

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative G Units 1, 4 and 6 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

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 from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations

- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills**: generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1866-1990

AS Unit 1: Imperial and Weimar Germany, 1866-1925

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of “the German November Revolution” in the context of political change in Germany at the end of the First World War. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that the “Revolution” was the political take over of Germany by the SPD who failed to curtail the power of the army and missed the chance to reconstruct German society. **1**

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. aware of the impact of World War I on the imperial regime, sets revolution in context with reference to the change from an absolute monarchy to a universally elected civilian government. Reference may be made to the naval mutinies, setting up of soviets, left wing government in Bavaria (October 1918) the Kaiser’s abdication, Ebert’s leadership, the Ebert-Groener Pact, the armistice (November 1918) and/or the incomplete nature of the Revolution, with the retention of traditional elites, army, judiciary and civil service. Reward any valid comments. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source B** challenges the views put forward in **Source A** about the state of the German army at the end of the First World War. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source A says the army’s performances “call for admiration” and that the army was “stabbed in the back” at the end of the war, whereas Source B says there were increasing numbers of “acts of cowardice and refusal to follow orders” in the final months of the war. **1-2**

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. explains the German military failure when faced with American troops, the enforced retreat (August 1918), the threat of invasion (September), the disintegration of military morale and the “stab in the back” myth as the civilian government was forced into negotiating an armistice. Candidates may show a grasp of the context of the sources and/or make direct, although limited comment on the nature and of the sources, explaining Hindenburg’s statement as a piece of self-justification as against Bessel’s factual historian’s account. **3-5**
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. a candidate might develop the information above and point out that the two sources are at least partly reconcilable, with Source A, the statement of an embittered general trying to defend himself against the situation described in Source B of which he was all too well aware. Candidates who show a good understanding of Hindenburg’s position and influence and are able to draw conclusions from an effective and evaluative overall appraisal of the sources should be placed in this level, alongside those whose wider understanding of the army’s performance enables them to make some convincing overall comment on the different views of the sources. **6-7**

(c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the position and attitude in the army, in relation to other factors, in explaining the difficulties faced by the new German government in the years 1918 to 1923. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions but will have valid links.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources – The sources all provide material on the position and attitude of the army. Source A shows the army's attitude to the peace and the "stab in the back" myth, masking the responsibility of the Generals and helping them preserve their reputations and positions in the Weimar era. Source B demonstrates the sapping of army morale at the end of the war, leaving many ordinary soldiers with the need to blame someone for their plight and so receptive to the elite's condemnation of the unpatriotic Weimar politicians. These men also provided potential recruits for extremist movements. Source C comments on the survival of the army's power as leading to political extremism and a grave mistake by the SPD politicians.

From own knowledge – Ebert's co-operative pact with Groener should be evaluated; the army was both a help (destruction of Spartacists and left wing) and a liability (army's refusal to help against Kapp Putsch, maintaining the army in a strong position so strengthening the right while making co-operation with the left impossible). The Freikorps of demobilised soldiers and officers might be discussed and shown as a destabilising force who were, in time, to provide a recruiting ground for Hitler's SA. The position and attitude of the army also need to be linked to the growth of right-wing extremism and in particular the Kapp Putsch (1920) and Munich Putsch (1923). The influence of the "stab in the back" myth should be considered and its widespread acceptance shown as a factor increasing hostility to the Republic and weakening the chances of democratic survival.

For a balanced answer, candidates should also examine other factors explaining the difficulties of the Republic. These are likely to include: hostility from the left; the influence of other right wing elites; problems posed by the Weimar constitution and economic problems, particularly reparations and hyperinflation.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points about the army and/or the difficulties of the Weimar Republic, either from own knowledge or the sources alone. They may be excessively generalised and assertive.

Level 2 answers will show a better use of the sources or some relevant own knowledge but answers will be unbalanced (either paying little if any heed to "other factors" or looking only at these and not at the army's position, or covering only a small section of the period), very descriptive or limited in relevant comment.

Level 3 responses will have a greater range of material and drawing on both sources and own knowledge to show some understanding of the demands of the question. However, there may be an imbalance of treatment or limited depth to the knowledge or understanding of the inherent position of the army.

At Level 4 there will be better balance between the influence of the army and other factors and the answer will show good use of both sources and own knowledge in support of its arguments.

