



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1J

The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Mark Scheme

2010 examination – January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2010

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Question 1

- (a) Explain why the German constitution of 1871 gave Prussia dominance in the Second Reich. (12 marks)

Target AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the German constitution gave Prussia dominance in the Second Reich.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Prussia's authoritarian model of Government was adopted for the whole of the German Empire and enforced through the constitution. Prussian Junkers then went on to control

top posts in the Imperial government, such as Bismarck as Chancellor and the armed forces

- the German constitution gave the German Emperor (i.e. the Prussian King) power over the appointment of Chancellors, foreign policy trade, transport etc, embedding Prussian authority in the Second Reich
- the constitution allowed Prussia to dominate the Bundesrat as only 14 votes were needed to block a motion. Prussia controlled 17 out of 58 votes
- Germany was unified through Prussian military might
- Prussia was the largest and economically strongest state in 1871. The Prussian Capital, Berlin became the Imperial capital and the Prussian King became the Imperial Emperor.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that even though the constitution created a federal system of government Prussia was able to dominate due to its sheer size and military power.

- (b) How successful was Bismarck in protecting conservative interests in Germany in the years 1871 to 1890? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Factors suggesting that Bismarck was successful in protecting conservative interests in Germany might include:

- the alliance of 'steel and rye' successfully upheld conservative authority and control of German domestic policy and helped push through the protectionist tariff reform of 1878

- the Anti-Socialist law introduced in 1878 prevented the Socialists from adopting an extreme position. Whilst the paternalistic 'state socialism' was constructed as a means of robbing the SPD of support by providing for the working classes at state level
- the Liberals were split and unable threaten conservative dominance
- the parties within the Reichstag were too divided to form a united front against Prussian conservatism championed by Bismarck
- in the 1887 elections, the Kartell (German Conservatives, Free Conservatives and National Liberals) won 220 seats, allowing Bismarck to push through a new seven year military budget, thus upholding conservative interests in Germany.

Factors suggesting that Bismarck was not successful in protecting conservative interests in Germany might include:

- until 1878 the Prussian conservatives, embodied by Bismarck, made an alliance of convenience with the National Liberals, thus forming an obstacle to conservative measure such as protectionism for industry and agriculture
- the Kulturkampf failed to destroy Catholicism and the Catholic Centre Party
- the socialist party grew in numbers despite the anti-socialist law. Welfare legislation backfired on the Prussian conservatives and by 1890 there were 35 SPD deputies in the Reichstag elected by over 500000 votes
- Bismarck's failure to control the Reichstag brought him into conflict with the new Kaiser, Wilhelm II, who used his power to dismiss Bismarck in 1890.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that prior to 1878, whilst the constitution guaranteed Prussian dominance, the political reality was that power had to be effectively shared with the National Liberals. 1878 saw Bismarck break from the National Liberals and entrench Prussian conservative political control of Germany. However, the Prussian conservatives faced increasing opposition due to the impact of social and economic change within Germany, primarily through the growth of socialism.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Chancellor Bülow resigned in 1909. (12 marks)

Target AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Chancellor Bülow resigned in 1909.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the catalyst event to Bülow's resignation was the rejection of his budget proposals within the Reichstag in 1909.
- however, the Daily Telegraph Affair of 1908 had fundamentally changed the nature of the relationship between Bulow and the Kaiser. Bülow had survived as Chancellor since 1900 by flattering the Kaiser and by generating popular support through the nationalistic policy of Weltpolitik. Bülow claimed not to have read the article in which the Kaiser made inappropriate remarks about the relationship between Germany and Great Britain, even though the article had been passed to him for approval. Bülow sided with the Kaiser's critics and called for constitutional limits to the Kaiser's power

- Bülow's position within the Reichstag was already weakened. The Hottentot election of 1907 had created an uneasy alliance of the conservatives and liberals in the Bülow Bloc. The liberals demanded the kinds of social reforms which the conservatives would not consider.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that the real reason for Bülow's fall from power was the loss of the Kaiser's confidence.

- (b) How far was the political stability of Germany undermined by economic changes in the years 1890 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

In 'How far' and 'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that the political stability of Germany was undermined by economic change against others which do not.

Factors suggesting that the political stability of Germany was undermined by economic change might include:

- between 1890 and 1914 the Germany economy expanded on average by 7-8% per annum. Germany was Europe's industrial superpower. Industrialisation had a number of significant social impacts. These included the growth of the working classes and the rise of socialism, the growth of the middle classes who became increasingly disillusioned with the 'fig-leaf' of democracy which the German constitution put into practice and the growth of a new industrial elite which challenged the traditional bastions of political and economic power the Prussian Junker elite.
- the political scene was becoming increasingly polarised as the SPD's vote increased in the Reichstag. By 1912 the SPD was the largest party in the Reichstag with 110 seats. The growth in socialism was a direct consequence of Germany's industrialisation and Bismarck's attempts to at first crush it through anti-socialist laws and then 'kill it with kindness' through welfare reform. The SPD resisted indirect taxes and caused problems for Bülow in 1909 and Bethmann-Hollweg in 1913.
- industrialisation had created economic demands for the acquisition of raw materials and markets beyond Europe. A number of radical nationalist pressure groups formed, such as the Pan-German League, which reflected the radicalisation of the middle classes and peasantry who feared the rise of the left. It can be argued that the policy of Weltpolitik was an attempt to placate these pressure groups demands, but in reality the policy further undermined the political stability of Germany.

