



# **Examiners' Report** **June 2024**

**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 2024

Publications Code 9HI0\_1G\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## 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. This year's paper proved to be accessible and well received by candidates who produced some excellent responses. Answers were broadly in line with the indicative content in the mark scheme, but some candidates offered information and analysis beyond that which we anticipated. In section C the extracts offered no difficulties for the majority of candidates and provided an accessible interpretative framework.

The advice offered to centres and candidates remains unchanged from last year.

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 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 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 whether the economic challenges faced by Weimar governments, in the years 1918 – 32, were caused mainly by the impact of the Treaty of Versailles.

This was by far the more popular question in section A and candidates were well prepared for it. The majority of candidates were able to identify the key economic challenges facing Weimar and relate them to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Typically, candidates could provide evidence for the economic challenges caused by World War One, the 1923 crisis and the Wall Street Crash, and link these to the terms of the Treaty.

At the top end candidates were able to offer analysis about the extent to which the Treaty was the main cause of economic challenges and weigh this against other causes such as external influences, political factors and the internal opposition that the regime faced. The hallmark of answers at this level was the deployment of the criteria by which a judgement could be reached.

At level 3 candidates were often strong on showing how the Treaty had serious economic impacts but failed to weigh the importance of other factors, asserting an agreement with the given factor.

Less successful candidates tended to concentrate too much on the 1923 crisis and failed to cover the time frame, or included material that was not linked to the question such as the various coups post-1918.

Economic challenges faced by the Weimar governments may seem largely caused by the impact of the Treaty of Versailles, as the crippling reparations led to other issues, such as hyperinflation. On the other hand, economic challenges may have been caused by other factors, like an overreliance on the US economy.

The impact of the Treaty of Versailles undoubtedly contributed to the economic challenges faced by Weimar. For instance, the high amount of reparations ~~set~~, a total of £6000 million, set by the Inter-Allied Reparations Committee in 1921, virtually crippled the Weimar economy. Reparations meant the government had to raise money, through means like taxes, which was difficult in a time of high unemployment, with 1.1 million unemployed in February 1919. The 1923 hyperinflation crisis exacerbated these issues, leading to the default of payments. In the French occupied Ruhr region, workers also went on strike in December, fighting against the reparations payments. This suggests that the Treaty of Versailles ~~just~~ created more economic challenges, as the government had to pay striking workers, which further harmed the economy. Therefore, the Treaty of

(Section A continued)

Verdilles both harmed the economy initially and further into the period. Stresemann's policy change to fulfillment in the Ruhr gained sympathy from the Allies and helped create the 1924 Dawes Plan. This led to a reduction in reparations and a loan from the US of 800 million gold marks. However, the Dawes Plan suggests that Weimar were in dire need of economic assistance, with hyperinflation leading to the creation of notes of 1 trillion marks in November 1923. This indicates that the impact of the Treaty of Verdilles, indeed caused many economic challenges for Weimar governments, as Stresemann clearly sought foreign assistance, ~~among~~ <sup>as well as</sup> introducing other measures, like spending cuts.

On the other hand, it could be argued that economic challenges for Weimar were actually caused by an overreliance on the US economy. ~~With~~ <sup>although</sup> the 1924 Dawes Plan effectively assisted the Weimar economy, it led to Weimar being in massive debt to the US. ~~It could be argued~~ The Dawes Plan, combined with the 1929 Young Plan which created more debt, could suggest that the debt accumulated led to bigger issues. With the Wall Street Crash in October 1929, the US recalled its loans, leaving Weimar in <sup>a</sup> worse ~~debt~~ economic position than before. The Depression contributed to the closure

of 5 major banks in 1931 and unemployment reaching a high of 5.8 million in 1932. This suggests that overreliance on the US economy harmed both the US economy and the citizens of Weimar, by exacerbating the effects of the Wall Street Crash. However, the Hoover Moratorium did delay reparations payments, suggesting that the US economy perhaps still helped the Weimar economy. Foreign help also led to the 1931 Lausanne Conference which effectively abolished reparations~~which~~<sup>this</sup>. This could suggest that although overreliance on the US economy led to greater economic challenges, it also may have led to the abolition of reparations in the long-term, reversing these economic challenges. Therefore, overreliance on the US economy both solved and created more economic issues for Weimar ~~governments~~ governments.

In conclusion, the impact of the Treaty of Versailles seemed to have ~~led~~ mostly caused the economic issues faced by the Weimar government. Furthering this is the idea that overreliance on the US economy could be ~~down~~<sup>as a result of</sup> the impact of the Treaty of Versailles, leading to the Dawes Plan. Therefore, the Treaty of Versailles along with the reparations it imposed on Weimar, caused the majority of economic issues.



This is an example of work at level 4.

