



# **Examiners' Report June 2023**

**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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2023

Publications Code 9HI0\_1G\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this year's 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 any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity/difference and significance with a time frame of not less than ten years. Section B offers a further choice of essays using an extended time frame of not less than one third of that offered by the specification as a whole. 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 handwriting. 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 offered by both the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

## Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to consider how far they agree that opposition to democratic government was the most significant impact of the Treaty of Versailles within Germany in the years 1918-33. Question 1 was the more popular question in section A and was accessible to a range of abilities. The majority of candidates were able to offer argument and evidence about the significance of the consequence given in the question, 'opposition to democratic government', and weigh it against other consequences of the Treaty of Versailles.

At the top end candidates engaged with the given consequence of opposition to democratic government and often argued that this was more connected to the Treaty of Versailles in the early part of the time frame. Successful candidates also managed to consider problems at the end of the time frame, using their own time effectively. Most candidates argued that the fate of Weimar in the final analysis was decided by the serious economic situation Germany faced after 1929 and related this to the reparations demanded from Germany in 1921.

Less successful candidates tended to overload their answers with material from the early period. This sometimes included recalling the terms of the Treaty of Versailles without getting round to dealing with its consequences, and at others involved detail on the various violent putsches and the period of hyperinflation.

To assess the 'most significant impact' of the Treaty of Versailles within Germany, the criteria must note an impact that is both wide-reaching in society, and sustained across the period. It is argued that 'opposite' to democratic government, acts as this impact, noting how numerous groups sought to oppose the democratic system that Versailles enforced. However, upon further evaluation, it becomes clear that the economic impacts not only outweighed opposition, but in many ways facilitated it, along with the cultural upheaval that the treaty brought. Thus we cannot note opposition to government as the 'most significant impact'.

The Versailles treaty inherently brought about opposition to democratic government. Due to the concealed nature of Germany's war losses, coupled with the 'dictated' nature of peace, the population was unwittingly prepared for the shift to democratic government that the treaty brought. Thus, this would spur opposition, as those who signed the treaty were dubbed 'November Criminals', and they faced mass opposition, such as Erzberger, one of these 'criminals', who was assassinated by the right-wing O-C in 1921. However,

the treaty not only stimulated extra-political opposition to democratic government, but also the creation of political parties that were built upon its overturning, such as the Nazi Party, who note in their 1920 '25 point programme' that the treaty must be overturned. The growing support of the ~~the~~ Nazis and anti-democratic parties can be cited as a wide-reaching impact of the treaty, with anti-democratic parties receiving over 50% of the vote in 1932.

However, this does overlook the other aspect of a most significant impact; the sustained impact. Though violent opposition to Weimar was pervasive in the early years, it did not continue into the 'golden years' of 1924-29, and indeed the anti-democratic parties lost support in this period, with the Nazis at just 2% of the vote in 1928. What this

conveys, is that ~~the~~ opposition to the democratic government was not a 'sustained' impact, but rather an intermittent one, flaring up at key moments of discontent, thus not the 'most significant' ~~and~~ impact.

These periods of increased opposition to government owe their explanation to the economic legacy of the Versailles treaty. The 132 billion marks in reparations cannot be downplayed in their

impact upon Germany. Not only did they serve to destabilise the government, as policies had to continually form around economic realities, but also acted to bolster opposition, as lower living standards breed anger. ~~With~~ Weimar's lasting legacy, that of the 1923 hyperinflation, can be traced directly back to Versailles, as the excessive printing of money was primarily to pay reparations ~~for~~ payments, and to compensate for the /Passive resistance employed in the Ruhr region, which had produced 81% of Germany's steel. Arguably, it is the hyperinflation, coupled with ideological incompatibility, that sparked mass opposition, as did the later Great Depression. Notably, the economic impacts of Versailles extend beyond opposition, as ~~the~~ economic policy became the focus of many offices, such as the foreign policy from 1924-29, headed by Gustav Stresemann - the 1924 Dawes Plan, 1929 Young Plan, and the joining of the League of Nations in 1926 could all be argued to owe their roots to economic factors, as foreign loans and cooperation were intrinsically brought in to address the rampant ~~reparations~~ reparations. Whilst one may note that economic crises were not a 'sustained' impact, policies that were the result of Versailles' economic legacy permeated the era, and served ~~to~~ to bring

about the consequences of the Great Depression to Germany, with 30% of the population unemployed in 1932. Thus, not only do economic legacies of Versailles outweigh the 'wide-reaching' and 'sustained' impact of opposition, it actually acts to facilitate the opposition, shaping public opinion via disseminating realities.

