

Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS1J Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: history@aqa.org.uk

AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers

General Introduction by the Chief Examiner

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

Unit 1

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

GCE History HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925**Responses to June 2009 Questions****Candidate 1**

- 1 (a) Explain why the Anti-Socialist Law was introduced in Germany in 1878.
(12 marks)

One reason why Bismarck introduced the anti-socialist laws in 1878, was because he was given the opportunity to. Due to the patriotism and newly found nationalism of the united Germany, the two assassination attempts on the Kaiser caused great uproar and so when Bismarck shifted the blame onto the SPD, it is understandable why they lost significant support.

This leads to why Bismarck felt the need; he knew that the SPD who held a considerable amount of seats within the Reichstag, would impose a tremendous threat to his aim of withholding power in the hands of aristocracy and of course himself. Along with other statesmen after the Paris Commune, Bismarck dreaded one last grasp of the socialist movement on German politics. It would have given too much power to the people.

Bismarck introduced the anti-socialist laws in order to retain power at central government (the Kaiser and the Chancellor) as socialism allowed for the radicalisation of people and their rights so to speak, thus contradicting Bismarck's conservative views of hierarchy and how lower classes should look up to higher and the newly formed Mitterstand.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This response, whilst not perfect, is very good. It had three clearly defined reasons with some depth of evidence e.g. reference to the "two assassination attempts" and "Paris Commune". There are clear links between factors in the final paragraph which lifts this from Level 3 to Level 4 – 11 marks.

Candidate 2

- 1 (a) Explain why the Anti-Socialist Law was introduced in Germany in 1878.
(12 marks)

The anti-socialist law was introduced from many reasons. Firstly Bismarck felt that socialists were a threat to Germany. For example they had a large number of seats in the Reichstag, and therefore could stop laws from being passed.

Secondly, the socialists had a great deal of influence on the working class, therefore could stop Germany from producing products. This would prevent Germany from developing and could effect the economy.

Thirdly, the socialists didn't like Bismarck and so would do their best to prevent Bismarck from achieving his aims – for example the socialists didn't agree with laws (some) being passed and therefore would vote against them.

To conclude, the anti-socialist law was introduced for a number of reasons, but the most important reason is that the socialists would do their best to stop Bismarck

from succeeding.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This response lacks depth of information. The idea of socialist threat is somewhat asserted by the candidate "they had a large number of seats in the Reichstag". Again socialist links to the working class, whilst correctly identified, is in no way developed. Thus, whilst the candidate has identified three reasons, this response is then and imprecise in development of ideas. Level 2 – 4 marks.

Candidate 3

- 1 (b) How successful was Bismarck in maintaining his political dominance of Germany in the years 1878 to 1890? (24 marks)

The years between 1878 and 1890 mark the tail end of Bismarck's tenure as the Chancellor of Germany. This period saw the rise of various new political factions in Germany, which the Chancellor was set to put down. The success of this is not certain, and one new source of power, the Kaiser, led to his dismissal.

The socialists were the *Reichsfeinde* which were focused on by Bismarck during this period, although he used two different ways of trying to reduce the support for them. The Anti-Socialist legislation which was passed in 1878 did not have the effect intended, the SPD merely becoming in Traynor's words, "a more lean and efficient organisation", and holding their meetings in secret or abroad. The legislation turned the SPD into a more close knit organisation, having much the same effect as *Kulturkampf* had on the Centre Party (*Zentrum*).

The other, more effective method Bismarck used against the socialists was "state socialism". This involved what Fulbrook called "welfare measures", such as the passing of the Accident Insurance Act of 1883 and the Pension Act of 1889. Although this legislation slowed the growth of socialism, it did not deter those such as *Leibniz*, who called it "crumbs from a rich man's table". It is clear that both of these policies eventually failed with the "red election", of 1903, although the problem of socialism, it could be argued, was not big enough at that time to warrant such efforts.

