

Examiners' Report  
January 2012

GCE History 6HI01 F

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson about Edexcel qualifications. Their contact details can be found on this link:

[www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices)

## ResultsPlus

### Get more from your exam results

#### ...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk) .

January 2012

Publications Code US030592

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

# Introduction

## Unit 6HI01 – General Comments

Candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on the amount of knowledge shown and the serious application given to answering almost the entire range of questions across the six options. Legibility was generally good and very few scripts were difficult to read.

The standard of English and spelling is a perennial concern. Colloquialisms were commonplace and the use of abbreviations, perhaps linked to the universality of text messaging, seems to be on the increase. Some abbreviations might be tolerated where they are in general use, such as MLK for Martin Luther King. However, to link MLK to JFK and LBJ, and to credit him with the passing of the CRA and the VRA, not to mention the success of the MBB, can be confusing and often obscures the point being made.

It is interesting to note that long narrative answers, which were once common, no longer appear very often. Fewer candidates reiterate the question at the beginning of their answers, and more are attempting to engage with the question from the outset. Some groups of candidates, however, appear to bring a learned response to the examination room, with a succession of scripts offering the same factors and the same supporting evidence. While this approach may produce an acceptable level of attainment, it can be a limiting tactic because candidates have difficulty in accessing a wider pool of evidence and ideas in order to show their own initiative and thinking; such answers find it difficult to meet the direct focus and explicit understanding required for Level 5 marks.

Answers at Level 5 require elements of sophistication in which students can provide analysis, inter-related links and judgements using evidence which reflects their own opinions and thoughts on the specific question asked.

Stated factor questions were generally approached with a discussion of the stated factor in the first paragraph and a consideration of other factors in the following paragraphs. However, some candidates were not able to play the factors confidently one against the other as the answer unfolded. Also a substantial number of answers applied a stated factor approach where none was needed or desirable. Question D9 asked 'How successful was Martin Luther King's campaign for civil rights in the years 1955-68?'. There is no invitation in this question to consider other factors influencing civil rights, such as Malcolm X and Black Power, but many answers dealt only briefly with King's campaign as one of several, often irrelevant, factors.

A number of answers displayed an imbalance between content and analysis. Many of these were answers with a great deal of relevant content but with limited discussion of the effects or the significance of events, which thereby hindered the development of a detailed and focused analysis. Some perhaps considered the significance self-evident. For example, some answers on the Provisional Government (Question D5) contained much relevant detail about the continuation of the war, but then simply stated that this 'made them unpopular'. Lenin's slogan of 'Peace, Bread, Land' was apparently so popular it made the outcome of the October/November revolution a foregone conclusion. However, there are also an increasing number of responses which provide secure analysis, and often very good conclusions, but do not provide sufficient relevant and accurate factual supporting material to justify their argument.

Overall, however, there were few overtly weak responses, with most finding their home somewhere within Levels 3 and 4.

## Questions 1-14

### Option F

Most candidates were well prepared for topics F1-F7 by their centres and examiners saw a full range of responses at all Levels. As usual most centres cover F7 with one other topic. Examiners noted that there is encouraging evidence of both increased subject knowledge and more nuanced understanding of issues related to topic F7 – From Second to Third Reich: Germany, 1918-45. There are also an increasing number of centres opting to study Spain (F4). Most candidates have at least a reasonable knowledge of their chosen topics and show some understanding of the question asked, but many competent responses fail to attain Level 5 because of the lack of a direct approach to the specific question asked and/or the failure to select appropriate supporting material.

Addressing the focus of the question is a crucial factor in gaining success in this exam. Also, to reach the higher Levels, candidates need to create a reasoned argument throughout the essay not just produce a series of well supported assertions with a reasoned conclusion at the end. Once again, chronological awareness and knowledge was, at times, lacking. Questions which require an explanation of change over time should show an awareness of the key dates and, perhaps even more importantly, the amount of time between key events and developments. However, despite these weaknesses, an encouraging number of candidates are at the very least attempting to engage with the question focus (Level 3) and there are very few candidates who just tell the story of what happened. The best answers show clear engagement with all aspects of the question asked and come to well-reasoned judgements in an articulate and interesting manner.

Please refer to the Examiners' Report for Option E for further examples of exemplification.

### F1 – The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Both questions were popular and most candidates were well prepared with strong knowledge of the period. However, some candidates find the chronology of events somewhat confusing particularly in relation to the events between 1848-52 and 1859-61. There is also the perennial problem that a minority of candidates seem unaware of the death of Cavour in 1861 with references to his role as Prime Minister as late as 1870.

Q1. Most candidates were aware of Piedmont's contribution to the development of Italian unity during the period 1848-61.

Many were able to offer a decent analysis of the reasons for Piedmont's emergence and continued position in the move towards closer unity but seemed reluctant to prioritise their reasons in order to evaluate their significance and so reach the higher Levels. Some good responses were limited by the lack of coverage of the whole time period with some ignoring the emergence of Piedmont in the years 1848-52 and/or the developments after Villafranca. Some responses, while agreeing that Piedmont emerged as leading state in the 1850s, argued that Piedmont was more a driving force for Piedmontisation than Italian unity. However, there were a minority of candidates who interpreted the question with reference to the importance of Piedmont in the process of Italian unification in relation to other factors rather than discussing 'why Piedmont'? The best answers were able to distinguish the developments which allowed Piedmont first to become a leading state and then continue to influence events across the whole period coming to an overall or integrated judgement as to the reason why.

(This page is for your first answer.) There is a historical debate about ~~why~~ how Piedmont became and renewed the driving force towards Italian unification. This includes the position of Piedmont after the revolts and how they maintained their position under King Victor Emmanuel and his prime ministers including, Mazzini and Cavour.

Although the War of Liberation (2nd) was ~~was~~ unsuccessful, it left Piedmont as the only realistic route for unification. The combination of a liberal King (Victor Emmanuel II), who kept the statute when replacing Charles Albert, and Balbo's theory of a constitutional monarchy (similar to the British system) being the only realistic theory left (Gioberti's failed because of the allocation and Mazzini's theory ~~was~~ republic was defeated on battle); meant that ~~all~~ people seeking a liberalism or unification joined Piedmont and united under these claims, whereas before Italians were not united. Many of these people joined the National Society, whose aims were to unify Italia and were run by Daniele Manin who ~~was~~ previously ~~to~~ fought for unification in Venice.

