



Pearson

Examiners' Report

June 2017

GCE History 9HI0 1G

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 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_1G_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see that candidates were able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the first year of the reformed A Level paper 1G which deals with Germany and West Germany, 1918-89.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. In Section A questions have a time frame of no less than 10 years. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance, but questions have a time frame of no less than one third of the time frame of the option. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter-argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks, and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to offer less factual evidence, or drifted away from the specific demands of the question to the wider-taught topic.

Question 1

This question was by far the more popular of the two in Section A. The majority of candidates were able to marshal evidence about the Weimar constitution and why groups opposed it, and to then compare this to other problems that Weimar governments had to deal with. At the top end there were some excellent answers that built their argument from the start, acknowledging that there were a number of factors which operated together to ultimately bring down the Weimar Republic. These answers kept a tight focus on the groups that opposed the Weimar constitution and offered evidence about why they were a major threat. These candidates also covered the time frame and were acutely aware that the republic was replaced by a dictatorship. At the bottom end candidates saw the question as being about the general problems that the government faced. These answers often wrote too much about putsches and hyperinflation and offered little on the years 1929-33.

SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

In the years 1919 - 1933, Weimar constitution's most significant problem for the government to deal with wasn't opposition, however it was a big problem for the constitution. After the war, there was a huge increase in opposition towards the Weimar government due to the loss of the war and the Treaty of Versailles resentment from the German people. This caused a huge problem for the Weimar Constitution and gave extremist parties a platform for their policies and promises. However, the most significant problem for the Weimar Constitution was the economic problems which they faced after the war and throughout the ~~period~~^{period}. ~~The political~~^{opposition} ~~and other~~ economic and social problems however, all need to be assessed ~~&~~ in order to be able to conclude whether opposition or other factors

were the most significant problem which the Weimar Constitution faced.

There was a lot of opposition throughout the years 1919-1933 and did cause a problem for the Weimar government, however, many other political parties which opposed, used **(Section A continued)** the economic problems the country was facing. In the early years of the Weimar Constitution, many German people opposed this type of constitution because of them signing the armistice to end the war and the Treaty of Versailles. This was a significant problem for the Weimar Constitution, because it meant people started resenting the government and branded them as the 'November Criminals', which then ~~led~~ led to them turning to extremist parties such as the DVP and ~~DNVP~~ DNVP. This was then a problem because it then meant that small extremist parties gained more popularity and led the way for popular uprisings. Small uprisings from the extreme left and right, such as; the Spartacist Uprising of 1919 and The Kapp Putsch may have lacked support, planning and leadership but these ~~small~~ uprisings in the early 1920's allowed other extremist to gather support and oppose Weimar without

problem such as the Nazi Party. These uprisings in the early 1920's, made the Weimar Constitution look weak and unstable, as they failed to deal with the opposition effectively. This then caused a huge problem for the Weimar Constitution because it meant that

(Section A continued) the German people were losing even more faith in democracy and turned to extremist parties who were promising a strong, stable leadership. Although opposition was a significant problem for the Weimar constitution, many of the opposing parties, based their policies and promises on the economic problems which occurred throughout 1919-1933.

The economic problems within the Weimar Constitution period, were the most significant problem the constitution faced. After the war debt and reparation debt, the German people hit economic hardship and poverty. The Weimar government were seen as the 'November Criminals' because they had made the economic problems in Germany worse by signing the Treaty of Versailles. This caused a huge, significant problem because the Weimar Constitution showed inability to solve the economic crisis which meant that the German people began to turn to extremism,

who promised strong leadership and to ~~the~~^{save} the economic problems. This meant that opposing political parties now had a platform for their propaganda aims. Although through the years 1924 - 29, the economy started to

(Section A continued) thrive again, when the Wall Street Crash happened and the Depression started, the German people blamed the constitution for the economic downfall they faced again. People were fearful of returning back to the problems of 1923 hyperinflation and therefore again, started to turn to extremism. This allowed small political opposition like the Nazi Party to use fear as a way of creating political policies and oppose the Weimar Constitution, again. Therefore, the economic problems in the years 1919-33 were the most significant problem which the Weimar Constitution faced.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an example from a response that fell just short of level 4 and was awarded level 3, 12 marks. The candidate does not focus on the problems caused by opposition to the Weimar constitution but rather on problems that the government faced. Because the stated factor – the one given in the question – is not at the centre of the work it proves difficult for the candidate to weigh the other factors that are there. There is a real attempt to answer the question but the lack of explicit focus confines the award to level 3.



A good lesson to be learned here is that it pays to work out what the focus of the question should be before starting to write. Opposition to the constitution was a central feature of three important parties' propaganda and actions. The DNVP, KPD and the Nazis all built opposition to the constitution and advocated its abolition.

SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

The years 1919-1933 were ~~marked~~ undoubtedly a troubling time for the Weimar Republic, almost constantly remaining in a precarious position, with the exception of the years between 1924-1929. Whilst they faced opposition towards the constitution, problems with the structure of the constitution itself and poor economic conditions also had a role in causing significant problems. Whilst opposition certainly was a burden to the government and demonstrated that the Reichstag were governing without the support of the people, it arguably was not the most significant problem that they had to deal with.

The extent of opposition fluctuated between 1919-1933 and whilst there was a presence throughout Germany, the most impact that was

felt were from a minority of extremists. This does not however suggest that opposition was not of significance. The constitution faced opposition from the left and the right. Evidently from the left, the Spartacist Revolt in 1919 (Section A continued) attempted for a communist revolution, whilst from the right ~~the~~ Hitler's attempt of the Munich Putsch in 1923. The government did find however that right wing opposition had more of an impact than those from the left. The Freikorps were relied upon to suppress left wing opposition, however they were reluctant to do so when opposition was expressed from the right. Though the Munich Putsch was seen as a failure, it gained publicity for the Nazis and gave time for Hitler to establish his ~~own~~ aims, in time for mass opposition following ~~the~~ 1929 when ~~a~~ the government failed to pass effective policies in economic downturn. This opposition did not have a short term effect on the Republic but did in its later years in the early 1930's. The Weimar Constitution ~~was~~ ^{was} not greeted with opposition from the public majority considering that ^{around} 82% voted in the 1919 elections. ~~Opposition~~ Furthermore, political violence decreased when ~~the~~ the government had a hold on the economy during ¹⁹²⁴⁻²⁹ and re-occurred once this was disrupted. This

demonstrates the role that ~~economic~~ economy had on sparking opposition, therefore opposition ~~by~~ was not itself the most significant problem

(Section A continued) for the government, but rather what ~~at~~ it derived from which was arguably economic ~~problems~~ problems. Further opposition was focused mainly on the government itself rather than the constitution.

