

AS

History

The quest for political stability: Germany, 1871–1991
7041/1L Empire to democracy, 1871–1929
Mark scheme

7041
June 2016

Version: 1.0 Final

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk.

June 2016

The quest for political stability, 1871–1991

AS History Component 1L Empire to democracy, 1871–1929

Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of Bismarck and the Reichstag in the years 1871 to 1890? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO3

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

Extract A: In their identification of Simon’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- overall, Simon is arguing that the Reichstag and the political parties had no control over government
- he argues that opposition from the Reichstag and the political parties was merely ‘inconvenient’
- Simon suggests that Bismarck did not ‘fear’ the Reichstag, and that his political authority was easily maintained by manipulating the parties.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- students could use their knowledge of the constitution to support Simon’s argument: the Chancellor was accountable only to the Kaiser and could only be removed from office by the Kaiser; in this respect, therefore, Bismarck did have little to fear from the Reichstag
- students could refer to a number of Bismarck’s actions to support Simon’s argument that Bismarck was able to manipulate and control the Reichstag, such as: his early dissolution of the Reichstag in 1878 because of opposition from the National Liberals to his anti-socialist laws; ending the Kulturkampf in 1878 to win Centre Party support; calling early elections again in 1887 to overcome opposition to the new army budget
- overall, students might argue that the Reichstag exerted very little influence over Bismarck’s legislative agenda throughout his time in office.

Extract B: In their identification of Koch’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- overall, Koch argues that Bismarck’s political authority was subject to the Reichstag’s control
- he argues that the Reichstag was able to hold Bismarck to account, particularly when exercising its right to discuss the budget
- Koch suggests that the Reichstag was important because the Chancellor had publicly to account for his actions; if Bismarck could not obtain majorities the Kaiser could sack him.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- students could also refer to the constitution to support Koch’s argument, pointing out that the Chancellor had to gain a majority in the Reichstag for any legislation he wished to enact; for example, Bismarck had to compromise over the 1874 budget
- the influence of the Reichstag could be exemplified by its refusal in 1890 to make the anti-socialist laws permanent, which contributed to Bismarck’s fall from power
- overall students might support Koch’s view by refuting Simon’s suggestion that parliamentary opposition to Bismarck was more than ‘inconvenient’, for example by referencing the Centre Party’s regular anti-Bismarck attacks in the 1880s.

In conclusion, students may argue that both extracts overstate their case somewhat and that the truth probably lies somewhere in between. Extract A is accurate in its depiction of Bismarck's contemptuous attitude towards parliamentary politics, however, it downplays too far the constitutional importance of Reichstag approval for new legislation and therefore Bismarck's need to take the political parties into account. Extract B, on the other hand, emphasises the constitutional role of the Reichstag but, as a result, exaggerates the level of influence the Reichstag could bring to bear on the Chancellor who was ultimately only answerable to the Kaiser.

Section B

02 'The social structure of Germany changed little in the years 1871 to 1914.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Arguments suggesting that the social structure of Germany changed little in the years 1871 to 1914 might include:

- the Junker class remained dominant, for example in the army and the civil service, and steadfastly refused to contemplate marriage even with the sons and daughters of the wealthiest entrepreneurs in order to protect their social status and the newly rich owners of big businesses and industry aspired to the same social status as the traditional elites
- although the working class grew rapidly in size it remained apart from the social elites and mobility between the classes was restricted
- the role and status of women in society changed little in this period. Very limited progress was made towards votes for women and women's rights within marriage remained severely restricted.

Arguments challenging the view that the social structure of Germany changed little in the years 1871 to 1914 might include:

- the growth of the urban proletariat led to the emergence of trade unions and the SPD. To the traditional elites this represented a serious challenge to the social structure of Germany
- peasants suffered during the social and economic changes of these years; thousands of peasants left the land in search of work in the new industrial towns and cities. The percentage of the population employed in agriculture fell from 50% in 1871 to 35% in 1907
- the middle class expanded significantly in size during this period. White collar workers in industry, business, administration, education and the law all became more numerous. 'Bourgeois' values came to the fore in the culture of the expanding towns and cities and the lower middle class or 'Mittelstand' also grew in size
- the landowning Junker class came under more pressure in this period as incomes from agriculture fell. Some landowners were forced to sell their estates to the newly rich upper middle class families from the cities.

Higher level answers will provide some judgement in direct response to the question. For example they might argue that there was a great deal of social change in Germany in this period due to the transformation of the economy, however, this had a limited impact on the social structure of the country which remained resolutely hierarchical with little social mobility between classes. As a result, the political dominance of the rich right-wing elites was increasingly difficult to maintain in the face of opposition from the democratic representatives of the growing middle and working classes.

- 03** ‘The weaknesses of the German economy in the years 1914 to 1929 were due to the First World War.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Arguments suggesting that the weaknesses of the German economy in the years 1914 to 1929 were due to the First World War might include:

- to finance the war the government issued treasury bills and raised war loans with a view to paying back the borrowed money with interest following victory in the war. Defeat in the war left Germany unable to repay its debts.
- The loss of over 2 million men dead or wounded, and the payment of widows pensions, was crippling to the economy.
- the Treaty of Versailles took away a significant amount of German territory and her overseas colonies thereby damaging the German economy. Germany lost significant iron ore and coal deposits and some of its arable land; Germany also lost foreign markets.
- the reparations demanded by the Treaty of Versailles put a considerable strain on the German economy. Germany defaulted on its payments in 1922, causing the occupation of the Ruhr, which in turn contributed to the hyperinflation crisis of 1923.
- Germany's over-reliance on American loans and foreign investment stimulated by the Dawes Plan in 1924, could be considered an effect of the war as the Dawes Plan was specifically formulated to address the problems of reparations.

Arguments challenging the view that the weaknesses of the German economy in the years 1914 to 1929 were due to the First World War might include:

- the hyperinflation crisis of 1923 can be considered to be the result of decisions taken by the Weimar government, not just because of the First World War. The government continued printing money in order to pay off debts with inflated currency and called for passive resistance in the Ruhr which massively reduced Germany's industrial production but necessitated paying the workers whilst not working.
- the extensive welfare state established by the Weimar Republic was a significant burden on government finances. The government refused to countenance spending cuts or significant tax rises through fear of losing popularity.
- trade unions and state arbitration of industrial disputes forced wage increases regardless of productivity. As a result, unemployment started to rise in the mid-1920s reaching 3 million in February 1929 as businesses looked to cut costs.
- agriculture struggled due to a lack of investment (especially compared to industry after the Dawes Plan), low food prices and high taxes.

Higher level answers will provide some judgement in direct response to the question, for example they might argue that the First World War had a significant impact on the German economy up to 1924, not least due to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, however, following the Dawes Plan a lot of these problems were resolved and Germany entered a period of relative economic stability and prosperity. There were, however, ongoing weaknesses in the German economy from 1924 to 1929 which had more to do with the nature of the Weimar Republic and government policy, such as the extensive welfare state and generous wage settlements. Germany was effectively living beyond its means. Therefore, even before the Wall Street Crash, the German economy was in recession and unemployment had reached 3 million which was not due to the impact of the war.