

AS

HISTORY

7041/20

Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Component 20 The Weimar Republic, 1918–1933

Mark scheme

June 2023

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

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 attitudes to the Weimar Constitution in the years 1918 to 1923?

[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 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 having 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 the liberal creator of the Weimar Constitution, and it reflects a pragmatic perspective on the problems the constitution intended to resolve
- it has an optimistic tone, revealing a confidence in the German people's ability to grasp the opportunity for progressive reform presented by the collapse of the German monarchy.

Content and argument

- the source describes the collapse of the German government, by 1918. Students may refer to Ludendorff's 'parliamentisation', and the turbulence surrounding the abdication of the Kaiser
- the source describes the prospect of a communist terror. Students may refer to the spread of communism, and particularly the Spartacist revolt, to show that Preuss's fear was well-founded
- the source references the moderate political views of the German electorate. Students may describe the moderate response of Berliners to the Kapp Putsch in support of this perspective, or they may challenge it by describing widespread extremism on both left and right.

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

Provenance and tone

- the source comes from the writings of a nationalist and therefore reflects a right-wing perspective on the Weimar Constitution
- it has a critical, somewhat despairing tone, reflecting a sense of the marginalisation of once-powerful authoritarian voices from the new Republic.

Content and argument

- the source refers to the political turmoil of the early years of the Weimar Republic. Students may discuss the nature of the Weimar Constitution and in particular, the problems caused by proportional representation and extremism

- the source refers to the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Students may refer to specifically right-wing criticisms of a dictated peace and discuss how that undermined Weimar's constitutional experiment
- the source describes nationalism as a force from the past for the future. Students may discuss the legacy of authoritarianism prior to 1919 and its persistence through the Kapp Putsch and beyond.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students may reflect that both sources share a similar understanding of the political complexities in Germany but that Source A is from a liberal perspective which is positive that a well-drafted constitution will overcome them, while Source B is right wing and much more negative in its evaluation. They may judge that Source B is more valuable, because while Source A reflects the intent of the constitution, it is written at such an early stage that it was overly idealistic, whereas Source B shows that the challenges the Weimar Republic faced were by means so readily overcome.

Section B

- 0 2** 'Stresemann's foreign policy significantly strengthened Germany's international position in the years 1924 to 1928.'

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 substantiate. **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 Stresemann's foreign policy significantly strengthened Germany's international position in the years 1924 to 1928 might include:

- Germany's security increased with the Locarno Pact and the Treaty of Berlin
- Germany joined the League of Nations, as a permanent member, with power of veto, showing that it was accepted as a key world power again
- agreements with foreign powers, including France (the end of the Ruhr occupation) and the USA (the Dawes Plan) meant that Germany was able to re-engage with the global community, to support domestic economic goals.

Arguments challenging the view that Stresemann's foreign policy significantly strengthened Germany's international position in the years 1924 to 1928 might include:

- the Locarno Pact accepted the much-reviled territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles on Germany's western borders, by permanently ceding Alsace-Lorraine
- Germany's imperial ambitions were permanently dented as former colonies were not restored
- the Rhineland remained under unpopular occupation and the Saarland continued under mandate.

Students may decide that Stresemann's foreign policy significantly strengthened Germany's international position. They may balance this with the recognition that this was achieved at the expense of accepting the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles, which impacted on the regime's popularity. They may also note that the Dawes Plan, while providing economic stability made the Republic fatally vulnerable to economic factors beyond its control. Any balanced and sustained argument should be seen as valid.

0 3 “Backstairs intrigue’ was the main reason for the collapse of democracy in Germany between October 1929 and January 1933.’

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 ‘backstairs intrigue’ was the main reason for the collapse of democracy in Germany between October 1929 and January 1933 might include:

- the ‘backstairs intrigue’ between Hindenburg, Papen and, to a lesser extent, Schleicher, was responsible for Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor, which was a turning point in the collapse of democracy
- Hitler did not otherwise possess the political strength to accede to that role, at that point, particularly as the Nazi share of the vote in the Reichstag elections of November 1932 suggested the party was beginning to decline
- support for Hitler’s elevation to the Chancellery was intended to preserve democracy by neutralising the emerging threat of an undemocratic military coup.

Arguments challenging the view that ‘backstairs intrigue’ was the main reason for the collapse of democracy in Germany between October 1929 and January 1933 might include:

- the Reich President ruled by emergency decree with dramatically increased frequency after the 1929 crash, which fundamentally undermined the democratic process
- it was the surge in extremism, on the right and the left, following the 1929 crash which put the Weimar Republic under such intense pressure that selecting Hitler appeared to be a politically astute move, as it harnessed the ascendant right wing
- it was the particular selection of Hitler that was catastrophic, because of his strong anti-democratic values and his populist appeal
- the political strength of the NSDAP, as the biggest single party in the Reichstag by July 1932, gave Hitler the ability to break free of the oversight of Papen’s cabal, seen when Goring was able to prevent Papen from dissolving the Reichstag in 1932.

In reaching their conclusion, students may choose to give weight to the role of ‘backstairs intrigue’ in setting into motion the chain of events by elevating Hitler to the Chancellery, although they may reflect on the fact that intrigues take place in all political systems, particularly democracies based on proportional representation, without necessarily leading to their collapse. Alternatively, they may point to the cataclysmic impact of the 1929 crash and subsequent depression as the underlying reason why the weakness of the Weimar constitution reached a critical point, or to the growing organisational strength and popular appeal of the NSDAP which brought calls to end democracy to the fore.

Any balanced and sustained argument should be seen as valid.