Issues

Economic ~~problems~~ were arguably the most ~~the~~ significant problem during the Weimar Republic. With the terms of the Treaty demanding over 150 billion marks, Germany were in unrecoverable debt. With large amounts of debt, unemployment rose and living standards decreased. With 90% of 2-6 year olds being malnourished, public support for the government was rapidly ~~and~~ maintained at low levels. ~~but~~ The inability ~~of~~ to pay back these reparations and the occupation of the Ruhr in 1923, the government's response to print more money further worsened the economic situation with hyperinflation. The government were unable to plan a solution until 1924 with the Dawes Plan. Although this appeared to revive the economy, the reliance on debt affected Germany even harder when the Great Depression

occurred in 1929 and no longer having access to this financial aid. Unemployment rose once again with the highest it had ever been in

(Section A continued) 1932, making extremist parties who sought to address these issues seem more appealing. With the growth of Nazi seats from under 20 in 1928 to over 100 in 1932, this demonstrates the role that economic factors had on causing problems for the government.

The effects of the poorly planned nature of the constitution also became ~~an~~ a problem that the ~~governments~~ government had to address. The use of proportional representation ~~is~~ led to the presence of 29 political parties following the 1919 elections. As a response, parties formed weak coalitions which were detrimental to the government, making it almost impossible for the parties to agree on effective policies. ~~This did arguably cause opposition~~ ~~Not only did~~ with parties failing to co-operate, the use of Article 48 became increasingly frequent, with Hindenburg ruling by ~~using~~ Presidential Decree following 1930. This stoked opposition from the population who ~~then~~ considered this as ~~an attack on~~ a contradiction of democracy, though opposition

from the general public had little impact on the government. This also caused problems for the government itself as the nature of

(Section A continued) the constitution allowed Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor. This led to the passing of the Enabling Law in 1933 which ~~was~~ essentially destroyed the constitution, a significant problem to the government which they had no power to stop and was ~~caused~~ caused by the structure of the constitution

To conclude, the opposition to the constitution had significance worth addressing, though it wasn't as significant as economic factors. Opposition was not mostly directed to the constitution, but rather the government itself. The instability of the ~~the~~ economy demonstrated to the population that the government were ~~not~~ weak in decision making and led to ~~an~~ a rise in support for extremism.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is from a well organised response that was awarded 18 marks. The candidate has addressed a range of important factors, given each some consideration in terms of evidence and argument and effectively works towards a well-considered judgement. Opposition to the constitution could have been given a little more consideration but the candidate argues that it was the government itself, and not the constitution, that was at the centre of opposition.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

A good lesson to take from this response is how to select evidence to meet the demands of the question. Too many candidates start writing without a plan and get bogged down in lengthy detail on the Munich Putsch. Whereas this response covers most important issues and also covers the time frame of the question.

Question 2

This question was tackled well on the whole. Most candidates were able to marshal evidence about the popularity that the dictatorship gained from improved economic fortunes and the so-called peoples' community the Nazis sought in the period to 1939. Similarly the majority of responses acknowledged the terror and the various opposition groups that defied the dictatorship. At the top end candidates were clear that a dictatorship deliberately erases evidence of unpopularity and trumpets propaganda about successes, and factored this into their evaluations. They also covered the crucial changes brought about by war and looming defeat. At the bottom end candidates tended to list the popular features of the regime mostly and answers lacked balance.

9:00-9:45

SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

Hitler as the head of the NSDAP came into power in the backdrop of the Great Depression. Caused solely by the Wall Street Crash in 1929, German voters became dissatisfied with the liberal Weimar and voted more extremist. Hitler was elected Chancellor and took full power in 1934 after President Hindenburg's death. Despite being voted in, Hitler's move into dictatorship caused a lot of unrest that could not always be voiced.

Hitler and Heinrich Himmler - as head of the Gestapo - led Germany into a rule of terror. The Night of Long Knives in 1934 was a sign of ruthlessness by Hitler, as he murdered his own personal army (the SA). This was just the beginning of the violence since the Gestapo were well-known to take people who were against the Nazis, never to be seen again. Spies were a fear for Germans and reminded the people that freedom of speech was now gone. Even in 1934

a law was passed making newspaper editors responsible for what they printed. All of these and more caused outrage that had to be taken underground after the widespread use of concentration camps and violence from the SS. Edelweiss Pirates' ~~sub~~ sabotage action and the White Rose Group's anti-Nazi leaflets were clear indicators of a non-popular dictatorship and this did not fade. Lightning strikes lasted (Section A continued) through the 1930's, scuppering the Nazis' effort to gear for war. Therefore, there is clear evidence to argue from 1934-45 there was not a popular dictatorship since the July 1944 assassination attempt on Hitler was by one of his own generals.

However, there is evidence that Hitler continued to gain support after his election in 1933 since he effectively used incentives and rewards to win over the people. He won support from many couples with the ability to pay off the marriage loan scheme of 1000 Reichmarks, 250 marks at a time per child. Similarly with mothers, they received extra benefits for having over 4 children such as greater access to free vitamins and healthcare. As well as the introduction of medals to these women in 1939. Hitler gathered popular support with the RAD schemes since it provided men with well paid work for a long period while this also helped the economy. And the ~~sub~~ ^{ideology} 'Beauty of work' furthered this notion. While 'Strength through Joy', a leisure scheme, gathered popular support with easier access to holidays,

theatre and even the Volkswagen scheme that over 200,000 Germans signed up to - showing areas and reasons why Hitler claimed more support. Hitler's more dark movements were the persecution of Jews, gypsies and blacks. This did however garner support from those angered at the failures of the Weimar as well as those who simply didn't like those groups. Hence Hitler did well to achieve varied support from very different demographics

(Section A continued) of the public, such as women ^{and} workers.