(This page is for your first answer.) With Victor Emmanuel being liberal, he chose and backed two strong liberal ministers, Cavour and Ricasoli. Ricasoli brought about the start of modernisation of Piedmont so that in the future they could compete with the large nations of France and Austria, maintaining themselves as the driving force towards unification as it would mean that unlike during the 1820s, 1830/1 and 1848 revolts the metropolitan system may not be able to defeat them. Another problem he overcame was the power of the church. In the 1848 revolts the allocution on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April 1848 severely weakened Piedmont's attempts to unify Italy. Ricasoli introduced the Siccardi laws which limited the Church's power and influence in Piedmont, ~~and~~ decreasing the impact that the Pope could have on Piedmont's unification attempts. Cavour furthered Ricasoli's modernisation plans, trade increased by 300%, the military was grown and trained substantially, ~~then~~ agriculture was modernised and a railway system spanned the state. Under their liberal system, and

(This page is for your first answer.) with growing wealth and power, Piedmont cemented themselves as the driving force towards Italian unification. From the aftermath of 1848, ~~there was a~~ an ideal of realism was introduced by Cavour, where he recognised that they would need an foreign support if they were to succeed in unifying Italy. This is an important step as it shows ~~the~~ a change in ideology from romantic nationalism which had failed previously.

The Crimean war 1854 was very unpopular with the people of Piedmont, there was a large loss of life and Cavour failed in his attempts to negotiate once the war had finished in 1856. However it was probably the key moment in them being able to ~~use~~ unify Italy as it destroyed the metternich system. Austria had lost Russian support as they stayed neutral during the war, and so unlike when Russia helped Austria before in the revolts in Hungary and helping ~~Stephen~~ Ferdinand regain Naples, they ~~are~~ no longer had this support, giving them a chance of unification.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~The~~ ~~Baron~~ The foreign help gained by Cavour in Plombières (1858) ~~was~~ meant that they were able to mount an attack against Austria. The third war of liberation began on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April 1859, with France declaring war on Austria the following day. This allowed Piedmont to win military victories ~~over~~ at Majenta (4<sup>th</sup> June) and Solferino (24<sup>th</sup> June). Although Piedmont was betrayed by ~~the~~ Napoleon III at the armistice of Villa Franca, they gained Lombardy ~~and~~, showed that Austria could be beaten, and had gained French support. They had managed to cause revolts in the central duchies and Romagna, due to the National Society which was ever present in the attempts towards unification and through French help again (Napoleon renouncing the treaty) gained Ancona with plebiscites.

The further military victories by Garibaldi in May 1859 at Maserla and on the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 1860 at Volturmo, led to Victor Emmanuel being declared the

(This page is for your first answer.)

King of Italy shortly after. Although Garibaldi was a strong leader, his acts ~~concerning~~ would not have been possible without the help of the British (both deliberately and accidentally).

Overall ~~the~~ the argument the foreign help was the main reason for Piedmont remaining as the dominant force towards unification is a strong one, as without the French Piedmont wouldn't have been able to compete with Austria on a military level, and they gained a large amount of territory due to this ~~of~~ action. Also the British help at Massara and the Straights of Messina in August 1859 helped unification as Cavour only united Northern Italy and if Garibaldi hadn't crossed the South it may never have happened. Modernisation was also very important as the factories helped the French empire before the Austrians could defeat Piedmont and the economic ~~and~~ military developments helped in their fight towards unifying the country. Overall though I think foreign help is the stronger argument.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

Although at times brief, this response attempts to show both why Piedmont emerged as the leading state in Italian unification and why it maintained its position over the period.

The response succinctly outlines Piedmont's emergence from the 1848 revolutions as the state most likely to succeed, suggests that modernisation was begun before the arrival of Cavour and argues that Cavour's continued liberal modernisation and the intervention of foreign powers kept Piedmont at the foreground of the unification process. Although not always well developed there is security in its use of supporting material and a succinct awareness of the time period being covered.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Try to make sure that the answer covers the whole time period of the question. Although some of the coverage here is very brief, this response acknowledges the whole time period from the 1848 revolutions to Garibaldi's handover of the south.

Q2. There were a variety of interesting approaches to this question. Some responses concentrated on the geographical unity of Italy using the events of the previous decade to determine the extent to which Italy had become united by 1870. Others accepted the virtually complete geographical unity but questioned other aspects of Italian unity such as political, economic, cultural unity etc. However, many of those giving this response failed to include even the briefest supporting evidence of the geographic unity resulting in an imbalanced answer which only addressed the negatives to any extent. Also weaker responses made generalisations as to a lack of common identity or language which became assertion rather than explanation. The best answers suggested that despite the outward appearance and political institutions of a nation state Italy was still far from 'completely unified'.

## **F2 – The Unification of Germany, 1848-90**

Question 3 was by far the most popular answer with only a few candidates attempting a response on Bismarck's politics post-1871. However, there were more attempts than in previous papers covering this aspect and centres should note that Bismarck's policies from 1871 to 1890 are an integral part of the topic.

Q3. Most centres provide candidates with a solid understanding of the developments in the process of German unification. However, it is vital that candidates focus on the question set rather than write a general response as to the emergence of Prussia as a force for unification. The focus of the question here was the failure of Austria to maintain its dominant position rather than the reasons why Prussia became the dominant power. As a result many candidates with good knowledge wrote responses which were well focused and had some understanding of the key issues and which lacked well selected supporting material (Level 4), rather than responses which were directly focused with explicit understanding and well selected supporting material (Level 5). Most candidates focused on the strength of the Prussian military and economy in relation to the weakness of Austrian resources. Disappointingly few candidates focused on the decline of Austrian dominance itself with little discussion of the changing nature of power after the apparent re-emergence of Austrian power at Olmutz (1850) and the events leading to defeat in 1866. A significant number of candidates also seem confused as to the chronology of the developments of the Zollverein, making wide generalisations about Austria's failure to join and attempts to exploit its own trading area. The best responses were able to discuss the reasons why Austria was unable to maintain dominance over Germany in the years after 1848 with reference to the political, military, international and economic situation.

Q4. Very few candidates attempted this question but those who did seemed better prepared than in previous exam sessions. There was a definite increase in the amount of accurate, detailed supporting material used to answer the question. The best answers were able to use evidence from the success of Bismarck's main policies against the 'enemies' of the German Empire, such as *Kulturkampf* and anti-socialism, to determine the extent to which a national identity was established. Other confident answers referred to the extent to which the Constitution created a national identity and to the establishment of/lack of 'national' symbols and institutions. However, a few candidates approached this as a multi-factor question attempting to establish other factors which encouraged greater national identity, and often with reference to events before 1871, leading to some confused responses (Level 3).

