

AS
HISTORY
7041/20

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

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 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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from 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 © 2024 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** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining German attitudes to the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1922?

[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 having 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

- students may note that this source is valuable because Wolfgang Kapp was the leader of an attempted right-wing coup against the Weimar Republic, in March 1920; they may recognise this therefore as an extremist perspective
- students may link this Proclamation in Berlin to the beginning of the Kapp Putsch and note that it was designed to stir up active opposition to the new Weimar government; they may comment on the way in which the new government had to flee to Weimar as a result
- Kapp's tone is angry because he is extremely critical of the Weimar Republic for failing to protect Germany's national interest in the aftermath of the First World War.

Content and argument

- Kapp blames the Weimar government for putting Germany in danger from foreign powers. Students may note that this is valuable because he connects 'Empire' to the humiliating loss of Germany's colonies in the Treaty.
- Kapp also attacks the politicians within the government, as 'ineffective' and 'lacking authority'. Students may identify that this is valuable because right-wing extremists felt that the Weimar Republic had betrayed Germany by accepting the Treaty and that criticisms of its politicians as weak and treacherous dogged the Republic as a result. Some may link this to the assassination of Erzberger, or to other political assassinations.
- students may discuss Kapp's confirmation that he would accept the Treaty, by noting that the victors were prepared to invade Germany if the Treaty was rejected. They may note that Kapp's conditions for this acceptance would, in fact, render the Treaty unworkable.
- students may describe the value to an historian of the inclusion of far-right tropes by Kapp, including his reference to the Fatherland, the German people and [dis]honour. They may discuss how widely held such views were in this period, or they may comment on the rapid failure of the Kapp Putsch, to qualify the significance of Kapp's ideology and actions.

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

Provenance and tone

- students may be able to connect Mann's role as an author and a democrat with the progressive developments that were a feature of the Weimar Republic
- students may discuss the date of this lecture: right-wing nationalism remained a persistent and severe threat to the Weimar Republic, with ongoing political assassinations, violence and conspiracy
- students could note Mann's strident tone in defence of democracy and reflect on the political turmoil that is its context, with threats from left, right and external.

Content and argument

- Mann appeals to 'German youth'. Students may reflect on the way in which young people may have been attracted by militarism that made them particularly vulnerable to radicalisation; they may draw a link to the emergence of the Nazi SA
- Mann recognises the appeal of the 'glory of war' but draws attention to a wider range of German qualities. Students may link this to the contemporary anger over the 'November Criminals' and the 'Stab in the Back' and they may realise that he is finding common ground with young people before going on to promote democracy
- Mann makes the case for a progressive democracy. Students may comment on the liberal and progressive features of the Weimar constitution, perhaps linking this to the reforms to the franchise, or to welfare provisions
- he references corrupt individuals, brute force and lies. Students may make links to leading extremists in this period and may try to make a distinction between them in terms of their morality, aims and impulse towards violence.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that Kapp shows the right-wing challenge to the Republic while Mann represents a pro-Republic voice. They may decide that Kapp's criticism was widely shared, particularly in the earliest years of the Republic, while Mann's positive view only became widely shared during the 'golden years' which were to follow.

Section B

0 2 'The Weimar Republic was politically stable in the years 1924 to 1928.'

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 substantiate. **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 supporting the view that the Weimar Republic was politically stable in the years 1924 to 1928 might include:

- despite expectations, Hindenburg decided to fully support the constitution following his election in 1925. This neutralised the threat of moderate right-wing/traditionalist challenges to the Republic, increasing its stability
- middle-class support for the Republic, crucial for its long-term survival, increased in this period in reaction to the economic recovery that Stresemann achieved. The recovery of Germany's international status under Stresemann further encouraged consensus in support of the Republic
- the German Communist Party changed strategy after 1924, concentrating on attacking the SPD rather than agitating for revolution. There was no attempt by Communists to overthrow the republic by force in this period and voters began to move away from KDP to more centrist socialist parties
- the NSDAP also changed strategy following the imprisonment of Hitler in 1924 and the order banning him from making public speeches which lasted until 1927. There was a reduction in right-wing violence and no attempt to overthrow the republic by force from the right.

Arguments challenging the view that the Weimar Republic was politically stable in the years 1924 to 1928 might include:

- there were six coalition cabinets between 1924 and 1928, with successive crises making long-term, strategic planning impossible
- proportional representation and the party list system meant that there was a significant disconnect between the demands of local constituencies and the priorities of Reichstag deputies, which was an obstacle to building consensus in support of democracy. Infighting within the leadership of each party further impeded the development of a stable political system
- while extremist parties on both sides were more quiescent in this period, this did not reflect a resolution of their goals or a rise in support for the Republic; in fact, both were occupied in different strategies which laid the seeds for more vigorous and effective activity post-1929
- while Hindenburg became a pragmatic supporter of the Republic, his ongoing right-wing nationalist views persisted and he remained a credible figurehead for an alternative political future.

Students may argue that the Weimar Republic achieved a considerable improvement in political stability during this period, in contrast with 1919–23, but that the inherent weaknesses of the constitution meant that this stability substantially rested on the guiding hand of Hindenburg, while extremist views were only temporarily suppressed.

0 3 'Hitler was personally responsible for the growth of Nazism in the years 1928 to January 1933.'

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 supporting the view that Hitler was personally responsible for the growth of Nazism in the years 1928 to January 1933 might include:

- Hitler's unique blend of racist and bitter invective chimed with those within Germany who were alienated from the Weimar Republic, particularly as their conservative, nationalist views became more intense in reaction to the liberalisation of some sectors of German society in this period. Prolific promotion of *Mein Kampf* ensured that his personal views were spread across the population
- Hitler possessed profound charisma which, combined with his speech-making skills and physical stamina, entranced and beguiled many Germans; his speeches across Germany in 1932 were particularly effective at building mass appeal
- Hitler's ideological flexibility enabled him to adapt his message according to the audience he was facing. For example, he successfully targeted industrialists, particularly after 1929, despite their natural resistance to his messaging towards working-class Germans
- Hitler inspired competition among his supporters, particularly Hess, Himmler, Goring and Goebbels, who vied for his attention and consequently, worked creatively and tirelessly to transmit his 'vision' of Germany's future into policy.

Arguments challenging the view that Hitler was personally responsible for the growth of Nazism in the years 1928 to January 1933 might include:

- a significant proportion of Germans had held strong right-wing views since the earliest days of the Republic; they were already primed to support the next expression of right-wing politics, in the shape of the reformed NSDAP in the latter years of the Weimar Republic
- the weak response of the government to the impact of the Wall Street Crash, and the political turmoil of 1930–32 in particular, led to the evaporation of support for a democratic constitution and renewed the latent appeal of authoritarian leadership. Weimar democracy began to collapse in on itself
- fear of communism was high among the middle and upper classes in Germany: the socio-economic crisis caused by the events of 1929 caused the escalation of genuine fears of a communist revolution and in this context, the NSDAP with its virulent anti-Communist message appeared to be a protective force
- Goebbels' particular skills as a propagandist created a vision of a revitalised, powerful Germany that many found impossible to resist. He was able to make powerful use of emerging technologies, such as radio and film.

Students may recognise the crucial role that Hitler played in the growth of Nazism but note that he was aided by the apparent collapse of democracy, was supported by very talented individuals and proved able to exploit deep grievances and distress that were the legacy of the First World War and its aftermath.