Finally, a vast area of support for Hitler's government was through acts of aggression that overturned the Treaty of Versailles (1919) and showed a stronger Germany on a European stage. From 1924, Hitler made it transparent that he wished to expand East for ~~Lebensraum~~ Lebensraum and create the idea of pan-Germanism and similarly 'one Nation'. From 1933, Hitler called a vote to leave the unpopular and overbearing League of Nations. 95% voted to leave ^{NATO} with a 96% turnout rate showing almost absolute support. Further acts such as the remilitarisation of the Rhineland ~~1935~~ ¹⁹³⁵, Anschluss of Austria a year later in 1938, a vote in the Saar to join Germany ending in 95% support (1935) and the taking of Danzig and Sudetenland in 1938 gathered huge support. As mentioned, these portrayed both Hitler and Germany as very powerful and showed the Nazis were going to proceed with all of their proposals from 1933 and Mein Kampf in 1924.

Some of Hitler's foreign policy was not at all popular with the people. Significantly after the full invasion of Czechoslovakia

in 1938, people's support waned for little reason and a similar sense of slowing support was gathered from the growing relationship with Mussolini in Italy. After the Spanish Civil War, 1936, these 2 nations became close and the Germans saw little reason as to why Italy were weak and held different foreign policy goals as they wanted to expand south. Hitler's decisions led to 15 assassination attempts from 1921-45 as a ~~the~~ fundamental indicator

(Section A continued) that Germans were not well pleased with their leader.

Despite good efforts to win over many demographics of the German people and proceed with his foreign policy goals that were successful, there is greater evidence that the Nazi government in the 1934-45 period was not a popular dictatorship. Due to the lack of democracy and fierce use of control methods to limit freedom of speech.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This extract contains some of the mistakes other candidates also made in answering this question. Firstly, the opening passage is trying to make an argument about the use of terror preventing the opposition from gathering. The candidate's enthusiasm to make the argument leads to exaggeration. The opposition and strikes in no way scuppered preparations for war. There are some errors concerning dates too. Nevertheless, the response has strengths. It is organised and focuses evidence and argument on the extent of the Third Reich being a popular dictatorship. The response is analytical and offers an analysis based judgement. This is mid-level 4 work.



When writing about the popularity or otherwise of a dictatorship always acknowledge the difficulties that this entails. In this response the candidate compares evidence for opposition against evidence for support with some success, but the evidence for the extent of opposition is very difficult to gauge, precisely because opponents were silenced and lived in fear. Dictatorships put a lot of effort into manufacturing popularity - and therefore the evidence has to be carefully weighed.

Whilst the Nazi Regime garnered considerable popularity between 1934 and 1939, it cannot accurately be considered a popular dictatorship, especially when taking into account the rise in opposition following the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. For a dictatorship to be considered popular, it must have the consent of the public with minimal opposition or attempts to overthrow it, and a lack of dissidence. This is not the case in Nazi Germany, as this lack of opposition was the result of the successful oppression by the 'police state' of Germany, rather than due to popular support.

To an extent it can be agreed that throughout the regime of the Nazi government it was a popular dictatorship, as shown in the range of incentives the government offered to receive popular support. Women in particular were incentivised to conform to the Nazi's traditionalist view of women ~~in the family, which in 1934~~ as mothers and wives. For example, ~~for~~ Aryan couples were given a one thousand mark loan upon marriage, a quarter of which was paid off for every child they had, furthermore,

Through the National Socialist Service (NSV) women received childcare assistance, and free healthcare to ensure they were producing healthy children. Therefore, there is a clear reason why women would want to support the Nazi regime and refuse to oppose it. This can similarly be seen in organisations such as the KDF or 'Strength through Joy', an organisation for workers which offered benefits such as subsidised or free trips to the theatre or art shows such as the 1938 exhibition of 'degenerate art'. Many individuals received the incentives given to them, such as medals and those belonging to the KDF, therefore, giving their consent to the Nazi Government providing them, showing that the regime had popular support (as there was no resistance to these services) and can be considered a popular dictatorship.

However, the argument that so the Nazi Government can be considered a popular dictatorship due to the fact some individuals conformed to the Nazi's ideological expectations, is limited, as there are many cases in which individuals did reject the services offered by the Government, therefore resisting it. A prime example is that of the so-called Edelweiss pirates, formed in the 1940s as an anti-Hitler youth group. Rather than young people (aged between 6 and 20) joining the heavily ideological Hitler Youth movements, they many joined the alternative subversive alternative Edelweiss pirates. They carried out many similar activities,

such as camping and physical activity, but without the ideological stance, and when the war began they were increasingly active in opposing the Nazi regime, for example, dismantling rail tracks to disrupt Nazi transport and communication lines. This shows that the Nazi regime was not popular in the sense that a vast majority of people supported their government, as ~~is~~ cases such as the East Angles Pirates show that there was resistance to the Nazi objective to enforce conformity. In the light of this knowledge, the Nazi Government cannot be considered a popular dictatorship.

Evidence that the Nazi Government was a popular dictatorship can be seen ~~in~~ the lack of successful opposition. The only way in which the Nazi regime was overthrown is when the Soviets arrived in Berlin in 1945, proving internal opposition wholly ineffective. Most oppositional resistance groups were small, for example the White Rose Group formed in 1942 and based ~~in~~ at the University of Munich was made up of fewer than twenty individuals. Therefore, it ~~was~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~expected~~ that they would not form significant opposition to Hitler's Nazi Government. During the war there were fifteen attempts to disseminate Hitler, all of which were unsuccessful, showing that in all cases of ~~or~~ resistance, more

people supported the Nazi Government than opposed it. This provides striking evidence that the Nazi Government was popular, as if it were not, opposition would have been more threatening, formed of larger groups of people and have had a much higher success rate. Instead, this shows, that the Nazi Government was a popular dictatorship.

