

Examiners' Report
June 2014

GCE History 6HI01 F

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2014

Publications Code US039072

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

Introduction

6HI01 – General comments

This year most candidates were able to provide some explanatory framework as a basic scaffolding for their answer, had a general understanding of the demands of the question and were able to sustain a focus on the question set. The ability to call on some relevant information, and to develop it to some extent, means that fewer answers were placed in Level 2. Level 1 answers were, as always, characterised by their brevity, often just one or two paragraphs of generalised material with no development. At the other end of the scale of attainment, many answers accessed Level 5. These answers were directly focused and analytical, considered a number of relevant points, and exemplified these with a range of detailed information. Moreover, most Level 5 answers came from candidates with good communication skills and the ability to use historical words and phrases confidently.

There was a variety of approaches towards questions which had a multi-factored focus, usually signalled by the phrase 'the most important reason'. Some of the most confident answers included an introduction which either agreed with the role of the stated factor or proposed an alternative. Many candidates, however, were more reluctant to commit themselves. Their introduction usually agreed with the stated factor 'to some extent' but did not propose an alternative. Weighing up different factors before reaching a clear conclusion often differentiated between Level 4 and Level 5 answers.

There have been some improvements overall in the quality of written communication, with far fewer abbreviations and colloquialisms scattered through candidates' answers. However the quality of handwriting on a small number of scripts meant that some words and phrases were impossible to decipher, and this factor weakened communication overall.

Option F – General Comments

Over 3500 candidates sat the Option F paper in the June 2014 session. As in previous years centres and candidates are to be congratulated on their preparation for the examination. The majority of candidates were able to attempt an analysis of the focus of the questions set and were able to produce paragraphed responses with at least a sound knowledge of the content covered. However, there appeared to be more candidates this year relying on a type of 'model' answer which addressed the question sufficiently enough to be well-focused (Level 4) but not directly focused (Level 5) enough to create a well-rounded evaluative response.

It was noticeable yet again this summer that a large number of responses referred to the whole time period of the question in sweeping general statements with little regard to change over time. This was particularly so in Q5 – topic 3 – where most candidates referred to Mussolini's control of Italy in the years 1925-43 as if it were an unchangeable reality.

There is much good practice amongst centres to promote the use of 'connecting' terms and phrases at the beginning of paragraphs to create more discursive answers, e.g. on the other hand, nevertheless, further etc. However, there are also an increasing number of responses where the use of these terms seems to have become either arbitrary or formulaic. Both of these approaches often create the opposite effect to that which was intended, i.e. poorly reasoned and incoherent responses. Of most concern is the wide use of 'on the contrary' or 'on the other hand' when candidates are in reality discussing an extension of the previous point or developing a factor related to the previous point.

Many candidates this year produced sound Level 4 responses with good supporting material but were unable to fashion a response which moved securely into Level 5. This led to many responses following the pattern of a series of discrete paragraphs about the contribution of various factors to the process of unification with the focus of the question only really being

addressed in the conclusion. Many excellent concluding statements were not supported by the material discussed in the main body of the essay. These responses could be improved with regard to the following:

- introductory sentences which clearly show an understanding of the stated factor and the focus of the question along with the relevance of the beginning and end dates of the time period – this may prevent discussion of irrelevant material particularly with regard to events after the end date of the question
- chronological awareness – this may facilitate a greater awareness of change over time
- more focused analysis and explanation – many good responses produce well developed paragraphs which outline and expand on the contribution of various factors but this often leads to either inference or assertion rather than explanation and analysis
- linking related factors to create an overall impression of causation, consequence, significance or change over time – responses are often made up of a series of paragraphs about different factors with the assumption that they are completely independent of each other even where the links are obvious or fundamental.

The more able responses are those which create a discussion of the hypothesis or statement in the question by developing a balanced argument using accurate, well-selected supporting evidence and coming to a reasoned conclusion.

F1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question 1

The 'unification' topics for Option F had a small entry but most candidates were well prepared, had a sound knowledge of the content and were able to reach a judgement. However, in this session examiners commented on the continued increase in somewhat formulaic answers which although relevant and generally focused failed to engage explicitly with the question asked. One examiner commented:

'I often felt that some candidates had learned about the process and complexities of Italian unification, but in many cases did not apply their knowledge to the question demands – they had learned the topic, but seemed at times to have rehearsed answers to unification instead of adapting to the question demands'.

Many of the responses in both questions created imbalanced answers due to a lack of coverage of the whole time period of the question. Thankfully, there were far fewer responses than in previous sessions that included references to Mussolini.

