

AS

History

Paper 1LThe Quest for Political Stability: Germany, 1871–1929
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 1.0

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

AS History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme**1L The Quest for Political Stability: Germany, 1871–1929****Section A**

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of Wilhelm II's political authority in the years 1888 to 1914? | [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 Röhl's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Röhl emphasises the personal rule of Kaiser Wilhelm II arguing that he was the main driving force behind German policy in this period. For example, he refers to Wilhelm as 'in charge' and to his generals and chancellor dressing up, or changing their clothes, to please him
- furthermore, Röhl states that Wilhelm had his own 'style of kingship' and 'set himself' the task of uniting the German nation.

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

- Bülow was known as 'the eel' due to his sycophancy towards the Kaiser, which was one factor influencing his appointment as chancellor in 1900
- it would seem fair to say that the position and influence all of the chancellors in this period was 'dependent on the Kaiser's support' as Wilhelm forced the resignation of four chancellors in this period
- Wilhelm was certainly different in temperament from his grandfather, who allowed Bismarck to dominate politics and from his father, who was too ill to take an active role
- Wilhelm was intensely patriotic and created a self-image, in his own mind at least, as a great German ruler capable of rallying the nation around his nationalistic policies, such as Weltpolitik
- the impression of the generals and courtiers as merely subservient to the Kaiser's demands could be challenged. The Camarilla heavily influenced Caprivi's resignation; Tirpitz and others played a leading role in driving naval expansion; Bülow was cultivated by Eulenburg as the rising star in the 1890s
- some would question the claim that 'Wilhelm's whole style of kingship was his own invention'. There is an alternative explanation that Wilhelm was merely a figurehead, used by the right-wing elites to 'front' their desire for nationalistic and conservative policies.

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

- Wehler puts forward an alternative interpretation, often said to depict Wilhelm as a ‘shadow emperor’ or ‘schattenkaiser’. Thus Wehler states that there was a ‘power vacuum’ at the ‘apex’ of the German political system
- he describes the appearance of a ‘grandiose personal regime’ as merely a ‘facade’ and that the Kaiser was ‘incapable of ruling the Reich personally’
- instead, Wehler argues, it was the ‘traditional ruling elites’ who most influenced government policy in this period.

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

- there is evidence to support the claims that ‘diverse personalities and forces’ and ‘rival power centres’ competed for influence within government. Examples could be the chancellors; the Camarilla; right-wing pressure groups; the military; and the Reichstag parties
- ‘the facade of a grandiose personal regime’ could be considered a valid interpretation. Throughout this period Wilhelm loved to be portrayed as a great, militaristic German monarch
- Wilhelm could certainly be considered to have been ‘incapable of ruling the Reich personally’. His tactlessness, e.g. in the Daily Telegraph interview in 1908 and his frequent changes of mind, e.g. over his attitude towards socialism in the 1890s, were unhelpful characteristics in a ruler with significant constitutional powers
- evidence to support the view that it was the ‘traditional ruling elites’ who directed government policy could include: pressure from Junkers to end Caprivi’s tariff reforms; demands from right-wing pressure groups for imperial and naval expansion; the War Council meeting of December 1912 between Wilhelm and his military leaders
- the claim that there was ‘a power vacuum’ at the top of German politics could be challenged. The Kaiser retained the constitutional power to appoint and dismiss the chancellor, which Wilhelm brought to bear four times in these years
- the view that there was a ‘permanent state of crisis’ in Germany could also be challenged. There was strong support from across the traditional right-wing elites for Weltpolitik and Bülow was able to manufacture a conservative majority in the Reichstag in 1907. In 1914, a political truce was declared between all parties and even the SPD voted for the war budget
- it could be questioned whether the power of the traditional elites was ‘sufficient’ without Wilhelm’s role. The Kaiser was very much the public face of government policy throughout the period and could be seen as necessary for the patriotic nationalism of Weltpolitik to work.

Section B

0 2 'The transformation of the German economy, in the years 1871 to 1914, was due to government action.'

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 supporting the view that the economic transformation of Germany was due to government action, might include:

- the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine and the imposition of reparations on France following the war of 1870/71 provided a boost to the German economy
- the policies of further unification introduced by Bismarck in the 1870s, such as the removal of internal tariffs; a common currency, weights and measures; the development of the railway network all served to boost economic growth
- Bismarck's decision to introduce protective tariffs in 1878/79 helped German industry to recover from the worldwide economic depression of the 1870s
- the naval expansion after 1897, due to Wilhelm II's policy of Weltpolitik, led to a significant increase in demand for the raw materials needed to produce the new warships
- expansion of Germany's empire, especially under Wilhelm II, increased opportunities for German businesses to trade around the world.