This view that a lack of successful internal resistance meaning that the Nazi Government was popular is short-sighted, failing to recognize that the Nazi Regime was a 'police state' with serious government oppression which quickly set shut down resistance from assassination attempts to letting jokes which portrayed Hitler in a poor light. Policing of the public was carried out by the SS under ~~Hitler~~ Himmler from 1934, and its rules included ^{most significantly the} organization of the system of concentration camps (to which thousands of individuals went for political crimes, such as the leadership of the former SPD party) and the use of control of the Gestapo, or secret police, headed by Goering. The Gestapo was able to root out dissidents through its 15,000 informants and controlling the Gaus, local officials who monitored areas as small as apartment blocks searching for evidence of anti-Nazi sentiment such as listening to a

British or French radio station. Any opposition which became too organized ~~with~~ it was effectively traced and shut down, often with its leaders executed or sent to concentration camps. Rather than there being lack of opposition due to popular support for the Government, there was a lack of opposition due to the Government being so effective (Section A continued) at shutting opposition down. Therefore the Nazi Government cannot be considered a popular dictatorship.

A further argument to suggest that the Nazi Government was a popular dictatorship is that the Nazi ideology was actually highly appealing to the public and its propaganda was effective in encouraging popular support. Throughout the 1920s, Hitler was known as a public figure who opposed the 'disgrace' of the Treaty of Versailles, and expressed a nationalist, racially pure German empire following the defeat in 1918. It is understandable why this would have been an appealing message, and support is shown in that ~~Hitler~~ 15,000 copies of Mein Kampf were sold during the regime of the Weimar Government. Hitler was able to actualize many of his promises made, in the late

1920s and early 1930s, for example
Hitler's Anschluss, the reunification of Austria with
Germany was achieved in 1938, and Hitler
completely ignored the terms of the Treaty
of Versailles, openly beginning rearmament
and conscription from 1935. The Nazi
Government had a vision of Germany

(Section A continued) becoming a strong power in
Europe (and possibly the world) once again,
and it can be argued that this message
was sufficient to cause the Nazi Government to have a
'popular dictatorship'.

However, by the late 1930s and the
outbreak of World War II, it is less
convincing to argue that the Nazi Government
was a popular dictatorship. For example, there
was considerable opposition to Hitler's decision
to take Czechoslovakia, as shown in that a
1938 military procession through Berlin was met
with little enthusiasm by the public; and the
Beer Hall Putsch was also attempted in 1923, in which
General Kapp led an unsuccessful plan to
assassinate Hitler and terminate the monarchy
due to his opposition to Germany entering
Czechoslovakia. By the beginning of the

War on Two Fronts in 19 and the war
with the defeat in the battle of Stalingrad
in 1941, support was increasingly falling
as it was at this point many
resistance groups arose, for example the
Communist party became active again and the
Anti-fascist Workers Group was established.

(Section A continued) Whilst there may have been early
support for Hitler's regime due to his
promises of a Great Germany, when these
did not achieve, the Nazi Government ~~lost~~
lost significance support. Therefore, especially
during the war, the Nazi Government cannot
be considered a popular dictatorship.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is an example of level 5 work. The main features of the answer are a willingness to offer broad evidence and analyse it. The answer builds up an argument from the start and acknowledges the inherent difficulty of evaluating Nazi popularity. The discussion explores a number of issues relevant to the question and establishes clear criteria for judgement.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

There is a clear lesson from this response. Discussion is crucial to the process of evaluation. Avoid the mistake of simply presenting evidence and asserting the evaluation.

Question 3

This was the more popular question in Section B and it produced the full range of responses. At the bottom end candidates did not distinguish between culture and social policy. They therefore offered much evidence about the role and status of women with few links to the question. In the middle of the range there was a mixture of responses where candidates defined culture broadly as *a way of life*. This is acceptable if the focus is on culture. These candidates still wrote about women but linked it to cultural empowerment. Similarly the suppression of so-called Jewish culture under the Nazis is relevant and could get candidates into level 4. The other response was to compare the liberal cultural forms under Weimar to the official art of the Third Reich. Again this provided access to level 4 and above. However, the best answers understood that in both the Weimar and Nazi periods culture was fought over and became a means of political expression. Thus flamboyant Weimar culture was opposed by conservative forces as decadent, and Nazi anti-intellectual culture produced a determination to foster modern popular cultural forms such as Jazz - albeit in private. The top answers had excellent supporting detail from a range of cultural forms which were carefully selected to make an argument.

SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

The Weimar Republic was seen as the 'Crisis Era' in both culture and politics. It can be argued that political ideology did ~~not~~ influence culture during this period, but it is important to note that ~~the~~ foreign influence also held a lot of weight at this time. During the Nazi regime, culture was undoubtedly shaped by political ~~ide~~ and regulated by political ideology in all aspects of life.

The Weimar period was regarded as highly democratic and this can be seen through Article 109 of the constitution

that stated, in theory, women were equal to men. In the Weimar period there were 112 women in the Reichstag. ~~Despite~~ However, women were paid a third less than men on average which can be seen to be influenced by political ideology as Article 109 states that women were only equal in theory, not in practice. ~~The New Woman was a large aspect of female culture~~

(Section B continued) ~~in the Weimar but can not be said to be influenced~~ Another aspect of culture that can be seen as being influenced by political ideology to some extent is the treatment of ethnic minorities. Article 113 of the constitution stated that ethnic minorities could speak their own language and preserve their traditional customs. There were no restrictions placed upon Jews because although the theory of eugenics existed at this time, it was not used upon and a third of Jewish people in Germany were married to non-Jews.

On the other hand, culture was not fully influenced ^{shaped} by political ideology as there

cartoonists were attacked and their work labelled as degenerate. In May 1935 25 000 books were burnt. * Within schools, eugenics was a large part of the curriculum and textbooks criminalised Jews. In terms of women, in stark contrast to the freedom of the Weimar period, married women were expected to give up jobs and remain at home to care children.

(Section B continued) to produce the new Aryan Generation. The Lebensborn programme was the, often forced, impregnation of young girls from the BDM (female youth group) by suitable members of the SS. This all encompassing control and desire for the perfect Aryan race shows how far culture was in fact ~~influenced~~ ^{shaped} by the political ideology during the Nazi period.