Q1. This question focused on the role of Victor Emmanuel in the process of Italian unification. Candidates mostly discussed Victor Emmanuel in the context of Cavour and Garibaldi. Some introduced Napoleon as an individual. The more able candidates recognised and defined figurehead – although very few did this as part of an introduction, this meant they often lacked precise focus (see Option F general comments). The best examples often discussed Victor Emmanuel as being 'king in name' but also recognising his political contribution. However, there was a tendency by some candidates to engage with Victor Emmanuel's role and then introduce other figures (as a list) without offering links or a comparison or to dismiss Victor Emmanuel completely with little development. Many did not take into account evidence from across the whole date-range. Some candidates confused that the term 'figurehead' with that of leader or most important figure.

Question 2

Q2. This question focused on the role of France in shaping the process of Italian unification in the years 1858-70. This was generally well answered with candidates commenting on the French contribution at the various stages of Italian unification during these years. However, many candidates would have profited from briefly outlining the key elements of the 'shaping' process at the beginning of the response and so would have been more likely to cover the whole time period. In particular, many candidates did not refer to the plebiscites in the Central Duchies or the acquisition of Venetia; although some candidates suggested that France played no part in the events of 1866 at all. Some of the more able candidates suggested that while France was most important in the expulsion of Austria from Italy in the north it was the work of Cavour and Garibaldi which unified the rest of the peninsula. There were also some effective responses which focused on both the positive and negative impact of France on the shaping of the process. Less able candidates did not clearly establish links between various influences often leading to inference rather than analysis.

F2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question 3

Candidates were generally well prepared and had good understanding of the content of the Topic. There was much more evidence this year of secure chronological awareness leading to more coherent responses but many candidates still confused the dates of Bismarck's appointment as envoy to the German Confederation (1851) and the appointment of Cavour in Italy (1852) with the appointment of Bismarck as Minister President in 1862. Many candidates were able to deploy supporting evidence succinctly but some responses lacked clear exemplification and/or explanation of points made. Please note that the general comments made under the Unification of Italy also apply to this topic.

Q3. This was the less popular of the two questions but those who chose to answer this question often produced interesting answers which attempted to show the links between the events in 1848-49 and the process of unification in the years after. These answers often referred to the failure to unite Germany from below, the emergence of Prussia as a potential leader of a *Kleindeutschland* and the early signs of Austrian weakness despite the apparent 'victory' at Olmutz. Some were able to show the link between the consequences of the 1848-9 revolutions for liberal-nationalism and their relationship with Bismarck in the 1860s. Less able candidates tended to dismiss the contribution of 1848-49 revolutions and launch into a prepared answer with reference to other factors. Some responses at Level 2 described the course of the 1848-49 revolutions.

Question 4

Q4. Candidates overwhelmingly chose to answer this question. Most were able to address the role of Bismarck in the process of unification but many candidates are still unaware of the concept of diplomacy in this context; a significant minority see the meaning of diplomacy as Bismarck's ability to be 'diplomatic' in carrying out both this foreign and domestic policy. There were also a significant number who took the response beyond 1871 with particular reference to *Kulturkampf*. More able candidates gave detailed knowledge of Bismarck's diplomacy and were able to distinguish between the way in which he handled different situations – luck, opportunism etc. This was argued against a range of 'other' factors such as economic, military, Austrian weakness and Napoleon's miscalculations. Examples of individual situations were often skilfully explained, e.g. the Schleswig-Holstein question and its links with the lead-up to the Austro-Prussian war. However, many responses showed a lack of balance with too much focus on the early stages at the expense of the events leading to the Franco-Prussian war. Candidates could have prevented this by briefly outlining the key elements of the process of unification earlier in their response (see Option F general comments).

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

Question 5

Topic 3 was the second most popular area of study for Option F after Topic F7 and as such produced a wide variety of responses. As with last year, most candidates were well prepared with good knowledge of the content covered in the specification but there were a significant number who found it difficult to select supporting evidence which was wholly relevant to the questions asked or who made assertions without justifying or explaining the points made. A significant number of candidates also produced responses with a very confused chronology. In this session the chronology of both time periods covered were often confused and many responses included material irrelevant to the years being discussed.

Q5. This question was by far the most popular of the two. The question produced a wide variety of responses but most candidates had sound knowledge of the underlying influences on events in the years 1919-22. However, a worrying number of candidates included material from the post-1922 period and seemed to assume that Mussolini's promises were actually policies being actively implemented during the period. The responses were generally differentiated by the ability of the candidates to focus on the key elements of the question; growing support for Fascism as opposed to the rise to power of Mussolini, and fear of socialism as opposed to the growth of socialism. Many candidates were aware of the nature of, and responses to, the socialist threat but tended to assume that a description of socialist activities and the Fascist response was enough to explain the growth in support for Fascism. There was also an overwhelming assumption that Fascist policies and aims were attractive without outlining or explaining what those policies and aims were. The more able candidates often showed that the fear of socialism explained the growth in support from certain groups, e.g. the middle-classes, but that a combination of other factors led to other groups supporting Fascism.