Level 5 responses will show greater analysis and judgement and a sophisticated understanding of the army's position as part of the continued right wing influence which undermined the values of the Weimar Republic.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “National Liberals” in the context of Bismarck's Germany. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was a political party which favoured unification or parliamentary government, had moderate to left wing views or were the dominant party in the 1870s. The source might be repeated to suggest some national Liberals wanted further constitutional change. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. how the Liberals had supported unification and a “liberal” constitutional government and how, despite differences of outlook had found themselves at one with Bismarck in legislation for the unity of Germany in the 1870s. Reference might be made to their support for the Kulturkampf and their dispensability when Bismarck veered to more conservative policies from 1878. Candidates might point out that, although the strength of the party was ruined by the protection crisis, a small number continued to follow Bismarck and participated in the Liberal/Conservative Kartell of 1887. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bismarck opposed any extension of parliamentary (Reichstag) power after 1871. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Bismarck disliked any challenge to his own position and felt he had given away enough in 1871, or he was a natural conservative who was frightened of giving power to his “enemies” (Reichsfeinde) – the Centre (Catholics) and the Socialists. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explains how Bismarck believed the constitution of 1871 to be more than “adequate” (the Empire was unified and his aims had become defensive, guarding against change) and at times complained that the people were not using it as intended (particularly when he faced opposition within the Reichstag – the Catholic Centre Party in the earlier 1870s and the Socialists from 1878 [these reichsfeinde were seen as disloyal]); the constitution gave him sufficient power to ignore any demands for change; Bismarck wanted to retain the dominance of the Kaiser, Prussia and the elites; he believed in ministerial responsibility to the Kaiser alone and regarded himself as “above” party politics; he had and Emperor in Wilhelm I whose views coincided with his own; jointly they believed that the army should be beyond the control of the “fickle and uneducated” (this led to the curbing of parliamentary power over the military budget,

1874 and the argument over army estimates, 1887); parties within the Reichstag were too divided to form a united front to demand change and their powers too limited to exert pressure on the Kaiser and Bismarck. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. balances points stressing the strength of Bismarck's position against the relative weakness of the Reichstag using some of the points made in Level 2 above, or draws conclusions about Bismarck's attitude as an "authoritarian" ruler, or a Chancellor who tried hard to make the parliamentary constitution work. Reward any attempts to link the factors given in Level 2 effectively and with a good conceptual understanding of the positions of Bismarck/the political parties and/or the Kaiser. **6-7**

(c) "Bismarck preserved his power until 1890 by maintaining a skilful balancing act between the various political groupings." Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers should focus on Bismarck's dealings with the political parties and other political groupings and his use of coalitions and political support to get his way in government. Candidates must assess whether he preserved power by balancing the political groupings one against the other or whether other factors were equally or more important.

Evidence that he preserved his power by balancing political groups effectively would include: his reliance on the National Liberals to counter the Centre Party to 1878, and on the Conservatives to counter the Socialists from then on; the alliance of Steel and Rye which enabled Bismarck to counter Liberal and left wing demands and his Kartell of 1887, used to weaken the Centre which had become an unreliable ally against the SPD.

Other factors preserving Bismarck's power might include: the support of the Kaiser (essential); his personal prestige as the architect of unity; his natural political skill which led him to change policies according to circumstances; the support of the elites; economic policies; his reputation and ability in foreign affairs and huge prestige abroad.

Candidates might argue that Bismarck was able to rule without relying on political groupings because he had the support of the Kaiser and was answerable only to him, or they might take the opposite stance that because he needed support within the Reichstag in order to pass legislation, he had to have political allies and much of his time was occupied by the need to maintain a majority support. They could even take the view that his "balancing act" was more between Kaiser and Reichstag.

Answers at Level 1 will either contain a few generalised points or offer a brief and poorly focused account of some of Bismarck's political alliances or policies.

Most Level 2 answers will be largely descriptive although some that try to respond to the question but are very thin or unbalanced, e.g. concentrating on the 1870s only, might appropriately be placed here.

Level 3 answers will attempt to "agree or disagree" and although the analysis may be slim in places will try to respond to the question showing a reasonable grasp of material and some understanding of Bismarck's position and attitude.

Level 4 answers will contain more precise evidence and a better balance and understanding. Candidates may argue whichever way they please but they must explain "why", with some reference to the opposing case.

