



AS HISTORY 7041/20

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

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



2 2 6 A 7 0 4 1 / 2 0 / 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

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 © 2022 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 the conduct of German foreign affairs under Stresemann?

[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

- the source comes from a private letter to his sister and, therefore, is valuable as he has no obvious reason not to be open and candid in his views as this is a personal rather than an official communication
- the source comes from von Seeckt, who was a monarchist and strongly right-wing military leader who despised the terms of the Versailles Treaty, in particular the military and Polish clauses. This has value in giving a starkly different view from Source B
- the source has a very negative and critical tone, both towards the foreign policies of Stresemann and the man himself, with words used such as 'distrust', 'weak' and 'deteriorated'.

Content and argument

- Source A argues that both the Locarno and Geneva policies were wrong as they brought Germany 'no advantage'. Students may point out that this is a typical right-wing view about Stresemann's policy of co-operation giving too much away and appeasing the allies
- Source A's condemnation of Locarno and Geneva may be challenged by students in terms of value in that they gave, in Stresemann's view, Germany greater status and equality in Europe as well as more tangible benefits, such as making a repeat of the 1923 Ruhr invasion practically impossible, as well as making the eastern provisions of the treaty less secure than the agreed western ones
- Seeckt argues in Source A that Germany 'are still too weak to give any direction and are thus always led by others'. Students may point out that this was, to an extent, true, due to Germany's weakness and isolation following the Versailles Treaty but may also point out that Stresemann's strategy was to build support and agreement in order to end that weakness and to revise the terms of the Treaty. Students may also point out that this victim label painted by Seeckt is not fully valid as Stresemann showed resolve and strength in the Locarno negotiations as well as leadership in negotiating the Treaty of Berlin with the USSR in 1926
- Seeckt, in Source A, shows a hostility to the Weimar Republic's democratic politicians by labelling the Chancellor Luther as a 'little' man and Stresemann as the 'man of general distrust'. Students may point out that this has some validity as Luther was only Chancellor for just over a year and Stresemann was not fully trusted, either by the right in Germany or by the French. However, students may conversely point out that Seeckt's own political opinions are reflected in these opinions.

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 keynote speech from Stresemann to the League of Nations on the occasion of Germany becoming a full member of the organisation. This has value as it illustrates Stresemann's intention here to reassure his audience of Germany's peaceful intentions and commitment to the League's principles
- the source is also intended by Stresemann to defend his policies to the League, citing Locarno as an example, both to the League itself but also to his own country
- the source has a pacifying and reassuring tone with use of words such as 'co-operation', 'fair', 'unswervingly' and 'wholeheartedly' and has value as it contrasts significantly from the tone of Source A.

Content and argument

- Source B argues that Stresemann's policy of co-operation with the league 'must and will lead to fair solutions for the fundamental questions which arise'. Students may refer to the outstanding issues of reparations as well as Germany's eastern borders which Stresemann wanted to revise
- Source B refers, as evidence of Stresemann's determination to pursue a policy of peace and co-operation, the 'Pact of Locarno'. Students may agree with this argument. Pointing out that Stresemann managed to secure the western borders as set out at Versailles, but this time through agreement rather than imposition, as well as making a French repeat of the Ruhr invasion of 1923 much more difficult. Students may point out that his refusal to countenance an Eastern Locarno showed strength and cast doubt on the viability of that part of the Versailles Treaty
- Stresemann, in Source B, also argues that his policy of fulfilment and co-operation, despite being initially unpopular, was now becoming 'more deeply rooted with the German people'. Students may agree that along with more economic stability following the Dawes Plan and political stability following the end of the Ruhr Crisis, that Stresemann's overall strategy of peaceful co-operation and revision was becoming more accepted, but may also point out that this was not the case with the right in Germany who saw his policies as weak and further capitulation
- Stresemann also argues, in Source B, that Germany will 'wholeheartedly devote ourselves' to the League and its duties within it. Students may point out that her Treaty of Berlin with communist Russia, as well as Germany's refusal to accept her eastern borders, may show a more calculated and strategically ruthless side to this friendly and co-operative veneer.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that both sources are valuable but for different reasons. Source B has value as it explains, in Stresemann's own words, the policy of co-operation and fulfilment and gives reference to perhaps his two most significant foreign policy successes; that of the Locarno Treaty and Germany being admitted to the League of Nations. Whereas Source A, is also valuable in giving the alternative view that far from being successful, Stresemann's conduct of foreign affairs continued in the same vein as Versailles with Germany appeasing and surrendering to the allies, whilst Versailles in all its essential elements, remained unaltered. Students may find either source more valuable in terms of provenance as Source B is most certainly for public consumption and therefore, gives clear insight into Stresemann's strategy of fulfilment whereas Source A, as a personal letter, gives an unfettered account of how the right wing in Germany viewed Stresemann's strategy.

Section B

0 2 'German resentment of the Treaty of Versailles was based on unrealistic German expectations.'

