

AS

# History

Paper 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany 1918–1933  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version: 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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1933

#### Section A

- |          |          |  |                   |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why Hitler was appointed Chancellor in January 1933? | <b>[25 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

*Target: AO2*

*Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.*

#### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will provide a range of relevant of well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be partial. There may be <b>either</b> some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question <b>or</b> some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.  | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The answer will <b>either</b> describe source content <b>or</b> offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.                                       | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

## Indicative content

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

**Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

**Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

### Provenance and tone

- Schroeder was a contemporary witness, having been present at a key meeting.
- He was part of the 'inner circle', connected to powerful and influential people in politics and business.
- His evidence is a recollection under oath.
- His tone is 'factual', presenting himself as a mere facilitator. He stresses his non-involvement in decision making by emphasising that discussions were 'exclusively' between Hitler and Papen.
- In assessing value in relation to provenance and tone, students might refer to the following context: von Papen's pivotal role as a 'go-between' between Hitler and Hindenburg and his belief that he could 'corner' Hitler, which explains his willingness to defer to Hitler; the weakening position of the NSDAP, reduced parliamentary seats, worsening party finances, Strasser's resignation, which helps explain both Hitler's willingness to compromise despite still playing 'hard ball'.

### Content and argument

- Schroeder is describing a key 'behind the scenes' meeting, which led Papen to persuade President Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor.
- His argument is that Hitler was in the driving seat at the meeting, setting out his demands.
- He suggests that businessmen in Germany desired a strong leader.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points. For example:**

- Von Papen's motivation in seeking a political accommodation with Hitler.
- Attitudes of the elites towards Weimar democracy.

- Awareness of the constitutional crisis facing the Weimar Republic following the collapse of democratic accountability after the resignation of Mueller's government in March 1930.
- The extent of the 'wheeling and dealing' focused around Schleicher, Papen and Hitler.

**Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

### **Provenance and tone**

- The industrialists named are amongst Germany's most powerful, influential and well-connected.
- The tone is very deferential: 'Your Excellency'; it has the tone of a request, not of a demand.
- In assessing value in relation to provenance and tone, students might refer to the following context: Hindenburg's all-powerful constitutional position and the extent of his personal authority, which demanded total deference; an understanding that big business regarded Hitler as a crucial bulwark against communism, which helps explain their guarded request that Hindenburg transfer power to Hitler to stop the Left.

### **Content and argument**

- The content focuses on the outcome of the November election and the difficulties in forming a stable government under strong leadership.
- The industrialists' argument is that it is in the national interest for Hindenburg to appoint Hitler (though he is not named) to lead a Presidential Cabinet.
- They argue this would be good for the economy and, by implication, good for business and good for them.
- They imply that it would give millions more people more of a stake ('active participation') in the country.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the value of these points. For example:**

- Hitler's relationship with big business; what big business wanted from Hitler
- the significance of a 'Presidential Cabinet'
- consideration of Hindenburg's constitutional role and his personal opinions about Hitler and Papen.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.): Source A is more valuable because its author had significant personal involvement of the intrigues behind Hitler's appointment. Conversely, Source B has the value of showing how powerful business elites had access to and influence over, the President. It could be concluded that both sources complement each other; that together they are valuable for illustrating how, in the end, Hitler's appointment as Chancellor had little to do with true democracy.

Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'The greatest threat to the political stability of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1923 came from right-wing groups.'

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.**

The Weimar Republic faced substantial handicaps: it inherited a catastrophic defeat and was attacked from all parts of the social and political spectrum.

**Arguments supporting the view that the greatest threat to the political stability of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–23 came from right-wing groups, might include:**

- numerous political parties opposed the democratic foundations of the Republic: notably the DNVP, which had not only Junker and big business backing but also had middle and working class supporters; the NSDAP emerged as a threat in 1923 but its influence at this time was largely confined to Bavaria
- paramilitary groups, particularly the Freikorps in 1919-20, provided armed opposition
- right wing, anti-Republican sentiment was deeply entrenched in powerful institutions: the judiciary, police, civil service and, most importantly, the army
- all of these institutions associated the Republic with its traditional social and political enemies: liberals, socialists, Catholics, Jews
- this threat can be exemplified by reference to a series of violent and revolutionary actions: the Kapp Putsch, March 1920; the Munich Putsch, November 1923; the right wing death squads, which murdered over 300 Republicans between 1919–23, including the Foreign Minister Walter Rathenau in June 1922.

**Arguments challenging the view that the greatest threat to the political stability of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–23 came from right-wing groups, might include:**

- left wing groups posed a serious threat: the Spartacist revolt in Berlin in January 1919; communists seized power under Eisner in Munich in 1918–19; the KPD never reconciled itself to supporting the Republic
- the harsh actions of the victorious Allies served to undermine the Republic's political stability: the Treaty of Versailles 1919; the French invasion of the Ruhr 1923
- economic factors also contributed to political instability: war debt, unemployment; but particularly reparations leading to hyperinflation
- the Weimar constitution itself was flawed: it did not build in sufficient democratic safeguards, particularly the lack of restriction on minor parties being represented in the Reichstag; this led to political instability because governments could only be formed by coalitions of three or more parties.

Students may conclude that in many respects, it is surprising that the Republic survived at all. Overall, it can be argued that political instability resulted from a combination of factors, many of which were interlinked. However, the most persistent and hostile threat came from the right wing groups deeply rooted in German society. Many right wing elites never supported democracy. This reason alone, perhaps, sways the argument towards the right wing being the Republic's greatest threat.

**0 3** 'Changes in German society in the years 1924-28 did much to heal post-war social divisions.'

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 changes in German society in the years 1924–28 did much to heal post-war social discontent, might include:**

- students might refer to a range of social and cultural factors to argue that a semblance of ‘normality’ returned to German society after the social and political upheavals of the period 1919–23
- the welfare state made impressive progress: health provision was far better than in the pre-war period; over 300,000 new houses per year were being built
- new consumer goods proliferated: radios, telephones, cars
- big department stores offered greater choice and value for money
- Weimar avant-garde culture and Bauhaus architecture achieved international pre-eminence
- mass entertainment flourished: cinemas, dance halls, sports
- popular music, especially jazz, was emerging.

**Arguments challenging the view that changes in German society in the years 1924–28 did much to heal post-war social discontent, might include:**

- class divisions remained embedded
- relatively high unemployment, over 2 million people were out of work in 1926, was a source of deep social grievance
- small shopkeepers and producers felt their livelihoods threatened by big department stores and large co-operative ventures
- many craftsmen and artisans, a traditionally important lower-middle class social group in German society, equally felt threatened by mass consumerism
- farmers saw themselves as an abandoned class suffering as a result of falling agricultural prices
- cultural developments also sharply divided German society: the new avant-garde art forms offended more people than they attracted; Goebbels rubbished popular culture as ‘asphalt culture’, ‘American’ and ‘degenerate’.

Students might conclude that on the surface the years 1924-28 were a ‘golden age’. However, this view needs balancing. Living conditions might have improved for many but for a sizeable minority they worsened. Relative stability and normality gave the appearance of greater cohesion but not far below the surface Germany was a deeply divided and discontented society in transition, a situation fully exploited by the Nazis as the crisis years after 1929 unfolded.