Level 5 answers will have a sustained argument, and a good conceptual grasp of the workings of politics and parliamentary government in the Bismarckian period.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "concessions to the working classes" in the context of Germany in 1890. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. (from the source) Wilhelm never understood how to treat the workers so his policies veered between helping the working classes and repressing them; or (showing a little knowledge) the concessions refer to welfare legislation or social reforms to help the workers'; or "this refers to the repeal of the anti-socialist legislation" (presented without further explanation). 1

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. some explanation of the context of "1890". In 1889 Bismarck had proposed that the Anti-Socialist law be made permanent, but the new Emperor, Wilhelm II, believed he could win over the

workers by giving them more state insurance benefits. Bismarck was dismissed and General Caprivi launched the “new course” (limited working hours for many groups including all women and boys under 16 and allowed the anti-socialist laws to lapse). The results disappointed Wilhelm II, the Socialist Party grew (more votes, although not seats, than any other party in 1893), Wilhelm changed course and Caprivi resigned in 1894. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why there were many changes in social and economic policies in Germany in the years 1890-1913. **(7 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. (from source) changes were the result of the Kaiser’s inconsistency; or (from own knowledge) changes were the result of the frequent changes of Chancellor; a response to changing economic circumstances (growth of industrialisation, pressures of socialism, position of the junkers). **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the event through relevant and appropriately selected material. Candidates may comment on some of the following, e.g. Social policies changing from Caprivi and the New Course 1890, to pressure for anti-socialist and anti-trade union legislation because of growing support for Socialists and their revolutionary demands voiced in the Erfurt Programme 1891 (rejected by the Reichstag) – reverting to welfare schemes (while Bülow was preoccupied with foreign policy), e.g. accident and sickness insurance and limitations on children’s work in 1899 – then repression (time of rapid trade union growth) in 1905 – a hostile attitude which was maintained (with Wilhelm’s growing disinterest in domestic affairs) despite the success of the Socialists in gaining a Reichstag majority 1912. Economic policies – Tariff reductions designed to benefit Germany’s growing industries by reducing customs duties on agricultural products so that the reciprocating countries would buy German industrial goods (1891) were countered because the junkers (favoured by the Kaiser and regarded as essential in the running of the Empire and army) suffered and (through powerful pressure groups) argued for protection. In return for helping pass the Naval Laws of 1898 and 1900 they got a protection law in 1902 against Russian grain. Because of mounting defence costs from 1900 there was a constant need to find extra revenue. Inheritance tax was defeated in 1909 and 1912 because it hit the conservative elites, but in 1913 a tax on increases in the value of property was accepted because financial pressure left no alternative. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. shows how policy choices were often dependent on short term considerations, or how the conservative elite influence held back all experiments with progressive social and economic reform. Candidates might also be placed in this level for showing a good conceptual understanding of the Kaiser or the nature of imperial society. **6-7**

- (c) “Kaiser Wilhelm II had little interest in domestic policy and left internal affairs to his chancellors.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The focus of this question is on Kaiser Wilhelm II’s disinterest in domestic policy and it requires some assessment of his relationship with his chancellors and of who was responsible for the formulation of internal policy.

Evidence that the Kaiser was disinterested in domestic policy might include comments on his peripatetic lifestyle which kept him away from Berlin, his dislike for routine work, his passionate interest in all things military, the influence of Weltpolitik and his preoccupation with foreign policy. Candidates might cite the Daily Telegraph Affair (1908) or the Zabern Incident (1913) or even the moves to war (1914) as examples of his ignorance of, and disinterest in, the main issues of social division and the need for political reform within Germany.

Evidence of the Kaiser’s interest in domestic policies might come from an examination of his relationship with his Chancellors – his confrontation with Bismarck and differences over social policy in 1890 – Caprivi’s resignation after he tried to resist Wilhelm’s demand for a new anti-Socialist Law (1894) – the appointment of the sycophants, Hohenloe and Bülow, in an attempt to prevent internal change and ensure domestic policy followed the lines approved by the Kaiser, and the frustrations of Bethmann Hollweg who, like Caprivi, found himself unable to pursue an independent line. Wilhelm’s interventions and inconsistency in his

attitude to domestic policy may be exemplified from the source; he wanted concessions for the working class in 1890, repression in 1905; tariff reductions in 1892, but protection in 1902. Candidates may also mention the furore he caused when he interfered in domestic affairs as in the Daily Telegraph interview.

Candidates may argue that the Kaiser did indeed have little interest in domestic policies, but at time felt obliged to intervene in order to maintain the elitist/militarist society which he favoured; alternatively they may suggest that he was determined to maintain his power in all matters and certainly regarded internal affairs as his concern – acting as the master of his chancellors at all times (as evidenced by the many changes of chancellor and some of the chancellors' letters bemoaning their position). Some may conclude that Wilhelm II was totally unpredictable and only ever used his powers negatively – others that he had a personal vision for Germany and was consistent in his internal aims. Another possible line is that neither the Kaiser nor chancellors could ever be fully responsible for the direction of internal affairs because of the need to take the Reichstag into consideration.

Level 1 answers will make generalised, simplistic and undeveloped statements about Kaiser Wilhelm II, his chancellors or some of his policies, or will describe without clear reference to the question.

