



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2010**

**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 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres 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 candidates. 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 candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates 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. Candidates 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, candidates 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 candidate'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 candidate has begun to '*think like a historian*' and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates 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 candidates 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 candidates.

## **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 candidates 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 candidates' 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*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate 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 candidate 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 2010

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

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

**Question 1**

- 01** 'It was the actions of the Western powers in the years 1945 to 1949 which were chiefly responsible for the division of Germany.'  
Access the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

**Standard 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 a good 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 very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
-

**L5:** Answers will show a full 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 very well-structured and fluently written.

**38-45**

### Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.**

Candidates will need to identify and evaluate the actions of the Western powers in Germany in the years after 1945 and balance these against other factors which helped bring about the division of Germany in 1949. The emphasis should be on an evaluation of where responsibility lay. Candidates may differentiate between the different western powers or between actions at different times within the years 1945 to 1949.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the actions of the Western powers were responsible for the division:

- France never favoured a reunited Germany while USA and Britain only wanted it on their own terms
- the western allies were less thorough than the USSR at ridding their zones of Nazi influence so going back on former agreements
- the USA's refusal to hand over German reparation payments to the USSR from May 1946
- the West's decision to create Bizonia in January 1947
- the Bevin Plan, February 1947 by which the British promoted an independent West Germany
- the introduction of the Marshall Plan
- the West's failure to work for compromise – especially in conferences in 1947/1948 and the decision to create an independent West Germany at the London Conference of June 1948
- the introduction of the new Deutsche Mark into West Germany in June 1948
- the creation of the FRG in 1949.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that other factors were responsible for the division:

- the situation in Germany by 1945 with invading armies 'liberating' different areas
- the breakdown at the Potsdam Conference and the USSR's distrust of the west, democratic systems and their demand for heavy reparations
- the Soviet's handling of their zone – with changes to the economy and society and the imposition of Stalinist controls
- the development of the Communist 'buffer' states in Eastern Europe
- the USSR's uncompromising reaction to western initiatives – setting up the German Economic Commission (June 1947), Cominform (September 1947) and the German People's Congresses for Unity and Just Peace' (December 1947/March 1948)
- issues relating to new currencies
- the special position of Berlin and Soviet attempts at blockade (June 1948–May 1949)

- the Cold War which left Germany as a pawn of the super-powers –and its divisions the product of global developments.

In conclusion, candidates may argue that the West was primarily responsible as most of the initiatives emanated from the west. However, it could be suggested that the USSR was primarily responsible because of its ideological commitment to maintain communism and suspicion of the West (which jointly held more territory). Alternatively it could be suggested that the division was a by-product of Cold War tensions between USA and USSR in which Britain and France played little part.

---

**Question 2**

- 02** 'The period 1949 to 1971 was one of stability in East Germany.'  
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

**Standard 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 a good 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 very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full 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 very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**



---

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.**

Candidates will need to assess and explain the degree of stability achieved in East Germany under Ulbricht. Better candidates are likely to make some comment on what they understand by stability and a well-rounded answer is likely to address political, economic and social stability, although a good answer which considers only one of these fully could be worthy of the highest marks.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in debating political stability:

- from 1949–1953 the GDR was established as a separate state under SED government with strong central control
- the 1953 workers' rising was a sign of underlying instability – but this was crushed (with Soviet troops) and, despite Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation speech on 1956, which provoked further unrest, the GDR survived and apparent stability was preserved through the activities of the Stasi and show trials to remove oppositions
- GDR's incorporation into the Warsaw Pact as an equal partner, national sovereignty with new flag and a state army with the support of USSR power gave the state credibility
- the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961 ensured the political survival of the regime.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in debating economic stability:

- a planned economy developed, with 5 year plans (1951 and 1956, abandoned in favour of 7 year plan, 1959), investment in heavy industry, collectivisation of agriculture and crafts, the influence of Comecon. Disturbances suggest the measures were not wholly successful in the early 1950s
- Ration cards abolished 1958 leading to belated development of consumer goods and good growth 1958–1959
- the building of the Berlin wall was a response to the flight of refugees caused by economic instability but played a part in stabilising the economy by 1963
- by 1971, Ulbricht had failed to create an 'economic miracle' in the East and economic tensions persisted.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in debating social stability:

- GDR instituted a national Construction programme to regenerate towns and cities, offered welfare provision and the establishment of state organisations – free German Youth and Free German Trade Union Federation creating sense of unity
- it provided a socialist equality and citizens enjoyed the highest standard of living in the Soviet bloc
- by 1971 a 'niche society' which accepted socialist life was beginning to emerge
- the flight from the GDR – at least to 1961 and the popular reaction to the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact troops, suggest the stability was ephemeral.

In conclusion, candidates may suggest that the stability of the GDR was artificial, and dependent on the domination of the USSR. They may refer to the need to rely on repression and the economic problems that were never fully solved. It could be argued that the building of the Berlin Wall was a sign that the so-called stability of the 1950s was simply an illusion – and that which followed, simply 'enforced'.

**Question 3**

- 03** To what extent did the policies adopted by West Germany in the years 1949 to 1990 bring about the eventual reunification of Germany? (45 marks)

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

**Standard 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 a good 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 very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full 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 very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

---

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.**

Candidates will need to assess West German policies in the years 1949 to 1990 and evaluate their contribution to the eventual reunification of Germany. There should be both critical coverage of these policies and some analysis of other factors that led to reunification, in order to address 'to what extent'.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in their consideration of the policies adopted by West Germany:

- the development of a prosperous and democratic West Germany under Adenauer which fulfilled his belief that such would act as a 'magnet' to East Germans
- the West's determination that any unification would be on the FRG's terms prevented early schemes for reunification in 1950s and refusal to recognise and negotiate with GDR as independent state – Hallstein doctrine – was prejudicial to reunification
- continual friction between East and West (and encouraged by West)—especially over the building of the Berlin Wall, 1961 –reduced likelihood of compromise
- Brandt's Ostpolitik policy from 1963 was both a help and hindrance to eventual reunification
- the Berlin agreement of 1971 and the subsequent agreements between the East and West states showed positive side of Western policies but with a continued acceptance of division and a lack of negotiation on political unity
- the West's immediate failure to seize the opportunities afforded by Honecker's resignation in 1989 and other events of that year
- Kohl's 10 point plan for reunification, November 1989
- the West German initiative in 1990 (especially the currency unions, Kohl's meeting with Gorbachev, July 1990), and the FRG's part in the official reunification October 1990.

There are also a number of other factors to consider:

- economic forces, e.g. the post-war boom favouring the West and the financial problems in USSR and GDR by the late 1980s
- the artificiality of the division with the Berlin Wall as an indication that partition could not survive
- the failure of GDR leaders
- political factors and the ending of the Cold War; events in Eastern Europe 1989–1990, and the policies of Gorbachev
- the reform movement in the GDR –forces 'from below'
- the attitude of USA, Britain and France in 1989–1990.

In conclusion, candidates may adopt any one of a number of lines, including essential agreement with the quotation. Other suggestions are likely to be that the policies of West Germany did more to hinder than help eventual reunification, or that reunification was the product of the peculiar circumstances of 1989–1990 and its coming was not foreshadowed by earlier policies.