



---

# A-level HISTORY 7042/1L

Component 1L The quest for political stability: Germany, 1871-1991

---

Mark scheme

June 2021

Version: 1.0 Final



2 1 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 1 L / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead 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 from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

#### **Copyright information**

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.

Copyright © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

### Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

### Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

**Section A**

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to political developments in Germany in the years 1890 to 1914.

**[30 marks]***Target: AO3*

*Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

**In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:**

- the main argument is that Wilhelm II was incapable of ruling personally, perhaps even being ‘unbalanced’ and constantly on the verge of ‘a nervous breakdown’
- he had to be ‘managed’ by his entourage who ‘shielded’ him from criticism and ‘tried to prevent him from committing blunders’
- the Kaiser’s inner circle did this because of personal loyalty to him and a belief in monarchical government.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- to support the extract, it could be argued that Wilhelm was indeed incapable of personal rule and prone to blunders as evidenced by the Daily Telegraph Affair in 1908
- Wilhelm earned the nickname the ‘Reisekaiser’ because of his time spent travelling and on his yacht. This would back up the argument that he could not work hard enough at the business of government
- Bülow, Chancellor 1900–09, was well-known for his sycophancy towards the Kaiser (earning himself the nickname ‘The Eel’), which was a strategy to ‘handle’ the Kaiser as argued in the extract
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that Wilhelm did show himself capable of personal rule. He appointed Caprivi to win the support of the working classes, which initiated the ‘New Course’ of 1890–94
- furthermore, Wilhelm appointed Hohenlohe in 1894 precisely because he could dominate him. In 1897, Wilhelm dismissed Hohenlohe’s ministers and appointed his own in order to pursue a new policy of *Weltpolitik*, which remained the main theme of government policy to 1914.

**In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:**

- the main argument is that real political power in Germany in these years lay with leading figures from the military, industry and right-wing pressure groups
- neither the Kaiser nor his chancellors exercised any meaningful authority
- there was a lack of co-ordination at the centre of government in Germany.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- Von Tirpitz was appointed as Naval Secretary in 1897 and did much over the next few years to push through legislation, expanding the size of the navy as part of the wider policy of *Weltpolitik*. He was supported in this by the Navy League, which had over 500 000 members by 1914
- the Agrarian League and Industrialists’ League both lobbied for high tariffs to be restored following Caprivi’s reduction of them. They were able to bring about Caprivi’s downfall in 1894 and higher tariffs were reinstated by Bülow in 1902
- the Army showed its indifference towards the constitution and the rule of law during the Zabern Affair in 1913 and both the Kaiser and Bethmann-Hollweg simply acquiesced with the Army’s actions in the face of widespread public criticism

- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that it was Wilhelm himself who initiated the policy of *Weltpolitik* in 1897, and Bülow skilfully manufactured support in the Reichstag for the policy in 1902 from the Centre Party, and in 1907 from the Progressives
- it could be argued that there was not a lack of co-ordination at the centre of government. The Kaiser's personal priorities of military expansion, pursuit of empire and strengthening of autocratic government were in line with those of the right-wing elites.

**In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following:**

- the main argument is that Germany entered a new era of mass politics based on universal male suffrage coupled with active and influential political parties
- all social classes found ways of expressing their demands through the political system
- the politics of the ruling elites no longer satisfied the majority of the electorate.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- the government introduced various measures in response to demands from the SPD and other parties, such as extensions to social welfare (1900–03), the secret ballot (1904) and payments for Reichstag deputies (1906)
- in 1909, Bülow's finance bill to raise the money needed for military expansion was defeated in the Reichstag. In the same year, the Kaiser was forced to give assurances that he would respect the constitution in future following the Daily Telegraph Affair and an outcry in the Reichstag
- the SPD provided effective representation for the views of the growing proletariat and became the largest party in the Reichstag in 1912. Together with the Progressives, they formed a left-wing majority in the Reichstag for the first time, making it difficult for Bethmann-Hollweg to get legislation through the Reichstag
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that the ability of the parties to influence government policy was limited. For example, the Kaiser simply ignored a vote of no-confidence passed in the Reichstag against Bethmann-Hollweg following the Zabern Affair in 1913
- after the 1907 election, the Progressives supported Bülow's imperial and military spending and, in 1914, even the SPD approved the war credits. This could be seen as evidence that the new parties were still prone to fall in line with the patriotic and nationalistic policies of the elites.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'The governments of Germany dealt effectively with the economic challenges they faced in the years 1923 to 1945.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

