

GCE

History A

Unit **Y251/01**: Democracy and Dictatorships in Germany
1919–1963

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H105**

Mark Scheme for June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.















All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
	Assertion
	Analysis
	Evaluation
	Explanation
	Factor
	Illustrates/Describes
	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Judgement
	Knowledge and understanding
	Simple comment
	Unclear
	View

Use the following indicative content mark scheme in conjunction with the generic levels of response in the Appendix

MARK SCHEME Section A

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1*	<p>‘The Government of the Weimar Republic was never seriously threatened by opposition in the years 1919-1923’. How far do you agree?</p> <p>In arguing that the government of the Weimar Republic was never seriously threatened,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the ease with which the army and Freikorps suppressed socialist/communist strikes and riots and the Spartacist Uprising by the KPD in 1919, and the uprising in the Ruhr in 1920 • Answers might consider the preparedness of the Freikorps to assist the regime against left-wing threats despite their dislike of it and the successful mobilisation of the trade unions to defeat the Kapp Putsch in 1920. • Answers might consider the success of Ebert in bringing potential political opponents into the early Coalition Government, and therefore win their support for the new constitution, and of Stresemann to again neutralise potentially threatening political opposition in the ‘Great Coalition’ of 1923. • Answers might consider the inherent weaknesses and failure of the Nazi Party’s Putsch in Munich in 1923. • Answers might consider the survival of the Weimar Republic through its difficult early days, and its entry into what has been called a ‘golden age’ thereafter. <p>In arguing that the government was threatened</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the difficulty of facing threats from both the Left and the Right, and the Government’s inherent weakness in being reliant on using one to combat the other. 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the extent of threat. • At higher levels answers might establish criteria against which to judge the extent of threat. • To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider the wide range of social groups who opposed, or were at least hostile to, the Weimar Republic, which made it vulnerable at times of crisis.• Answers might consider the failure of the regime to stem rising support for both left and right wing extremist groups through this period and the growth of right-wing terrorism after 1920.• Answers might consider the threat posed to the government by the Freikorps; the initial ease with which Wolfgang Kapp, backed by the Freikorps, forced the government to flee in the Putsch of 1920.• Answers might consider the success of the Right in propagating the ‘Stab in the Back’; and ‘November Criminals’ myths, which undermined Weimar’s credibility from the outset.• Answers might consider the rapid and large-scale left-wing uprising in the Ruhr in 1920.• Answers might consider the light sentences imposed on Hitler and the architects of the Munich Putsch, indicating the weakness of the regime in dealing with threats.		
--	--	--	--	--

2.*		<p>How successful was the economy of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in the years 1949-1963?</p> <p>In arguing that the economy of the GDR was successful,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the imposition of collectivisation, which met the aim of creating a socialist economy, and gradually improved the efficiency of farming as compared to the small plots which had been redistributed to small-scale farmers in 1945. • Answers might consider successful nationalisation of industry, which had more or less phased-out private ownership by the early 1960s and the growth of heavy industry in the 1950s. • Answers might consider the positive impact of the Berlin Wall on stemming migration and retaining productive workers for agriculture and industry. • Answers might consider the New Economic System for Planning and Direction (NOPSL) of 1963, which redefined productivity in terms of quality. • Answers might consider the subsidisation of every-day essentials, making them accessible to all East Germans, with some improvement in the availability of consumer goods in the late 1950s onwards. • Answers might consider the increased participation in the workforce of women. <p>In arguing that the economy of the GDR was not successful, answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the unpopularity of collectivisation, which led to many farmers fleeing west, and its impact on food supply to urban areas. • Answers might consider the Berlin Uprising of 1953 indicated deep dissatisfaction with the regime's economic policies, particularly collectivisation and 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the extent of success. • At higher levels answers might establish criteria against which to judge the relative importance of the successes/failures. • To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.
-----	--	---	----	--

			<p>the insistence on increased productivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider the failures of the Five Year Plans and the problems inherent in a system which focused on quantity over quality.• Answers might consider the growing gap between West and East Germany, and the lack of realism on the part of the government as to the likelihood of closing the gap or how to achieve it.• Answers might consider the failures of the consumer economy, with shortages and a lack of desirable consumer goods.• Answers might consider the increased focus on politically-orientated party officials running and supervising business and industry rather than individuals with the best qualifications.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

