

AS
HISTORY
7041/20

Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945
Component 20 The Weimar Republic, 1918–1933

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

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, i.e. 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.

Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Component 20 The Weimar Republic, 1918–1933

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the passing of the March 1933 Enabling Act? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- the source comes from Kurt Lüdecke, a Nazi who was part of Hitler's inner circle before 1933 and therefore inevitably gives a contemporary account which is supportive and sympathetic to the Nazi cause, despite his arrest and exile after the Night of the Long Knives
- the tone is one of begrudging respect for the doomed SPD, referring to 'impossible position' and 'showed courage' but also one of jubilation at the success of Hitler in getting the Act passed and the reactions to his speech with reference to 'roars of laughter' and 'storm of applause'
- emotive language is used, such as 'beaten and miserable', 'annihilated' and 'hurricane' to emphasise the resounding Nazi victory.

Content and argument

- the source argues that Wels and the SPD faced an impossible situation with SA men ringing the building and a negative parliament facing him. Students may refer to the intense effort the Nazis put in to get the necessary 2/3 of the votes to ensure the passing of the Enabling Law following the Reichstag Fire, such as preventing the Communists from gaining access and doing deals with other Parties
- the source also argues persuasively that the SPD and their leader, Otto Wels, despite having little chance to prevent the passing of the law, showed courage in sticking to their principles despite the intimidation and being the only Party voting against the Act. Despite the triumphalist tone of much of the source, Lüdecke does display some respect for this stance
- the source argues that Hitler claimed he did not need the SPD votes, which was valid due to the absence of Communist Deputies following the Reichstag Fire and the deals done with the Catholic Centre Party and the Nationalists. This enabled the triumphalist tone of Hitler as he realised that the Act, which would give him the power to make his own laws without Parliament for four years, would pass.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- the source comes from a distinguished Centre Party historian, who had also been a Reichstag Deputy. The fact it is a diary entry suggests that he is debating the rights and wrongs of the Centre Party voting with Hitler to himself and anguishing over whether they did the right thing
- the tone is very uncertain and hesitant as to whether the right decision, from a moral point of view, was taken to vote for the Enabling Act. There is also a tone of self-justification and hope in that this decision may help them to influence the Nazis in the future. However, a feeling of dread and fear can also be perceived, e.g. of violence if they voted against it
- the fact he is a distinguished historian of the Centre Party suggests that he is an expert on them and can place the decision of March 1933 into the wider context of the Party's history to judge it.

Content and argument

- the source argues that resistance from the Centre Party, in terms of voting against or abstaining, would have been pointless as the Act would get through anyway and that violence would ensue against the Party. This could be supported as the Communists were barred from voting after the Reichstag Fire and deals had been done with the Nationalists. Students may consider whether this point made more to assuage their guilt and conscience
- Kroll Opera House was filled with intimidation and threats of violence from the Nazis to try to ensure the passing of the Act so Bachem may be right to suggest the fury and violence which would have resulted from the vote not being passed. Students may refer to how these threats were primarily aimed at the SPD who refused to be cowed, to ensure the passing of the Act
- the source argues that voting against or abstaining would have been an empty gesture which may have been 'heroic' but would not benefit their 'cause'. Students may link to the Centre Party's strong links to the Catholic Church and the cause was ensuring continued independence of the Catholic faith in Germany and non-interference from the State. Students may point out that such assurances had indeed been given by Hitler in his Reichstag Speech on the same day as the Enabling Act was passed. Students may also comment on the reference to protection against Communists and that, in the end, the Centre Party sided with Hitler to protect itself and follow its own self-interest
- the source also refers to the hope that by siding with the Nazis, the Catholic Centre Party would indeed, be able to influence and moderate the Nazis behaviour, both in terms of how he handled the Church. Students may suggest that this is unlikely given his own admission that 'their instincts are so completely different from our own'.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that both sources have value; Source A for identifying the intimidating atmosphere generated by the Nazis in the Kroll Opera House for the Enabling Act debate and that the SPD were a defeated force and Source B for showing the dilemmas faced by the democratic parties in March 1933 as they faced the challenge of Hitler's consolidation of power after he became Chancellor in January 1933.