Public realities fluctuated significantly across the period, yet the cultural legacy of Versailles ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> a key facet of social life throughout. Though hard to quantify, the humiliation and distrust in government that Versailles brought did not solely manifest in opposition, but also had significant cultural repercussions. For instance, the creation of the 'Neue Sachlichkeit' movement was inherently linked to the failures of government officials at Versailles, as the movement sought to expose realities of the war, often at the expense of the government. Otto Dix notably painted 'The War' in 1932, a perspective of Neue Sachlichkeit culture, which permeated Weimar society as a result of a perceived military 'stab in the back'. In addition, the painter George Grosz depicted the humiliations of Versailles in 'Germany: A Winter's Tale', a more cartoonish depiction that served to ridicule German leaders. Cultural experimentation is intrinsically linked to Versailles

due to the ~~that~~ lack of faith in Weimar manifest in the cultural dictum that 'anything goes'. Indeed, Cabaret culture was often critical of government activity, with artists such as 'Fink' becoming renowned in Berlin. Further cultural links to Versailles stem from the noted economic impact. The reparations brought the hyperinflation, which rendered savings obsolete, incentivising a 'care-free' culture where Germans knew their economic realities were unstable, and thus sought often illicit activities as a distraction, such as with Cabarets. Thus, one may note that other factors, not Versailles, brought about this cultural change, the sense of cultural change was significantly 'wide-reaching' and 'sustained' across the period, influenced either by the sense of humiliation in Versailles, or the economic realities shaping culture due to the treaty, and though counter-culture may be viewed as opposition, it is not a direct part.

Concluding, opposition to democratic government did not come as the 'most significant impact' of the Versailles treaty. Though opposition was 'wide-reaching', the level as to which it was 'sustained' is disputable, and, more prominently, it often drew upon the economic failures to bolster support, which are their criticism to the treaty as well. Arguably, opposition may subtly manifest through culture, yet this cultural experiment not

only is disintegrated, traced to Versailles, but is convincingly  
linked to economic realities, showing an  
interpretation of opposition to democratic ~~growth~~<sup>growth</sup> as not legitimising  
the title of 'most significant impact' of Versailles.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at the top of level 5. The candidate offers good, detailed and relevant evidence and subjects it to analysis. In particular the candidate has thought about how to judge each of the chosen consequences by looking at whether they were sustained throughout the period. Unusually this candidate considers the cultural impact of the Treaty of Versailles, but keeps the evidence and analysis focussed on the question.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Historical questions have to be judged by selected criteria. A consequence can be judged by the way it impacts politics, economics and society. It can also be judged by the length of time its impact lasts. These criteria are best considered during revision.

## Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider how accurate it is to say that the Great Depression was the most significant economic challenge that Germany faced in the years 1918-45. This question produced many well-informed answers and the majority of candidates had sufficient knowledge to deal with the most serious economic challenges of the period.

At the top end successful candidates established the criteria by which the various economic challenges might be judged. The best answers tended to include political fallout from the various economic challenges as being important. The fall of the Weimar Republic in 1933 and defeat in war in 1945 were convincingly cited as ways to evaluate significance.

Less successful candidates tended to describe the extreme impacts that the hyperinflation and Great Depression had on the population but were unable to develop other ways of evaluating significance.

The Great Depression was not the most significant economic problem faced by Germany in the years 1918 - 1945. Whilst the Depression, triggered by the Wall Street Crash and Black Tuesday, was a significant economic challenge (made worse by Weimar Germany's reliance on American loans and finance), the hyperinflation crisis of 1923, and to some extent the preparation for war and the period of Total War from 1935 to 1945, were even greater still.

The hyperinflation crisis was an extremely significant economic challenge for the Weimar Republic. Fuelled by the French and Belgian invasion of the Ruhr (due to Weimar Germany failing to pay an installment of its 132 billion RM / \$6.6 billion reparations bill) and the subsequent excessive money printing programme by the federal government, the crisis ensured that the Reichsmark became completely worthless and people were left using their banknotes as fuel for their fires, such was the degree of inflation that was experienced. Poor economic policies were

enacted in response to the crisis, so between January and November 1923 the reichsmark became worth less than a billionth of a US dollar. The crisis was the worst Germany Weimar Germany saw, with mass starvation plaguing the nation. Politicians, not helped by the const in-practice ineffective form of parliamentary government that returned 20 coalition governments over the 14 year history of the Weimar Republic, were unable to control the crisis. It took for Gustav Stresemann to bring in the Rentenmark during his five months as Chancellor to slightly end the crisis, but even then, inflation persisted. Even through the so-called 'Golden Years' of the Weimar Republic from 1924 - <sup>1929</sup>~~1928~~, little was golden economically. Whilst culture and the arts flourished, the economy never truly recovered from the hyperinflation crisis: minor increases in agricultural and industrial production could not hide the rampant unemployment and poverty that was haunting most of Weimar Germany. As such, the hyperinflation crisis was a significant economic crisis experienced between 1918 and 1945.