Level 2 answers will be largely descriptive but they will contain at least some implicit links showing some awareness of the development of internal affairs under Wilhelm II. These answers may cover only a small part of his reign and will almost invariably agree with the statement.

Level 3 answers will be aware of the need to “agree or disagree” and will make more comment on material presented. These answers will show a reasonable grasp of the whole reign (at least to 1914) although the detail may be better in some areas than others.

At Level 4 there will be greater analysis and a greater awareness of debate backed by effective use of evidence; this will produce a more balanced answer.

Level 5 responses will argue throughout and make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgements based on a developed conceptual understanding of the development of domestic affairs under Wilhelm II. (Note even at this level candidates do not necessarily need to examine internal developments 1914-1918.)

Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1866-1990**A2 Unit 4: Germany, c1880-c1980****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain what is meant by “export-orientated industries” in the context of the development of the German economy before the First World War. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. that German industrial growth before the First World War had been dependent on the “world market” and driven by a healthy trade in exports. This situation contrasted with the “catastrophic” situation in wartime when the allied blockade cut industries off from their markets. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. the response may be thin, but it will show understanding. It is likely to explain what the “export orientated industries” were and also explain, at least in part, that Germany relied on the export of staple products, e.g. produced two thirds of European steel, half of Europe’s coal as well as iron, heavy metal, engineering products and cotton goods. It also exported the products of its newer industries particularly chemicals and electrical goods. Candidates may point out that the revenue from exports helped fund continuing industrial growth and enabled Germany to pay for vital imports of foodstuffs and raw materials in this period, such as cotton. They may develop detail from the source, or comment further on the context to be placed at the top of this level. **2-3**
- L3: As at Level 2, but with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge. Answers at this level will be fuller. They may contain greater detail, perhaps referring to export figures, which more than tripled 1880-1913, to changes in trade patterns; for instance in 1873, 38% of exports were finished industrial products, but by 1913 this had risen to 63%, or explaining the government’s support for export orientated industries through tariffs, subsidies and preferential freight rates or the role of the banks in financing the expansion of exports. Alternatively, they may show a greater understanding of the place of export-orientated industries in the rapidly developing Wilhelmine economy, referring to the “dynamic growth of German industry” and explaining how export-led industries encouraged overseas investment in the Americas and the Near and Far East (almost £1,250 million in 1914). Other candidates may gain Level 3 by drawing conclusions from the evidence they provide and demonstrating judgement. They might, for example, comment on how the export-orientated industries changed the balance of economic power in Europe, so that by 1913 Germany’s share of the world trade almost equalled that of Britain and was twice the size of the French share. **4-5**

- (b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Comment on the usefulness of **Sources B** and **C** in explaining changes in the German economy from the late nineteenth century to the 1950s. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Candidates at Level 1 are likely to make some simple observations about each source, perhaps quoting a few key statistics. From Source B they might point to the marked growth of all coal and steel to 1940, interrupted only by the years of war and periods of inter-war depression. They might also observe that the growth of the newer industries of cars and chemicals from 1945 was clearly far greater than that of these staples. From Source C they might indicate the steady decline in the numbers living in smaller communities under 2,000, compared with the dramatic growth of numbers in communities of over 20,000.

Level 2 candidates will demonstrate explicit understanding of the utility of both sources, with reference to own knowledge of changes in the German economy from the late nineteenth century to the 1950s, but, as at Level 1, will still be largely dependent on what the statistics show. These answers will develop the points at Level 1 above using own knowledge, e.g. they may explain (using Source B) how the traditional staple industries (coal and steel) enjoyed a dramatic growth to 1913 aided by Germany's geographic advantages, the availability of credit, high levels of education and government support. The "second industrial revolution" in chemicals and cars can be seen to have shown an even more dramatic growth from 1910, but the depression of 1923 with the French invasion of the Ruhr for coal and steel, and the implications of the 1930s depression for all industrial development, can also be observed in the figures. Able candidates may also explain the discrepancy between the post-war performance of the more "modern" cars, chemicals and steel as opposed to the older coal industry. Clearly the growth of industry went hand in hand with the growing size of communities (urbanisation) as shown in Source C, and candidates may explain this with reference to internal migration to the development of industrial areas such as the Ruhr.

Level 3 candidates will draw conclusions about the utility of the sources in relation to changes in the German economy from the late nineteenth century to the 1950s, with reference to both sources and own knowledge. These answers will provide some direct comment on

the sources, offering some overall conclusion and attempting to reconcile the two sources. They might, for example refer to their presentation of factual information but absence of comment and the problems of the division of Germany post-1945. The limitations of the sources are likely to be alluded to, with specific reference to the need for further knowledge of political and international developments, in order to place the sources in context and understand the statistics fully.