Overall it can be seen that in the Weimar period, political ideology definitely had some influence on culture but was nowhere near as influential as political ideology during the Nazi regime. The Nazi regime ensured

that all culture was ~~based on~~^{shaped by} political ideology and was acceptable in the eyes of the Führer, ~~but~~ i.e. was not classed as degenerate, or influenced by anything other than the Nazi's political ideology.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response draws attention to the need to define culture before writing the answer. In this instance the candidate uses a very broad definition of culture as a way of life, but fails to offer any limits as to what might be used. Thus the candidate includes the role and status of women as well as something on women and culture. The candidate clearly understands that political ideology did shape culture, and contrasts Weimar and Nazi attitudes, but there are few examples of culture being affected, and little on other factors that shaped culture in these years. The answer is therefore only partly successful and thus was marked at mid-level 4, 14 marks.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When writing about culture in these years be clear that under the Weimar Republic there was no official culture whereas under the Third Reich there clearly was.

SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

~~to what extent was German culture shaped by political ideology 1918-1945~~ Reichskulturkammer

German culture was shaped by political ideology to an extent in the years 1918 to 1945, more so after Hitler became Führer in 1933 and dictator in 1934.

Considering the influence that political legislation and attitudes had on the culture either directly or indirectly, it is clear that while ~~before~~ the culture up to 1933 was mostly inspired by experimentation of the elite art culture, from 1933 to 1945 the government political ideology has very much controlled over ~~the~~ German culture.

Firstly, the ~~art~~ culture of the Weimar republic from 1918 to 1933 was not shaped significantly by the government legislation to a great degree. ~~While some~~

~~conservatism~~ The Bauhaus movement, which started in 1918 possessed a beautiful simplicity and gave way to a ~~new~~ ~~more~~ movement beyond art. New Objectivity, which was born out of

(Section B continued) Expressionism and impressionist styles
was also unguided by political ideology.
However, the feminist communist activist
Marie Kaptan believed that New Objectivity,
which with a focus on focus on the harsh
realities of urban life, squatters and social issues
life in Weimar society, was a great tool
for addressing ~~total~~ social inequality and
to push for social change. In this aspect
the art movement could have been
used for ~~political~~ to express political
ideologies, but then this was not as they
were intended. Therefore it ~~was~~ would
better be contentious to claim that
the culture of the Weimar republic in
1918 to 1933 was shaped by political
ideology. ~~Yes~~ it was art, theatre,
~~and~~ literature and the growth in
an appreciation for American culture
was for the most ~~part~~ part a
result of the ubiquity of ~~the~~ the
period, in particular the 1920s.
~~During the 1920s film took off ~~with~~~~
~~with the~~

On the other hand, the government did
subsidise cultural endeavours, which

(Section B continued) brought culture to ever the smallest towns, ~~and so~~ the ~~government~~ government set up a film commission which produced the most expensive film made at that point, Lang's 'Metropolis'. Furthermore, the ~~first~~ first vampire movie was made in Germany in 1922. This does not mean, however, that that culture was shaped by political ideologies, it was rather an expression of the creativity of the art elite groups and appreciated by many - not all - in the years 1918 to 1933. Therefore, culture was often subsidised by the government, but the lack of censorship as well as the freedom of speech of all citizens & continued in the Weimar constitution resulted in multiple cultural experimentation offering ~~work~~ from many and different sources and for this culture, in the Weimar republic was one of freedom and experimentation free from government control, influence and free from overriding political influences.

(Section B continued) However, the Nazi government did introduce heavy controls over culture during the 1930s, thus it is correct to claim that culture was shaped by political ideology - simply because it had to be ~~written~~ under such ~~that~~ strict control. Hitler introduced the Reichskulturkammer organisations under Goebbels which organised the strict control of culture. For example the Nazis held book burnings through the 1930s with the first being held in May 1934. The Nazis destroyed any works of art, literature, film or even textbooks which they saw as 'degenerate' that is to say that did not 'conform' to Nazi political ideology. Books from foreign authors, such as Ernest Hemingway or French authors, anything with an 'unacceptable' message such as a pacifist message and anything of 'unacceptable' style such as the expressionist, or as a focus on urban life. The Nazis favoured realistic representations that idealised rural living and ~~was~~ presented ~~has~~ healthy strong boys. This control of all culture shows that

(Section B continued) a direct link with the Nazis' political ideology - one which favoured rural dwelling, was anti-intellectual, nationalistic and anti-Semitic. Both the Nazis' political legislation such as the banning of Jewish MPs in 1934, as well as their attitudes towards such art is evident. For example, a degenerate art exhibition was set up in Munich and this showed depicted 'unacceptable' art with information boards ~~or~~ dictating why they ^{were} unacceptable and 'anti-German'. Thus indoctrination, ~~and~~ propaganda and censorship or censorship were on the Nazis' agenda and through the control of ~~culture~~ culture, they could express their political ideologies.

Overall in the time period 1918 to 1945 it ~~is~~ ~~the~~ culture was shaped by political ideologies to a very varying degree. Firstly in the Weimar Republic there was ~~large amount~~ much ~~amount~~ more freedom of expression ~~to~~ ~~show~~ shown by the

(Section B continued) many ~~diff~~ different styles available and while some of it may have been used by certain groups such as communists, it was significantly more free from political control and was shaped by creative individuals rather than political ideology for the most ~~part~~ part. However, the second ~~part~~ part of the time period - the Nazi period of 1933 to 1945 culture ~~in~~ became victim of great ~~of~~ government control and thus it was, of ~~course~~ course, much more shaped by ~~of~~ political ~~idea~~ ideology; in this ~~idea~~ ideology was that of the Nazi ~~part~~ party and the particular Hitler as every other form of expression was banned. Thus, culture was not ~~so~~ significantly shaped by political ideology to the ~~same~~ extent ~~in~~ between 1914 and 1933 to the same ~~of~~ extent but it was ~~in~~ the period 1933 to 1945.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

In contrast to the last example this is a response from the top end and was given full marks. The focus is definitive on the issue of culture being shaped by political ideology throughout. The candidate makes periodic assessments and has a sharp analysis of the extent to which political ideology shaped culture. The examples underpinning the argument and the discussion provide secure judgement.

