



**General Certificate of Education
June 2013**

A2 History 2041

HIS3L

Unit 3L

From Defeat to Unity: Germany, 1945–1991

Final

Mark Scheme

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 events which all examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

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.

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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students 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. Students 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 students 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 student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**A2 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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- 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)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2013

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3L: From Defeat to Unity: Germany, 1945–1991

Question 1

- 01** How effectively did the occupying powers deal with the legacies of Nazism and war in the years 1945 to 1949? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| | Nothing written worthy of credit. | 0 |
| L1: | Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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 demands of the question. They will either be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. | 7-15 |
| L3: | Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. | 16-25 |
| L4: | Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. | 26-37 |
| L5: | Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. | 38-45 |
-

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 analyse the ways in which the occupying powers attempted to deal with the legacies of Nazism and war between 1945 to 1949 and provide a supported argument as to whether such dealings were effective or otherwise. They can, but do not need to, separate the legacies of war and Nazism and/or the dealings of the 'western powers' and the Russians, in which case they may arrive at separate conclusions but some material, e.g. the Nuremberg trials which overlaps such an approach would need to be incorporated into any argument.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the effectiveness of the actions of the occupying powers.

General Points:

- the Nazi Wehrmacht was disbanded, the Nazi Party was dissolved
- the Nuremberg trials dealt with major war criminals
- denazification was implemented, in accordance with agreements at Yalta and Potsdam in 1945. There was no re-emergence of Nazism
- reparations were exacted, but houses were built, food supplies restored and economic structures established to provide a reasonable standard of living for the German people and end the immediate wartime misery
- 'Experts' were used in all zones, whatever their past, provided they showed commitment to the future.

Specific to Russian zone:

- denazification was tied into a socialist restructuring of society but an amnesty, with re-education, was given to those prepared to help advance the socialist society and who were needed to do so, e.g. doctors.
- land reforms ensured an adequate food supply.

Specific to western zones:

- the initial mass internment of former Nazis was rapidly modified and a more individualistic approach adopted which enabled 'expertise' to be harnessed for rebuilding Germany (the Persil trials)
- Western allies worked towards establishment of democratic systems to revive German involvement in political future
- initial plans for harsh economic treatment were rapidly abandoned and Marshall Aid agreed June 1947 which led to economic co-operation and economic revival through Bizonia (and subsequently Trizonia).

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the ineffectiveness of the dealings of the occupying powers:

- initial 'relief' was chaotic and the wartime deprivations got worse (swelled by refugees) before they got better. Allied soldiers were instructed not to fraternise (although relaxed by Sept 1945) and a lack of co-operation between the four occupiers impeded action

- treatment differed, depending on the zonal occupier with the four Ds (demilitarisation, decentralisation, denazification and democratisation) addressed differently and the three latter were never fully applied
- clashes over Berlin – the western currency reforms of 1948 and subsequent Berlin blockade held back process of revival and perpetuated wartime problems (e.g. reintroduction of rationing in West).

Specific to western zones:

- the school system was not radically restructured and former Nazis remained in positions of authority, particularly at university level; 'Re-education' was limited in extent and thoroughness
- the initial witch-hunt of Nazis increased resentments since the Germans thought of themselves more as victims of Nazism and this made it more difficult for Germans to come to terms with their past – so perpetuating the wartime/Nazi legacy
- initial actions were harsh – dismantling industry and exacting reparations (although this policy was rapidly abandoned).

Specific to Russian Zone:

- Russians exacted harsh reparations, dismantled industry and weakened the economic structure, reducing productive capacity by 50%
- rather than addressing political issues, the Russians simply imposed another authoritarian regime on the peoples of the Eastern zone
- whilst denazification was more thorough, issues of control, subjection to repression and propaganda and the demand for blind obedience were perpetuated in the new regime.

In conclusion, students may observe that by the time of the division in 1949 the immediate post-war problems of housing, food supplies and employment had been largely addressed and new political regimes had been established to replace Nazism. However, in both west and east, issues remained making it difficult for the Germans to address their past fully and the cloud of Germany's Nazi/wartime past remained, which it would take many years to address.

Question 2

- 02** How successfully did the governments of West Germany deal with the economic and social problems of the 1960s and 1970s? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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 demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

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 identify the economic and social problems faced by the West German governments between 1963 and c1980. They will need to assess the successes and failures of policies and actions in trying to control these.

Students may refer to some of the following material in relation to economic problems:

- Germany's 'economic bubble' which had brought wide-ranging economic prosperity to post-war western Germany burst c1965. Between 1965 and c1982, German governments struggled to cope with inflation and rising unemployment
- an underlying economic problem was Germany's reliance on the US and the financial commitment this involved. For example, Erhard failed to get the US to agree to a reduction in the German contribution to the support of US troops in West Germany and his government fell as a result in 1966
- economic problems brought political problems. Kiesinger's 'grand alliance' of 1966 brought the socialists into government. But this ran into criticisms of a 'one-party state'. Kiesinger also faced hostility to his constitutional changes, allowing for emergency powers to go to a committee in the event of unrest – but such political control, was the product of economic unrest
- the 1960s saw various efforts to reduce public spending in order to halt rising inflation. However, economic improvements were made at the expense of welfare reform, which again had political repercussions. Pressure for social change gave Germany its first SPD Chancellor – Willi Brandt, in 1969
- whilst Brandt was successful in combining a range of welfare, educational, employment and liberalisation measures whilst still trying to control inflation, Germany was hit by the oil crisis from November 1973 and Schmidt's solution was to work within the EEC to control inflation and established the EMS (European monetary system) to fix exchange rates in Europe
- overall, to 1982, Germany fared quite well economically compared with the whole of western Europe. Standards of living increased and unemployment never rose above 8% (although foreign workers were not included in statistics).