3.		<p>Mark Scheme Section B</p> <p>Read the interpretation and then answer the question that follows:</p> <p>‘There was little evidence of a collapse of morale undermining the Nazi war effort [1939-1945], but there was increased grumbling... at no time was there a popular threat to the regime.’</p> <p><i>From: J.Hite and C.Hinton, Weimar and Nazi Germany (2000).</i></p> <p>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making reference to other interpretations that you have studied.</p> <p>The historical debate centres on the nature and extent of opposition to the Nazi regime that developed during, and because of the demands of, the Second World War.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the interpretation, answers might note that the interpretation does not see the regime threatened by opposition and implies that serious opposition was limited and ineffective. Answers might note that it characterises the popular response to war as one of ‘grumbling’ as opposed to low morale, implying that the population were never seriously dissatisfied with the consequences of war.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The high levels of morale in the years 1939-41 due to German victories and the successful organisation of a war economy; the successes of Goebbels in maintaining a level of morale in the face of defeat through effective propaganda. 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • Candidates must use their knowledge and understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate surrounding the issue to analyse and evaluate the given interpretation. • Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation. • The quality of analysis and the evaluation of the interpretation should be considered when assigning answers to a Level, not the quantity of other interpretations included in the answer. • Other interpretations considered as part of evaluation and analysis of the given interpretation do not need to be attributed to specific named historians, but they must be recognisable historical interpretations, rather than the candidate’s own viewpoint. • Answers may include more on strengths or more on limitations and there is no requirement for a 50/50 split in the evaluation, however, for Level 5 there should be well-supported evaluation of both, in line with Levels descriptors. • Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation.
----	--	--	----	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite rationing and shortages, the German people maintained a good calorific intake throughout the war, there were high levels of employment and, at the outset of war, good wages and bonuses for workers. A degree of solidarity and social cohesion developed amongst Germans in the face of the Allied onslaught, particularly bombings, later in the war. • The total failure of opposition movements such as the communists, youth movements, religious groups and the conservative elites to undermine or overthrow the regime, even at a time of great weakness. • The ease with which the Gestapo identified and tackled resistance, for example the Red Orchestra, the Edelweiss Pirates, the White Rose Group, Dietrich Boenhoeffer and other religious figures, and the successful defeat of the Stauffenberg Plot in 1944. <p>In analysing and evaluating the limitations of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of patriotic fervour at the outbreak of war in 1939, indicating that morale was already low and the reduction in morale which occurred once it became clear that Germany was being defeated, particularly after Stalingrad. • Severe reductions in living standards which resulted in low morale, particularly the restricted diet, lack of fuel and lack of consumer goods and the impact of higher taxation on reducing disposable income; the severe demands placed on rural, agricultural communities. • The impact of Allied blanket bombing on civilian morale, particularly from 1942 onwards. • The alienation of youth, women and workers due to 		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>the disproportionate demands of war on them, which manifested itself as dissatisfaction, withdrawal and low-level civil disobedience such as working slow, even where it was not formalised resistance (arguably more serious than 'grumbling').</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The development of more significant, elite, conservative resistance later in the war which culminated in the Stauffenberg Plot of 1944, which was nearly successful in assassinating Hitler. <p>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interpretations that believe that the impact on popular morale was far more serious than what is indicated here, but nonetheless do not believe that any opposition that could threaten the regime emerged.• Interpretations that see the regime as in a far more precarious state by the latter stages of the war, and which emphasise the growth of opposition and the threat it posed.		
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 1 – this contains the generic mark scheme grids

	<i>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.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]
Level 5 25–30 marks	There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
Level 4 19–24 marks	The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
Level 3 13–18 marks	The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.
Level 2 7–12 marks	The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made. The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
Level 1 1–6 marks	The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis. Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.

	<i>A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]
Level 5 17–20 marks	The answer has a very good analysis of the interpretation. It uses detailed and relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows thorough understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of detailed examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a well-supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 4 13–16 marks	The answer has a good analysis of the interpretation. It uses relevant knowledge of the historical context and good understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 3 9–12 marks	The answer has a partial analysis of the interpretation. It uses some relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows partial understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of reference to other interpretations, in order to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation. The evaluation may be un-even with only limited treatment of either limitations or strengths, but both will be addressed.
Level 2 5–8 marks	The answer has a limited analysis of the interpretation. It uses generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows limited understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of generalised reference to other interpretations, in order to produce a limited evaluation of the given interpretation. The evaluation may deal with either strengths or limitations in a very superficial way, or may only address limitations or strengths.
Level 1 1–4 marks	The answer has a very limited analysis of the interpretation which may be descriptive and relate more to the topic area than the detail of the interpretation. It uses very limited and generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows very limited or no understanding of the wider historical debate, with reference to other interpretations being implicit or lacking, in order to produce a very simplistic, asserted evaluation of the given interpretation.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding or reference to the interpretation.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017