Question 4

Although this question was the less popular of the two in Section B, answers tended to be at a slightly higher level. Candidates found this question accessible. The main issue that prevented candidates from reaching the top level was a tendency to explain economic development rather than focus on evaluating the issue of whether this was due to government intervention or outside support. The majority of candidates knew about the main features of economic development and could handle issues such as the social market economy and the benefits of aid from the USA. At the top end there was some excellent detailed evidence deployed and a sophisticated causal analysis. At the bottom end there tended to be a narrative of German economic development and an assertion about causal factors.

SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

The economic development in the years 1945-89 is highly significant due to the great amount of stability that was brought about by the government of the FRG. One reason for this was the help of government intervention, for example the economic policies of Adenauer, Erhard and Kohl later on. However, there ~~is~~ were other factors responsible for economic development, such as the help of the guest worker and also the help that came from outside of the FRG, such as the impact of the Korean War and US economic aid from the Marshall Plan.

In many ways, government intervention was the most important factor in the economic developments from 1945-89. By the 1960s, the FRG was the

third wealthiest nation in the world with a stable economic base, this was largely a result of the government intervention of Adenauer. Along with the help of economic minister, Erhard. They ran a 'social market economy' which had capitalist principles but offered a security net for the poor. One significant example was (Section B continued) the creation of the Bundesbank which was based entirely on economics and not politics ensuring economic efficiency and expertise. A new currency, the Deutsche Mark, was created by the government which contributed to economic developments, large quantities of the DM were given to banks to aid industrial development. Erhard also put an end to rationing and cut price controls which put an end to the Black Market immediately. This clearly brought about great stability as there was an average economic growth of 8% per year, inflation was at a consistently low level of 1.1% and ~~the~~ unemployment fell from 11% in 1950, to 1.3% in 1960 and ~~the~~ 0.7% by 1970.

There is also evidence of the importance of government intervention later on in the period. In the 1970s there were two oil crises which

caused unemployment to reach 2 million, then 7 million and there was a four fold increase in oil prices. The main factor that contributed to the recovery from this was the intervention from Kohl's government. He cut government expenditure and the welfare state and students grants became loans. This contributed to recovery and by

(Section B continued) the 90s there was almost complete recovery from the oil crises of 1972 and 1978.

However, it can be argued that other factors are responsible for the economic developments in the FRG. For example, the impact of the Guest worker. These were foreign workers from areas of Europe like Turkey, they took the lowest skilled, lowest paid jobs and played a huge role in the development of the economy. There was an impressive strike free record in the FRG, there were labour relations other nations envied, and Trade unions had actually played a role in these developments. There was a constant flow of available labour, from 1969-1973 3 million German workers left industrial and mechanical jobs for 'white collar' jobs. However, around 1.2 million guest workers filled these roles, ensuring the FRG possessed an effective workforce, what

economists call 'human capital'. Even in the economic hardships of the 70s and 80s, Germany still exported huge amounts, largely due to the dedicated workforce of FRG citizens and Guest workers who were producing good quality products, and marketing effectively to new emerging markets.

(Section B continued) Another factor responsible for the economic developments in West Germany may be the economic aid that came from external sources outside of Germany. One example of this was the 'Marshall Plan'. In 1947, the US Secretary of State, George Marshall, announced his plan of European recovery. He had ~~\$13 billion~~ \$13 billion to give ~~to~~ to Western European countries to aid their economic development. In 1948 alone, West Germany received 99 million dollars. This money made up for 37% of German exports, and also went in to the establishment of new and effective engineering and manufacturing industries which allowed the FRG to maintain high export rates throughout its existence. Just as the Marshall Plan was beginning to cease, the FRG's economy received another boost from the Korean War. The war meant USA, Britain and France were joined in rearming, and there was a

demand for West German goods such as machine tools and motor vehicles, therefore these powerful nations were putting money in to the FRG's economy that contributed to its development.

In conclusion, it can be argued that government intervention was clearly a very significant factor,

(Section B continued) as without it, the economic developments of the FRG wouldn't have been as successful.

Even in the factors that were independent of government intervention (such as the skilled workforce and rate of the westward), still were influenced by government ~~policy~~ policy, for example the government introduced the 'principle of co-determination law' in 1951, which actually contributed to the efficiency of the workforce as it gave the workers managerial roles in their industries which encouraged strong labour relations.

However, it can be seen that some of the factors the government did influence, went on to prosper without intervention, for example the Bundesbank which ran independently from the Chancellor.

~~Therefore~~ a combination of the factors contributed to the economic developments of the FRG as all sectors of the country worked together to ensure stability.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The example is from a response at the top end of level 4, awarded 16 marks. This response is well organised and has a good range of accurate detail. The response does engage with whether economic development was due to internal or external factors but the response is more an explanation of German economic development and is less strong on the second order concept of causation.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When planning an essay like this it is a good idea to factor in where the key points of analysis can be deployed. It is easy to get involved with economic detail and forget the reason why it is being cited. Never lose sight of the focus of the question.

SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

A variety of factors contributed to German economic development in the years 1945-89. Internal government intervention as well as external factors such as war end immigration ~~was~~ all resulted in economic development. To be classed as "most important", a factor must have resulted in long-term developments in all areas of the economy, including business performance, industrial output and living standards. As such, an analysis of all of these is required to conclude one factor as being the most important.

Government intervention was crucial to economic development in various ways. Firstly, Erhard's establishment of a social market economy had significant impact. This was a

free market economy with welfare built in for the poorest.

The social market economy was various ways. Firstly, the structure provided a bridge between workers and employers.

This is important as it minimised strikes and maximised efficiency, resulting in greater industrial output. This is illustrated in car production, where 1959 levels were quadruple that of 1950. As greater industrial output is a sign of economic development, this establishes intervention in the form of the social market economy as very important.

