and progressive”, e.g. the strong economic growth and technical development of the time. Expansion in chemical and electrical engineering in particular triggered a second wave of industrialisation which built on the pre-1890 developments, and powerful companies such as Siemens and Krupp came to dominate world markets. Germany was transformed into Europe’s most powerful industrial country. Candidates may also refer to Germany’s apparently “democratic” constitution with a Reichstag and elected political parties.

Evidence that Germany was not a “modern and progressive state” would include reference to the stunted political situation whereby the Reichstag had little power, and the Socialists, despite becoming the largest party by 1912 could make little impact on politics. The radicalisation of the right wing, the power of the military, and the pressure of the Pan-German league and Navy league with their nationalistic and anti-Semitic ideas also made the country defensive and backward looking in matters of domestic politics.

A good answer will consider whether the quotation is valid (perhaps qualifying it slightly), invalid, or only partially valid. The position adopted does not matter so long as there is supported argument and points from both sides are considered.

Answers at Level 1 will either contain a few generalised points or offer a brief and poorly focused account of one or two developments in Wilhelmine Germany. Level 2 answers will mostly be relevant but over-descriptive accounts although some will try to respond to the question but will be very thin or unbalanced. Level 3 answers will attempt to “agree or disagree” although analysis may be slim in places. They will show a reasonable grasp of at least some of the material although they may concentrate on only the economic or political situation in the period. Level 4 answers will contain more precise evidence and a better understanding. Candidates may argue whichever way they please (see above) but answers at this level must show balance in the argument. Level 5 answers will have a sustained argument and a good conceptual grasp of the both modern and traditional elements within Germany at this time. At this level, candidates will be expected to address economic and political issues.

---

**Question 3**

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the ‘the republican constitution’ in the context of Germany from 1919. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. brief mention of some aspect of the constitution of the new Weimar Republic such as an elected President, proportional representation or universal manhood suffrage. Alternatively there may be a limited reference to the abdication of the Kaiser, the setting up of a fairer or more modern system of government in 1919, or a ‘dictionary definition’ of a constitution. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the system of government established in August 1919 clarified the events of November 1918 when Wilhelm II abdicated, by creating a parliamentary democracy. This included an elected President, with power under Article 48 to rule by decree in an emergency, a Reichstag elected by all men and women over 21, proportional representation, provision for referenda, the continuation of federal government, and a statement of the rights and duties of a citizen, including social rights (e.g. the right to work). **2-3**

- (b) Explain why 1923 was a critical year for Germany. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. that the French invaded the Ruhr and/or there was hyperinflation and/or Hitler staged the Beer Hall Putsch. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the occupation of the Ruhr and passive resistance weakened the already failing German economy and roused renewed nationalism. Hyperinflation resulted from the loss of productive capacity and the demands on the social welfare system. There was a danger of left-wing revolution in the Rhine-Ruhr region that would have split the Reich. In Bavaria, the right-wing including Hitler and the Nazis sought to overthrow the democratic republican government. Although crushed, the Beer Hall Putsch in November was modelled on Mussolini’s March on Rome a year earlier and was understandably alarming to the authorities. At this level candidates may refer to just economic or political problems. **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. candidates would be expected to link economic and political problems and understand that hyperinflation and left and right-wing political activity were all linked to the Ruhr invasion and the government’s reaction to this. Candidates might also be placed in this level for drawing a suitably supported conclusion, for example showing a good conceptual understanding of the difficulties
-

of the Weimar politicians and the “no win” situation in which they found themselves by 1923. 6-7

- (c) ‘By the start of 1925, stability had been fully restored in Germany.’  
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 the state of Germany by the start of 1925. The best candidates will appreciate the need to address both political and economic stability and some may argue that stability had been achieved in some areas but not in others.

Candidates will need to identify the stability achieved by the start of 1925. This might include – Stresemann’s appointment as Chancellor (August 1923); the overthrow of the radical left-wing movements in Saxony and Thuringia and the defeat of the Nazis; the success of the democratic parties in the elections of December 1924; the end of hyperinflation through the Rentenmark (November 1923); the Dawes Plan (April 1924).

A balanced answer should also contain some material questioning the level of stability. This might include – the continuing problem of reparations; the dependence on short-term American loans; low levels of economic growth; continuing unemployment; agricultural depression; the burdensome demands of the welfare state. Politically, instability resulted from continued coalition government with a weak liberal centre; the election of the authoritarian figure of Hindenburg as President; weakness in the constitution; the continued power of the elites.

Good candidates should offer some judgement as to how “fully” stability had been restored and are most likely to reject, or at least qualify, the given quotation.