Question 6

Q6. This question was the less popular of the two. The question gave candidates a chance to discuss the nature of Mussolini's control over Italy across the period 1925-43. It was, therefore, disappointing that very few candidates acknowledged the clear changes over time which took place. Indeed, most candidates referred to the period 1925-43 as if it were a whole and made virtually no reference to his fall from power. Also, while contextual reference to the period 1922-25 is clearly relevant, many candidates referred almost entirely to events in the period before 1925 or made general statements with limited reference to chronology of any kind. Many candidates also found it difficult to determine what was meant by personal popularity and, although linked to popularity, produced predetermined responses on the role of propaganda. Also in many responses popularity was seen entirely in relation to his popularity amongst the elites and individuals such as the king and the Pope. More able candidates were able to discuss the extent to which Mussolini was popular with the Italian people at various times across the period and in relation to other factors with which Mussolini attempted to control Italy.

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

Question 7

Once again it was a pleasure to note that the candidature studying this topic continued to rise. Centres should be congratulated for preparing candidates to deal with a complex and often confusing content and chronology so well. It was very rare to find a candidate who confused the Nationalists and Republicans during the Civil War period but some candidates did still find difficulty with the complexities of the period 1931-36. Without overemphasising the need for detail there was much more well-selected and relevant exemplification than in past sessions.

Q7. This was the less popular of the two questions. Most candidates were able to identify and explain the weaknesses of the reforms and how that provoked opposition. However, many struggled to understand the nature of 'conservative opposition' and then link it to the weaknesses of the government of the Second Republic. There was a tendency to narrative and often a failure to distinguish between left and right wing governments in the period. As a result many candidates would have profited from a clearer definition of the key terminology and time period as mentioned in the general comments to Option F above. More able candidates were able to explain how the strength of the military, Catholic Church and landowners/industrialists were able to undermine the initial reforms of the Republic and evaluate this in relation to other factors such as divisions amongst the left.

Question 8

Q8. This was the most popular question and most candidates were able to produce effective answers to the question. However, the focus was on the significance of Franco and many candidates produced imbalanced responses where Franco's role was dealt with briefly before launching into other factors. This was also a question where responses often dealt with the various factors, including the different contributions of Franco himself, as completely separate from one another with little acknowledgement of the links between them. However, there was some excellent exemplification of Franco's role and the nature of his approach to warfare. Some of the more able candidates were able to show the links between Franco's contribution and other factors such as external support or compared the effectiveness of Franco's contribution in comparison to the failures of the Republicans.

F5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question 9

As in previous years the candidates for this topic were usually very well grounded in the overall context and themes of the post-war period for Germany. Knowledge was usually good but there was a tendency to focus on questions which candidates wanted to answer rather than the questions on the paper itself. This led to responses which had some relevance but were not focused enough to achieve beyond mid-Level 4. This was also highlighted by the selection of supporting evidence which may have had some relevance and allowed some analysis but which was not relevant enough to explain clearly a response to the exact question asked.

Q9. This was the more popular of the two questions. Most responses were well-focused with a sound grounding of the events leading to the partition. However, as mentioned in the general comments to Option F, most candidates would have profited from clear reference to the creation of the separate states in 1949 early on in the response. Candidates were able to discuss a range of points about US actions, with the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Bizonia and currency reform all being dealt with in most answers. Similarly most candidates were able to discuss the Soviet contribution especially with regard to the Berlin Blockade. Some candidates were able to go further back and look at differences between the Allies and the USSR at Potsdam and make more general points about the Cold War context. Some candidates were able to effectively discuss internal factors, particularly the roles of Adenauer and Ulbricht. A significant number of responses provided a description of events from 1945 – 1949 and failed to analyse the responses systematically. Less able candidates discussed the emergence of the Cold War between 1945 and 1949 rather than focusing specifically on Germany.

(This page is for your second answer.) To what extent were the actions of the USA, 45-49 responsible for the partition of the two separate states.

In 1949 Germany was split into two separate states. The West of Germany under a Capitalist regime passed the basic law in 1949 setting up their new constitution. At the same time the East of Germany, under Communist control was doing the same thing. It can be argued that it was primarily due to the actions of the USA that the decision occurred, as they worked together with the Western Allies to merge their three zones of Germany, introducing a currency reform, which economically divided the West. However it can also be debated that it was the USSR that was responsible for the separation; as they created a physical divide of the Berlin Blockade to add to the partition of the two separate states.