**Indicative content**

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

**Arguments supporting the view that the governments of Germany dealt effectively with the economic challenges they faced in the years 1923 to 1945 might include:**

- Stresemann and Schacht introduced the Rentenmark in order to bring an end to the hyperinflation of 1923. The value of the new currency was backed by land and industrial resources and its supply was restricted, therefore it became trusted and held its value
- Stresemann successfully negotiated the Dawes Plan (1924) and Young Plan (1929) in order to reduce the burden of reparations on the German economy and to secure American loans to stimulate investment and growth
- the governments of the final years of the Weimar Republic took some steps to ease the impact of the economic depression. Brüning's government secured a moratorium on reparations payments, and under Papen and Schleicher some public works schemes were started to create employment
- the Nazi regime successfully reduced unemployment from 1933 onwards through rearmament, the National Labour Service and deficit financing of public works schemes
- following Speer's appointment as Minister of War Production, and Goebbels' exhortations for a total war effort, the German war economy became more efficient after 1942. The Central Planning Board, the conscription of women, the use of prisoners all served to increase production.

**Arguments challenging the view that the governments of Germany dealt effectively with the economic challenges they faced in the years 1923 to 1945 might include:**

- the supposed economic recovery of the Weimar Republic between 1924 and 1928 was built on shaky foundations, which came tumbling down following the Wall Street Crash. Even before the crash, unemployment was on the rise but the withdrawal and recall of US loans caused an unemployment crisis from 1930
- from 1930 to 1932, the Weimar government failed to deal effectively with the Depression. Brüning's deflationary policies merely exacerbated the unemployment problem and the lack of demand within the economy
- the Nazis' 'economic miracle' was based on unsustainable levels of rearmament, which caused serious imbalances in the economy. Germany continued to import large quantities of raw materials, causing a significant balance of trade deficit
- preparations for war between 1936 and 1939 were not adequate to meet the needs of total war from 1939 onwards. Levels of consumer production remained high and targets for synthetic ersatz materials were largely unfulfilled
- between 1939 and 1941, the response of the government to the demands of war was limited. The labour force was not sufficiently expanded, eg through the mobilisation of women and of prisoners, and production of consumer goods remained high.

In reaching an overall judgement, students might argue that on the surface it appears that the governments of this period had some significant successes in overcoming economic challenges, not least hyperinflation and reparations in the 1920s, and unemployment from 1933 onwards. In both cases, however, there were significant underlying structural weaknesses with the economic policies pursued and, when subjected to unforeseen stresses, ie the Wall Street Crash in 1929 and the unexpectedly early outbreak of total war in 1939, they were unable to cope. Therefore, overall, it could be argued, German governments did not deal that effectively with the economic challenges they faced in the longer term.



**0 3** How far was the dominance of the CDU/CSU, in the years 1949 to 1969, due to the weaknesses of the other political parties?

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

**Indicative content**

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

**Arguments supporting the view that the dominance of the CDU/CSU, in the years 1949 to 1969, was due to the weaknesses of the other political parties might include:**

- the SPD, from 1949 to 1952 under Schumacher's leadership, pursued policies which were not popular with voters. They prioritised the issue of reunification, which did not seem a realistic prospect, and opposed Adenauer's policy of closer alignment with the West
- Ollenhauer was not an inspirational leader of the SPD from 1952 to 1963. In 1956, he opposed the creation of the Bundeswehr, which ran counter to the majority of public opinion
- from 1949 to 1959, the SPD consistently criticised the 'capitalist' policies of Adenauer's government – a stance which was increasingly out of touch with the very obvious benefits of the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s
- support for the Communist KPD collapsed due to increasing fears about communist control of East Germany. In 1956, the KPD was declared anti-democratic and therefore illegal
- the conservative DP was unpopular with most West Germans due to its right-wing views and association with nationalism. It disappeared from national politics following the 1961 election. Its successor on the right-wing of politics – the NPD (formed in 1964) – never passed the 5% threshold for representation in the Bundestag.