A contemporary commentator of the time, Bamberger stated that, "all trembled before him [Bismarck]", and this can be seen to be the case in government, for example, his son was made Foreign Minister and Wilhelm II commented that they were not his but Bismarck's ministers. This allowed Bismarck to enact his policies much more effectively, ensuring his political control was complete. Clarke noted that the ministers of Bismarck were reduced to "senior clerks", and this allowed Bismarck to fill a power void.

The relationship between the Kaiser and the Chancellor remained good between the years 1878 and 1888, with Bismarck and Wilhelm I having similar views on the world, Carr commenting that the Kaiser was "a deeply conservative ruler". Bismarck and the Kaisers Wilhelm I and Frederick III were content that the Kaisers should remain a weak figure, but on the surprise death of Frederick III, Bismarck was left with the young Wilhelm II who immediately stated that he wanted to "rule as well as reign". Bismarck, a future opponent of Wilhelm's, was powerless, due to the constitutional power which had last been left to monarch. Bismarck was dismissed by Wilhelm, who Traynor suggests tried position himself as a "people's

ruler”, rather than the, “stuffy old Chancellor”.

The attempts by Bismarck to counter threats within Germany proved to fail, however, he retained his power above them, they being weak anyway. It was in fact the constitutional power of the Kaiser which he himself had designated which lead to his fall from power, the Kaiser Wilhelm filling the “void of power”, in Craig’s words.

Principal Examiner’s Comments

This is an excellent example of a concise, well controlled response. Whilst the candidate could have considered a broader range of issues, those covered are done so with precision and depth of evidence. The candidate begins to make judgements in the conclusion lifting this response from level 4 to Level 5 – 22 marks.

Candidate 4

- 1 (b) How successful was Bismarck in maintaining his political dominance of Germany in the years 1878 to 1890? (24 marks)

Bismarck was a very clever statesman. He was rather cunning in how he gained power – always siding with the party with the most power so that he had the majority in all votes. He also never tried to upset too many people as he may need to use them later, so when he did upset people he went out of his way to get them back onside. There is a long running historical debate as to how successful Bismarck was in maintaining this political dominance.

Bismarck realised that to gain the overall majority he would have to rely on the party with the largest proportion of seats within the Reichstag. This lead to his unlikely friendship with the liberals. Bismarck was a conservative but knowing he needed the overall majority meant he had to compromise and gain the support of the Liberals.. This worked well for a while until the Liberals started to disagree with what Bismarck wanted and Bismarck grew tired of compromising. The Liberals had also started to lose some support. Bismarck decided that the best thing for him to do was to dissolve the Reichstag and hope fresh elections would return more support. They didn’t. The main gainers were the conservatives and centre party, due to assassination attempts on Kaiser blamed on socialist, they didn’t get as many votes. This meant that Bismarck could now depend on the conservatives and the centre party to give him the majority vote.

Before this could happen, however, Bismarck had to gain back the support and trust of the centre party after his attacks on the Catholics in the Reichfinde Scheme. he had discriminated against Catholics and more closely watched the schools and churches. To win back there support he had to give them back some of the freedom he had taken from them and gain support and trust. By doing this he could rely on the support of the conservative parties and the centre party to give him the overall majority within the Reichstag.

Overall there is strong evidence to suggest that Bismarck was successful in maintaining his political dominance of Germany. Evidence suggests that he was a very clever and cunning man who used manipulation skills to win people and parties over to gain there support when he needed it. This can be seen with how he treated the Catholics of the centre party. Bismarck seemed very good at

keeping the majority on his side in order for him to retain his political majority and power, though to the end of his time in office with the introduction of Wilhelm II. he began to lose power then until he was dismissed in 1890.

Principal Examiner's Comments

Whilst the candidate had some limited understanding of the question being asked the response lacks development. In particular there is very limited factual support relating to the precise period of the question. Material pre-1878 is classified as background as the start date of the question is 1878. Level 2 – 10 marks.