Level 1 answers will make generalised, simplistic and undeveloped statements about the degree of stability or will describe events 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 the state of Germany by 1925. These answers may cover only political or economic stability and will usually be very one-sided. 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 position by 1925 although the detail may be better in some areas than others and there may be sections of description. At Level 4 there will be a more secure understanding backed by suitable evidence and the answer will be balanced as well as making direct reference to “how fully”. Level 5 responses will argue throughout and make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgements based on a developed conceptual understanding of the problems faced by the Weimar Republic and the limited nature of the politicians’ response to these. Answers at this level should address the extent of economic and political stability. Answers may distinguish between the government’s failure to tackle long-term (e.g. constitutional) problems, but success with short-term (e.g. hyperinflation) problems. Alternatively they may suggest there were those problems that could be remedied (e.g. the crushing of small scale risings) and those which the governments stood little chance of tacking (e.g. reparations, resentment of Versailles and the influence of the right-wing).



## 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.

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** in explaining the methods used by the Nazis to direct the German economy in the years 1933 to 1939? (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

Answers at Level 1 are likely to comment on the utility of the sources, with reference to their content, relating, (fairly briefly), what each source says about the methods employed in the direction of the economy with reference to its revival and preparation for war. Source B reflects on the achievements of the past two and a half years and emphasises state “control” as a theme. It speaks of “planned provision of labour, a planned regulation of the market, a planned control of prices and wages” and using the “living energies of the whole nation” breaking down “conditions giving rise to interference”. Source C shows the sort of orders issued in 1936 which demanded “determination” “organisation” and “urgency”. Making Germany independent of imports, and using new techniques to achieve this, is an underlying theme. At Level 2 many answers will be still largely dependent on what the sources say, or fail to say. However, these answers will develop the points at Level 1 using own knowledge, e.g. they may explain how the high level of unemployment in 1932 was reduced by Schacht’s policies of deficit financing coupled with the launch of public works schemes. They might identify 1936 as a turning point, when the methods changed to support rearmament more forcibly and a drive to autarky was undertaken.

At Level 3 answers will attempt some direct evaluation of the sources, probably referring to their provenance, purpose and context and commenting, in particular, on the ideological drive behind Hitler’s pronouncements. It may be argued that while neither source is comprehensive, both are useful indicators of what Hitler believed to be the most useful methods to fulfil his aims. At Level 4 answers are likely to acknowledge that both sources are useful as examples explaining Nazi methods, but that both are limited by their provenance and propagandist purpose. At this level candidates should be precise about “what is missing”

and the need for more specific evidence. Some may even question the economic revival and preparedness for war by 1939, but such thoughts do need to be related to the inadequacy of the sources. Candidates might also develop some links or comparisons between the sources, perhaps reflecting on how both emphasise state control and ruthless determination. Conclusions should be convincing and well supported.

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

‘The growth and the modernisation of the German economy between 1880 and 1980 were largely dependent on internal factors.’

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 key factors which promoted the development of a modern and successful German economy between 1880 and 1980, with a particular focus on

the influence of internal factors. Candidates might use Source A and to some extent Source D to link population growth and urbanisation to economic modernisation. Source A, Source C and Source D also refer to the use of new technologies. All four sources have references to state intervention/control and Source A to investment banks, concentration and cartels. Note that Source D concentrates mainly on Western Germany and implies the influx of refugees from the East helped the West. The ability to re-build from scratch after the Second World War, with the latest equipment, is another internal factor referred to here.

Candidates will also need to explain the source references from their own knowledge of the growth and the modernisation of the German economy from the 1880s, perhaps explaining the supply/demand potential of the growing population and the organisation or control of business and the labour force. Candidates might link technological development to the growth of electrics, chemicals, cars, microelectronics and other branches of engineering and in turn relate this to the support sustained by high levels of education. Germany's well developed banking system, the organisation of industry and the role of governments should all be developed, alongside factors such as Germany's natural resources and geographical position. For a balanced answer, these internal factors should be weighed against the external factors affecting the development of the economy through this period for example, war, the Treaty of Versailles and reparations, the Wall Street Crash, foreign loans, (e.g. the Dawes and Marshall Plans,) the division of East and West in the Cold War and the oil crisis of the 1970s.

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 source references, 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 understanding may not be entirely convincing. Level 4 answers should show reasonable coverage of the whole timescale, and a clear analytical approach showing balance, understanding and some judgement. They will address both growth and modernisation, showing the inter-linkage of the two. Level 5 answers will balance factors effectively, revealing a high level of understanding, perhaps offering a succinct overview 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’s personality, rather than Nazi ideology, determined the way in which the Nazi political system developed in the years 1933 to 1939.’