Section B

- 02** 'The Weimar Republic was seriously challenged by right-wing extremism in the years 1919 to 1923.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that the Weimar Republic was seriously challenged by right-wing extremism in the years 1919 to 1923 might include:

- right-wing anger at the armistice and of the fall of the Kaiser and replacement by a Republic was intensified by the terms of the Versailles Treaty and led many to join groups that were hostile to the very existence of the Republic and wanted to see it overthrown
- many on the right believed whole-heartedly in the 'Stab in the back' myth and there was fury at the military terms of the Versailles Treaty, leading to the March 1920 Kapp Putsch which sought to take power in Berlin, forcing the Ebert Government to retreat to Dresden. The army's refusal to put down the revolt with the 'troops do not fire on troops' reference showed how vulnerable the Republic was
- wave of political assassinations of key Weimar figures such as Rathenau and Erzberger, by members of right wing terrorist groups such as Organisation Consul – 354 by 1923 – posed a genuine challenge to the Weimar democracy
- continuing power of right-wing judges and army generals made the protection and development of democracy and democratic values difficult.

Arguments challenging the view that the Weimar Republic was seriously challenged by right-wing extremism in the years 1919 to 1923 might include:

- the threat from the right-wing, whilst apparent, was not a united one. Some wished to see the return of the Kaiser whilst others wanted some form of dictatorship and, in areas like Bavaria, there was a separatist agenda
- the Kapp Putsch collapsed within 4 days, brought down by a general strike from workers in Berlin. This may have been motivated more by hostility to the right, rather than genuine love for the democratic republic, but it still reduced the threat to survival
- right-wing terrorist groups, such as Organisation Consul were forced to disband, although this was not always fully enforced. However, assassinations, while blighting the stability of the Republic, were never likely to bring about its collapse
- the 1923 Munich Putsch posed little threat to the Republic, failing in its aim to seize Munich never mind the Reich as a whole.

Students may conclude that there was a serious and multi-faceted challenge to the Weimar Republic from the right wing but not one that came close to threatening its survival. Terrorism and assassinations, as well as rebellions, battered the Republic in its first four years, fuelled by defeat, a humiliating treaty and economic crisis, but a challenge to its survival may be too strong an argument. However, students may point out that there was, however, a simmering and embedded hostility to the Republic and its democratic values throughout this period. Students may also interpret this question as allowing them to look at other aspects that seriously challenged the Weimar Republic, such as the Treaty of Versailles or economic crisis. This may have some validity, especially if linked to right-wing extremism.

- 03** 'Cultural changes, in the years 1924 to 1928, significantly reduced support for the Weimar Republic.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that cultural changes, in the years 1924 to 1928, significantly reduced support for the Weimar Republic might include:

- there was some strong hostility to the explosion of creativity in the arts, such as theatre and film, art and architecture. In rural areas, where the Church's influence was still strong, there was a clear tendency to cling onto traditional norms of culture and view the Republic as being far too permissive in its outlook
- the greater sexual freedom for gays, transvestites and lesbians, epitomised perhaps in the Berlin nightclubs, was viewed with horror by older, more traditionally minded Germans, already concerned at the evidence of young people's desire to challenge authority and societal norms, who linked this looser moral framework to the decadence and perceived immorality of the Weimar democracy
- many were concerned by the growing foreign influence in German culture, such as American Jazz, played mostly by black American musicians and equated this dilution of German culture with the more liberal outlook of the Republic
- modernist architecture, such as the Bauhaus movement, as well as a growth of expressionist art and more experimental film and theatre, were condemned by many on the right as decadent, unpatriotic and cultural Bolshevism and served to further cement their hostility to the democratic Republic which oversaw these developments.

Arguments challenging the view that cultural changes, in the years 1924 to 1928, significantly reduced support for the Weimar Republic might include:

- many in Germany found the new creativity and experimentation exhilarating and liberating, especially after the crisis-ridden years of the war and post-war years
- young people in particular, were engaged by the themes explored of modernity, challenge to authority as well as greater freedom on issues such as sex and political satire
- cultural change was limited, especially with reference to rural areas. Traditionalism, in terms of cultural norms, was strong outside urban areas, suggesting that cultural developments held limited importance in changing people's perspectives
- cultural experimentation and innovation divided Germans in the same way as politics, class and religion, suggesting it simply reinforced already formed views rather than created new ones
- students may also argue that it was not cultural changes that reduced support for the Weimar Republic but other factors, such as continuing problems in the economy, particularly agriculture, as well as further political stability due to the unstable nature of the Constitution as well as persistent hatred of Versailles and those deemed to be responsible for it.

Students may conclude that cultural change in these years certainly created controversy and many, especially older people and in rural areas, found the changes unsettling and disturbing. However, students may also suggest that others, especially younger city dwellers, found them exciting and refreshing. As to whether these changes significantly reduced support for the Weimar Republic, students may conclude that it hardened already formed judgements rather than solicited new ones.