The USA can be held accountable for the partition of Germany in to two separate states in 1949 due to the promises they broke at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Together with the Western Allies they merged their three zones of Germany in 1947 to create 'Bizonia'. The following year in 1948 a new currency was introduced. The

~~Reichsmark~~ Deutchmark replaced the worthless Rentenmark. This made Stalin, the Soviet leader of the USSR very suspicious. He saw the currency reform an attempt from the West to create

(This page is for your second answer.) a large Anti-Soviet entity in the West, he saw it as a threat, their way of protecting the West against communism, therefore ~~the~~ the USA can be seen as responsible for the division as they broke their promise and created a strong, economically advanced country, separate from the East. However it could be argued that it was not just the USA that broke their promise of the Yalta and Potsdam agreement. The USSR too did not follow the planned settlement as he did not hold free and fair elections in the East, as he wanted to ensure that ~~the East~~ East Germany would have a communist government, therefore the SED (communist party) received 99% of the vote, this was clearly a violation of the promise. Additionally Stalin and the USSR can be held responsible as he stripped the east of much of their materials and industry and took it back to Russia. He justified this as reparations as the USSR had suffered severely in the second world war. However the West did ~~not~~ see this as going against the agreements of 1945, and as a result they stopped sending industrial products to the East. Therefore the USSR can take some responsibility for the division as they went against the agreements as well, making the East of Germany ideologically different with a communist government and economically different as they removed much of the industry.

It can furthermore be argued that the USSR are responsible for the division of the two separate states of Germany because of their building of the Berlin Blockade. In 1948 Stalin blocked the road ways, rail and waterways that linked the West of Germany to Berlin. His aim was to prevent the west from providing provisions to Berlin and as a result force them out, so that the USSR could take full control. However the Berlin Blockade failed, as in 1949 the west found a way of delivering desperately needed provisions by air, therefore standing up to the communist threat. With this taken into account it can be argued that the USSR were responsible for the partition.

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~we~~ ~~the~~ created a physical divided ~~between~~ ~~the~~ ~~two~~ Germany, declaring the separation and differences between them. Many people called the Berlin Blockade a childish reaction.

On the other hand, it can be suggest that the USA were responsible as the Berlin Blockade was a direct reaction from the USSR to the introduction of the currency reform in 1948, which Stalin saw as a direct threat, and retaliated by taking a stand against the capitalist influence of America in West Germany. Additionally it can be suggested that Stalin actually did not want to divide Germany. In 1947 he pressed to the Western Allies the idea of a United Germany with one Central Government. Therefore the USA can be blamed for the decision as they rejected this proposal in fear of a communist take over.

Another factor that must be taken into account for the partition of Germany in 1949 is the Greater Cold War context. Germany was a major player in the cold war, as who ever had control of Germany ~~was~~ had the most power. The two different ideologies, Capitalism & Communism, that were strongly opposed on the two separate sides of Germany can be seen as a reason for the decision. Furthermore the Cold War can be held responsible for the action of both the USA and the USSR. The tensions were extremely high between the two super powers, neither knew the extent of the nuclear weapons they both ~~held~~ possessed. Therefore the Cold War can be held responsible for the decision as it meant that both the USA and the USSR were keen to impose their will on the two sides of Germany, and it is a direct link to the Berlin Blockade which physically divided Germany, as it was an attempt for the USSR to regain communism and retain power in the 'buffer zone' that protected them from the threat of invasion.

(This page is for your second answer.) Overall though the actions of the USA were mainly to blame for the division of Germany between 1945-49, it was a combination of both the USA and the USSR, in the greater cold war context that can be held mainly responsible as it resulted in drastic actions from other sides to impose their ideological beliefs and show their power and control on their part of Germany. Hence the reason for the West's formation of Bizonia in 1947 and the currency reform in 1948 which created a Capitalist society, and the subsequent reason of the USSR to hold the Berlin Blockade. Therefore both can be held responsible for the division, as through high tensions, each wanted to prove their power on the separate sections of Germany.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. It is securely focused on the contribution of the actions of the US to the events which led to the partition of Germany. The paragraphs show links between the actions of the US and other factors and sets the whole period within the Cold War context.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to write a conclusion which is a clear evaluation of the points made in the main body of the essay. This conclusion establishes the contribution made by the US along with its inter-relationship with other factors within the wider context of the Cold War.

Question 10

Q10. This was the less popular of the two questions. There were some good responses to this question, which saw well-written answers that were able to assess continuity and change in both economic and political relations in a strongly analytical framework. Many answers found it easier to discuss political change rather than economic aspects. The political changes mainly focused on *Ostpolitik* and the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, with the treatment of the 1950s being far vaguer. However, a surprising number of responses made little reference to the 1980s. More able candidates could point out the continuities of hostility and suspicion, and used propaganda campaigns and the superficiality of *Ostpolitik* to support this. When it came to economic policy, candidates tended to stress the lack of interaction produced by the different economic systems, though the increasing importance of West German loans in the GDR economy was a point made by several candidates. However, the main problem with many answers was that they gave a narrative account of changing relations between 1949 and 1990, and often found it difficult to explain and analyse the extent of change, with some less able candidates resorting to outlining the differences between East and West Germany. Some candidates also gave a lot of detail about the period 1945 – 1949 without linking it to the period identified in the question.