Assess the validity of 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 assess the degree to which Hitler’s own personal characteristics and idiosyncrasies determined the way the government of the Nazi State operated. These, in turn, must be weighed against the influence of Nazi ideology and abstract beliefs. Candidates will need to show an understanding of the nature of Nazi government and assess which was the more important influence shaping it.

The influence of Hitler's own personality might include: his personal disinterest in day-to-day affairs; his reputed laziness; his preference for unwritten orders; his fostering of internal rivalries between Ministers and officials, civil servants and the Party; his own obsession with power and control.

The influence of ideology might include reference to: racial theories, Social Darwinism and the survival of the fittest; the Führerprinzip; anti-semitic traditions; the primacy of the Aryan people.

Candidates are likely to explain that Nazi government operated through a state of competition and rivalry (Party/SA; Schacht/Goering; Goering/Himmler; state/private business; Army/SS; gauleiters/central government; Borman/other "barons"; the civil service/Party; SS/Church). An explanation of this competition may be linked to the Nazi belief in Social Darwinism and/or to Hitler's own position. They should consider whether this was deliberately encouraged by Hitler and what his motives, if any, were or whether this was merely a reflection of Nazi Social Darwinism. Candidates may refer to the historiographical debate on whether Hitler was a strong/weak dictator, the cult of personality and the need for individuals to "work towards the Führer". Broszat (and other structuralists) would suggest that neither Hitler's personality nor ideology had an overwhelming impact and such have argued that Hitler responded to circumstances and did not have the power to rationalise the economy, the political structure and even the party structure which were all established before he became Chancellor. He simply managed as best he could. However, it is more important that candidates provide supported judgements of their own than that they reproduce the views of others.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions. They may fail to see the full implications of the quotation and are likely to have limited knowledge and understanding. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts of Nazi government or policies showing little appreciation of the question asked. Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but the answer will be thin, very unbalanced or largely descriptive with a few links. At Level 3 answers should show some understanding of the workings of Nazi government and refer in some way to the influences on it and will offer some limited analysis of degree to which Hitler's personality and/or Nazi ideology influenced the running of the state. Level 4 answers should show more analysis. Answers will show a good understanding of the workings of the Hitler State and there will be balanced evaluation of the two factors. Whatever their argument, these answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate explicit understanding of the question. Level 5 answers will show sustained judgment and clear conceptual awareness, for example assessing the nature of the regime and/or analysing whether Hitler's style of dictatorship was really a sign of strength or weakness and whether either ideology or personality played a major part in the development of Nazi government.

---

### Question 3

‘Inconsistent and unsuccessful.’

How valid is this comment on the attempts of the Nazi regime to change the position of women and of the churches in Germany between 1933 and 1945? (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 consider the extent to which the Nazi regime tried to change the position held by women and the Churches in Germany and must assess how successful any change was. The “inconsistency” of policies should lead to some assessment as to whether they followed a single plan/aim.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material:

**Women** – reversal of the female emancipation of the Weimar years. Women seen as wives and child-bearers – encouraged by marriage loans. Propaganda emphasised restoration of “traditional roles”. Education reinforced female role (domestic science and biology compulsory). New Germanic style of dress (Fashion Bureau 1933 under Magda Goebbels). Emphasis on physical fitness and anti-smoking. Undesirables forcibly sterilised; Aryan men encouraged to divorce Jewish wives; abortion banned (except for Jews). To 1937 women actively discriminated against to force them out of work (percentage fell). 1936 – banned from practising law and from jury service. 1937+ labour shortages increased female employment – but expected to couple this with family responsibilities. Single women beyond child-bearing forced into lowest paid jobs; Speer’s proposal to conscript women workers, 1943 initially opposed by Hitler.

Success? – improvement in male employment; slight increase in birth rate but not clearly attributable to Nazi policy – more marriages, but not more children per marriage; many women ardent supporters of Hitler.

Inconsistent? – reversal of anti-employment policy necessary in wartime; some undermining of family unit (children in Hitler Youth/ Nazi education/ Gestapo denunciations within the family etc.) weakened role of mother; female emancipation and status undermined despite claims to “respect” woman’s role more.

**Church** – Nazi claim to stand for traditional values (including Christian values) – shallow. Church was tolerated/used. Attempt to create Reich Protestant Church but resistance from Niemöller’s Confessional Church and others meant unsteady relationship. 1937 – deal whereby non-Nazi church authorities continued in return for support, but tendency for churches to act as centres of resistance and offer alternative authority. Church authority undermined by increase in paganism – especially among SS. Christian festivals challenged – 1938 carols and nativity plays forbidden in schools; Christmas became Yuletide.