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 German resentment of the Treaty of Versailles was based on unrealistic German expectations might include:

- Germany's accusation that Wilson's 14 Points, which they believed the Treaty would be based on, was not being fairly and fully applied, could be deemed unrealistic as the Points did allude to Alsace Lorraine being returned to France, Poland being given access to the sea and that German disarmament would be necessary
- the Treaty was not as harsh or severe, despite German beliefs to the contrary, as it might have been, as if France had her way, it would have been far more stringent with the border being pushed back to the Rhine and far higher levels of reparations. This Treaty, at the insistence of the other allies, was far more moderate than Germany could have been given
- Germany's belief that the Treaty should be lenient enough to help stabilise the new German Republic can be seen as unrealistic when compared with the German imposed Treaty of Brest-Litovsk against defeated Russia in March 1918. This annexed huge swathes of territory and had broken up the western part of the Russian Empire and this Treaty was heavily supported in the German Reichstag with only the USPD voting against it
- Germany's own war aims had included stringent reparations against the defeated Allies, as well as extensive annexation of territory and colonial expansion at their expense, so to expect a very different treaty to be imposed on themselves can be seen as unrealistic.

Arguments challenging the view that German resentment of the Treaty of Versailles was based on unrealistic German expectations might include:

- Germany's outrage and hostility to the Treaty can be seen as valid and realistic in terms of its highly selective adherence to the Wilsonian principle of self-determination. The millions of Germans left within the borders of the new states of Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as the denial of the Anschluss, showed that this principle was denied when it affected Germany and was only implemented when it suited the Allies
- Reparations, set in 1921 at the figure of £6 600m, could challenge the idea that German resentment was based on unrealistic expectations as they believed this amount would only serve to cripple the economy, especially when combined with the loss of territory and economic resources, such as the coalfields of the Saar
- Article 231, the 'war guilt clause', was perceived by Germans as fundamentally humiliating for the country but also because it was viewed by Germany and many neutral observers that the guilt for the war could not be pinned on any one country or side and that countries such as Serbia, Russia and France had as much culpability as Germany. This suggests that German resentment was due to the humiliating clause of the Treaty rather than any unrealistic expectations they had of the terms that were going to be imposed on them by the Allies
- the fact that Germany was heavily disarmed, whereas there was no equivalence elsewhere, as well as her exclusion from the new League of Nations, was perceived as vindictive and symbolic of a treaty based on punishment rather than peace and justice. These examples can be used to show how divisive and unfair the terms of the Treaty were, as well as providing long-term resentment which may lead to sustained peace not being achieved.

Students might conclude that the Germans themselves would clearly view the terms of the Versailles Treaty as completely unreasonable due to how unjust, severe and humiliating it was to them. They would argue that they were militarily, financially and territorially stripped bare and that was counter to the principles laid out by Wilson in his 14 Points and would only lead to further bitterness and conflict.

However, students might also counter this view by arguing that when looked at dispassionately, this outrage might be more caused by unrealistic expectations rather than by the terms of the Treaty itself. When compared to what Germany imposed on Russia or, indeed, what they planned to impose on the other Allies if victorious, the terms of Versailles may appear to be far less harsh than is supposed by Germany.

0 3 'In the years 1930 to 1932, Communism had little impact on 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 supporting the view that in the years 1930 to 1932, Communism had little impact on the Weimar Republic might include:

- the KPD's priority to replace the democratic SPD as the main party of the left had limited success as the Socialists remained the largest party in the German Reichstag until the July 1932 election
- at its height electorally, the KPD achieved 16.9% and 100 seats in the November 1932 election. Whilst significant, it remained a minority party which failed to break out of its working-class base and strongholds
- its revolutionary message, use of violence through the Red Fighters League and its ultimate desire to overthrow the Weimar Republic, scared off significant sections of the population, the middle and upper classes for example, and ensured that its appeal remained confined to the poorest parts of Germany's industrial cities
- the speeches of Thalmann and its use of propaganda, both of which focused on the class struggle and the smashing of Capitalism in Germany, helped to attract members and appealed to its committed followers but lacked impact and mass appeal beyond that group.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1930 to 1932, Communism had little impact on the Weimar Republic might include:

- the KPD's obsession and conflict with the SPD, whom they condemned as 'social fascists', ensured that as much focus was spent on attacking the moderate left party as was spent on combatting the growing threat of the Nazi Party
- the growing electoral success of the KPD, whilst remaining a relatively small minority of 16.9% at its height in November 1932, ensured that the left's vote was split and weakened the democratic SPD's electoral strength
- through its increasing focus on the economic impact of the Depression and on the plight of the unemployed, with hunger marches, frequent battles with the police and the SA on the streets and agitation against Brüning's austerity policies, the KPD became the voice for many of the poorest and worst affected in the industrial cities, such as the Wedding district of Berlin. This radicalising of many working-class districts undermined faith in, and loyalty to, the Weimar Democracy
- the growth of the Communist Party's appeal and its improving electoral performance provided propaganda for the Nazi Party who claimed to be the only party who could protect Germany from Bolshevism in the polls and the SA to protect Germans on the streets from Communist violence.

Students may conclude that the impact of Communism, though certainly increasing as a result of the economic and political pressures facing the Weimar Republic following the onset of the Great Depression, remained of limited significance due to its failure to appeal to a wide enough range of the German people. Students may conversely conclude that the growing appeal of Communism served to further corrode faith in the democracy, especially amongst the poorest in German industrial cities but also, perhaps inadvertently, forced millions of voters to make a choice between Nazism and the threat of a Communist revolution, so hastening Hitler's advance to power.