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

Question 11

Once again this was a popular topic and, as in previous years, although candidates had generally been well-prepared there was still a tendency for responses to lack secure chronology. This often led to confused responses with a lack of overall coherence. Also following on from last year, it was clear that centres were increasingly confident in delivering the post-1979 period of the specification and responses were often interesting and well-organised with appropriate supporting material.

Q11. This was by far the most popular question. As stated in the general comment to Option F, most responses would have profited from a clear definition of the key elements of the question in the introductory sentences. The mark scheme acknowledged that the 'growing power of Israel' might be defined in several different ways and so a clear introduction would have created a more coherent response; as would the acknowledgement that the focus of the question was the cause of Arab-Israeli hostility rather than Arab hostility towards Israel. Many responses were severely undermined by chronological confusion. More able candidates were those who identified a number of factors which created hostility across the period and discussed these in relation to the growing power of Israel. Many effective responses referred to the role of external influences and the changing circumstances in relation to the consequences of events for the Palestinians.

Question 12

Q12. This question focused on the increase in radical Islamist activity in the Middle East and Gulf regions in the 1990s. Most candidates were able to discuss the effects of western involvement in the First Gulf War on the growth in the activity and also suggested a variety of other factors which contributed, such as events in Palestine, Arab-Israeli relations and the growth in political Islam. More able candidates were able to show the inter-linking of various factors in relation to the stated factor. Some less able candidates listed different factors discussing each separately and so found it difficult to establish the extent to which western involvement in the First Gulf War was responsible for the increase. A few less able candidates focused on western involvement in general rather than the effects of the intervention in the First Gulf War specifically.

F7 From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany 1918-45

Question 13

As usual the overwhelming majority of candidates studied Option F7 and the varying level of response was very wide indeed. There were a significant minority of candidates performing at Level 2 who produced either simple, relevant developed answers or made sweeping assertions supported by inaccuracies which were, therefore, not able to provide the more secure support required for Level 3. Although few responses were straight narrative many answers produced assertions and/or descriptive passages which attempted analysis but were just not well-focused enough to reach Level 4. Many responses were also not secure enough in their knowledge or chronological security to be placed in Level 4 either. Despite this many responses did show the level of analysis and secure knowledge required to reach the higher Levels and at their best, thought-provoking and discursive. In particular, this year many candidates who chose to do Q13 produced interesting responses with well-selected evidence to support their responses.

Q13. This was the most popular of the two responses. The majority of the candidates were well-prepared for a response which explained the failure of the Weimar Republic. Some candidates chose to address failures across the whole period while others concentrated on the latter years of its existence. The more able candidates tried to explain the contribution of the rise of the Nazi Party to the undermining of the Republic in relation to other factors or by showing the inter-relationship between the factors. Some more able candidates suggested that the Nazi Party merely took advantage of underlying structural weaknesses or the impact of the Great Depression. Although, as in previous years, many candidates still equate hyperinflation with the Wall Street Crash. Many responses produced well-developed paragraphs explaining the contribution of the rise of the Nazi Party and other factors only to assert rather than evaluate the contribution of the factors discussed. Less able candidates outlined the rise of the Nazi Party in the years 1924-33 and described the weaknesses of the Weimar Republic to create a narrative response. These responses often wrote in detail about the events from 1919-24 using simple statements (Level 2).

(This page is for your second answer.)

13) How far do you agree that the rise of the Nazi party in the years 1924-33 was the main reason for the failure of the Weimar Republic?

In 1933 the Weimar Republic came to an end with the passing of the Enabling Act, creating a 1 party totalitarian dictatorship with Hitler in power. Yet the Nazis could never have been in a position to abolish parliamentary democracy and therefore the republic without other factors, such as the depression in 1929 and the appointment of Brüning and

As these ~~is~~ other factors were more significant reasons as to why the Weimar Republic failed.

The rise of the Nazi party was one of the reasons as to why the Weimar Republic collapsed in 1933. In the 1930 Reichstag elections the Nazis won 6.5 million votes, making them the 2nd largest party in the Reichstag. They were the ~~first~~ first 'Volksparty' with a wider support base than any, making them a significant threat against the Weimar Republic, whom they were openly against, highlighting the Republic's failures at every opportunity. The Nazis ran an effective propaganda scheme - with Goebbels at its head, access to Hugenburg's vast media empire and 3 million RM in funding from conservative imperial elites - they were able to spread their Anti-Republic message in a compelling manner, turning many against the republic and therefore contributing to its failure. Hitler was also greatly admired, ~~is~~ ^{and} respected for his humble origins and so many were inclined to follow his lead even if it meant turning against the republic. Yet the Weimar Republic ultimately failed, ~~not~~ ^{not} through due to Hitler's desire to create a dictatorship. The actual end _{and abolish the Reichstag.}

appealing to many people using policies such as 'mass suggestion' and scapegoats

(This page is for your second answer.)

of the Weimar Republic came about to due the Enabling Act, whereby all parliamentary procedure of legislation was ended and Hitler had full powers with the Reichstag for 4 years. Hitler would never have been able to do this if he ~~did not~~ had not become Chancellor, which events such as the depression of 19~~28~~ 1929 and Brüning's term as Chancellor enabled him to come to power. It could also be said the Nazi Party were very weak until ~~about~~ the depression in 1929 - in 1928 they only polled 2.6% of the vote and their membership was only 27,000 in 1925. It could therefore be said that they were not a threat to the Weimar Republic ~~for~~ before 1929 and so were not the long term cause of the failure of the Weimar Republic.