**Arguments challenging the view that the dominance of the CDU/CSU, in the years 1949 to 1969, was due to the weaknesses of the other political parties might include:**

- Adenauer was a major asset for the CDU/CSU. He was skilful in maintaining coalitions from 1949 to 1956 and again from 1961 to 1963. He also effectively rehabilitated many former Nazis into senior positions in the economy and politics. His 'Keine Experimente' approach was popular
- the CDU/CSU built up an extensive and effective national party organisation under the guidance of Hans Globke. Over half the West German population was Catholic, which also strengthened support for the CDU/CSU as it was the natural successor to the pre-war Centre Party
- the CDU/CSU was also helped by the new constitution which prevented parties which gained less than 5% of the votes in an election from winning seats in the Bundestag. The Constitutional Court also helped by declaring the SRP and KPD illegal in 1952 and 1956 respectively
- the CDU/CSU benefited hugely from the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s and early 1960s. The majority of West Germans were satisfied with the increases in their standard of living and saw no reason to vote against the party in government which had overseen these improvements
- the FDP were willing to support the CDU/CSU in coalition governments from 1949 to 1956 and from 1961 to 1966, therefore making a significant contribution to the stability of West German democracy and the success of the governments led by the CDU/CSU through the period.

In reaching an overall judgement, students might argue that the main opposition party – the SPD – was indeed weak in the 1950s due to its policies being significantly out of tune with the majority of public opinion. This undoubtedly eased the task facing Adenauer and the CDU/CSU in consolidating their position as the dominant party. However, such an outcome was not an inevitability – for example, 12 parties contested the first West German election in 1949 – and much of the CDU/CSU's success was due to the skilful leadership of Adenauer and Erhard, which created the political and economic stability which most West Germans craved in the 1950s.

Therefore, although the weaknesses of opposition parties created an opportunity for the CDU/CSU to exploit, it was down to the skill and leadership of the CDU/CSU that this opportunity was seized and the party dominated the first 20 years of the FRG.

**0 4** 'Extra-parliamentary opposition posed a significant threat to the stability of West Germany in the years 1966 to 1989.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

**Arguments supporting the view that extra-parliamentary opposition posed a significant threat to the stability of West Germany in the years 1966 to 1989 might include:**

- following the student protests in 1966 at the Free University of Berlin, and the shooting of Benno Ohnesorg in June 1967, there were organised protest groups in all German universities by the end of 1967 under the umbrella of the 'June 2nd Movement'
- the APO organised hundreds of protests in 1968 and 1969 in opposition to the Emergency Laws, nuclear weapons, the Vietnam War and the coalition government. Many protests turned violent and the atmosphere of crisis was very real in many people's eyes
- from 1969, a hard core of extreme left-wing radicals formed the Red Army Faction (Baader-Meinhof Gang). The RAF carried out a wave of robberies, kidnapping and murders which shocked most West Germans, who considered the RAF a significant threat to society
- the RAF had links with international groups such as the PLO and, it was later revealed, assistance from the Stasi. Such support increased the potential scope of RAF terrorism
- extra-parliamentary environmental opposition groups emerged in the mid-1970s and grew to represent a significant body of opinion within West Germany. Large demonstrations by environmentalists continued into the 1980s, sometimes resulting in violent clashes with the police.

**Arguments challenging the view that extra-parliamentary opposition posed a significant threat to the stability of West Germany in the years 1966 to 1989 might include:**

- extra-parliamentary opposition could do nothing to prevent the Grand Coalition government from passing the 'Emergency Laws' amendment to the constitution
- by the end of 1969, the APO had passed its peak. There were internal arguments over tactics and most of the student protestors took their degrees and then pursued careers in the mainstream economy and society
- the ending of the Grand Coalition, and the election of an SPD government in 1969, provided a democratic outlet for the left-wing views of many of the former protestors from the APO
- both Brandt and Schmidt took determined action to prevent the escalation of terrorist activity in the 1970s. Police numbers and powers were increased which proved effective in restricting the terrorist threat. Public opinion was also supportive of their actions and disdainful of the RAF
- many environmental activists came to the conclusion that opposition from within the parliamentary system was likely to be far more effective than extra-parliamentary opposition. In 1980, the Green Party was formed and it won 27 seats in the 1983 election.

In reaching a final judgement, students may argue that at the time, especially in the early years from 1966 to 1976, the threat from extra-parliamentary opposition seemed very significant and potentially dangerous to the political and social stability of West Germany. However, with the benefit of hindsight, the extra-parliamentary opposition does not appear as significant. The majority of the student protestors of 1966–69 went on to live very mainstream lives and the environmentalists soon came to the conclusion that democratic opposition would be more effective. The RAF clearly posed a significant threat; however, the impact of their actions was not matched by the level of support they had from the majority of West Germans. Therefore, overall, the extra-parliamentary opposition of these years was, in the end, not a significant threat to the political and social fabric of West Germany.