Catholic – agreed Concordat 1933 (non-interference by state in return for priests not opposing regime) by constantly undermined by state interference – Catholic education, youth organisations and newspapers suppressed; 1936 quarrel, re: racial laws and sterilisation; outspoken hounded by the Gestapo; monks, nuns and priests sent to concentration camps and victims of hostile propaganda (one in three priests suffered reprisals); 1937 “with burning anxiety”, Pope condemned attacks on Catholic priests.

Success? – independence of Churches preserved; protest over euthanasia and secrecy surrounding holocaust suggest religious convictions remained; Church loyalty may have even increased especially in rural communities – strengthened by persecution and war. But – little fundamental resistance. Only Bonhoeffer actively involved (executed 1945)

Inconsistent? – Churches survived because Hitler had no long-term plans and policies fluctuated.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing that policies were inconsistent and unsuccessful but offering very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts of some policies, showing little appreciation of the question asked. Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but answers will either be thin, very unbalanced or largely descriptive with a few links. Answers may deal with women only or Churches only or have a few smatterings of information on each but with very little depth or understanding. Level 3 answers will show reasonable understanding of both areas and will address both consistency and success, although there may not be equal coverage of either. They will contain some analysis and judgement but may not be fully convincing. Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis in the examination of the extent and consistency. They will offer a balanced assessment supported by secure evidence. Such answers should be wider ranging (e.g. many will look at both the Catholic and Protestant Churches) and demonstrate explicit understanding. Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and a critical awareness of the limitations of Nazi policies. They may make some comparative comment and may draw their information on women and the Church together to explain the overall Nazi impact on society. Answers at this level should demonstrate good conceptual understanding and convincing judgement.

---

**Question 4**

‘After 1953 there was a steady growth of economic, social and political stability in both East and West Germany.’

Assess the validity of this opinion on the development of the two German states in the years 1953 to 1961. (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**

Candidates will need to focus on the economic, social and political developments in both East and West Germany from 1953 and assess the degree of stability achieved in each. There must be some attempt to address the validity of the statement with respect to all three areas and to East and West Germany for the highest level. Candidates who deal with one state only cannot rise above Level 2.

Candidates should be aware of the significance of the starting date of 1953. The promulgation of the Basic Law (West Germany) and a new constitution (East Germany) in 1949 left both states with considerable difficulties to overcome. For the West, 1953 marks the year when Adenauer’s governing coalition won a large majority and consolidated its position. For the East, it was the year of Stalin’s death, the crushing of the workers’ rising and the adoption of Soviet style systems. From 1953, both states were in a position to stabilise.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material:

Economic stability – references to the West are likely to include the development of Erhard’s “social market economy” and the high levels of prosperity reached in the later 1950s when annual growth rates were c10% and West Germany became the third strongest industrial country in the world. Stability entailed the development of large-scale firms, and improved transport. References to the East are likely to include the development of a planned economy to build ‘Socialism’ (5 year plans 1951 and 1956, but abandoned in favour of a 7 year plan, 1959); the collectivisation of agriculture and crafts; the influence of Comecon; the expansion of heavy industry; and the belated development of consumer goods. Ration cards were abolished in 1958, although East Germany did not achieve all its targets. It was subjected to the needs of the USSR and was still losing its people, many of whom disliked collectivisation.

Political stability – references to the West are likely to include West Germany’s alignment with the western defence alliance NATO (1954), its position as a Sovereign state (1955), its reconciliation with France and its part in the founding of the EEC. Internal political stability was developed under Adenauer and the CDU/CSU coalition. References to the East are likely to include the incorporation into the Warsaw pact as an equal partner, national sovereignty symbolised by a new flag and state army (although the policy agenda was still set by the USSR). In addition political stability can be shown by the firm establishment of the



SED under Ulbricht, who developed his own personality cult, and the way opposition was ruthlessly put down by the Stasi (set up in 1959), and through show trials.

Social stability – references to the West are likely to include the growth of living standards, provision of welfare and social services including publicly assisted housing, the integration of refugees and compensation for victims of Nazi crimes. References to the East are likely to include the National Construction Programme to regenerate towns and cities, welfare provision, and the establishment of state organisations such as the Free German Youth and the Free German Trade Union Federation.