Students may refer to some of the following material in relation to social problems:

- there was an outbreak of student protest in 1968 which combined social issues with political and international concerns (anti-Vietnam War). The government reacted in a heavy-handed way but was condemned for allowing excessive police brutality
- Willi Brandt passed a spate of social reforms as Chancellor (1969–74) – addressing welfare, education and employment as well as introducing liberalising legislation, for example lowering the voting age, making abortion easier and promoting the equality of the sexes. Such measures were extended throughout the period
- in the 1970s some students turned to more extreme violence and urban terrorism – including the Baader-Meinhof Gang which again forced a government crackdown – this time from the socialist government (under Brandt). Links to the PLO forced extreme government action but they did succeed in bringing the ring-leaders to justice
- Schmidt was particularly successful in refusing to give into terrorists in the Red Army Faction (linked to the B-M protest movement).

Students may use material relating to the 1980s and Helmut Kohl in order to comment on the outcomes of policies of the 1960s and 1970s. Such an approach can be valid as long as it is **used** to support a relevant argument and not narrative description for its own sake.

For example, students might refer to some of the following:

- between 1982 and 1989 Kohl returned to the social market economy reducing the high public spending prevalent since 1966. He introduced tax cuts, but it was a wider international revival, aided by a fall in oil prices from 1985, that helped the recovery of exports and brought a fall in inflation that he was able to claim credit for
- in the 1980s, Kohl introduced welfare measures to help the unemployed to get jobs, including reducing the retirement age and developing state training schemes.

In conclusion, students may perceive the connection between economic recession and social issues – particularly those of the disaffected youth. On the whole, governments dealt quite successfully with both, but not without political casualties and media condemnation. The economic issues of this period changed the course of German political development and whilst Kohl was to claim credit for putting Germany 'back on track' the recovery, as much as the earlier recession, was primarily a reflection of a wider international situation.

Question 3

- 03** 'The survival of Ulbricht and Honecker as leaders of the GDR between 1949 and 1989 was entirely dependent on the support given by the USSR.'
Assess the validity of this view (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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 demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

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 evaluate the part played by the USSR in the survival of the Ulbricht and Honecker as leaders in the GDR between 1949 and 1989. They may balance the contribution of the USSR against other factors which preserved these men in power or they may argue around the ways in which the USSR was or was not helpful to them. Either approach, or a combination of the two is acceptable.

Students may refer to some of the following material which shows the value of support from the USSR:

- initial involvement as the occupying power ensured a firm political regime and economic structure within which the leaders worked. (The GDR was also supported by Comecon (1950) and the Warsaw Pact whereby the USSR provided for its economic support and military protection)
- Ulbricht was favoured as the first leader because he had lived in USSR 1937–45
- following the 1953 rising, Russian tanks were used to quell unrest – and thus restore Ulbricht's authority
- Ulbricht's loyalty at the time of the Hungarian rising of 1956 was rewarded by the shelving of plans to remove him as too hard-line.
- Russia backed Ulbricht and permitted the building of the Berlin Wall 1961
- from 1971, the USSR chose to support Honecker as a man who could take GDR forward with Socialist reforms
- propaganda and the emphasis on links with the world superpower, which had military strength and scientific technology, helped with the stability and acceptance of Honecker's regime.

Nevertheless, the involvement of the USSR was not always an advantage to either leader:

- in the years to 1950, the USSR continued to demand heavy reparations (25% of all industrial goods) making it difficult for Ulbricht to revitalise the GDR economy
- economically, the leaders were limited by USSR/Comecon demands
- in 1953 USSR put Ulbricht under pressure to modify policies (during period of détente with west). They only relented after the 1953 rising was crushed
- Ulbricht only just survived Khrushchev's secret speech in 1956; Plans in Moscow to replace him were shelved when the Hungarian rising broke out
- the importance of USSR backing became apparent after Gorbachev came to power in USSR and followed a policy of perestroika from 1985. Without USSR as a prop, Honecker could not control the voices of dissent and was forced to resign in 1989.

Other influences on the survival of the leaders might include:

- western attitudes of non-interference in the internal affairs of a soviet-bloc country
- loans from FRG (Ostpolitik)
- skill, particularly of Honecker, in policy formulation and in winning loyalty and support
- propaganda and repression
- apathy and acceptance within the soviet state (the niche society).

In conclusion, students may suggest that whilst the backing of the USSR certainly perpetuated the East German state, its leaders were at all times vulnerable to political change in USSR and were effectively puppets of that regime. Whilst other influences helped keep them in power, the Russian interest could sometimes be a threat to their own positions, so that they were not 'entirely' dependent on the USSR, nevertheless the leaders of the GDR were, in reality, dispensable Russian pawns.