Level 4 candidates will use material selected appropriately from both the sources and own knowledge to reach sustained judgement about the utility of the sources in relation to the changes in the German economy from the late nineteenth century to the 1950s. Such answers will acknowledge that both sources are useful as providing factual support for any survey, but that for a full picture an understanding of the many influences on economic development would be needed. At this level, candidates should be precise about limitations of the sources as evidence. Candidates might also develop the links or comparisons between the sources, for example the growth of large communities in the years 1871-1910, reflecting the dramatic take-off of industry in the same period, with similar comparisons between the levelling in the 1920s and the more accelerated growth rates post-1945. Answers should demonstrate supported judgement and provide firm conclusions about the place of these sources in any examination of economic growth, perhaps suggesting that an awareness of political developments might be of greater value in understanding economic change rather than bald statistics.

(c) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

“The growth and modernisation of the German economy between 1880 and 1980 was a story of continuous success.”

Assess the validity of this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion.

5-8

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.
12-13
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.
14-15

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question. It is not anticipated that coverage of the 100 year period will necessarily be complete but there should be some awareness of the 100 year timescale for the award of Level 3 and clear reference to the whole period, perhaps by citing key incidents and issues, effectively, but not necessarily equally, for Levels 4 and 5.

Candidates will need to examine the growth and modernisation of the German economy between 1880 and 1980, exploring aspects of "success". The given sources should lead them to question the concept of "continuous success" and examine the impact of factors such as depression, political change and war. By examining continuity and change in this way, candidates should be able to produce a relevant and supported assessment of the validity of the given view.

Candidates should glean a good deal of useful material from the sources. Source A provides material on economic success in the pre-1914 period, but also points to the catastrophic effects of the First World War. Source B illustrates the varying cycles of growth and illustrates the down-turns caused by depression, political change and war. Source C provides statistics supporting overall economic growth by showing the pattern of urbanisation, while Source D provides useful information on types of growth in the post-1949 period.

Candidates will need to examine the overall degree of success and explain the pattern of growth and modernisation with reference to their own knowledge; e.g. they might refer to the growth of old and new industries, technological change, investment, employment, the redistribution of the labour force, and the expansion of trade and exports. They might also indicate the underlying factors affecting change and modernisation throughout this period, such as population growth, Germany's geographic advantages, the banking system, education, supportive government policies and the contribution of trade agreements and overseas aid as in the Dawes and Marshall Plans.

Candidates should also refer to disruptions to the continuity of economic success; e.g. they might refer to the economic depression 1873-1895 when the expansion of the railways slowed down and investment fell, the problems of war from 1914 and the difficulties of the immediate post-World War I period, the Ruhr invasion, 1923, the impact of the Wall Street

Crash and the decline of international trade 1929-1933, the effect of Nazi economic policies, World War II and the post-war legacy, the divergence of East/West Germany and the effect of the world oil crisis from 1973.

At Level 1, answers may be very limited in timescale, or be based on unsupported general assertions. Alternatively they may be very descriptive, with no explicit attempt to address the question, or relevant but limited to a few source references.

Level 2 answers may lack any source reference, but will otherwise try to address the question, or they may use the sources but produce an answer which only makes limited links to the question. Alternatively the answer may be assertive in type and very unbalanced.

For Level 3, there should be some awareness of the 100 year period although there may be considerable unevenness and lack of balance. These answers will display use of sources and own knowledge and will try to respond to the question, although the understanding may not be entirely convincing.

For an award at Level 4 there should be reasonable coverage of the whole timescale, and a clear analytical approach showing understanding and judgement.

Level 5 answers will balance factors effectively, revealing a high level of understanding and displaying sustained judgement.

Section B: the Third Reich and its Legacy 1933-1965

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

“In his 12 years of rule in Germany, Hitler’s methods of government produced massive confusion and inefficiency.”

“Hitler was a strong dictator who thoroughly and effectively imposed his will on every part of the regime.”

Explain which of these two statements better reflects the methods and achievements of Hitler’s government in Germany in the years 1933 to 1945. *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content:

Answers should focus on the government of Nazi Germany and try to assess whether it was marked by “massive confusion and inefficiency”, or worked effectively and efficiently under the strong hand of Hitler. Good answers should, as directed, refer to 1933-1945, i.e. both peace and wartime.