Factors suggesting that the political stability of Germany was undermined by other factors might include:

- Wilhelm controlled all major political appointments and he could appoint and dismiss Chancellors at will. He had the right to dissolve the Reichstag and personal command of the army and navy.
- Caprivi resigned in 1894 due to disagreements with the Kaiser over the reintroduction of the anti-socialist laws.
- Hohenlohe's resignation in 1900 was precipitated by the Kaiser's persistent failure to consult him on important policy matters.
- Bülow resigned in 1909 because he lost the Kaiser's confidence.
- he intervened directly in policy-making creating domestic difficulties for the Chancellors who had to find funding for his schemes such as the naval bills, military expansion and Weltpolitik.
- Wilhelm took independent action, ignoring ministers and creating tensions at home and abroad, e.g. Kruger telegram 1896, Daily Telegraph interview 1908, Zabern Affair 1913.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness the political stability of Germany was undermined by economic forces unleashed by industrialisation. The instability of Germany in this period was a result of the German elite's trying to satisfy these new political pressures without relinquishing power. However, it can be successfully counter-argued that the greatest threat to political stability in the period came from the Kaiser himself, who created a powerful, but unstable 'personal rule'.

Question 3

(a) Why did revolution break out in Germany in November 1918? (12 marks)

Target AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why a revolution broke out in Germany in November 1918.

Candidates might include some of the following longer term factors:

- the devastating impact of Britain's blockade and war on the German economy combined with poor harvests in 1917 and 1918 meant that the German population were existing on only 1000 calories a day. As many as 750,000 people died of starvation. The desperate plight of many German's led them to loose faith in the Kaiser's leadership, creating revolutionary tension.

And some of the following short term (or immediate) factors:

- the failure of 'revolution from above'. Ludendorff's creation of the constitutional monarchy sanctioned by the Kaiser and Prince Max von Baden's constitutional reforms failed to provide a practical political solution to the radical internal disturbances within

Germany. The military defeat of Germany was a certainty by late September 1918 forcing the new government to negotiate an armistice with the allies. One of the conditions of the armistice made by the President of the USA, Wilson, was that those who were responsible for German policy resigned. Thus there was increasing external and internal pressure to remove the Kaiser completely.

- the sailor's revolt at Kiel illustrated the lack of political control of Prince Max's government and was the catalyst for the 'second revolution'. The Kiel Mutiny fanned the flames of discontent throughout Germany and by 8 November numerous workers' and soldiers' councils had been established in the major cities.
- by the 9 November the 'revolution from below' reached Berlin and Prince Max persuaded the Kaiser to step down.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that the sailors revolt at Kiel as the immediate catalyst for revolution which forced the abdication of the Kaiser.

- (b) How successful was extremist opposition in undermining the authority of the Weimar Republic in Germany in the years 1919 to 1925? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

In 'How far' and 'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that extremist opposition undermined the authority of the Weimar Republic against others which do not.

Factors suggesting that extremism did undermine the Weimar Republic might include:

- Left-wing extremism in the form of the Spartacist revolt of January 1919 did temporarily threaten the authority of the Republic as it seized control of Berlin. There were further

uprisings in Bavaria and the creation of a Soviet style Republic in April 1919, attempted risings in the R uhr 1920, Saxony and Hamburg 1923

- Right-wing extremism posed a much more serious threat to the Republic. One of its key strengths was the extent to which its supporters were entrenched in key positions of German society. The army, judiciary, police and to some extent the teaching profession and the civil service had sympathy for the political extremists on the right
- extremist opposition on the right fed off the resentment of the Treaty of Versailles, reparations and the occupation of the R uhr
- Right-wing opposition had a sizable electoral support base and in the 1924 election just over 25% of votes cast were for the right
- between February 1919 and November 1923 nine separate governments held office, their average life span was 6 and half months. The political opposition of the extreme left and right did undermine the effectiveness of the Republic to some extent by creating political crises.

Factors suggesting that extremism did not undermine the Weimar Republic might include:

- the KPD suffered from a lack of effective leadership and popular support. The KPD's decision to join the Communist International in December 1920 alienated many potential supporters
- extremism on the left was crushed by the actions of the Freikorps, whilst extremism on the right, the Kapp Putsch, was overcome by the striking working class. Thus, it can be argued that the authority of the Republic was somewhat strengthened by the divisive nature of the extremist opposition
- although the extreme right-wing did pose a much more serious threat it was not a unified or coherent political movement
- in the General election of January 1919 pro-Republican parties polled 76% of the vote, thus the vast majority of Germans were in favour of the democratic Republic. By the election of 1920 the pro-Republican share of the vote had dwindled to 48%, yet they still dominated the Reichstag as opposition on the left and right would not co-operate
- stability following the financial crisis of 1923 reduced the threat from the left in particular as the social and economic conditions within Germany improved
- the Ebert-Groener Pact ensured that the army did not openly revolt against the Republic. The army was important in crushing the Munich Putsch of 1923.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that political extremism (more so from the right than the left) did pose a major threat to the authority of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–1923. However, by 1925 it appeared that the authority of the Republic was more secure due to growing economic stability and the divisive nature of extremist opposition.