### **F3 – The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943**

This is a very popular topic and once again it is encouraging that centres are clearly preparing their candidates to cover the whole time period and not just the rise and rule of Mussolini and the Fascists. As a result, although Q6 was the most popular question, Q5 was answered by a significant number of candidates. Increasing knowledge of the period from 1896 is very pleasing but too many candidates still seem to be of the opinion that in 1896, and even by 1903, Italy was a newly created state barely out of the Risorgimento when a quarter of a century had gone by since 1870 and almost forty years since the creation of the Kingdom of Italy. Also candidates often refer to the number of government administrations which had been in place since 1870 when referring to any stated period within the topic including 1896-1914, 1896-1922 and 1919-22, leading to wide generalisations and inaccuracies which undermine the security of knowledge in the whole answer.

Q5. This question was focused on the promotion of political stability in Italy in the years 1903-1914, allowing for candidates to discuss the attempts by the Liberal State to deal with the growing political divisions between liberals, socialists, Catholic politics and nationalists. However, many candidates concentrated more on general economic, geographic and social division which, although often relevant, led to answers which gave generalised responses rather than a specific focus on the political issues. As a result there were many answers in Level 3 and low Level 4 rather than in the higher bands. Also, there was a general lack of chronological awareness of when different policies and actions took place within the time period leading to weak selection and application of supporting material. The best answers were able to suggest that despite attempts by Giolitti to introduce political and social reform, and to follow a more aggressive foreign policy that might prevent growing divisions in Italy, he was far from successful in healing divisions and in 1914 his administration collapsed with Italy divided over both future political developments and entry into World War One.

Q6. This question was the most popular and most candidates were able to discuss the role of force and intimidation in relation to other factors contributing to the consolidation of Fascist power. Many responses were limited to achieving Level 3-mid Level 4 by a lack of clear focus on the question asked and/or a weak selection of appropriate and detailed supporting material. The time period stated, from 1922-1929, allowed candidates to encompass events from the March on Rome to the signing of the Lateran Treaties and to concentrate on the consolidation of power rather than the early rise of the Fascist party. However, many candidates focused on the development of Fascism pre-1922 and/or the failure of the Liberal State as well as events from 1922 while others included material about policies implemented in the 1930s leading to imbalanced answers. There were also many answers which either had a very weak grasp of the chronology and/or discussed factors in very general terms with little detail. There was also a tendency towards assertion rather than explanation and evaluation which meant few answers attempted a judgement or an integrated evaluation leading to Level 5 marks. The best answers often discussed the physical consolidation of political power, rather than making generalised assertions about propaganda or popularity, with a discussion of the use of force and intimidation to take over political institutions in combination with 'legal' methods, the role of the elites and the Catholic Church and the genuine popularity of Fascist policies.

This is a low Level 5 response to Question 6.

The plan to this answer clearly indicates that the candidate understands the need to both develop the given factor and to evaluate with consideration of other factors.

(This page is for your first answer.) How far do you  
PLAN: agree that the consolidation of  
Fascist power in Italy in 1922-29 was mainly due to  
force + intimidation  
Was due to force / Wasn't  
& intimidation  
- Ras & Squadristi's Laws / decrees  
actions  
1 Getting power due to force & intimidation  
2 Within gov - forced through bills  
↳ Acerbo law  
Mattedi crisis  
Actually, quite a little force & intimidation  
↳ OVRA  
Though pleasing the public - Dapporto  
Grand Fascist Council  
Rope Pius XI  
away

(This page is for your first answer.)

In October 1922, Mussolini was appointed Prime Minister of Italy by Victor Emmanuel III. To ~~consolidate~~ <sup>consolidate</sup> his power, Mussolini used some force, aggression and intimidation, ~~is~~ through violent squads and <sup>political aggression</sup> ~~intimidation~~. However, ~~violence~~ <sup>intimidation</sup> was not seen as the biggest reason in consolidating power, as legal changes to government and through pleasing the public, fascist power was maintained and fully consolidated by 1929.

Mussolini did somewhat rely on intimidation and force - in fact the reason he came to power was by threatening government during the March on Rome <sup>October 1922</sup> (Mussolini), in order to consolidate the power of the fascists, used intimidation to remove his opponents, so that by 1925, Italy had effectively become a one-party state. He imprisoned, <sup>and occasionally killed</sup> those who were considered to be a threat, and the The 1924

(This page is for your first answer.)

Matteotti Crisis was an example of this. Mussolini allegedly ordered the murder of opposition leader Giacomo Matteotti, which led both the public and government to be in fear of him. The fact he got away with it consolidated his power, <sup>and that of the Fascists</sup> showing his strength of character and ~~as~~ <sup>as</sup> few were afraid to go against him.

As well as controlling the population through repression with the Blackshirts, Mussolini intimidated his opponents in Parliament. By passing the Acerbo Law of 1923, ~~he had~~ the largest party, currently the Fascists (PNF), would gain 66% of the seats in parliament, effectively meaning that Mussolini could pass any legislation he wanted to put the Fascist party. This also consolidated the power of the Fascists, and allowed an increase in their power.

The fascists were also fearful towards the general public. The ras and squadisti were violent to those speaking out against the Fascists, and the PSI, the Italian Socialist

(This page is for your first answer.)

Party, were the first to be targeted. This was extended to anyone who was considered Anti-Fascist. Mussolini made treason capital punishment legal for treason after an assassination attempt on him, all of this intimidating the public to become Fascist and to vote for them, consolidating the power of the fascists.

On the other hand, it could be seen that the RNF were not particularly violent or intimidating at all: OVRA (the organisation for vigilance and repression of Anti-Fascism) was nowhere near as violent as Germany's equivalent, the SA, with fewer than 20 people being killed for anti-fascism by 1929, suggesting it wasn't significant to Fascist power consolidation.

Other factors were more important than intimidation *ad fore* in consolidating Fascist power. Mussolini and the PNF were actually considered quite popular by some without the violence or repression intimidating

(This page is for your first answer.) Then they had created the Popolavoro in 1925 to launch sport and activity clubs and ~~the~~ <sup>Mussolini</sup> was seen as both a charismatic and successful leader by many, after the success of getting Somalia after the Corfu incident and acquiring Rome in 1924, and subsequently extending its influence in the Adriatic region and gaining Albania. Through popular and successful policy, the Fascists consolidated their power and retained their position, <sup>More so than through violence & force.</sup> The Catholic Church ~~the impact of the~~ <sup>The Catholic Church</sup> individuals also helped consolidated their power. Pope Pius XI was unwilling for the Catholics to be involved in politics, and shut down the Popolari party. The Catholic Church was ready to negotiate with the PNF and through the Lateran Pact & Concordat, the Church was happy with PNF ruling Italy. The PNF's negotiation with the Catholic Church was thus important in consolidating Fascist power, ~~as it~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~only~~ ~~way~~ ~~that~~ ~~could~~ ~~be~~ ~~achieved~~ ~~in~~ ~~Italy~~ ~~at~~ ~~that~~ ~~time~~.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~remove the PNF?~~

because the Church could have been a large opponent of the fascist regime. ~~The fact they~~

The Fascists also consolidated power through political and by legally changing the way the country was run. Mussolini set up the Grand Fascist Council in December 1924 and by phasing out parliament from the governmental system, he had removed all opposition from government. By doing this, the Fascists eliminated another threat to their power, consolidating it further, ~~and~~ <sup>with the</sup> use of intimidation.