Candidates should consider how the Nazi political system worked, and may refer to the Nazi ideology, (Social Darwinism and the Führerprinzip), the dual nature of the state (with its retention of the pre-Nazi conservative elite alongside new Nazi officials), the competition between Nazi ministers such as Himmler and Goering, and the place of rival Nazi party structures. The nature of decision making might also be discussed with particular reference to Hitler’s own laziness and disinterest in details balanced against his “hold” over his ministers and his insistence on taking ultimate decisions. Candidates may show an understanding of the historiographical debate of “polycracy” versus “totalitarianism”, and the “weak” versus “strong” dictator, but it is more important that answers try to make some evaluation of the effectiveness of Hitler’s methods of government, not only examining

Hitler's leadership style but also looking at government in practice. Reference might also be made to change in patterns of government over time, with the SS emerging as the dominant force from 1939.

At Level 1, answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing with one of the quotations and backed by very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the government of Nazi Germany but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced, perhaps looking solely at Hitler's personal "dictatorship" or largely descriptive with a few links.

At Level 3, answers will show greater understanding of the complex workings of the Nazi government and offer some limited analysis of its efficiency.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis examining the connections and links between the various governmental agencies and the place of Hitler himself. Such answers will be wide ranging, perhaps distinguishing between central and local government, and demonstrate a good understanding of the structure of government and the difficulty of assessing where power lay.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness of both the ambiguities inherent in Hitler's position and actions and the realities of everyday administration.

Question 3

"Between 1933 and 1939 most Germans readily accepted, or even wholeheartedly supported, the Nazi regime."

How accurate is this comment on German attitudes to the Third Reich before the war?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should focus on the popularity of the Nazis in the pre-war period, assessing the evidence of acceptance and support for the regime in the light of the candidate's understanding of the nature of the regime. Candidates will need to consider whether the Germans were willing supporters, seduced by the propaganda or forced into acceptance through fear of denunciation to the Gestapo. Better answers will also attempt to differentiate between different groups of people and take issue with the term "most Germans".

Candidates should consider the appeal of Nazi policies – economic revival and an end to unemployment; the idea of Volksgemeinschaft and the attractions of movements like Strength through Joy and the Hitler Youth; the Führer myth; anti-communism and even anti-semitism. They might refer to the restoration of national pride, international recognition and

the enforcement of law and order. They should also consider which groups (e.g. workers, youth) were most attracted by the Nazis' policies.

To provide a balanced argument, candidates should also consider those sections of the population which actively opposed Nazi policies, e.g. elements within the Church, the army and the dissident youth, and the extent to which the Germans were living in a police state and were unable to voice their true opinions. References, for example, could be made to the influence of the Gestapo, SS, judicial system and concentration camps.

Candidates might also refer to the recent historical debate (advocated by Peukert and Welch) on the extent to which the Germans were "depoliticised", i.e. encouraged to leave politics to the party and so became "passive consumers".

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing with the quotation and backed by very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts of Nazi propaganda and/or policies showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced (probably accepting the quotation without question) or largely descriptive of attitudes and policies with some rather assertive comment and other incidental links.

At Level 3 answers should show a better understanding of German attitudes of the Third Reich and offer some limited analysis of acceptance and support, aware that differing groups had different reactions.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis examining the nature of the Nazi regime, analysing the term "most Germans" and balancing acceptance of the Third Reich against fear of reprisals for failure to support. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate clear understanding of the demands of the question.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and conceptual awareness in their consideration of differing groups, and the reasons for their individual responses.

Question 4

To what extent was it the attraction of West German wealth and consumer goods, rather than intolerable political oppression, which led so many East Germans to cross the border to West Germany between 1945 and 1961? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should focus on the reasons for East German migration to the West up to the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. To answer this question effectively candidates will need

to examine the economic and political situation in East Germany in these years and contrast this with the situation in Western Germany. From this they should be able to assess whether those seeking to leave East Germany were “driven out” by political oppression or simply attracted by the prospects of greater wealth “on the other side”.

Politically, candidates will need to assess the “repression” of the communist system of the GDR in which the police, (Stasi) education system and law courts were used to enforce loyalty to the party and state. The importance of membership of the party (essential for certain professions) might be cited as a curb on personal freedom. The use of Soviet troops to crush the strike of 1953 might be mentioned as an example of repression. Nevertheless, at least some evidence should be cited which suggests the political circumstances may not have felt particularly oppressive to a large number of GDR citizens. They might refer to the view (as expressed by M. Fulbrook) that many East Germans did come to accept (possibly through indoctrination and propaganda) the politics of the regime and were grateful for the welfare benefits, guaranteed employment, education and housing which it provided.