Another reason as to why the Weimar Republic failed was the depression of 1929. It caused widespread suffering - national income shrank by 39%, ~~56~~ 6 million were unemployed by 1932 (1/3 of the workforce) and 50,000 businesses

(This page is for your second answer.)

collapsed. It not only affected workers, but also the middle classes who suffered from a lack of demand.* The fact that Nazi membership rose from 108,000 to 130,000 in 1929 alone is evidence that the depression ~~to~~ caused many people to lose faith in the Weimar Republic and turn to the Nazi Party who ultimately brought an end to the Republic and parliamentary democracy.

* The depression also had many political implications. It caused the Grand Coalition - which had a majority of 50% in the Reichstag and therefore helped stabilise the republic - to collapse, weakening the Republic.

It could therefore be said that the depression was a major cause for the failure of the Weimar Republic as it was the main reason as to why the Nazis were able to gain support and bring an end to the Republic.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Another factor that contributed to the failure of the Weimar Republic was ~~the~~ ~~also~~ Brüning, chancellor from 1930-32. When he was first elected he called for elections in which the Nazis gained 6.5 million votes, ~~also~~ giving them a far greater influence in the Reichstag and therefore making them more of a threat. Brüning, in his memoirs in 1970 stated that he wished to 'weaken the Reichstag and re-establish an authoritarian constitution'; evidence that ~~he~~ he was working against the Reichstag, therefore contributing to its failure. Brüning's economic policy of raising taxes and cutting government spending caused a worsening slump causing yet more people to turn to the Nazis, thus contributing to their rise. Brüning ~~re~~ re-accustomed Germany to presidential decree and ~~was~~ abolished parliamentary democracy, making it easier for a totalitarian regime such as one of the Nazis offered to be accepted by the German people. Brüning therefore

(This page is for your second answer.)

contributed to the ~~failure~~^{weakening} of ~~Germany~~^{the Weimar Republic} in a number of different ways, making him an important reason as to why the republic failed.

~~Another~~ There were also a number of flaws in the Weimar Constitution that allowed the Nazis to come to power and therefore end the Weimar Republic. Proportional representation encouraged the growth of small extreme parties like the Nazis and made it hard to ~~form~~^{and unite} coalitions gain overall majorities, requiring the formation of coalitions. Many ~~of~~^{the} negotiations and changes of policy needed to form ~~into~~ coalitions meant that many people became cynical of parliamentary democracy and began voting for the Nazis. This therefore helped the Nazis ~~to~~^{come} come to power although it has been ~~said~~^{said} said that a 'first past the post' system may have actually allowed them to come to power sooner. For this reason, it was not one of the main reasons as to why the Weimar failed. * (last page)

(This page is for your second answer.)

To conclude, although the Nazis were ultimately the ones who caused the end of the Weimar Republic, parliamentary democracy was already failing to date to the effects of Brüning and the depression and the Nazis would never have come to power and cause the ultimate failure of the Weimar Republic without these factors.

* Another limitation of the constitution was the remaining influence of the Conservative elites in Germany. They had a lot of power in Germany and their support of Hitler gave him the 3m RM in funding needed for their election campaign. For this reason, it helped the Nazis rise to power.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. It establishes the focus of the question from the introduction and attempts to establish the inter-linking relationship between the rise of the Nazis and other contextual factors. This response uses the concluding sentences of paragraphs to establish links between factors and subsequent paragraphs.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always use a brief introduction to try to establish both the focus of the question and the line of argument you are going to take. In this response the candidate has firmly located the end of the Weimar Republic at the point of the passing of the Enabling Act and the creation of a dictatorship under the rule of Hitler and the Nazi Party. It then establishes a line of argument which suggests that, although the Nazi Party brought an end to the Republic, they would not have been able to do so without other factors such as the Great Depression.

Question 14

Q14. Candidates who chose this question used a variety of different approaches as suggested by the mark scheme. Many used their knowledge of economic and social policies to judge the extent to which Germany was prepared to fight a war in 1939, while others looked at the circumstances of defeat to analyse preparedness in 1939. Responses were often differentiated by those who were able to discuss the extent to which Germany was prepared to fight a major war rather than a war in general. These responses often discussed the intention to follow a policy of Blitzkrieg and the extent to which the Four Year Plan had been achieved by 1939. Most candidates had some idea of the underlying economic and social tensions which were beginning to appear at the end of the 1930s, and even less able candidates made some allusion to the 'guns v butter' debate or the progress of autarky. Less able candidates often made relevant points but were unable to use appropriate supporting evidence or were chronologically insecure. Overall there were a wide variety of answers at all Levels but the majority of them were interesting and willing to attempt a discursive argument in response to the hypothesis.

