
A-LEVEL

History

Component 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

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 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

June 2017

A-level

Component 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the extent of opposition to the Nazi regime in the years 1934 to 1937. **[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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is written by a political party that has been banned by the Nazis. This could make it of limited value given its hostility to the Nazis, though the analytical nature of the report in assessing the weakness of opposition gives it value
- this is a report based on information that has been smuggled out of Germany; again this could limit its value
- the date, 1934, indicates that the Nazis have a strong control over Germany only a year after taking power
- the tone is one of restrained anger against the Nazi regime and frustration at the situation. It is analytical in nature – with the emphasis on assessing the reasons for the strength of the Nazis and the weakness of the opposition.

Content and argument

- the Nazi Party have strong control over Germany due to its control of propaganda and key positions in government. This was true: by 1934, the Nazis had banned all other parties and taken over all positions in the government; the propaganda machine was highly effective
- the mass of people are discontented due to economic reasons only. This was a key factor in Hitler getting support following the economic impact of the Great Depression and his economic successes explain why he maintained support
- the opposition is ideologically weak because there is still greater fear of Communism; again, this was true and links to previous point. Fear of a Communist revolution was a factor in Hitler's support
- the opposition is organisationally weak because they have no opportunity to organise themselves. The Nazis already had tight control over local government and had banned trade unions etc.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is an article in a British newspaper from an important British politician; it is thus of value for giving the outside perception as to the degree of opposition within Nazi Germany
- as a British visitor within Germany, however, the extent of Lloyd George's interaction with ordinary Germans would have to be questioned
- Lloyd George's involvement in the Treaty of Versailles could limit the value of this source, as he could be looking for the positives in Germany to prove that the Treaty had not been a total failure in the long-term
- the tone is one of admiration for Germany and Hitler in particular with the emphasis being on the importance of Hitler for having saved Germany.

Content and argument

- there was a greater sense of security in Germany. This can be supported by the fact that Hitler had already raised Germany's status on the international scene, asserting its new found strength by walking out of the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference. The rearmament of the Rhineland in 1936 would certainly have made Germany feel more secure
- German people were much happier. Nazi policies such as the reduction in unemployment had raised the morale of ordinary Germans
- old and young worshipped Hitler because he had saved Germany; Hitler also had much charisma and was indeed very popular
- there is some criticism of the speeches of Nazi leaders, but no criticism of Hitler. Lloyd George's comment regarding criticism of speeches of Nazi leaders is hard to support; no criticism of the government would have been tolerated.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a confidential report this has value; it is more likely to be accurate as to how the Gestapo viewed the situation with regard to opposition
- the information in the report would have been based on information from informers (as indicated within the source); this could limit its value depending on how accurate the information from informers was
- the date is interesting as it indicates that there is still a degree of political activity against the regime taking place even by 1937
- as an official report, the tone is fairly matter of fact, though also slightly defensive, with many excuses for why the Gestapo has failed to stop the illegal activities; indeed the emphasis is on the difficulties of catching people who are carrying out illegal political activities.

Content and argument

- Communist and SPD propaganda relied on word of mouth. By this point, the Nazi regime had arrested many members of the SPD and KPD making it much more difficult for them to spread anti-Nazi propaganda via written material

-
- it was difficult to carry out surveillance and to catch the perpetrators or get evidence of illegal activities. This is linked to the previous point – that the SPD and KPD by necessity were working much more secretly after 1935 due to continuous pressure from the Gestapo. They were much less effective, however, because of this
 - workers were being indoctrinated by Communist activities. Although the Gestapo surveillance made it difficult for the KPD and SPD to operate, in fact they still gained support from workers who were unhappy with the strict labour discipline imposed on the workers
 - the Gestapo had proof that the KPD and SPD were working together. In fact they rarely worked together due to the history of conflict between the two parties
 - the Gestapo is planning to devote its attention to 'illegal' activities in the factories. The use of informers in factories and workplaces, as implied here, was a key source of information for the Gestapo and Gestapo informers frequently infiltrated the networks of both organisations.