The Great Depression was also a significant crisis which the Weimar Republic, and ~~then~~ <sup>later</sup> Nazi Germany,

had to contend with. The Wall Street Crash and Black Tuesday forced <sup>many</sup> American financiers and banks to call in its loans, a huge number of which were to Germany as part of the Dawes and Young Plans (of 1924 and ~~24~~ 1929 respectively). ~~The~~ the calling in of the loans meant that the capital propping up the severely damaged post-WWI German economy was lost, and economic the economic situation, after a period of slight improvement during the Golden Years, worsened quickly. Poverty and hunger once again swept across Germany, not helped by Chancellor Brüning's fiscal policies which were highly contractionary. By ~~removing~~ raising taxes and cutting spending, Brüning was able to achieve his deflationary aims (the political and economic horror of the hyperinflation crisis still plaguing the minds of politicians, showing how significant an economic challenge it was) but at the same time caused the economy to shrink. Due to his policies, and the Depression, Germany suffered the most in Europe during the crisis. It took for the New Plan, enacted by ~~the~~ Schacht, at the start of the Nazi era in 1933, to begin to turn the tide on the Depression: huge infrastructure projects such as the building of Germany's

autobahns were one such way that Walter Schacht was able to help the German economy out of the crisis. The effects of the ~~de~~ Depression and the inability of Chancellor Brüning, ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~was~~ despite avoiding another bout of inflation, or worse ~~to~~ hyperinflation, made it a significant economic challenge.

The creation of a war ~~economy~~ economy provided a challenge for the Nazis and was a significant crisis for Hitler for his attempt to gain a decisive victory in the Second World War. Appointed ~~German~~ Plenipotentiary of the Four Year Plan, Hermann Goering was unable to deliver an economy, or army, fit for ~~war~~ <sup>war</sup> by 1939. ~~It~~ It is suggested that the economy was in fact not ready for war until 1942, representing for Hitler a significant economic crisis, especially in the midst of war. Most notably, by 1942, Britain was spending 60% of its GDP on the war effort, whilst Germany was spending 47%. Goering failed to achieve autarky (economic independence), as Germany failed to meet its production targets for oil, aluminium and buna (a type of synthetic rubber). Yet despite the apparent failure of the plan, the argument can be made that there was in fact

little economic crisis surrounding the Four Year Plan. Targets for production were ~~access~~ excessively high and potentially completely unattainable, meaning that the increases in domestic production levels, whilst below targets, were sufficient. On top of this, ~~Albert Speer~~ Albert Speer, formerly Hitler's personal architect but made ~~armaments~~ ~~at~~ Armaments Minister during the war, was able to increase production of, for example, ammunition by 97%. ~~The~~ Therefore, whilst initially a significant ~~crisis~~ economic crisis, the initial lack of success of the Four Year Plan gave way to a more successful and efficient total war economy after 1942.

Overall, the hyperinflation crisis was by far the most significant economic crisis experienced by Germany between 1918 and 1945. Not only ~~was it~~ did the crisis cause immense economic hardship for the ~~majority~~ <sup>vast</sup> vast majority of Germans between ~~19~~ in the immediate post-WWI period (with the crisis exacerbated by poor government economic policy), but the harrowing experience of Germans during the crisis ~~meant~~ meant that hyperinflation that occurred in 1923 was dictating and heavily guiding the economic policy of Brüning following the Great

Depression. The Depression represented another significant, albeit less impactful, economic crisis, poorly dealt with by Brüning and repaired, as Brüning did with the hyperinflation crisis, by Brüning. The failure of the Four Year Plan provided an economic, and thus military crisis, for Hitler, but a combination of excessively high, unrealistic targets and Speer's relative success whilst armaments minister offset much of the negative economic consequences of the failed Four Year Plan. Overall, therefore, I strongly disagree with the notion that the Great Depression was the greatest ~~economic~~ economic challenge experienced by Germany between 1918 and 1945, instead ~~believe~~ believing that it was the hyperinflation crisis of 1923 that was the most significant economic crisis during the time period.



This is an example of work at mid-level 5. The candidate presents a sustained argument based on sound evidence. This response covers the time frame and considers the significance of each economic challenge based on how difficult the following recovery was. This is a valid way of looking at significance, but it would only take an extra sentence to point out that the Great Depression ended democratic government in favour of Nazism. Nevertheless, evidence and argument is well organised, and the conclusion makes the candidate's judgement sustained and justified.



Take note of the conclusion offered by this candidate. It is a very good summary of the evidence and argument used and provides a final judgement on the question.

### Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates to consider the extent to which democratic government was the main reason for political stability in the FRG in the years 1949-89. This was by far the more popular question in section B. The majority of candidates were able to think about democratic government as being essential after the fall of the Third Reich. Most gave due consideration to the Basic Law and, for some, the constitutional differences to the Weimar Republic, although this was not asked for.

At the top end successful candidates were able to weigh the importance of democratic government against other reasons for political stability, with most arguing that economic growth was a very important reason for stability. A minority of candidates were able to challenge the premise of the question and show that there were periods of political instability and division. Other reasons included in the reasons for stability were membership of the EEC, the importance of immigrant labour, and the Equalization of Burdens Law.

At mid-range a number of candidates tended to stick to evidence from the 1950s and 1960s and neglected the later period.

Less successful candidates often struggled with the meaning of 'political stability' and compensated by listing the more favourable features of life in the FRG.

Democratic Government outlines the success of the FRG but, for stability, there are many factors that need to be considered with two others: ~~Inter~~ International relations and economy could be supported as both allowed for better governing of the country. Thus, I prefer to say that the economy was the main reason for political stability as the likes of the social market economy allowed to improve Germany's finances and strengthen them.

Democratic Government was certainly a crucial reason for stability of politics in the FRG as they followed Weimar's system but instead of the President having the most power with possession of Article 48 as an example ~~to~~ and commander of the German armed forces. But, the FRG changed that making the President a figurehead of the Government with very limited power to which allowed oppositional challengers to stay in the Bundestag without ~~throwing~~ throwing/banning other Parties' high rank politicians due to their different views. The FRG also established article 21 to which any organisations / parties that have anti-democratic views or tendencies would be automatically banned.

(Section B continued) from even being in elections as well as seats in the Bundestag with an example being communists being banned in 1955 by the Government. This may seem more restricting but it stabilised the Government as those who were in Parliament were democratic and willing to work diplomatically and peacefully outlining that such limiting articles were necessary to uphold democracy in the FRG preventing the mistakes of the Weimar Government.

Whereas, Economy was vital for political stability in the FRG as it provided a strong backbone for the country as most policies benefitted all parties in the Bundestag. With the setting up of the social market economy, it allowed to create economic stability in the country that both CDU and SPD stuck the policy as it was very effective. The policies like the Marshall Plan <sup>(1947)</sup> by the USA allowed regrowth of the German economy and new bank (~~Deutschebank~~ Rentenbank) and new currency (Rentenmark) in 1948 caused in future since 1949 to build the cooperation between parties with examples like the monopolisation law 1952 prevented large companies from dominating in the country allowing smaller businesses to grow with conservatives possibly being unhappy of the act; stabilisation 1967 law ~~as~~ was introduced allowing government to control taxes,

(Section B continued) loans and affect the stock market to which other right wing parties would be annoyed, but in need of crisis due to 1966 recession, they agreed to prevent an economic crisis and part-privatisation act (1982) selling government assets like Lufthansa and Volkswagen created large profits but needed to be sold to private companies due to debt created by SPD Chancellor Schmidt reluctantly all parties despite power both these assets. These policies show that in times of economic crisis, parties agreed together that may not appease them but were necessary to happen. Ensuring political stability in the FRG was strong and crucial for success of the country.

Integration with international powers were heavily sought for the FRG as they wanted to show that they wouldn't turn back to the Nazis period thus, they were willing to cooperate with the likes of the USA and other European powers like France. This can be shown through industrialisation of the FRG in late 40's to early 50's which Germany manufactured weapons for the USA and United Nations for the Korean war showing support for the west. Another example would be the creation of the EEC<sup>in 1957</sup> which was an economic organisation created by France,

(Section B continued) Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Austria and Germany where they traded without permits showing willingness to trade with other western countries. Thus, such policies and actions were taken to appease and ~~to~~ to be accepted by the west putting the FRG on a brighter future as they ~~would~~ wanted to change for the better outlining political stability as it showed that capitalism was the ideal for the Germany and not communism from the East as to which the politics allowed for stability without any extreme sympathisers of communism.

In conclusion, I believe the economy was the main reason for ~~political~~ political stability in the FRG as during crisis (economical), these differences would be settled aside to counter attack problems together as one state not one party. Even though, the international relations and democratic ~~government~~ government were vital, its economy that prevented divides and pushed for stability in the economic creating a stable political environment in the FRG.



This is an example of work at the top of level 4. The response contains some good analysis and there is clearly enough evidence to justify the candidate's argument. The response lacks coherence in places and this prevents it getting into level 5. Nevertheless, the response has many strengths. In particular the candidate is mindful of the constitution of the FRG and its differences with Weimar. This gives the answer a clear focus on the political stability of the FRG that the question asks for.