To assess the influence of the “attraction of Western wealth and consumer goods”, the economic situation in the west should be explained with reference to the injections of American capital (Marshall Aid); the “social market economy” policy of Erhard; the FRG’s “economic miracle”; the wide availability of consumer goods and the high standard of living, which contrasted with the economic situation in East Germany where the loss of plant (taken by the USSR) and materials and markets in the West, combined with attempts to control the economy, giving priority to heavy industry over consumer production to the 1950s, increasing working hours, and collectivising agriculture meant lower standards of living and limited availability of consumer goods. Nevertheless, candidates might stress that the GDR enjoyed the highest living standards and the best economic recovery rates in the Eastern bloc, and for some citizens the welfare benefits were an adequate compensation for fewer consumer luxuries.

In assessing the reasons for emigration from the East to the West, candidates are likely to conclude that it was indeed the lure of western wealth that was the more important, although there were always some who left for political reasons and the escalation in the number of emigrants from 1958 (which led to the construction of the Berlin Wall) may have been specifically related to political encroachments on personal freedom with a new labour code banning strikes and tightening factory discipline and the decision to collectivise all remaining farms.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions about the FRG and GDR, probably agreeing with the thrust of the question and backed by very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the differing circumstance of the two countries and some of the reasons for East-West emigration, but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced or largely descriptive of developments in the FRG and GDR with only a few, perhaps implicit links.

At Level 3 answers should show a greater understanding of the reasons for emigration and offer some limited analysis of the “push and pull” influences on emigrants.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis, examining the connections and links between emigration from the East and the contrasting political and economic

development of East and West Germany. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate explicit understanding of the issues involved.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness, possibly challenging or at least questioning, the suggested view.

Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1866-1990**A2 Unit 6: The Re-Unification of Germany, c1969-1990****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of the view in **Source B** about Kohl's attitude to the financial weakness of the GDR in 1989-1990. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. **6-8**
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the extract, e.g. will observe that Kohl "underestimated" the extent to which the East German economy was in difficulties, that "the economic development of East Germany required state intervention on a large scale" and that Kohl ignored problems because he was "reluctant to lose voters" in an election year.

At Level 2 candidates will introduce elements of own knowledge as well as showing some understanding of the given interpretation, although this may be implicit. While they will probably acknowledge that the source provides only one individual view, by providing corroborative own knowledge of the weaknesses of the GDR's centralised economy, the problems of under-investment, particularly in consumer goods, the mounting debt, and the GDR's reliance on injections of West German capital, they are likely to show support for Kettenacker's view that Kohl's chose to ignore or underestimate the grave financial weakness of the GDR in 1989-1990. However, a candidate showing implicit disagreement with the interpretation, suggesting Kohl knew exactly what he was doing or that the financial weaknesses were not as bad as suggested, but without clear support for these views, might also be placed in this level.

Level 3 answers will contain more extensive own knowledge and will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2. They are likely to emphasise that the comments made in Source B provide a useful appraisal from a distance by a modern West German historian. However, they might point out that these comments are the opinion of a writer with a pro-FRG standpoint (supported by phrases like "undeniable success"). The interpretation in the source that the economic development of East Germany required large scale state intervention or that there was no concerted effort to steady the economy in these years can be questioned. The source provides little detail of the context of 1989-1990, so that the validity of the view is limited by the need for further details of the GDR's financial position and of its

“prop”, the USSR. Furthermore, the comments on Kohl’s motives and attitude (“unprepared”, “reluctant”, “short-sighted”) can only be Kettenacker’s opinion and can be balanced by more positive interpretations of Kohl’s motives.

At Level 4 answers will offer a more balanced and sustained appraisal, perhaps with reference to the set reading material. At this level, candidates are more likely to question the given interpretation and perhaps the implication of the source that Kohl and the FRG could have done more to bolster the financial weaknesses of the East.

(b) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source A** as evidence about the attitude of the East German people to reunification in 1990? (10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will make simple statements related to the content of the extract, e.g. pick out the references to “tens of thousands shouted with joy” or to the “liberation from suppression and want”.

Level 2 answers will explore utility at a general level, demonstrating appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source. They may develop the comment in the source about “darkness coming to an end” and the fears of the pensioners, unemployed and small savers being assuaged by the promises of a better life. In this way the source usefully shows how the East Germans were won over by western propaganda which responded to their fears and needs. On the other hand the source is limited in what is actually revealed about East German attitudes. Earlier quiescence (the absence of popular protest after June 1953 or the support of the professional classes for a regime which provided them with opportunities for work and promotion), for example, is not mentioned.