Section B

- 02** 'The instability of Weimar governments, in the years 1919 to 1923, stemmed primarily from the problems created by the Weimar Constitution.'

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.

Students will need to examine the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution and relate these to the problems of post-war Germany; they will need to set these against the more positive aspects of the constitution.

Factors suggesting that the instability of Weimar governments, in the years 1919 to 1923, stemmed primarily from the problems created by the Weimar Constitution might include:

- the use of proportional representation allowed smaller parties to get seats in the Reichstag. Many of these were anti-Republican which undermined the ability of the government to create positive support for the new constitution and deal with the feelings of bitterness and distrust that existed
- the proliferation of small parties also meant that the larger parties were prevented from having a secure majority. This led to coalitions which frequently broke down thus preventing a strong government which was needed to sort out post-war Germany
- Article 48 weakened the claim of the Weimar constitution to be democratic; Ebert used it on 136 occasions. This led to many who had fought for a more democratic Germany becoming disillusioned.
- key centres of power in the new Republic; the civil service and judiciary were largely staffed by those who did not support the new Republic and so had the potential to undermine it. This was seen in the sentences handed out by the judiciary to those who attacked the government and the lenient sentences handed out to those on the right wing of politics.

Factors challenging the view that the instability of Weimar governments, in the years 1919 to 1923, stemmed primarily from the problems created by the Weimar Constitution might include:

- the fact that the Republic had signed the Treaty of Versailles and was associated with the defeat and humiliation of Germany led many Germans to reject its legitimacy and encouraged threats from both Left and Right
- the economic problems caused by the aftermath of the war and the impact of reparations payments contributed to the inflation crisis, which spiralled out of control in 1923 creating a desperate situation for many Germans, fuelling discontent with the government and playing into the hands of extremist groups that wanted to overthrow the Republic
- although the country was united in its hatred of the French following its invasion of the Ruhr in 1923, many right-wing Germans accused the Republic of betrayal when it ended passive resistance; this further fuelled opposition to the Republic
- the right-wing elite groups in German society remained strong and influential, not just within the government but also within the army, the landowners and industrialists. Their influence continued to undermine the Republic during this period.

Good students are likely to/may conclude that although the constitution was the most democratic in Europe, its weaknesses meant that it was inadequate for dealing with the myriad of post-war problems and it was thus responsible for much of the instability of this period. Alternatively, it could be argued that the instability was caused not so much by the constitution itself as by the legacy of bitterness engendered by the war and the determination of certain sections of society to undermine the republic.

- 03** How far was the improved economic and political stability of the Weimar Republic, in the years 1923 to 1925, due to Gustav Stresemann? **[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.

Students will need to assess the impact of Stresemann on Germany and analyse the extent to which he can be given the credit for Germany's relative stability during this period.

Please note that a maximum mark of level 2/10 can be awarded if only Stresemann is referred to and maximum mark of level 3/15 if either political or economic stability investigated.

Factors suggesting that Gustav Stresemann was responsible for the improved economic and political stability of the Weimar Republic in the years 1923 to 1925 might include:

- Stresemann dealt effectively with the threat of possible action by the right-wing government of Bavaria to march on Berlin and seize power. He sent in troops to remove Communist governments in Saxony and Thuringia which appeased a significant section of nationalist opinion
- Stresemann ended the inflationary crisis by ending the passive resistance in the Ruhr and he appointed Schacht to establish a new currency the Rentenmark
- he created financial stability by bringing the budget under control by cutting expenditure and increasing taxes. He also played a role in setting up the Dawes Plan which further stabilised the economy
- Stresemann helped Germany reintegrate into the international economy, e.g. with the Treaty of Locarno which also helped reduce internal discontent.