This response answers a question about the FRG but makes reference to the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich. However, the candidate uses this evidence from outside the time frame to strengthen the analysis being developed within it. As a rule, using evidence from beyond the time frame is not advisable because it can lead away from the question. However, when discussing the FRG the past weighed on the minds of democratic politicians and so this can be referred to. This response is useful in showing how it should be done.

## Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider whether Germans maintained a generally hostile attitude to cultural change in the years 1918-89. Many candidates interpreted 'culture' as a way of life rather than as creative production of art, music, film and literature as the question intended. Nevertheless, candidates were credited with answers that, for example, analysed democratic cultural attitudes as opposed to authoritarian attitudes. As the Nazis used a culture war as part of their propaganda and sought to change the way of life for all Germans this is a valid way to think about the question. However, a sizeable minority of candidates simply offered material on the lives of women and tended to see German attitudes as essentially Nazi attitudes.

At the top end there were some very good answers that considered the full period in the time frame and were able to refer to a variety of cultural changes and the consequent change in attitudes. Quite a few answers developed good counter arguments with some nuanced analysis of attitudes to culture in the Third Reich.

At mid-range candidates often neglected attitudes to culture in the FRG and tended to offer too much material on the Third Reich. There was also a tendency to substitute education for culture when candidates found themselves short of evidence, with varying degrees of success.

Less successful candidates tended to simply interpret culture as changes to women's lifestyle with a few including attitudes to Jews and other ethnic minorities.

Germans, ~~were~~ on the whole, did not maintain a hostile attitude to cultural change in the years 1918 to 1989. Throughout all three periods of government in Germany during the time period (the Weimar Republic, the Third Reich and the ~~Fere~~ Federal Republic of Germany) despite monumental and cataclysmic changes in literature, film, radio, art and other cultural mediums, the German people adapted to the changes. At times this acceptance was coerced, such as by Goebbels's propaganda ministry during the period of Nazi rule, whilst at other points Germans openly and willingly conformed to new cultural norms and conventions. Despite some <sup>minor</sup> opposition to cultural change ~~such as by Nazi students~~ ~~to when embarking on significant expeditions of book burning~~, cultural change was widely accepted and relished between 1918 and 1989.

Literature was one such cultural medium that, despite changing significantly between 1918 and 1989, was enjoyed across the ~~to~~ 20<sup>th</sup> century. Post-WWI literature, much of which focused on portraying the harrowing, and not glorious, nature of war (with novels such as Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet*

on the Western Front), proved particularly popular and revered, in Germany and beyond. When Hitler established himself as Führer in 1933, a rapid culture change in terms of accepted literature occurred, with Goebbels' Reich Chamber of Literature mandating those authors that the Nazi government and ideology accepted. Despite the immense popularity of authors such as Remarque, Thomas Mann and Ernest Hemingway, German people were quick to adapt to the decrees of the Nazi government in terms of the authors they were and were not allowed to read. Book burning occurred in Munich, as university students destroyed the work of Mann, Hemingway and Remarque (Remarque's work banned due to his portrayal of war as a harrowing event, which did not conform to Nazi ideals). Despite the general acceptance of Nazi decrees on literature, over 2,500 authors did not accept the changes, leaving Germany (Thomas Mann was one such author, who fled to Switzerland). ~~to the FKH, literature~~ The German people accepted the promotion of books such as Ernst Jünger's *Storm of Steel* which, by promoting the idea of war as a noble task, helped fuel the nationalism that drove Hitler and the Nazis. In the FKH, literature was equally as accepted, despite change from the Nazi period. Literature became similar to that

of Weimar Germany, with portrayals of harrowing yet vividly imaginative tales (such as *The Clown* and *The Tin Man*) all presenting themes of war in negative contexts and narratives. Across 1918-1989, despite huge change occurring in Nazi Germany, acceptance of this cultural change was widespread in Germany, but for a small handful of authors who countered book burning by fleeing Germany.

Film and radio were crucial cultural mediums during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. ~~but~~ Film was ~~also~~ a significant outlet for expressionist artist during the Weimar period. Works such as *Nosferatu* (1922) and *Metropolis* (1927) mirrored the futurism experienced through Weimar during the immediate post-war period. Cinema at the ~~the~~ time, whilst an emerging medium, was immensely popular. ~~Shifts~~ When Nazism gained power and Goebbels, through his Reich Chamber of Film was able to control cinematic output and expression, audiences remained loyal and the medium thrived. Only 13 of 75 recognised film stars left ~~to~~ Germany during this time, and so Goebbels was able to produce over 1000 films between 1933 and 1945, including pieces such as the heavily anti-Semitic *Die Rothschilds*. Yet despite the huge popularity of film in Weimar and Nazi