Overall, the Fascists had consolidated their power in Italy from 1922-29 successfully through a variety of methods. Although intimidation and force were somewhat part of the consolidation of power, the Fascists dealing with opposition, the Church and pleasing everyday citizens were all more important than

(This page is for your first answer.) intimidation, so the fascist power in Italy from 1922 to 1929 was not mainly due to the use of intimidation and force, rather the elimination of political opponents.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response is directly focused on the question asked with commentary on the given factor in relation to the other factors under discussion. The answer develops the key issue of force and intimidation with reference to the March on Rome, political opponents, ordinary people and other dictatorships that were to emerge during the period. It then goes on to develop its counter-argument with reference to popularity, the Church and legal consolidation. The supporting material is not always secure or detailed e.g. reference to Locarno rather than the Lateran Treaties but it does have range, and the material selected is appropriate and relevant.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to make sure that the opening sentences of each paragraph create and further the argument that has been outlined in the introduction. Although some paragraph openings here are more successful than others there is a sense throughout that the question asked is being answered.

#### **F4 – Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75**

As stated in previous examination sessions, it is pleasing to see the number of centres studying Spain. Most candidates seem to have a good grasp of the development of events over time. However, a significant minority of candidates in this particular session found it difficult to place the election of the Popular Front government in 1936 leading to some confused answers for Question 7. The use of basic time lines are recommended as a way to ensure that candidates develop a secure chronological knowledge of what was a fast changing period of history. Question 7 was by far the most popular question but it should be noted that the years of Francoism cover by far the longest time period within the topic and as such should be addressed if candidates are to be able to have a choice of questions to answer.

Q7. Most candidates are well prepared for questions concerning the outbreak of the war. Many candidates were clearly aware of long term, short term and immediate/trigger causes of the outbreak of civil war. However, it is important that if candidates are going to use this as an analytical approach that they do not just start at the beginning with the long term causes thus creating a narrative commentary which does not engage with the given factor until it appears in the chronology. Many good responses failed to achieve the higher Levels because they spent so long explaining the long term causes that, by the time they had reached the consequences of the Popular Front election, time was running out and so the given factor was dealt with briefly rather than evaluated in relation to other causes. A significant number of candidates confused the Popular Front with the Provisional Government of 1931 and a few responses confused the civil war with the revolution of 1931. The best answers were able to put the consequences of the Popular Front election into the context of the long term divisions and fears within Spain and to relate this to the decision of the generals to carry out the attempted coup d'état which led to the civil war.

Q8. Very few candidates chose to answer this question. Those who did were clearly aware of the general pattern of change over time with reference to Franco and the Nationalists support of and from the Catholic Church during the Civil War and the consequent close relationship after 1939 combined with some misgivings about Franco's use of terror and the effects of tourism on the morals of the Spanish people. Some responses also mentioned the influence of Opus Dei on the technocrat revolution from the late 1950s onwards. However, few candidates seemed to be aware of the role of the Church officials in the criticism of the Franco regime towards the end of his rule. Some candidates also confused Spain with Italy referring to events more indicative of the relationship between Mussolini and the Catholic Church. Most responses tended towards narrative and/or assertion and consequently achieved Level 3-mid Level 4.

#### **F5 – Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91**

Most centres prepare their candidates well for this topic and responses show a good knowledge of the topic with a clear understanding of the main themes. However, there were a significant minority of candidates with a weak chronological awareness of the changes over time and, in particular, are confused over the time scale of events after the creation of the Berlin Wall. A worrying number of candidates seemed to suggest that Mikhail Gorbachev came to power immediately after the death of Stalin.

Q9. Most candidates who attempted this question were aware of the significance of Willy Brandt and of the policy of *Ostpolitik*. Level 4 answers were able to explain the significance of Brandt in relation to other factors or to discuss the extent to which he was responsible but most failed to reach Level 5 because of either a failure to come to a judgement about his role or because of a weak grasp of chronology. Many responses suggested that he was Chancellor for the whole time period between 1969 and 1979 and few were aware of other developments in East-West relations or the actions of the East German government during the period, leading to Level 3 descriptions/assertions of Brandt's role. The best answers suggested that although Brandt played a very significant role in relations he was able to do so because of the Cold War context at the time and that the economic situation in East Germany allowed his successors to continue to dominate the relationship in the latter part of the decade.

Q10. This was a popular question and most candidates were well versed in the general causes of the collapse of communism in East Germany. Some candidates focused on the collapse in relation to the longer term causes while others concentrated exclusively on the events of 1989. Either approach was considered appropriate to the question asked. However, both responses were often limited in attainment by a lack of knowledge and/or chronological security. Many responses were unsure of the actions of the Honecker government in response to both events in East Germany and the actions of Gorbachev leading to weak discussion of the given factor. Also responses which looked at long term causes often referred exclusively to events which occurred in the 1950s and 1960s, or made wide generalisations about the economic differences between East and West Germany asserting that this caused the collapse, with little explanation. A few candidates appeared to believe that Solidarity emerged in Poland in 1989 and that Gorbachev was elected to power in the USSR. Some of the best answers suggested that the failure of the East German regime to respond to the changes spreading through eastern Europe combined with the influence of Gorbachev in the USSR meant that it was only a matter of time before communism collapsed.

This is an example of a Level 5 response to Question 10.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan: collapse of communism <sup>Repeal Honecker's law</sup> to introduce political reform

Honecker - Gorbachev

Protest East bloc movement - Hungary

Emigration Cold War tensions reduced

Failure of GDR's economy to what extent.

The collapse of communism in East Germany in 1989 was to a large extent a result of Honecker's government's refusal to implement reforms as it only served to undermine GDR's existence. However there were other factors that to a large extent influenced its collapse such as the emergence of Gorbachev in Soviet Union which sparked off the liberalisation movement in the Eastern bloc, the reduction of increasing protests & demonstrations by the GDR citizens themselves etc combined

(This page is for your second answer.) with the failure of the communists to create a working socialist state in GDR.

