

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945
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

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these three sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these sources to an historian studying the collapse of Weimar democracy. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |
| | 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 respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- Troeltsch is a liberal; as such the source is valuable both as the opinion of an advocate of democracy and supporter of the Republic and, therefore, as a view from someone representing the centre of German politics.
- Troeltsch is a member of the educated elite; his professional position as a contemporary thinker and historian gives the source added credibility. He would possess an overview of German political development, as does his active participation in the political process.
- The source also has value as a chillingly accurate predictor of what might occur should Germany fail to establish a 'conservative democracy'.
- In assessing the value of the source students could refer to the context of 1918: the shock of defeat; the 'revolution from above' and the opposition to the new Republic from both Right and Left; Troeltsch is writing just a matter of days before the start of the Spartakist revolt in Berlin (the 'revolution from below'); students may refer to the special position of the army in German politics and society.

Content and Argument

- Troeltsch is commenting on the political situation in the immediate aftermath of the war; he refers to the past, the present and the future in developing his argument.
- He is arguing in favour of the democratic ideal and is delivering a warning about the dangers facing the new Republic from the political extremes.
- Perhaps Troeltsch's most compelling argument is that the danger to the Republic also arises from Germany's shallow democratic roots.

Tone and Emphasis

- Troeltsch shows a passion for democracy; he speaks emotionally ('the most radical democracy in Europe') and almost in the tone of a prophet ('Germany could become a volcano of misery and civil war').

- He is arguing that the military in particular needs to be reformed if democracy is to survive.

Source B: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- This is a powerful source written by a committed Nazi: a war veteran, a party member and an SS man; a typical Nazi in many ways.
- If it has a weakness, it is that it was written at second hand in 1938.
- In assessing the value of the source students could refer to the context of 1930, when this writer joined the party: the fortunes of the Nazis was on the rise: its membership tripled from 100,000 to 300,000 between November 1928 and October 1930; its percentage of the national vote rose from 2.6 percent in May 1928 to 18.3 per cent in September 1930; the Great Depression was biting and Weimar's last truly democratic government, under Chancellor Mueller, collapsed in March 1930.

Content and Argument

- The author is explaining his reasons for joining the movement, which is a matter of keen historical investigation: why did men join the Party?
- He identifies his frustration with the 'system' and suggests additional motivations were faith in Hitler and an attraction to the Party's sense of 'community'.
- It is of value in showing that for many, it was a combination of factors that drew them to the movement.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone a real strength of the source; it is very resonant of the high moral and ethical tone often adopted by Nazis.
- It is also typically dramatic: it is not enough to say that Germany would be ruined, rather it would be 'plunged into the abyss'.
- It is also quite threatening in emphasis.

Source C: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- Though written in the post-war period as a recollection, this is a valuable contemporary source because it gives an insight into why someone would vote for the Nazis.
- The nature of the source is also of value: it gives us an insight into how local communities responded to the Nazis.
- The respondent's experience of both a big city, Berlin and a small town, is also a strength.
- It is also of value to note that he is a head teacher, therefore a respected, middle class, educated citizen.
- In assessing the value of the source students could refer to the political and economic situation in Germany in the early 1930s: the role of the SA in street fighting against communists; the Great Depression and its impact on jobs; its anti-Semitic comments which reflect the myths portrayed by Nazi propaganda.

Content and Argument

- He explains his reasons for voting for the Nazis: anti-communist, anti-democratic and, above all, anti-Semitic.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone is rather matter-of-fact but also suggests a very confident and certain view, which might be paraphrased as 'I saw it, therefore, it is true'.
- The language used also reflects his certainty: 'utterly', 'only', 'complete'.

Section B

0 2 'The improvement in Germany's international position in the years 1924–29 could not have been achieved without the significant contribution of Gustav Stresemann.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 improvement of Germany's international position could not have been achieved without the significant contribution of Gustav Stresemann might include:

- though the Dawes Plan in 1924 was drawn up by a commission led by the American Charles Dawes, Stresemann was involved in the negotiations; he demanded, successfully, that Germany should be accepted as an equal at the conference table and that Germany would only accept the Plan as a consequence of losing the war, not because Germany accepted 'war guilt'
- Stresemann achieved a great diplomatic triumph at Locarno in 1925; the central feature of the Locarno agreement was the Rhineland Pact, with France and Germany agreeing their western frontier. This set in motion the evacuation of French troops in the Ruhr (August 1925) and Zone 1 of the Rhineland (January 1926)
- at Locarno, Stresemann refused to accept Germany's eastern borders as final, thus leaving open a possible return of its lost territories
- in September 1926 Stresemann obtained Germany's full membership of the League of Nations; Stresemann believed that this gave Germany a forum where it could obtain the removal of the limitations imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles
- Stresemann accepted the Young Plan, which agreed a final reparations plan for Germany, only after obtaining a full agreement from Britain and France to withdraw their troops from the Rhineland; this was five years ahead of the schedule agreed at Versailles.

Arguments challenging the view that the improvement of Germany's international position could not have been achieved without the significant contribution of Gustav Stresemann might include:

- Stresemann was helped by a favourable international situation, with both Britain and France keen to reach an accommodation with Germany; neither could afford to risk another conflict
- the Kellogg pact also reflected this international desire for peace
- without American financial support through the Dawes Plan and other loans, Stresemann could not have acted as independently as he did
- similarly, and as a consequence of America's loans, German economic growth produced boom conditions, making Germany an enviable economic trading partner
- though Stresemann succeeded in removing foreign troops from the Rhineland, it remained demilitarised and a symbol of defeat to the Republic's right wing critics.