Candidates will need to assess the degree of stability and will probably conclude that superficial stability masked a number of problems in both states, but above all in the East. There were still social divisions in the West but in the East the new social order suffered from continual shortages and was, at least in part, kept quiescent through fear. The Berlin Wall of 1961 is a sign that the “stability of the 1950s was largely illusion.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping assertions, probably agreeing with the quotation or making bland comments about the differences between East and West Germany. Candidates will probably offer very limited evidence in support of their views. Alternatively answers may be entirely descriptive covering only part of the period or concentrating exclusively on some developments in one state. Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but will be thin or very unbalanced, perhaps addressing one state only or looking at only political or economic-social stability. Level 3 answers should show some understanding of the development of both West and East Germany in a range of areas. Answers may not be fully balanced or convincingly argued throughout, but they will address the issues of the question. Level 4 answers should provide a greater degree of analysis examining the degree of stability and providing a balanced assessment. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate explicit understanding of all aspects of the question. Level 5 answers will show some depth of evidence and clear conceptual awareness of the position of the two states. Answers will reach an informed and comparative judgement.

---

## 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 the stability of the GDR in 1982.

(10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

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

#### Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will be based almost entirely on the extract, e.g. observing that, according to this source the stability of the GDR was based on its comparative prosperity (with other Communist regimes), and national pride, encouraged by the SED particularly in vaunting sporting prowess. 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 some evidence to support apparent stability, which can be corroborated from own knowledge of the absence of rebellion after 1953, and some comment on the GDR's "niche society", they are also likely to question the interpretation and refer to the political and economic weaknesses of a single party state, reliant on the Stasi and dominated by the USSR. Level 3 answers will contain more extensive own knowledge and will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2. They are likely to balance the evidence for and against stability more effectively, with reference to alternative interpretations. At Level 4 answers will offer sustained argument, and convincing judgement. 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 attitude of East Germans to the GDR in 1969? (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 opinion poll and its findings, probably accepting the evidence without question. 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 timing (1969), the fact that it was not intended for publication but was for the SED party's use, that there is no obvious attempt to impart dishonest information given that it reveals views the regime would have preferred to hide, such as the 5-10% who rejected the values and goals of the GDR and the 14% who were not proud to be its citizens. The preference for the western media might also be considered indications of the report's reliability. The limitations of the source would include the fact it was commissioned by the authorities, that it only concerned young people who are not necessarily representative, and that people living in a dictatorial regime might be frightened to give their true opinions. 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 this source and might refer to other useful material which might corroborate or question it and broaden the picture to provide a better understanding of the attitude of East Germans to the GDR at this time. (Further reference to the work of Mary Fulbrook and her views would be helpful here).

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

‘The failings of the GDR have been much exaggerated. Most East Germans came to accept, if not support, the regime in the 1970s and 1980s.’

With reference to the years 1969 to 1989, 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 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 degree of support shown for the GDR in the 1970s and 1980s and debate should centre on whether it is unfair to categorise the GDR as a “failure” as a state in this period. Perceptive candidates may identify three different areas of argument – whether the GDR’s failings have been exaggerated, whether the East Germans accepted the regime and whether the East Germans supported the regime. These may be addressed as separate issues or linked in a general argument.

In support of the acceptance of the regime – **Source A** suggests that the citizens of the GDR enjoyed comparative economic prosperity; society was stable and East Germans had pride in their country. **Source B** provides statistics showing a good deal of support for the regime and its values and goals in 1969. In particular, 86% are ‘proud’ of the GDR and 90% love the GDR as their fatherland. **Source C** refers to the exaggerated beliefs of Western historians and the concept of East German acceptance of their lot with little organised protest – “resentment was experienced individually rather than collectively”.

To challenge the acceptance of the regime: **Source A** refers to the SED's manipulation of the media and suggests support was artificially contrived. The economic success is also qualified as being better "than all other socialist regimes". **Source B's** statistics can also be used to suggest that there was not wholehearted support. For example, figures for those preferring western media and suspicions of the political views imparted in the east would question the degree of acceptance. **Source C** refers to "anti-SED graffiti, swastikas and oppositional leaflets" as regular occurrences. It also speaks of "a population aware via Western television and other sources, of considerably better conditions in the FRG", and of irritation about the GDR's travel restrictions.

Candidates will have to develop and explain these ideas with reference to their own knowledge. Candidates will be expected to examine the historiography and evidence for the "niche society" (e.g. Fulbrook claims that despite the grumbling, there was not an incipient opposition and most people accepted the state to 1989) and balance their argument by looking at both the strengths and weaknesses of the political, economic and social structure.

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.

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 with limited comment.

Level 3 answers will make 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.