(This page is for your first answer.) When war broke out in 1939, many felt that it was through Hitler's preparation ^{but} ~~made~~ Germany ^{was} ready to go to war. However, despite the fact that they did seem mostly ready to fight a war, it is not the case that they were fully prepared, especially to fight for a long period of time.

The rearming of Germany's armed forces played a key part in being ready, with many aspects such as the airforce and navy, having several changes made to them. This increase greatly helped Germany, who began to become as strong as other countries in terms of their military. Hitler also increased the land army from the 100,000 set out in the treaty of Versailles, using this as a means to crush the treaty by disobeying it completely. This is further seen

(This page is for your first answer.) in his actions to remilitarise the Rhineland, while also investing heavily into new designs and creating a new airforce. In comparison to Germany's original forces, this was a great improvement which allowed them to combat ~~the~~ France for land forces and other countries with the new airforce, allowing them to be well prepared for ~~rather~~ war by 1939, as action before that would have likely changed this.

The invasion of other land prior to ~~the~~ 1939 also strengthened Germany for war, with land gained from the annexation of Austria and ^{the} taking of the Sudetenland. This gave Germany many more Germans available to contribute whether fighting or producing for Germany. The fact they also did not have to risk lives when taking these places also ~~also~~ allowed them to gain completely, having territories in key areas against the likes of France and Russia. The factories taken from these areas was also beneficial, helping to increase Germany's production and ~~just~~ use the resources from

(This page is for your first answer.)

these territories to compensate for any lack in their own raw materials. There was still a problem with this though, despite the gains they made, as Germany simply did not have some of the key raw materials that the allies had, leading to their eventual inability to continue performing as well as their enemies in mass production as the war went on.

One of the most important things that allowed Germany to even prepare for war up until 1939 was their international affairs. Hitler and the Nazis carefully pressed the allies, through things such as their invasions, but were also cautious to seem like they could co-operate as well. This can be seen in key moments such as with the ~~Munich~~ Munich Conference, where Chamberlain seemed to feel he averted war through his and Hitler's co-operation. This was untrue however, as Hitler got what he wanted still and in the spare time it gave him, eventually invaded Poland, starting the war. Had this not happened, and Britain and France sided with Czechoslovakia against Germany, Hitler would be likely submitted at

(This page is for your first answer.)

that moment. This did not happen though, allowing him to simply carry on and continue arming for war, as they were not ready beside that.

Germany's internal production was also changed to help prepare for total war, but this did not work as well. Despite having some raw materials, such as iron in Germany, its quality was not that good and Germany did not have as much as it as countries such as the U.S.A. The aim for a solution, such as synthetic material, was also only a moderate success and did not ~~work as~~ ^{work as} a long-term option. Despite the increased use of synthetic rubber on many army vehicles, the use of synthetic steel and other materials was not as effective, or as durable. Hitler's persistence to not import such things of better quality further worsened this, as by 1939 they had still not found a solution, leaving them unprepared to match the allies production wise, as it was physically impossible with the right resources.

Overall, I feel that by 1939 Germany was

(This page is for your first answer.) largely prepared for war, but not fully. Although their economies matched that of Britain and France in most areas, they could not maintain this through production over a long period. The lack of raw materials in Germany could not be easily replenished, ~~like~~ without importing goods, which still couldn't be done through the taking of invaded territories. This is further shown by the fact that even with the time they managed to gain from international co-operation, a result still could not be found, leaving them ready in all other areas but production, which was especially exposed and left Germany almost prepared by 1939, but not prepared enough.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. It discusses a range of factors which are relevant to the question and well-developed. The supporting evidence could be more secure and detailed but the key issues are understood and explained.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always try to put paragraphs into logical groups. This response could have been better organised with the paragraphs about internal factors and external factors being more clearly grouped together.

(This page is for your second answer.)

1924-33 ~~Failure of Weimar~~ ¹⁹²⁴⁻²⁹

The rise of the NSDAP

1924	1928	1930	1932	1933
7%	2%	18%	37%	44%

- Hitler out of jail in Landsberg - 25 point programme

Wall Street Crash 1929

Young Plan 1929

Backstabbing
betrayal

The Weimar Republic was established in 1919 after the abdication of the Kaiser in 1918 after the First World War. It was set up in Weimar because there was no room in the capital of Berlin, and Weimar was well known for its culture. By 1933 the Weimar government collapsed and Hitler rose to power.