The refusal of Honecker's government to implement reforms is to a large extent important in the collapse of communism as his intransigence meant that instead of reforms being introduced & thus the GDR changing, reforms weren't introduced & this res meant the GDR's <sup>communist</sup> existence was eventually undermined. There were calls from the GDR citizens themselves, from Gorbachev in Russia & even other SED members for reform, & however Honecker refused to implement them as he felt that if he did, the GDR would retreat from its Socialist principles. However this only & therefore there was the reason for its existence. However this only served to increase the discontent within the GDR and Gorbachev's reform that 'use' punishes those who want to 'cut' (some more or protests grew & discontent rose. It has been argued that if Honecker had been removed months before he died in 18<sup>th</sup> October 1989 that the collapse might have been averted, thus Honecker's refusal to implement reforms sped up the collapse of communism. When he returned from his operation he called for SED newspapers to denounce all emigrants as 'counter-revolutionary' & this increased

(This page is for your second answer.) internal opposition. Khrushchev's government's refusal to implement reforms also meant that when the successive government under Brezhnev attempted to it was too late & the opposition's appetite was only increased. Thus to a large extent Khrushchev's government to implement reforms contributed to the collapse of communism as <sup>his intransigence</sup> it meant calls changed from <sup>(communism)</sup> ~~the~~ reform to <sup>communism's</sup> its collapse.

However there factors to a degree & great extent were highly important in contributing to the communist collapse; both internal and ~~also~~ external. The most significant external threat ~~to it~~ was arguably the emergence of Gorbachev in Russia in ~~1985~~ 1985 and his reforms (Perestroika (economic reforms) and Glasnost (freedom of speech / right to have communists in ethnic guerrilla / freedom to etc) meant that liberalisation in Eastern bloc was sparked off ~~ideas~~ <sup>ideas</sup> that had two detrimental impacts on <sup>communism in the</sup> the GDR as it gave people the impetus to start calling for reform but also meant that the reform movement ~~meant~~ Khrushchev's hardline stance was undermined by Gorbachev & this <sup>in turn</sup> created a ~~double~~ dilemma for SED government. Part of Gorbachev's <sup>economic</sup> reforms to meant reducing military spending. This was highly important as there were ~~one~~ half a million

(This page is for your second answer.) Soviet soldiers in the GDR, twice the size of its own army, who helped to implement the government's socialist rule, such as in the June 1953 uprisings. Gorbachev however reduced this to just under 200,000 Soviet soldiers which meant that the West German government no longer had the backing of Soviet troops in Russia; this was further reinforced when the Russian commitment to the Brezhnev doctrine came to an end in 1988; therefore the confidence of the Government was severely reduced as they could no longer simply rear their head. This loss of confidence can be seen in the government's failure to put down the old growing demonstrators in Leipzig.

Gorbachev's reforms also paved the way for movements in other Eastern bloc countries which to a large extent contributed to the fall of communist regimes in 1989. It had the major effect, the first being that the protests in GDR grew more confident as they saw calls for reform were being successful elsewhere such as Polish Solidarity movement in August 1989. Another major consequence was the fall itself on the 2nd May <sup>1989</sup> the re-forming Hungarian Government opened its border with Austria. Not only

(This page is for your second answer.) This was a major blow from another Warsaw Pact ally, Hungary, but also meant that the growing problem of emigration intensified; in ~~summer~~ <sup>summer</sup> 1989 ~~30,000~~ <sup>30,000</sup> left the GDR for the FRG, and on the 11th of September the Hungarian government claimed that GDR citizens could legally use the border; this meant emigration intensified to 100,000 in the autumn. Thus communism in GDR was being undermined by the fact that its allies were reforming & by the fact that their citizens were clearly voting with their feet against it; thus the effects of reforms elsewhere were highly significant in sparking off the ~~fall~~ collapse of communism. Another factor that is arguably ~~to be~~ <sup>to be</sup> the greatest extent the most important factor in its collapse is the pressure from the GDR citizens themselves. Although the protests were sparked off ~~to~~ <sup>by</sup> ~~arguably~~ <sup>by</sup> the reform movements elsewhere, there had been growing discontent due to the failure to create a stable Socialist state; there was a poor quality of life compared to their neighbours in FRG. Thus when calls for reform started the underlying discontent surfaced & resulted in mass demonstrations & growth of new political parties such as new

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~From~~ From Timm. On the 9th October 1989 70,000 demonstrated in Leipzig & the government's refusal to not use force to put this claim meant that demonstrations grew in size & on the 11th of November half a million demonstrated in Alexanderplatz calling for reform within GDR. This is highly significant as it can be argued that without these demonstrations Honecker wouldn't have needed to <sup>use</sup> ~~not~~ implement reforms which arguably led to its collapse; thus the demonstrations brought to light the growing problems in the GDR & sped up communism's collapse. ~~for~~ for

Therefore we can see that when Gorbachev introduced freedom for all GDR citizens to travel on the 9th of ~~Oct~~ November 1989 ~~Germany~~ the Berlin wall fell & was opened, arguably the symbol of the end collapse of communism, that this ~~also~~ collapse was perhaps inevitable. Honecker's government's refusal to implement reforms meant that discontent grew & when Gorbachev succeeded him, his reforms were not enough to satisfy the appetite of the opposition that had increasingly grown. However it is arguable that this only sped up its ~~own~~ collapse and that the effect of ~~Honecker~~

(This page is for your second answer.) Gorbachev's reforms initiated the process, & the growing demonstrations due to emigration & protests within the GDR gave power to the movement that meant consequently it collapsed due to the force of the collective will of the GDR people that had grown weary with the failures of the socialist system. Therefore in conclusion Honecker's government's refusal to implement reforms merely spread up the collapse of communism & to a large extent it can be argued that the emergence of Gorbachev in Russia & the consequent results of this such as protests within the GDR were the most significant factors in contributing to the collapse of communism.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response directly answers the question asked. It produces an integrated argument but is firmly focused on the extent to which Honecker's refusal to reform affected the ultimate collapse of communism. Note that this answer is aware of the election of the pro-Solidarity government in Poland in 1989 and does not confuse this with the emergence of Solidarity earlier in the decade.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to make sure that paragraph openings advance the argument being made in the answer rather than stating a fact or making an assertion.

## **F6 – The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism**

This is a very wide-ranging topic and centres are clearly concentrating more specifically on the bullet points and clarification in the specification leading to more focused answers from candidates. However, there are still a significant number of candidates who focus entirely on the Arab-Israeli conflicts or who fail to read the time period stated in the question. It is vital for success in this paper that candidates answer the question and focus on the key words in the question set.

Q11. This was the most popular question. Candidates were clearly aware of the consequences of the Six Day War on Middle East politics and many responses were impressive in their detailed knowledge of the gains made by Israel and the effects on Palestinian politics. Unfortunately many candidates were not able to then use this to discuss the effect on Middle East stability in the years 1967-79 focusing instead on its importance as part of the continuing Arab-Israeli conflicts or on its role in the events leading to the Yom Kippur War and so finishing in 1973. However, there were some very good answers which were able to discuss the role of the Six Day War in the wider context of Middle East instability with reference to the decline in Arab nationalism, the growth of militant Palestinian politics, terrorist activity, the Cold War, the oil crisis and the emergence of Islamist views. A few candidates suggested that, in spite of growing Middle East instability during this period, the consequences of the Six Day War subsequently led to some rapprochement between Israel and Egypt.