Candidate 5

- 2 (b) Explain why German industry expanded so rapidly in the years c1890 to c1910. (24 marks)

On the one hand, in the years 1890–1914 political stability was achieved but on the other hand, the political landscape was far from stable. Whether the growth of socialism is the cause of the instability will be explored.

On the one hand, socialism was a threat to the political stability of Germany because the Kaiser and many influential people dealt with socialism like it was a significant threat to Germany and their power. For example, Chancellor Caprii introduced a bill banning Sunday working and restrictions on child labour, yet the SPD still grew. Furthermore, Caprii resisted the Kaiser's meddling and trying to introduce an anti-socialist bill because he believed that the Reichstag wouldn't pass it. This may have led to his downfall because the Kaiser was the only one who could dismiss him and he didn't do as he asked. Due to his resignation, this period was arguably politically unstable.

Furthermore, Chancellor Hohenlohe introduced Sammlung and the policy of concentration which rallied the upper and middle class but this failed also. This was from a direct influence of socialism further suggesting that it was a threat to political stability.

Throughout the Kaiser's 'personal rule' the social Democrat party increased in numbers despite the different approaches used and if these attempts to stunt socialism hadn't been tried then other laws could have passed in their place. This means that whilst people were dealing with the 'threat', nothing else politically could happen.

On the other hand, there were many factors other than socialism that were a threat to political stability of Germany. For example, the issue of tariffs was large one. Caprii may have resigned because of the pressure from the Agrarian League (pressure group) on his lowering of tariffs. Furthermore, Bülow who was Chancellor also tried to lower tariffs and make a compromise between the working classes and the upper classes but instead it didn't please any of them.

Moreover, the fact that there were so many pressure groups – like the Agrarian League, the Navy League and the pan German League suggests that there were a lot of mixed and different feelings on how Germany should be going and this would have created a lot of tension for the ruling classes, not knowing which direction to take.

The Daily Telegraph affair created threats and demands of changing the constitution. This also would have created political instability which wasn't due to the socialists. This was when the Kaiser was interviewed by the British 'Daily Telegraph' and it created uproar as he suggested that Germany didn't like Britain. This article before 'publication' was improperly checked by Chancellor Bülow and may have caused his downfall.

In conclusion, there were a lot of reasons to suggest that the socialism was a threat to the political stability of Germany in the years 1890-1914, such as the fact that no laws got through the Reichstag to do with socialism and it arguably helped in the dismissal of some chancellors such as Caprivi. However, there were also many other factors not affected by socialism that also contributed to the threat of instability for example, the daily telegraph affair and weltpolitik which was a strain on the economy. I believe that it was not a big threat as I think the biggest threat was the issue of tariffs which caused the springing up of several pressure groups and wasn't directly linked to socialism.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This is a very competent response. The candidate has clearly understood the question. The main issue of 'socialism' is dealt with in a secure and controlled way, with some precise factual detail. The response is balanced by a range of other factors which threatened political stability in Germany for example the issue of taxation, pressure groups and political scandals. The conclusion is more of a summary rather than a judgement, hence Level 4 not Level 5 – 19 marks.

Candidate 6

3 (a) Explain why the Kaiser abdicated in November 1918. (12 marks)

The Kaiser who was persuaded to abdicate in 1918 had not been in charge in any real sense for a long time. He had become a puppet of the elites and was forced to flee to Holland. The Kaiser's abdication was a sacrifice Germany was forced to make as a result of the defeat of the war and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles that demanded some sort of political change. The Army High Command that ran Germany during the time at the end of the war, knowing that they would be severely punished decided to create a democracy to perhaps show the allies good will and their openness to change in the hope this would lessen the punishment. So they chose the Kaiser instead of themselves as he was the embodiment of the "old feudal Germany" that the elites were anxious to erase. The Kaiser who by this time had suffered an emotional breakdown at the defeat of Germany was said not to have disagreed or protested as much as the psychological shock of the loss of Prussian values altered him significantly.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This response identifies a range of reasons why the Kaiser abdicated. Whilst the response has breadth there is little depth. However understanding is secure; a clear Level 3 – 8 marks.