Germany, and the acceptance of the cultural changes in the medium ushered in by Goebbels (surrounding the increase in propaganda and pro-Nazi messages in films), audiences shunned film in the FRG. The culture of film changed after the Second World War, with an increased number of action films and more ~~commercial~~ commercialisation of film. This led to audiences at cinemas, thanks also to the increased popularity of ~~television~~ televisions, decreasing from over 800,000 people per year to under 200,000 per year over the FRG period. The New Cinema movement's 1962 manifesto, which declared cinema as being focused on artistic, rather than commercial, excellence failed to increase cinema's popularity or the cultural shift that occurred between the Nazi and FRG periods. Overall, ~~despite~~ cinema's cultural changes were accepted during the Weimar and Nazi periods, but audiences were certainly hostile to cinema in the FRG.

Art and architecture were also widely ~~used~~ mediums in which Germans were not ~~so~~ hostile to immense cultural change. The expressionism, cubism and 'Dada' ~~art~~ fine art forms of the Weimar Republic made way for strikingly different visual motifs in Nazi Germany. The Degenerate Art Exhibition, run by the

Nazi Party, presented, often ~~poor~~ intentionally poorly hung, pieces from those artists (many of them Jewish) with whom the Nazis disagreed or whose paintings failed to conform with Nazi ideals. Yet despite this virtually unparalleled cultural change, the people of Germany were not hostile (despite great popularity of Weimar art by artists such as Otto Dix or Hannah Hoch), instead showing great ~~accept~~ acceptance of the cultural change. In the field of architecture this dynamic is matched: Germans were equally keen on the post-modernism of Bauhaus and the expansive and powerful traditional architecture of Nazi buildings such as the Reich Chancellery. It was the entrance of the Reich Chancellery that was flanked by two physically active statues representing the Third Reich's supposed power. In the FRG, art was a less prominent cultural medium, but that does not mean there was hostility to the ~~changed~~ change that ensued. Artists such as Anselm Kiefer, who painted scenes of a great destruction, ~~some~~ including imagery of trenches, was popular nationally and internationally. Other culture had a greater effect on Germans in the FRG, including football, but there was no hostility to the art of those such as Kiefer which was completely different to Nazi art.

Overall, there was certainly not a general hostility to the immense cultural changes which occurred in Germany between 1918 and 1989. There was some hostility, such as by the 2,500 authors and 13 actors who fled the nation, hostile to Nazi propaganda and censorship, but on the whole, changes in culture were accepted widely and strongly, despite how significant and traumatic these changes were.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at the top of level 4, and it is included to show a response dealing with artistic culture. This response is better on evidence than argument but the case for Germans welcoming cultural change is made effectively. The candidate has excellent knowledge and is able to offer evidence from across the time frame of the question. There could have been a better counter argument commenting on, for example, those Germans who thought Weimar art was degenerate, or the youth in the Third Reich who deliberately flouted Nazi cultural norms. Nevertheless, this is a good answer to a question that quite a few candidates struggled with.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Questions on culture are intended to elicit answers based on artistic culture. Examiners will test knowledge about the sociological appreciation of culture through specific themes such as attitudes to women and ethnic minorities.

## Question 5

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war. This was an accessible question. The majority of candidates were able to grasp that the extracts offered the rival interpretations concerning the causes of the Second World War, with Extract 1 generally being seen as containing a functionalist interpretation and Extract 2 being seen as intentionalist. Candidates who ignored labelling the extracts in this way were still able to attain level 5.

At the top end candidates treated both extracts to critical analysis that developed the strengths and weaknesses of both interpretations and found it relatively easy to provide evidence from their own knowledge that illustrated the effects of appeasement and the power of Hitler's racial ideology in causing war in 1939. The majority of candidates were well prepared for this question and left themselves sufficient time to give the question proper attention.

At mid-range candidates tend to either let their answers be driven entirely by the extracts, or, for a minority, answers are driven by their own knowledge with not enough focus on the interpretations in the extracts. The desire to explain what the extracts mean pulls the focus of the response away from points of interpretation.

Less successful candidates tended to offer a paraphrase of the extracts with weak links to the focus of the question. Some candidates still subject the extracts to AO2 analysis by discussing their usefulness and provenance.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war?

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

(20)

Extracts 1 and 2 provide opposing arguments as for why WW2 broke out. Kershaw (1) argues that 'sins' of the West were a key contributing factor to the outbreak of war in 1939 due to unpreparedness and guilt for the Treaty of Versailles. Fischer (2) argues far more convincingly that Hitler's quest for 'living space' is what pushed Germany to war - very intentional nationalist policy. Overall Fischer provides a far more reasoned account <sup>for</sup> the outbreak of war by examining Hitler's longstanding ideology rather than the weakness of Britain and France.