Students might reach the conclusion that Stresemann's role was indeed significant. His policy of fulfilment, by which he hoped to make Germany a Great Power once more, free from the shackles of Versailles, had achieved a number of successes by the time of his sudden death from a heart attack in October 1929. However, this conclusion needs to be balanced not only against an understanding that international circumstances favoured Stresemann, but also that he never was able to satisfy his vocal critics on the right wing of German politics who accused him, at best, of slow progress in recovering Germany's losses and, at worst, of betrayal. His reputation as Germany's outstanding politician of the Weimar era was not shared by his nationalist opponents.

0 3 To what extent was Josef Goebbels responsible for Reichkristallnacht?

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 Josef Goebbels was responsible for Reichkristallnacht might include:

- Goebbels was keen to push forward the Nazi anti-Semitic agenda: in May 1938 he had already instigated 'racial cleansing' actions against Jews in Berlin, following Eichmann's example in Vienna
- Goebbels was anxious to repair his relationship with Hitler, damaged by his very visible and publicly embarrassing affair with the Czech actress Lida Baarova
- Kristallnacht presented Goebbels with an opportunity to take forward both of these personal agendas
- on 8 November, on the morning following the shooting of vom Rath in Paris, Goebbels instigated a vicious press attack against the Jews
- on the evening of 9 November, following the announcement of vom Rath's death, Goebbels personally orchestrated the nationwide actions which became known as Kristallnacht.

Arguments challenging the view that Josef Goebbels was responsible for Reichkristallnacht might include:

- anti-Semitic tensions had been building during the summer and autumn of 1938, not all of which can be laid at Goebbels' door
- the 'Aryanisation' drive, to push Jews out of Germany's economic life, was largely directed by Goering
- a number of groups and agencies, 'working towards the Fuhrer', promoted anti-Jewish policies and actions: big and small business, Aryan professionals, civil servants, the SS and SD were all pursuing their own vested interests and specific agendas
- Himmler and Heydrich in particular were anxious to acquire 'strategic' control of anti-Jewish affairs
- Goebbels had consulted with Hitler on 9 November before issuing orders for actions to take place; Hitler clearly gave his approval and in this respect perhaps was primarily responsible.

Students might conclude that Reichkristallnacht was the culmination of a wave of anti-Semitic actions occurring throughout 1938 and ultimately triggered by the shooting of vom Rath in Paris by the Polish Jew, Herschel Grynszpan. However, Goebbels had clearly instigated and orchestrated the violent events throughout Germany on 7-9 November in an attempt to strengthen his own personal position in the regime. Perhaps a judgement might be reached that Reichkristallnacht was the result of a process of cumulative radicalisation, but the scale and viciousness of the attacks, unhindered by the police and Nazi authorities, was the work of Goebbels.

0 4 'Opposition and resistance in wartime had little impact in weakening the Nazi dictatorship.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 opposition and resistance in wartime had little impact in weakening the Nazi dictatorship might include:

- Conservative opposition was too little too late; the 1944 Bomb Plot was the closest to a successful assassination attempt, but it was botched; many in the military, despite their dissatisfaction with the regime, would not break their oath of loyalty
- the Kreisau Circle, a conservative group led by von Moltke, had a number of high ranking supporters but it was more a talking shop than a group dedicated to active resistance
- left wing opposition was minor; its remaining opposition cells were broken up by 1942-3
- Church opposition was largely confined to a few prominent individuals (Bonhoeffer, von Galen), but as institutions the churches largely concerned themselves with self-preservation
- youth opposition was relatively widespread but more an irritant than a threat; the Swing Youth largely confined their 'resistance' to youthful nonconformity; the Edelweiss Pirates were more active with a few in Cologne working with the communist underground but again was not a sustained threat to the regime; the White Rose in Munich spread anti-Nazi literature but it was a small and short-lived organisation.

Arguments challenging the view that opposition and resistance in wartime had little impact in weakening the Nazi dictatorship might include:

- passive opposition was widespread; low level opposition amongst a broad cross-section of ordinary Germans, whilst never threatening to topple the regime, was significant because it eroded confidence in the regime and led to a greater focus on personal 'survival' rather than 'sacrifice' for the national community; passive resistance, therefore, led to apathy, grumbling and, in some cases, defeatism
- the regime was sufficiently concerned about resistance to intensify its surveillance throughout the war and to encourage an atmosphere of fear of denunciation
- the regime increased its terroristic activities as the war progressed; the threat of the concentration camp or summary execution was often enough to prevent active resistance; even youth opponents were executed: the White Rose in 1943; a handful of Edelweiss Pirates in 1944.

Students may conclude that the view expressed in the question is a convincing one. Most people in Germany did not actively challenge the Nazis, but the longer the war went on the more people doubted and criticised the regime. 'Resistance' is a complex concept and can take many forms; from refusing the Hitler salute to an individual attempt on Hitler's life (Georg Elser in Munich in November 1939). Overall, opposition in the sense of non-compliance was everywhere, but fear and the struggle for personal survival and the lack of surviving organisational structures that could be used as mechanisms for opposition, proved to be significant factors limiting active, large-scale resistance.