Factors challenging the view that Gustav Stresemann was responsible for the improved economic and political stability of the Weimar Republic in the years 1923 to 1925 might include:

- the role of Hjalmar Schacht as head of the Reichsbank who made a significant contribution to the introduction and stabilisation of the new currency and also played a role in negotiating the Dawes Plan
- the role of American financial assistance; without this the economic recovery programme in Germany would have been a lot weaker. American loans helped to create machinery, factories and jobs thus playing a significant role in economic stabilisation
- the rise in living standards generally led to greater satisfaction with the government and therefore stability. This process was supported by the expansion of social welfare provision in Germany from 1920–1925
- the reduction in enthusiasm for right-wing nationalism; the failure of the Munich Putsch in 1923 dampened enthusiasm for right-wing extremism and after this there were no more attempted putsches of political assassinations.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that Stresemann played the central role in the stabilisation of the Weimar Republic after 1923, making brave decisions such as calling off passive resistance. Although he was helped by favourable factors such as the role of the USA in offering loans, it is also questionable whether this would have happened without Stresemann's initiatives on the international stage.

- 04** 'There was more continuity than change in Hitler's policies towards the Jews in the years 1938 to 1945.'

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.

Please note maximum mark of level 2/10 if there is not full coverage of the date range of the question i.e. 1938-1945.

Factors suggesting that there was more continuity than change in Hitler's policies towards the Jews in the years 1938 to 1945 might include:

- after 1938 there was a radicalisation in policies towards Jews, which coincided with the general radicalising of the regime's policies following the improved economic and military situation and the removal of those urging some moderation; the radicalisation of anti-Semitism remained a consistent feature throughout this period making any form of normality for Jews impossible
- throughout this period, Jews within German controlled territories were consistently subjected to humiliation, discrimination and violence
- Hitler's aims throughout this period remained consistent in their determination to rid Jews from German held territories
- there was always a policy to kill as many Jews as possible, as evidenced by the treatment of Jews in the concentration camps where many died of forced labour or brutality. Even before 1942, the conditions in the General Government and the ghettos caused starvation which led to the assumption of the Madagascar Plan, that Jews would die off on the island through harsh conditions.

Factors challenging the view that there was more continuity than change in Hitler's policies towards the Jews in the years 1938 to 1945 might include:

- the years 1938 to 1939 saw the Nazis focus on forced emigration of Jews. The start of war in 1939 and the changed international situation and the conquest of western Poland, meant that the emphasis moved from forced emigration of Jews to deportations and to the 'resettlement' of Jews
- the rapid conquest of France during May to June 1940 led to the Madagascar Plan which would involve sending 4 million Jews to Madagascar; this was shelved in favour of sending Jews to Siberia after the hoped for successful conquest of Russia, but it indicates the lack of a consistent plan in policy
- the invasion into the Soviet Union brought 3 million more Jews under Nazi control which meant that the issue of what to do with 'the Jewish question' was dramatically accentuated and had to be solved in a more radical way; hence the setting up of ghettos
- the activities of the Einsatzgruppen indicate a much more systematic approach to the killing of Jews. It could be argued that treatment of the Jews prior to 1941, e.g. including moving Jews into the General Government or the use of Jews for slave labour do not indicate a plan for mass extermination and that this only comes about after 1941 with the invasion of Russia
- the Final Solution, 1942 to 1945, marked a change in previous policies and emerged because all other plans had failed, e.g. putting Jews in ghettos, encouraging emigration, the Madagascar Plan etc. The policy emerged out of an unstable and chaotic regime and was not part of a consistent or planned policy which started in 1938.

Good answers may conclude that although anti-Jewish policies throughout this period were more extreme than earlier and were consistent in their violence against Jews and their determination to rid them from German held territory, in fact anti-Jewish policy underwent several changes in this period as the regime sought more effective ways of dealing with the large numbers of Jews under their control because of the war. Killing became more systematic, culminating in the implementation of the Final Solution after 1942.