Kershaw suggests that Britain and France's policy of appeasement 'assisted Hitler in creating a unique power base in Europe'. He is potentially referencing the 1936 remilitarisation of the Rhineland during which his general claimed sealed orders to retreat at any sign of resistance, from France, or the 1938 Munich Agreement which handed over the Sudetenland and inadvertently the rest of Czechoslovakia. Kershaw argues that left-over 'guilt' from the Versailles Treaty meant that Britain and France were more amenable to Hitler's

demands to revise the terms of the Treaty. However, as Fischer identifies in extract 2, Hitler's expansionist aims are what really drove towards declaration of war. Had Hitler's 'bullying and blackmail' been based on the Treaty of Versailles alone, he would never have pushed so far into Czechoslovakia and the allies should not have let him. In contrast to Kershaw, it is prevalent that Hitler's ideology - both 'racial and expansionist', is what began the second world war.

Fischer makes the more credible assertion that Hitler's intertwined Aryanism and quest for Lebensraum ('domination of 'inferior races' and the conquest of 'living space') are what drove Nazi Germany to war. Hitler's apparent lust for conflict is clear across many of his writings - 1928 Mein Kampf where he details hatred of Bolshevism and need for living space, 1933 Prophecy speech which predicted a world war spanning continents and the 1937 Hossbach memorandum which named explicit intention for conflict. Foreign Minister Ribbentrop reportedly said 'We want war' in 1938, thus insinuating discourse involving Hitler and regarding conflict. Fischer's extract also identifies Hitler's apparent belief of Aryan superiority and its linked quest for domination across the world as

a key factor of Hitler's attitude towards foreign policy. Overall this view of Hitler's ideologically enforced militarism is greatly convincing because of his consistent reference to Aryanism and war for the German people which hold far more credibility than Kershaw's attack on Britain & France.

Both extracts discuss <sup>the</sup> Western lack of preparation for war. Kershaw says that the allies 'were in no position to bring Hitler under their control' while Fischer says that 'Hitler's opponents were expected to give in.' Hitler's path to war began with 1935 conscription and the 1936 four year Plan which formalised preparations for conflict, while Chamberlain's rearmament only really started in 1938 after the invasion of Czechoslovakia as Hitler began to forego diplomacy. Both Kershaw and Fischer make credible arguments which hint at the invasion of Poland; in 1939 none of the allies were really in a position to stand up to the strength of Nazi Germany which is why it is plausible to suggest Hitler 'expected' the allies to 'give in', i.e. to abandon the Polish guarantee because of Kershaw's point that Britain was quite simply weaker than the Reich (as was France which was in political chaos at this point). Overall here the extracts offer similar arguments for the role of Britain and France in actuality.

and as of Hitler's assumptions because they were, in fact, not up to the same standards as Germany in terms of war preparations.

Ultimately, while both extracts work together in the case of ~~Hitler~~ the allies' status before the outbreak of WW2, only extract 2 with Fischer's use of Hitler's racial ideology explains the climate of the 1930s and why war seems to have been almost guaranteed by Hitler regardless of the actions of allies. Despite the 'sin' of France & Britain inevitably strengthening the Reich, Hitler's requirement for 'domination' acted as the overarching fuel for war in 1939.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at the top of level 4. The candidate clearly understands the extracts offer rival interpretations and offers a nicely balanced answer combining material from the extracts and the candidate's own knowledge. The candidate is in favour of the argument in Extract 2 and gives justified reasons for taking that view. A little more generosity to Extract 1 would have given the answer better balance, but this is a convincing answer to the question and worthy of the full level 4 award of 16 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Always give both extracts fair treatment. It is helpful if you can demonstrate the strengths of both interpretations before critiquing them.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war?

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

(20)

There is much historical debate surrounding the extent to which Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war. Kerstan argues that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war by assisting him in 'creating a unique power base in Europe. Conversely, Fischer makes the more convincing case that Hitler's desire for war was mainly caused by Hitler's desire for the 'conquest of Europe' 'rigid racial and expansionist ideas'.

On one hand, Kerstan argues that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war. This can be seen when he states that Britain and France 'went out of their way to appease him'. Britain and France followed a policy of appeasement which involved making concessions towards Germany in order to avoid wide scale war. For example, Britain and France did not intervene when Hitler breached the terms of the Treaty of Versailles by remilitarising the Rhineland in 1936. This increased Hitler's confidence in his foreign policy and encouraged him to take part in more aggressive foreign policy. Kerstan refers to this when he states as a consequence of appeasement, Hitler 'increased his

demands. This can be seen by Hitler's more aggressive foreign policy such as the Anschluss in 1938 ~~and~~ which also breached the Treaty of Versailles. Furthermore, the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1938 which ~~was~~ went against the Munich agreement in 1938. This as Kershaw suggests, is evidence of how Britain and France enabled Hitler's desire for war by following a policy of appeasement which encouraged Hitler to take part in more aggressive foreign policy and ultimately, to invade Poland in September 1939.

