
AS
HISTORY

Paper 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1933

Mark scheme

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 2 Specimen Mark Scheme**20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1933****Section A**

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why the Nazi movement began to attract mass support from 1930? | [25 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | 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. | 21-25 |
| L4: | 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. | 16-20 |
| L3: | 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. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or 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. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The answer will either describe source content or 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. | 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.

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

- the source comes from someone who was 'doing well' – fairly middle class in outlook and a supporter of the DNVP
- the tone is one of complacency which became increasingly angry with overtones of Nazi propaganda
- emotive language is used.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the dispossessed farmers had been undermined by the Jews and that the Nazis had their solution to their problems
- it suggests that other right-wing parties were not meeting the needs of the dispossessed

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- this was recorded in 1934 after one year of Nazi rule and the significance of this
- the extent to which it reflects the problems current in agriculture prior to the Nazis
- the claim that he was won over in 1930 and the extent to which, at this point, anti-Semitism was significant in Nazi propaganda

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

Provenance and tone

- there may be reference to provenance. This is from an unskilled labourer. He appears to have had little knowledge of or interest in politics before
- the tone is one of desperation with a degree of naivety.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Depression produced economic misery, hunger and that the Jews contributed to it
- the author of source shows no confidence in the Government and is critical of the Communists and in desperation turns to Nazism.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- to corroborate and/or challenge the impact of the depression on Germany at the time referred to
- to corroborate and/or challenge whether the government (Muller) was as portrayed
- to comment on the views expressed about the Communist Party

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of the sources, students may conclude that (e.g.) the sources represent important strands of opinion from different sections of society attracted towards the Nazis in 1930 and will comment on how far they were typical of the 'mass support' for the Nazis from 1930. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

- | | | |
|----------|----------|--|
| 0 | 2 | 'The main reason why the Weimar Republic survived its difficult early years, 1919 to 1923, was the skilful leadership of Friedrich Ebert.' |
|----------|----------|--|

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.

Students may provide some of the following points to support the proposition:

- Ebert was a moderate leader who saved Germany from being taken over by revolutionaries
- his agreement with the army (the 'Ebert-Groener Pact') was vital in keeping the new government in power
- Ebert recognised that it was essential for Germany to accept the terms of the Versailles Treaty, even though it was so unpopular
- by 1923 Ebert had become a respected national leader.

Students may use some of the following points to suggest other factors were important:

- it was not good management; it was good luck. The Republic survived only because of the mistakes of its enemies
- it was not Ebert's skilful leadership but the power of the army and the right-wing elites who compromised with him (and left the Republic weakened)
- the key factor was the financial recovery plan led by Schacht from 1923.

0 3 'By the late 1920s, the Weimar Republic was politically stable.'

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.

Students may refer to some of the following in support of the proposition:

- the turbulent years of early Weimar had been safely negotiated. Ebert had completed his term as president and been replaced by Hindenburg. This reassured the middle classes and many conservative elements
- the economy was recovering well and economic indicators were more positive than in 1913
- coalition governments had previously been very fragile but were now much more stable. The 1928 government coalition under Müller was thought to be talented and capable
- many army officers were thinking it necessary to rebuild relations with the Republic, instead of the instinctive opposition in the early years
- many Jews now considered the Weimar Republic to be the best country in Europe for Jews to live and prosper.

Students may also refer to some of the following to balance the argument:

- whilst there was economic prosperity, people did not trust it; there were still scars from the hyperinflation. The prosperity also depended on foreign loans
- Hindenburg may have been reassuring but he was no democrat and would do little to save the Republic if it ran into trouble
- Government stability depended on the SPD – which was weakened by the legacy of splits between moderates and extremists between 1919–1923
- important social groups vital for stability were thoroughly anti-democratic: business, the judges, parts of the education system and, above all, the army.

Students will be expected to produce a balanced response as indicated.