In addition to this, the social market economy structure had impacts in other areas of German economy - namely, living standards. The arbitration provided by fair worker representation resulted in wages real wages rising 21% between 1951-62, while unemployment dropped to 600,000 in 1961. This shows how state arbitration resulted in worker stability, which is a cornerstone of both illustrating and guaranteeing economic development. In addition, the included welfare elements brought living standards up among the poor. This is seen by savings of average Germans increasing from 4% to 10% 1954-1972. Consequently, the establishment of a free market economy was extremely important as it impacted all areas of the German economy in positive ways. Furthermore, this development was consistently long-term, from 1950-1980s. This supports the view that government intervention was the most important factor.

In parallel to this, economic reform and legislation compounded the benefits of social market economy to further aid economic ~~tax~~ development. Erhard introduced a low corporate tax, so businesses could pay higher wages while earning more in international markets. Low tax was instrumental in creating a budget surplus of 25b DM in 1970, as exports were far greater than imports. This is beneficial as it means more money inside Germany, which in turn results in greater tax income to support welfare schemes. This consequently provides evidence for government economic intervention providing the economy the means to develop.

In parallel to this, the final element of government intervention to consider is the Equalisation of Burden Act 1952. This was an asset tax which provided the economy a significant lump sum in order to kick start the post-war economic boom. This is important as it was the foundation of ~~as~~ all other economic developments, and therefore should be considered the primary 'cause' of economic development.

It is clear that government intervention did stimulate economic development in the years 1945-89. It can be regarded as "important" due to its long term and substantial impact across the entirety of the German economy. However in assessing if it was the

"most important" factor, other sources of economic development must be considered.

Firstly, the Korean War of 1950 was an external cause of development of which the German government had no intervention in. The shifting of WWII production to war goods resulted in German consumer goods becoming more popular abroad. This was compounded by good reputation to establish Germany as a leading exporter. Evidence of growth development is illustrated in the growth of German exports, from 10% of national GDP in 1950 to 19% in 1958. This resulted in more money entering the domestic circular flow of income, which substantially aided and magnified economic development. This shows how the Korean War was a factor in economic development as it resulted in German income drastically increasing - both for the country and ~~the~~ individuals.

However, the effectiveness of German export markets was compounded by the aforementioned tax structure and business model enforced by government intervention. Therefore it can be said the impact of the Korean War would not have been as great but for effective government intervention to maximize income. Consequently, government intervention should be regarded as more important than

The Korean War as the ² second directly relied on the first.

Another important factor in economic development in the FRG was the influx of guest workers.

The FRG received over 3.2 million economic immigrants who provided cheap labour. This was a factor in development as it provided businesses and industry with a larger workforce, and hence increased output and profits. In addition as workers were low paid and not given civilian status, it kept wage expenditure low while maintaining stability. Significantly, a large proportion of guest workers were skilled. - shown by average employment in the secondary industry being 49%. This aided development as it prevented the skills shortage most European countries saw in the 1960s-70s, meaning German growth could surpass it's neighbours.

Crucially while the government did accept these workers, it was not their intervention which behind this factor. As a result, the impact of guest workers must be regarded as completely independent of government intervention. If this impact was more significant in causing economic development, then government intervention could be seen as the most important.

Significantly, the impact of guest workers was not

consistently beneficial to economic ~~benefit~~ development.

During the recession of 1906-07 as well as oil-crises of 1973 and 1978, the use of cheap economic immigrants

(Section B continued)

resulted in significant unemployment - up to 1.5m in 1973. This is significant as it shows guest workers having an adverse impact on economic development - compared to that of government intervention which continuously aided it. This clearly supports the argument that government intervention was the most important factor.

In conclusion, government intervention was consistently beneficial to economic development in all areas of German society. Its importance can be illustrated with the Korean war, which while being a cause of development, was only impactful due to the government's policy. As a result of the negative impact of guest workers, it can be concluded that government intervention was the most important policy for economic development in the years 1945-49.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This extract is from a response at the top of level 5, 20 marks. The candidate has employed a clear structure that works. First the factor of government intervention is developed with reliable information and some analysis, then external factors are considered, but directly weighed against conscious government intervention. The discussion is reasoned and provides the criteria upon which the evidence can be judged. Focusing on the second order concept throughout achieves a level 5 award.

Question 5

This question produced a range of answers. Most candidates could understand the different interpretations in the extracts and were able to set up a debate between the blunders of Hitler and his opponents and the calculated risk of invading Poland. Most candidates could also find plenty of evidence to develop features of the extracts. A common, and often regrettable, feature of answers for this option is for candidates to label the extracts as either intentionalist or structuralist and then superimpose this onto their content. This produces varying results. It can lead to a superficial engagement with the extracts and an essay written from the candidate's knowledge of the historiographical debate, which often involves making unfounded claims about the extracts. However, better answers use the historiography to develop what is actually in the extracts and include information on the more nuanced points therein. In this case the best candidates spotted that Mason's interpretation was attacking Taylor's analysis directly, and they used the extracts to good effect, wringing out many of the subtler points. At the bottom end the engagement with the extracts tended to be cursory and they were mainly used as sources of information.

In light of the ~~differe~~ differing interpretations it isn't very convincing that the outbreak of the second world war was a 'result of blunders by Hitler and his opponents'. In order to assess this both extracts and interpretations (functionalist and intentionalist) both need to be explored. The functionalist point of view is that Hitler was an opportunist and war broke out due to him taking different opportunities. The intentionalist view is that Hitler always intended to go to war and are heavily reliant on him having a 'master plan'. Extract 1 by A.J.P Taylor is that of a functionalist view and Extract 2 by Tim Mason is that of an intentionalist view.

Extract 1 by A.J.P Taylor is that of a functionalist view and therefore supports the idea that Hitler was an opportunist. It is clear that Taylor has the functionalist view when he says, "though he often talked of such a war, he did not plan for it." This can be criticised by the intentionalists because in Meinkampf and his second book, Hitler makes clear step by step plan of how he intends to go to war. It is also shown that he planned for war with the Nazis Four Year Plan, which clearly showed the steps which needed to be made in order to achieve war by ~~1940/41~~ 1941/42. However, this can then be counter argued by the functionalists who say that Hitler couldn't or planned to go to war because war broke out in 1939 after the invasion of Poland, when the 4 Year Plan was ~~supposed~~ supposed to end in 1941/42, meaning Germany wasn't ~~ready~~ ready for war. This is supported when ~~the~~ A.J.P Taylor says "German armaments were not designed for such a war", showing that he didn't intend to go to war in 1939 because their weapons were not ready, meaning it would have been inevitable Germany

would lose the war.