Arguments challenging the view that the economic transformation of Germany was due to government action, might include:

- growth of the population providing both demand and labour in an expanding economy
- richness of Germany's natural resources, especially coal and iron-ore in the Ruhr
- geographical advantages such as the broad, flat north German plain which aided railway development and navigable rivers such as the Rhine and Elbe, which stimulated ship-building
- the German education system was the best in the world and placed a high emphasis on technical skills
- the German banking system was free from state control and developed close links with industry, funding new research and development
- the formation of cartels in several industries reduced competition, protected prices and therefore enabled more profits to be reinvested into the businesses
- the development of chemicals and electrical. Due to Germany's natural resources and forward-looking education system, the country became the world leader in these newer industries.

Higher level answers will provide some judgement in direct response to the question, for example they might argue that although German governments did take action which stimulated economic growth after 1871, the more important factors were outside of their control. Germany, post-unification, enjoyed several natural advantages as well as an industrial and financial system which was largely independent of government control. Indeed, it could be argued that government policy, such as the protective tariffs of 1878/79, was more a response to pressure from German industrialists rather than the first step in initiating the economic transformation.

0 3 'Left-wing opposition did not pose a serious threat to the governments of Germany in the years 1890 to 1929.'

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 supporting the view that left-wing opposition did not pose a serious threat to German governments, might include:

- Bebel and many leaders of the SPD in the years up to 1914 believed that improvements to the lives of working people could be best improved through parliamentary, not revolutionary, action
- Wilhelm II and Bethmann-Hollweg were able to ignore the Reichstag's vote of no confidence in the chancellor following the Zabern Affair in 1913
- the SPD accepted the political truce of 1914 and voted for the funds needed to wage war
- the right-wing elites and military high command retained political control of Germany throughout the First World War
- the Spartacist League only had around 1000 members and the rising of January 1919 was easily crushed by the Freikorps and the army. The short-lived Bavarian soviet style republic was crushed in May 1919
- the Ruhr rising of 1920 was also crushed by the Freikorps and army. Later KPD risings in Saxony, Thuringia and the Ruhr were all suppressed by the army and police
- use of Article 48 by President Ebert and the support of the army, secured through the Ebert-Groener Pact of November 1918, ensured that the government overcame left-wing rebellions in the period 1919-23
- greater economic and political stability from 1924 onwards prevented the Communist Party from gaining support. In the 1928 election the KPD won fewer seats than it had in May 1924.

Arguments challenging the view that left-wing opposition did not pose a serious threat to German governments, might include:

- Wilhelm II and his government were alarmed at the growth of the SPD. In 1893, the SPD won more votes than any other party. Wilhelm's government pursued 'Sammlungspolitik' from the 1890s onwards, portraying the socialists as enemies of the state
- in 1912, the SPD became the largest party in the Reichstag and together with the Progressive Liberals formed a left-wing majority. Bethmann-Hollweg was forced to introduce a special 'defence tax' on property in order to secure left-wing support for the increased military budget of 1913
- there was left-wing opposition to the government's conduct of the war. In 1916, the Spartacists (Communists) split away from the SPD and openly opposed the war effort. In April 1917, they were joined by the USPD. In July 1917, the Reichstag passed a 'peace resolution'
- the 'revolution from below' of October/November 1918 was inspired by left-wing ideals. Sailors involved in the mutinies raised the communist red flag; soviets were established in several major cities and a left-wing republic was set up in Bavaria
- a communist 'Red Army' of 50,000 workers seized control of the Ruhr in 1920. Disturbances also broke out in Thuringia and Saxony. Similar uprisings occurred in 1921 and again in 1923 during the hyperinflation crisis.

Higher level answers will provide some judgement in direct response to the question, for example they might argue that at times it appeared to the governments of Germany that left-wing opposition was a serious threat, most notably to the Kaiser between 1890 and 1914, and to the Weimar government from 1919-23. However, the extent of the threat was probably exaggerated in the minds of many moderate and conservative Germans and throughout the period the chances of a radical left-wing revolution were slim.