Q12. There were very few responses to this question. As in previous examination sessions with questions set on this period of the topic, candidates often lacked confidence in the use of supporting material and had a confused knowledge of the chronology of events. The time period stated allows candidates to discuss the reasons for the growth of Islamic fundamentalism between the Iranian Revolution and the September 2001 attacks in New York. Some good answers were able to discuss the impact of Western influence, continuing Palestinian issues, the consequences of the end of the Cold War, events in Afghanistan and the rise of Islamist politics. Centres are reminded that the indicative content section of the published mark scheme gives examples of supporting knowledge that might be used by candidates to answer questions.

## **F7 – From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany, 1918-45**

The majority of centres study this topic. Q13 was more popular than Q14. There is clear evidence that responses to questions are becoming more focused with a greater understanding of the key issues involved. The use of supporting material is also becoming more accurate but there are still many candidates who either make wide generalisation or bold assertions and who are confused as to the chronology of events. If candidates are going to use a thematic approach to answer the question it is vital that they use accurate dates. For example, an answer which refers to the Kapp Putsch (1920) in a paragraph following a discussion of the role of the Nazi Party in the Munich Putsch (1923) needs to make it clear which happened first.

Q13. This was a very popular question. In general, candidates approached this with some confidence and were able to discuss the different challenges to the Weimar Republic during the years 1919-29. Many responses were well focused but a significant minority focused on the reasons for the failure of the Weimar Republic to 1933 or on the rise of the Nazi Party. There were also some candidates who clearly confused right wing and left wing groups. Level 3 responses tended to give an account of the different political and economic threats to the Weimar Republic between 1919 and 1923, explaining how they were overcome rather than analysing the extent to which the Republic was under threat. Reference to the economic challenges to the Republic were less inclined to confuse the hyperinflation with the Great Depression, as was often the case in previous years, and many candidates were aware that the Wall Street Crash was the trigger for events which happened mainly after 1929. Indeed, some of the better answers were able to suggest that the greatest challenges were yet to come. Many answers discussed the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution but were unable to give specific examples of the problems that it caused referring to 'lots of' coalition governments and to the use of Article 48 without evidence. Some of the best answers suggested that, at the time, the threat from the left seemed to be the most challenging but that it was the exploitation by the extreme right of the weaknesses caused by the Versailles Treaty and the Weimar Constitution during this period which would prove to be the greatest challenge.

The following is a Level 5 response to Question 13.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan

Threat Right - Kapp Putsch 1920 March  
Munich Beer Hall Putsch  
Rise of Nazis

Left - 1919 Jan Spartacist  
1921 March Uprising  
1923 German October

Weakness of traditional institutions & constitution  
Treaty of Versailles / Hyperinflation

From the years 1919-1929 the Weimar ~~failed~~ republic  
 endured many challenges to its stability, significantly  
 from the extreme right which arguably led to  
 its increasing instability and its final collapse.  
 However its stability was also challenged by  
 threats from the extreme left, from its own  
 constitution, the Treaty of Versailles & the period

(This page is for your first answer.) of hyperinflation 1923, which all accumulated in significantly challenging its stability.

The threat to challenge from the extreme right significantly destabilized the Weimar Republic in these years as it posed a threat from the very beginning that was to worsen increased as the years went by and in fact was insidious. The first challenge came in March 1920 from the Kapp Putsch when Kapp put together 12,000 Freikorps to march on Berlin and threaten the aim of setting up a new government. The army significantly defeated the government were forced to flee Berlin, however on their way as they did so they called for a general strike which paralyzed the city and spread to other parts of Germany, however despite this meant after 3 days the putch failed, however despite its failure this still posed a challenge to the stability of Weimar Republic as they ~~did not~~ ~~understand~~ the challenge came early on its birth before the <sup>secure</sup> foundation had been laid. Another significant ~~threat~~ <sup>challenge</sup> from the extreme right was in November 1923 the Munich Beer Hall Putsch, arguably the first challenge to emerge from the Nazi Party on the 9th of

(This page is for your first answer.) November Hitler with 600 SA men held a meeting in Munich, Goebbels & declared a national revolution, however his fellow members Kahr & Lohse had lost faith in the plan with Secker mobilised the armed forces and so when Hitler returned into Munich the following day with 20,000 SA men they were quickly put down by the army & police. However this challenge provoked the young disaffected with the regime from the extreme left & the aftermath marked a significant turning point as Hitler re-thought his strategy for gaining power & on his release from prison (as a consequence of the Putsch) he reorganised the party. This is significant as it marks the beginning of the Nazi party's emergence and the following years it can be argued that their growth, although perhaps understated at the time, posed a significant challenge to Weimar Republic. In the years 1925-29 although the Nazi Party was not a prime party, it can be argued that their growth was a challenge to the Weimar Republic's stability as it presented how the people of Germany were growing increasingly <sup>disaffected</sup> ~~disaffected~~ with the regime. For example although the Nazis did

(This page is for your first answer.) poorly in the 1928 Reichstag elections only gaining 26% & 12 seats, in the State elections in Thuringia in 1929 they broke the 10% barrier for the first time with 11.3% (this marks the emergence of discontent within the rural population, which the Nazis successfully exploited in the year following; this presents a significant challenge to the Weimar Republic.

However, a significant challenge also came from the <sup>extreme</sup> left. In January 5<sup>th</sup> 1919 the Spartacist revolted / there were three days of savage street fighting ensued with 100 deaths; however they were ~~soon~~ not put down with the use of 500 Freikorps. However this challenge to Weimar Republic is not shown in how due to the chaotic disturbances the locally was forced to meet in Weimar not Berlin, hence the name the Weimar Republic; therefore we can see at the time this posed a serious challenge. There were continuous left wing disturbances in the early years of the Republic; 'March Revolution' in March 1921 saw a wave of strikes & rebellions & in June 1923 in Saxony there was a German October that led to the <sup>setting</sup> up of a KPD / SPD Government; this the challenge from the left ultimately may have ~~be~~ seemed more

(This page is for your first answer.) Significant. However they were successfully repressed by the Freikorps and meant they were weakened & in the following years couldn't mount a united attack. However they won did see success in elections gaining 10%. Therefore the extreme left posed a challenge initially however during the years of following the challenge significantly reduced.