At Level 3 answers will give more careful consideration to both utility and its limitations, demonstrating a reasoned understanding of the source in context. Candidates are likely to question the rosy picture of East German enthusiasm given in Source A and are likely to refer to attitudes within the East German reform movement, which favoured change without reunification. They may also question Kohl’s intentions and his own commitment to his promises. Answers are likely to emphasise that the source provides the views of a pro-FRG

commentator who is likely to have deliberately chosen material and voiced opinions to support the theme and title of his book “The Rush to German Unity”.

Level 4 answers will provide a clear evaluation of the source as a piece of evidence and offer sustained judgement. At this level, candidates will certainly question the utility of this source and might refer to other useful material, particularly “Anatomy of a Dictatorship” by Mary Fulbrook. They will also show an awareness of the differing conclusions that might be drawn from Kohl’s speeches, and from East Germans’ reactions to them.

(c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

“Without the determination and personal efforts of Helmut Kohl, the reunification of Germany, in 1990, would never have taken place.”

Assess the validity of this opinion.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion.

7-11

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

The focus of the answer should be on the personal contribution of Helmut Kohl to the reunification of Germany. His determination and efforts should be assessed rather than simply described, and there should also be some attempt to consider whether the reunification in 1990 would have taken place without him.

From the sources, candidates should identify Kohl's promises (Sources A and B), motives (Sources B and C), his specific contribution to the speed of reunification (Sources A and C), and some of the limitations on his achievements in 1990 (Sources B and C).

Kohl's determination and personal efforts might include:

As Chancellor from 1982 he inherited and developed the Ostpolitik policy of Willy Brandt and by November 1989, following the reform of USSR under Gorbachev, glasnost, the end of the cold war, and the growth of the reform movement within the GDR, he produced his own 10 point plan for unification. His initial assumption that it would be a long term business was altered by his enthusiastic welcome by the people of East Germany in December 1989, and from the beginning of 1990 he took the initiative. Rejecting the plan for a militarily neutral reunited Germany drawn up by the East German leader, Hans Modrow, he negotiated the Two Plus Four agreements (February-September 1990), won over the USSR with promises of money, created the currency union in July 1990 and led the official reunification October 1990.

However, his personal contribution might be criticised or tempered by the following observations:

The reunification could not have taken place outside the context of the events in Eastern Europe as a whole in 1989-1990, nor without the background of Ostpolitik and the co-operation between the two states of the FRG and the GDR that had been developed from 1969. Nor could Kohl ever have acted alone. He was at all times dependent on the support of the USA, and to a lesser extent, the goodwill of Britain and France. He was also aided by the circumstances of the USSR and its willingness to co-operate.

Suggestions that reunification would have taken place in 1990 anyway, even without Kohl might include:

Modrow's plans for reunification; the attitude of the USSR, which was keen to disentangle itself from commitments to GDR and to support any viable plan, and the dire financial weakness of the GDR.

Knowledge of relevant ideas, issues, arguments and differing interpretations should also be expected (in addition to the judicious use of specific factual material) for answers reaching Levels 4 and 5.

References from the set-reading material might include:

Garton Ash on the importance of the attitude of USSR and the slow development of the relationship between Kohl and Gorbachev; Mary Fulbrook for the view that once the borders were opened there was little hope the GDR could survive on its own; Kettenacker's belief that the GDR was doomed anyway, and that it was the collapse of the SED and the involvement of the international community, particularly the USA and USSR, which provided momentum – not Kohl and Jarausch's more specific stress on Kohl's contribution and his claim that it was the "miracle of Moscow" (Kohl's meeting with Gorbachev, July 15th 1990) which was decisive.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to restrict themselves to describing and defining what the sources say. Source A describes the content and effect of Kohl's speeches while Source B provides evidence of the unresolved problems following the collapse of the GDR which Kohl is accused of ignoring. Source C refers to Kohl's "astuteness and strength" and is clearly supportive of his efforts.

At Level 2, answers will either provide some comment on the statement but will have only limited information in support or they will be primarily narrative/descriptive of Kohl's contribution to reunification, with limited comment.

By Level 3 there will be a genuine attempt to debate the validity of the given opinion, with some range of evidence. Candidates are likely to consider a number of factors hastening unification, looking not only at the part of Kohl but also some other factors such as the impact of Soviet policy, the contribution of the international community, the effect of the opening of the borders and the end of the Berlin Wall on 9th November, economic considerations, the crumbling of the SED leadership.

Level 4 answers will integrate argument and evidence and provide a fuller and more balanced picture with some criticism of both parts of the given statement.

Level 5 answers will provide a more sustained argument, with supported evaluation throughout the essay. Answers will combine clear understanding with good factual support and make supported judgement about the differing interpretations.