Extract 2 by Tim Mason is that of the intentionalist view and therefore means that he supports the idea that Hitler had a 'master plan' and always intended to go to war when he did. Hitler knew that Britain and France had already warned that if he invaded Poland, they would declare war upon Germany and he still went ahead with the invasion, showing that he wanted to go to war. Tim Mason supports this intentionalist idea when he says, "The decision to take the risk launched the Second World War" and that the "risk was so obvious". This suggests that Hitler could see and knew that Britain and France would declare war on Germany but he was still willing to carry on with the risk. This also puts huge influence on Hitler himself and that it was his decision to invade Poland which was the catalyst for the start of the war, giving the idea that he knew what he was doing and always had a 'masterplan'. In conclusion, ~~the~~ I do not believe that

the view that the outbreak of the Second World War was a result of 'blunders by Hitler and his opponents', and therefore support the intentionalist view and ideas. Hitler showed he had a plan for war as he clearly took the risk of invading Poland ~~and~~ after being warned, Hitler knew the risk. Also, he made it quite clear in the Four Year Plan and his two books about his plan for war and to overturn the Treaty of Versailles, therefore showing that he was not just an opportunist, showing faults with the functionalist view.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response was given level 3, 12 marks. The candidate has used a prepared plan about the virtues of intentionalism and structuralism and fitted quotations from the extracts into it. In dealing with extract 1 the candidate has done this quite successfully and offers some development through a discussion and the use of own knowledge. However the second extract is treated less well. The candidate writes of the extract being intentionalist and supporting the idea of a 'master plan', but there is no reference to a master plan in extract 2. The conclusion is also focused on the historiographical debate and not the set question.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

The advice from this response is straightforward: do not turn the question into a debate about intentionalism and structuralism - answer the question that has been set.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the outbreak of the Second World War was a result of blunders by Hitler and his opponents' (Extract 1, lines 15–16)?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

The debate of the outbreak of the Second World War is diverse, but is usually split between arguments that Hitler always intended war (intentionalists) and arguments that it was simply a by-product of his overall aims (structuralists or functionalists). The two extracts clearly ~~disagree~~ disagree over whether Hitler's initiation of war was a 'mistake' (Extract 1) or simply a 'risk' (Extract 2).

In Extract 1, AJP Taylor suggests that war with the Soviet Union would have made far more sense, as it was greatly outperforming Nazi Germany in production, and presented direct and dangerous opposition. Identifying that this 'obsessed' Hitler, Taylor suggests that it would have 'made sense' for Hitler to plan a great war against Soviet Russia. This is a convincing argument, as

Hitler viewed Slavic Russia as 'inferior' to Aryan Germany, so for the manufacturing production of a 'lesser' nation^{to} have grown 373% more than that of Germany would have been viewed by Hitler as an embarrassment. Furthermore, Stalin's Soviet Union represented not only Slavic Eastern Europe, but also a communist state growing in power and stature - this gave Hitler two reasons to plan for war against Soviet Russia.

Extract 2, however, argues that the outbreak of WWII was simply a result of Hitler taking the 'straightforward risk' of invading Poland, preferring that Britain and France did not act, but anticipating them to do so. This extract tackles Taylor's view that the outbreak of war 'was a mistake', arguing that this is a relatively simple & conclusion to come to. Mason identifies that the outbreak of war was 'not just a matter of miscalculation' (as Taylor suggests). This argument holds significant weight, as Hitler had taken diplomatic and military risks prior to the invasion of Poland in order to pursue his expansionist foreign policy.

The most prominent risk Hitler had taken to this point was the re-militarisation of the Rhineland, which explicitly violated the Treaty of Versailles. This was successful, but is significant as it kickstarted Hitler's political campaign of opportunistic, risk-taking expansionism. Further risks were taken in the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1938, which further enforces the interpretation of Mason in Extract 2.

However, Taylor's conclusion that the outbreak of war was the 'result of blunders by Hitler and his opponents' is particularly significant too. It could be argued that this initiation of war, rather than preparation for war with the Soviets was a mistake due to the outcome of Operation Barbarossa. Hitler did eventually go to war with Soviet Russia, whilst also fighting on the Western front - and was crushed. This shows an massive lack of preparation and planning, and is concurrent with Taylor's interpretation that the outbreak of war happened due to a series of mistakes.

Extract 1 is also supported by the actions of the Allied powers in the

events leading to the outbreak of war. The complete absence of French action over the Rhineland in 1936, and the leniency of the Allies at the Munich Conference in 1938 could be very accurately described as 'blunders', which could have prevented the outbreak of war (if proper action was taken). However, these actions were taken in the interest of preventing war (particularly the Munich Conference), although still mistakes.

However, what ^{discredits} ~~is~~ Extract 1 is Hitler's long-standing policy of Lebensraum, which involved expanding Eastwards into the 'lesser' nations to conquer 'living space' for the Aryan population. This suggests that invasion of Poland (and subsequent eastern conquest) was always planned and by no means a mistake. Poland was far weaker than Russia, and would give the Nazis a foothold in Eastern Europe, so they were capable of launching a more dangerous offensive of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Hitler's record of taking diplomatic risks to expand Germany had largely been successful to this point, ~~which~~

he had no reason to stop with Poland.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This example is from a response achieving level 5. The extracts are analysed in terms of their interpretations, and then the candidate develops the arguments with reasoned addition of knowledge, which both adds weight and criticism to each extract. The focus is on the question set and the interpretations are examined on their own merits and not simply boxed into intentionalist and structuralist descriptors. This allows the candidate to build an argument which ends with a sustained conclusion.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When planning the essay and analysing the extracts keep the key words in the question at the forefront of your thinking. 'Blunders by Hitler and his opponents' should form the centrepiece of an answer to this question.

Paper Summary

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

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes or consequences, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to relying solely on pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question

- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

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>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