A hugely significant challenge to the Weimar Republic was the constitutional issue. Although successful in many ways the faults acknowledged there the issue of proportional representation meant that it was almost impossible to form a majority government hence coalitions had to be formed based on compromise, this led to instability. The issue of Article 48 was to be played out during 1930-33 however in these years meant that the president had powers equivalent to those of a substitute emperor, thus this meant that to mean that Article 48 was a constitutional anomaly paving the way for authoritarianism. However the most significant problem lay in the allowance of the constitution to let the horrors of the Weimar Republic remain & not to change them. ~~FOR~~ This posed a very significant challenge to Weimar Republic

(This page is for your first answer.) as it handicapped its survival. For example the judiciary remained sympathetic to the right and this can be seen in their leniently handing the Putschists of 1920 & 1923, when only one was punished as to what the court did the judge during Hitler's trial was known only giving him 5 years and he only served 9 months; this reflects how the judiciary was perhaps encouraging the extreme right challenge. This can also be seen in the fact that out of 376 political assassins in this period 254 from the right & only 28 were punished whereas 22 from the left & 10 were sentenced to death. The actions of the army also ~~challenged~~ challenged the Republic; in the Kapp Putsch, despite the Ebert-Saenger agreement, they did not intervene, undermining the Republic and in the aftermath it was not transformed & Seeckt became leader which is seen the army became a state within a state & thus posed a significant challenge to Weimar Republic. The old institutions such as the civil service & the universities also continued to sympathise to old imperial values. This meant that Weimar <sup>Republic</sup> faced internal challenges to its stability throughout the period 1924 - 1919 - 1929.

(This page is for your first answer.) Therefore, in conclusion the challenge from the extreme right did pose a serious challenge to the Weimar Republic as it was present throughout the whole of its lifetime and arguably grew becoming an even greater challenge. One was to pose play a key role in its eventual collapse. However it can be argued that at the time the challenge from the extreme right appeared more serious as there was a series of parliamentary disturbances that this meant Weimar Republic came to rely on the traditional forces such as the army & judiciary. This in itself arguably posed the greatest threat as the forces on which Weimar Republic came to rely were not sympathetic to the Weimar Republic & thus posed a arguably the most significant challenge as the constitution undermined the Weimar Republic. Thus the ~~challenge~~ <sup>challenge</sup> from the extreme right did add to serious and this can be seen in the collapse of Weimar, however the underlying challenge of its own constitution arguably was the most serious challenge.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response is directly focused on the question asked and attempts to produce a more integrated response. It argues that the right became the main challenge only after the end of the time period 1919-29, that during this period the challenge from the left was just as significant and that the Weimar constitution itself created a challenging environment which was later exploited by the right. This response points out that Article 48 was really only used to any effect from 1930 onwards but it was the ability of the right wing elite in the shape of the army and judiciary who were able to undermine the constitution during this period with a succession of coalition governments.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

- 1) The supporting material in these paragraphs is often long and detailed - the response could have been even better if this was broken up into shorter paragraphs or written more succinctly.
- 2) A good conclusion is one which comes to either a clear judgement or provides a more integrated response - this is an example of a good integrated conclusion.

(This page is for your second answer.) From 1919-1929, the extreme right-wing political groups such as the NSDAP were growing in popularity. The numerous Putschs, campaigns around the country and increasing awareness of the extreme right increased its presence and made it an important factor for the instability of the Weimar Republic between 1919-29. However, the threat from the left was also significant, as was the 'stab-in-the-back' ideology, but most importantly, the economic instability was the most significant challenge to the stability of the Weimar Republic, as these economic problems were the main reason to its collapse in 1933.

The extreme-right was significant in posing a threat to the future of the Weimar Republic. In 1920, the Kapp-Lüttwitz Putsch was the first sign that the right-wing attitude may become an increasing problem. The 1923 Hitler-Ludendorff Putsch (or the Beer-Hall Putsch) in Munich, Bayern was where Adolf Hitler, now leader of the NSDAP

(This page is for your second answer.)

made a name for itself. It was considered a failure by many, but Hitler's imprisonment gave him the chance to write Mein Kampf. These were all signals that the threat from the extreme right posed a threat to Weimar.

Once

Once the USDP became more popular, their threat to the stability of Weimar increased. In 1928-29, the extreme right was more significant than ever before. Hitler encouraged peasants disgruntled with poor wheat prices to vote Nazi in spite of the Covenant. Hitler also campaigned considerably opposing the Young Plan. The Anti-Young campaign made Hitler a well-known name. Although these were considerable in causing anxiety ~~and~~ in Weimar government, they were not particularly significant as a threat to the Weimar Republic.

Some may consider the threat from the left to be even more significant. Bavaria had declared itself a 'socialist republic' and the increasing

(This page is for your second answer.)

In place of the Spartacists under the likes of Rosa Luxemburg was definitely important in making <sup>the</sup> Weimar ~~unstable~~ Republic unstable. Furthermore, ~~the right wing wasn't~~ as well known in 1929 as

Although the right wing NSDAP came into power only 4 years after 1929, they were not the biggest threat at the time. With only 1 million votes at the 1928 election and only 3 deputies including Hitler himself, people in 1929 wouldn't have considered Hitler and the Nazis as a threat to the collapse of the Weimar Republic.

Others may consider the 'stab-in-the-back' myth a more important factor challenge to the stability of the Weimar Republic. ~~There was mass~~ contention with ~~the~~ ~~series~~

The people of Germany were unhappy that the Weimar Government's main members had agreed to sign the Treaty of Versailles as it was considered by some as Anti-German. This 'stab-in-the-back'

(This page is for your second answer.) myth led to many people being disgruntled with the Weimar government - this could be argued as being more of a threat than the <sup>extreme</sup> right wing.

However, the most important factor challenging the stability of the Weimar Republic was undoubtedly the economic situation. The dire economic situation was not only extremely significant on its own, but also led to the increase in support for the left and right wing in the first place. ~~The~~ The war-guilt clause of the Treaty of Versailles meant that Germany had to pay extremely high reparations to the Entente. The land that most of their ~~agricultural~~ agriculture and mining of ores and metals took place on was given to France and Poland and to solve this, quantitative easing was enforced, leading to hyper-inflation until the introduction of the Rentenmark in 1923. This was causing mass hardship <sup>and unemployment</sup> for the German population.

(This page is for your second answer.) and was the major reason as to why the majority of people were unsupportive of the Weimar Government. The Dawes Plan and the Young Plan of 1924 and 1929 respectively meant a heavy reliance on US money, which the Wall St Crash of 1929 demonstrated. By the end of 1929, Germany was in a deep depression and the people were disheartened with the Weimar Republic.