The Nazis (NSDAP) gained 7% of seven per cent of the vote in the Reichstag in 1924 but this rose to forty four per cent in 1933. The Nazis had been rapidly increasing support since 1928 following Hitler's release from prison

(This page is for your second answer.)

in Landsberg for his role in the Munich Putsch of 1923. After Hitler's release Hitler was released after serving just 6 months of his 5 year sentence. After his release he changed his thinking and began reorganising the Nazi party so that it could gain power through legal means by gaining a majority in the Reichstag. The reorganisation included drafting the 25 point programme and changing the

move from DAP to NSDAP (National Socialist German Workers Party). The Nazis gained support by propaganda means and using violence by the SA. In 1933 when the Nazis won 44% of the vote, they were the biggest party in the Reichstag. However they still didn't have a majority. In order to gain a majority rather than the support of the DNVP who won 31% they had to add to the two hundred and eighty eight seats won by the Nazis. This was done by a majority and made Hitler a candidate for Chancellery. The rise of the Nazis contributed to the downfall of the Weimar Republic as it made them look weak and was just not gathering as many votes ~~as~~.

Although the rise of the Nazis was an important factor, it was not the only factor. Between 1924 and 1929

(This page is for your second answer.)

the German economy was recovering under Stresemann. This period is known as the 'Golden Years'. But following the death of Stresemann in October 1929, the German economy was plunged back into crisis because of the Wall Street Crash. The Wall Street Crash was when the American's stock market took a huge fall. This badly affected Germany, along with the rest of the world, but Germany especially as America began to recall the loans it had given Germany to rebuild its economy after the war. Germany was unable to do this as all the projects it had on were long term. The Wall Street Crash of 1929 led to the Great Depression which worsened German morale. This

contributed to the failure of the Weimar Republic as the blame for the depression was put on the government. After everything the German people just wanted a government that would take control of their economic situation. It was not looking like this would be the Weimar Republic as their popularity was declining and the Germans secured a more radical government.

Another factor which contributed to the failure of the Weimar Republic was the 'Backstairs intrigue'. This was the concept of political dealings that were going on behind the scenes which ultimately led

(This page is for your second answer.)

to Hitler's appointment. Brüning was suggested as ~~Schleicher~~ Chancellor by Schleicher to President Hindenburg. He remained chancellor from 1930-32 and his ~~role~~ chancellery was tolerated in the Reichstag. However, when he planned to split up the Junker estates into small land holdings he lost the support of Hindenburg who was a Junker. ~~This led to the appointment of Brüning~~ was also unusual as the former Chancellor because of his strict policies to reduce government spending and increase taxation by reducing wages. This led to the appointment of ~~von~~ Papen, Little Franz, in 1932 who Hindenburg liked very much. However, his government failed because Schleicher's ^{political} 'talking' had to do a right word shift and Schleicher contacted Papen. Also Papen failed to get the DNVP and NSDAP to support Hindenburg as

president. Hitler and Hindenburg faced an election which Hitler won in 1933. This contributed to the failure of the Weimar Republic as their governments were failing. Also it was the intrigue of the conservative elites who wanted Hitler as Chancellor and the removal of the Weimar State.

(This page is for your second answer.)

To a limited extent it was the rise of the Nazi Party (NSDAP) in the years 1924-29 that was the main reason for the failure of the Weimar Republic as the ~~Weimar~~ once-Weimar supporters were turning to Hitler and his strong authoritarian party to fix Germany. However it was not the main reason. The main reason was the economic crisis in 1924-29. Support for the extremist parties declined in what was known as the Golden Years, it was in fact the Radicals' intrigue which led to the downfall of the Weimar Republic. This is because they put pressure on the Weimar to remain the republic and appoint Hitler as Chancellor. The German state would now ~~become~~ become a dictatorship by March 1933.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. It covers a range of factors with well-developed paragraphs and shows understanding of the key issues before coming to a conclusion.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always try to establish your argument in the main body of the response. In this way your conclusion will be sustained rather than making an assertion.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Do not attempt to limit your revision by trying to predict questions or by producing model answers based on past questions. This may lead to a lack of choice or a lack of focus on the demands made by the question.
- Try to analyse causation by using a variety of different methods. This year the factors which influence causation have been largely addressed with confidence. Differentiation between candidates' answers has often arisen when candidates come to evaluate and weigh up the relative significance of conditional against contingent factors and then suggest which factor seems the most important.
- Try to understand issues concerning change and continuity over the whole timescale of your period of study. Consider how things stayed the same, how they changed and, most importantly, why change did or did not take place.
- Develop the skill of using appropriate historical terms with fluency and use these in your answers where appropriate.
- Plan your answer beforehand. This will help you to organise your thoughts before you start to write.
- Familiarise yourself with the format of the examination booklet. You should begin your first answer on page 4 and your second on page 12. On each of these pages you should place a cross to indicate which answer you have chosen. Knowing the format of the examination in advance should help to relieve the stress of the examination overall.

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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



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