Furthermore, Kershaw argues that the Treaty of Versailles was 'central to Hitler's blackmailing strategy' as it left an 'unhealthy guilt complex in the West'. This can be evidenced through the fact that the Treaty of Versailles was viewed as a dictated (dictated peace) because of its harsh terms such as the army was restricted to 100,000 men and also Germany had to pay reparations. Evidence of this creating an 'unhealthy guilt complex in the West' comes from the fact that the US provided international loans to Germany in the Dawes Plan in 1924 which helped reduce the burden of reparations. However, more specifically, evidence of Britain and France's 'guilt complex' comes from the Munich agreement in 1938. This was where Britain and France revised the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and gave Hitler an area of ~~the~~ Czechoslovakia ~~in 1938~~ called the Sudetenland. This, as Kershaw suggests, is evidence of how Britain and France

assisted Hitler's desire for war because this gave Hitler the confidence to invade the rest of Czechoslovakia as he ~~do~~ correctly believed Britain and France would not intervene.

The nature of historical debate must be acknowledged as Kerhew's interpretation does not reveal the whole picture. Fischer makes a more convincing case in juxtaposition to Kerhew's argument as he argues 'Hitler's foreign policy was based on rigid racial and expansionist ideas'. For example, the 'conquest of living space'. In 1925, Hitler wrote Mein Kampf which showed his desires for Lebensraum (living space). This involved uniting all German speaking people and using Eastern Europe to expand into to provide space. This is referenced by Fischer as he states Hitler believed the Aryan race was the 'top of the biological and cultural order'. Hitler also followed Social Darwinism. This is where races evolve through 'survival of the fittest' and as Hitler believed the Aryan race to be the 'fittest', this meant <sup>the</sup> 'racially inferior' ~~as~~ such as Poles and Czechs were to be eradicated. This, as Fischer suggests, is evidence of how Hitler's desire for war lay in the desire to create a 'racially pure' German state by expanding into 'racially inferior' countries such as ~~Germany~~ <sup>Poland</sup> in order to provide living space.

Secondly, Fitcher argues that whilst there was some 'basic continuity' in foreign policy, Hitler's stands out as he viewed war as a 'preferred means of achieving Germany's aims'. There is credibility in Fitcher's assertion of 'basic continuity' as Hitler may have been influenced by previous governments. For example, Kaiser Wilhelm II's Weltpolitik scheme involved the desire for colonial expansion, ~~about~~ whilst the Kaiser viewed war as a way of achieving expansion, Hitler was influenced by this and he took it to a further extent as he outlined in the Hossbach Memorandum in 1937 that Germany needed 'small wars of plunder' in order to achieve their aim of Lebensraum. This, as Fitcher suggests is evidence of how Hitler's desire for war was more based upon the influence of previous governments and the desire to achieve their aim of ~~living~~ Lebensraum.

Fitcher supports Kershaw's argument that the Treaty of Versailles was used as blackmail when he says 'German people were doomed to be perpetually dominated if they limited themselves to the national borders of 191<sup>4</sup>', suggesting that Hitler wished to overturn the Treaty of Versailles.

There is no real similarity between Kershaw and Fitcher's interpretations as they are mainly in juxtaposition with each other. Whilst Kershaw makes the case to argue that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desires for war, this is

only convincing to a small extent as Hitler ~~and~~ ultimately did not ~~understand~~ misinterpreted the policy of appeasement which created a desire for war which would not be allowed by Britain and France. It is Fischer that makes the more convincing case that Hitler's desire for war came from the desire for expansion into the East as this was something Hitler had wanted from very early on in 1925 and he was ~~also~~ influenced by the colonial expansion of previous governments which encouraged him to use war as a way of achieving his aims.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at mid-level 5. This candidate develops the rival interpretations with a deep analysis of the extracts that focusses on their strengths as interpretations. The evidence supplied from own knowledge is relevant and gets integrated with material in the extracts to produce a convincing answer.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

History is a subject that involves discussion. It is highly unusual for one interpretation to be entirely right and the other to be entirely wrong. It is a good idea to think about how a point made in one extract can develop a point from the other. For example, both the extracts in this exam are trying to explain Hitler's desire for war. His success at bullying the western powers shown in Extract 1 reinforced Hitler's racial fanaticism referred to in Extract 2. Aim for your judgements to be nuanced and thoughtful.

## 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 over 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/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 seemingly 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 within these 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:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