The rise of the NSDAP and the extreme right was ~~also~~ a challenge that the Weimar Government would have had to have dealt with in 1925. However, because its importance was only really prominent ~~off~~ between 1929-33, other factors were more important than this. The 'stab in the back' myth and rise of the left wing extremists were also just as important as the threat from the right between 1919-1929, but the economic situation of the Weimar Republic was more

(This page is for your second answer.) *important than all of these factors in posing a challenge to the Weimer Government from ~~the~~ 1919-1929.*



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This response is focused directly on the question - although there is some suggestion that the candidate would be more comfortable answering a question about the collapse of Weimar, rather than the challenges to it. The answer develops the given factor with the second major paragraph being much stronger than the first. This is a clear Level 5 paragraph - it makes a point, provides succinct and relevant supporting evidence and ends with an evaluative concluding sentence. It has a weaker section on the left but finishes with a clear counter-argument that both the Versailles Treaty and the subsequent economic problems were more important.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Write an opening paragraph which addresses the question directly. This opening puts the key issue into the context of the time period and suggests alternative challenges which are of greater significance. The key to a good answer is to then go on to develop this opening argument in a sustained manner.

Q14. Most candidates who attempted this question understood the general aims and objectives of the Nazi policies towards women and were able to suggest some extent of success or failure and change over time. Candidates were able to establish range through the discussion of a variety of areas including employment, marriage, birth rates and social standing and through a consideration of changing attitudes over time. Most responses were able to show how Nazi policies were implemented and to suggest that the policies were greatly affected by the outbreak of war in 1939. However, in general there were far too many bold assertions about women being banned from all work, being 'forced' to have babies and being required to go back to work as soon as war broke out in 1939. There was little awareness that the percentage of working class women in work remained high throughout the period or of the reluctance of the Nazi hierarchy to address the necessity of war work for married women directly until the increasingly desperate situation in the mid-years of the war. Discussions of the attempts to raise the birth rate and the extent to which women supported the policies were less simplistic though. The best responses were able to discuss a range of policies and to evaluate the success of policies across most of the time period.

This is an example of a low Level 5 response.

~~The~~ Although the Nazis did not have a clear plan about how they were going to create an ideal society when Hitler became Chancellor in 1933, they did have some ideas of what a harmonious society would look like. ~~to~~ ~~The aims of their~~ This involves a traditional family unit, with the father going to work and the mother at home and responsible for the children. ~~They~~ There was also a desire to increase the size of the population. Thus, the aims of the Nazis were to reduce the number of women in employment and increase the birth rate. Broadly speaking, the Nazis were successful until the outbreak of World War Two in 1939, ~~but~~ <sup>until</sup> ~~the~~ the men went to war. Taking into account the whole period and <sup>policy towards women</sup> in light of their aims, the Nazis were only marginally successful. Firstly, the Nazis did enjoy limited success in reducing the number of women in employment. There were various policies which aimed to do this. For example, if women gave up their jobs so that men could work, they were rewarded economically. ~~As a result~~ This enjoyed some success, with ~~thousands of women~~ approximately 2 million women standing down as a result of this policy. The number of women teaching in universities fell from 75 in 1933 to 25 in 1939. This policy was successful to the extent that there was a fall in ~~un~~ unemployment from 6% when the Nazis ~~took~~

(This page is for your second answer.)

came to power to 1 million in 1940.

However, ~~in some ways~~ <sup>the Nazis</sup> somewhat failed in <sup>their aim of</sup> restoring women back to their 'natural ~~for~~ environment', the home. When the men went to war from 1939 onwards, then women were required to take up their jobs. They played an important role in armaments production in particular. As a result, the number of women in employment increased. Furthermore, ~~women also had~~ <sup>to</sup> as a result of the policies of job creation, a shortage of labour started to emerge in some industries from 1938 onwards, so women were required to work regardless of the impacts of war. Thus, it can be seen that the Nazis only temporarily succeeded in reducing the number of women in employment; that women were happy to come back suggests they had not changed the mindset of the population to one where women would not, ~~work~~ <sup>if possible, work</sup>. For example, the number of women teaching in universities rose from 25 in 1939 to 50 in 1945.

~~The~~ The Nazis also enjoyed ~~a~~ limited success in their bid to increase birth rates. This would be done in a variety of ways. In 1938, ~~the~~ a law was created which allowed infertility as grounds for divorce. Abortion and contraception were outlawed, which also

(This page is for your second answer.)

pleased the Church. It was made easier for marriages to take place and married couples received tax breaks. The most famous example was ~~the~~ a scheme ~~of~~ where women were rewarded for how many children they had, with a Gold Cross for 8, Silver Cross for 6 and Bronze Cross for 4. Thousands of women ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> many children and were able to meet with Hitler as a result. ~~Birth rate~~ ~~As~~ Birth rates rose until the men went to war, increasing the size of the German population by 5 million, and in this respect their policy towards women were successful.

On the other hand, birth rates fell after <sup>1939</sup> ~~1939~~ as ~~men~~ ~~were~~ ~~required~~ ~~to~~ ~~of~~ many men went to war so breeding could not take place. As well as this, the fact that women did not have so many children after the period shows that ~~they~~ the Nazis did not succeed in changing the natural outlook of women towards children; it was only with great incentives ~~that~~ that they could give up their jobs and have more children. ~~Thus~~ ~~great~~ ~~credit~~, however, the Nazis did achieve success in the policy of increasing birth rates, as the average number of children per woman rose from 2.8 to 3.8.

(This page is for your second answer.)

On balance, therefore, it can be seen that the Nazis did achieve limited success in their policies towards women. Indeed, had it not been for the outbreak of war in 1939, perhaps ~~it~~ the ~~policy~~ policies may have turned out to be a definite success in the period 1933-45. The aims were to reduce the number of women in employment so that men could take their jobs, ~~and~~ and increase the birth rate ~~to the first case~~. In both cases, incentives were offered with ~~succeeded in~~ so far as the data <sup>suggests that</sup> ~~supports their~~ the aims were fulfilled. However, it was only with great incentives, and even with these, ~~the~~ policies had to be reversed after 1939. Thus, the Nazis were only marginally successful in achieving the aims of their policies in the years 1933-45, as the changes were superficial and underlying ~~changes~~ <sup>In societal structures and attitudes</sup> had not been made.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response has a direct focus - understanding of the key issues and covers both a range of issues and most of the time period.

## Paper Summary

Centres might consider the following areas to help improve candidates' responses:

- Answer the question set – are candidates concentrating on the specific wording in the question and the dates covered?
- Chronological awareness and application – do candidates know the key dates and are they able to explain/expand points made with accurate reference to the order in which events happened?
- Supporting material – are candidates using sufficient relevant, specific and accurate material to support their analysis and, in particular, the conclusions to which they come?
- Reaching a judgement – is a relevant and analytical conclusion just placed at the end of a response which makes a series of developed assertions/explanations or does the conclusion reached reflect the argument made and sustained in the main body of the essay?

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code US030592 January 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