The response is quite brief but does a good job with what is there. There is a clear and valid explanation of how the reparations demanded by the Treaty led to the hyperinflation crisis of 1923, and a counter argument is there about the reliance of Weimar on US finance.

The quality of the argument makes it a clear level 4 response, but it lacks a bit of range. This response was awarded 15 marks.



This response is limited by the range of evidence offered. Limited range can only mean a limited judgement. Plan to ensure that there is a sufficient number of factors to weigh against each other, and make sure the time frame in the question is covered.

The Weimar government, in the years 1918 to 1932, faced several economic challenges. These included the state of the economy which they inherited in 1918, the economic problems faced as a result of the invasion of the Ruhr and in 1923 and the Wall Street Crash and subsequent Great Depression in 1929. All of these factors presented it with unique challenges to <sup>the</sup> Weimar <sup>g</sup> government and all of them were characterised by economic downturn, and drops in living standards. ~~and~~ In regards to the statement, I agree, to a <sup>large</sup> ~~considerable~~ extent, that the economic challenges faced in the years 1918-32 were caused by the impact of the Treaty of Versailles.

The state of the German economy inherited by the Weimar Government under Ebert following the beginning of the end of WW1 was dire. Government debt had trebled from 50bn marks to 150bn marks. The war-time government had sold all of Germany's gold to fund its war machine and millions of its men had died. Furthermore, <sup>a</sup> ~~huge~~ <sup>significant</sup> portion of its population was ~~displaced~~ <sup>displaced</sup> and

(Section A continued)

its economy now had to shift from war production back into a civilian economy of consumer goods. The government, despite its lack of tax revenue from the millions killed and the bankruptcy of businesses, committed to social welfare for the parents, and wives and children of dead soldiers as well as disabled veterans who had been injured during the war. This meant the government was forced to print money to ensure it met its spending commitments, driving up inflation even more than <sup>it had been</sup> during the war period. This by no means was caused by the Treaty of Versailles as it had not yet even been completed, yet alone ratified. The economic challenge faced by the initial post-war government was thus a product of the war, not the Treaty, which would officially end it.

However, the hyperinflation crisis of 1923 most certainly was the product of the Treaty of Versailles. Following Germany's inability to make its reparations payments for the and with the French government believing Germany was attempting to get out of its payments and that it could afford them,

## (Section A continued)

occupied the Ruhr, as was their right under the Treaty of Versailles if Germany defaulted on its payments. This came as great expense to the German economy which as the Ruhr was its industrial heartland. The government urged those living and working in the Ruhr to engage in a policy of passive resistance which proved successful but the government had also committed to paying the wages of those who struck, called in sick etc. The combination of the removal of the Ruhr as a source of revenue as well as rises in government spending resulted in the hyperinflation crisis of 1923 which was a considerable economic challenge for the Weimar government. It was also clearly caused by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Although it could be argued it was the fault of government for raising spending, the Treaty played a divisive role in the initial occupation and loss of its revenue.

Furthermore, the impact of the Great Depression on Germany had been exacerbated by both the Dawes Plan and Young Plan of the 1920's. The US had worked with German politicians such as Gustav Stresemann in a bid to make reparations more reasonable and to rebuild the German economy so that it could

## (Section A continued)

6/10/2024, 11:14

regard its reparations. When the Wall Street Crash hit in 1929 and resulted in the Great Depression, the US recalled its loans and the Germany economy collapsed. In its bid to seek more moderate terms for the Treaty of Versailles reparation payments, the German economy had constructed itself upon US loans that were vital to its growth. This is clearly an economic challenge caused, ~~by~~ mainly, by the Treaty of Versailles. Although it can be argued it was once again the government's fault for constructing the German economy on subsidies and investment provided for by American loans, the Treaty of Versailles clearly playing the decisive role in pursuing the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan to reduce its reparations, make them more affordable and strengthen the German economy so that it could make the payments. Stresemann himself viewed foreign policy as integrated to economic success.

In conclusion, despite not being the cause of the economic situation in 1918, the Treaty of Versailles clearly played the decisive role in the Hyperinflation Crisis and the Great Depression. The reparations payments, specifically, lead to events in which economic challenges to the Weimar Republic, in the

**(Section A continued)**

years 1918 to 1932, became more severe and more prevalent.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at level 5. In outline it is very similar to the previous response at level 4.

This response has good detail and a developed analysis that considers the extent to which the Treaty was the main cause of Weimar's economic challenges. The candidate successfully shows that German economic challenges stemmed largely from the strains of war, and that the Treaty impacted these conditions.

This response was awarded 18 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Show the examiner that you are thinking about the demands of the question. This response is useful in showing how good, detailed evidence still requires an evaluation to answer the question well.

## Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider whether Nazi education and cultural policies were driven mainly by racial prejudice in the years 1933 – 45. This question, although less popular than question 1, proved to be accessible to those candidates that chose it.

The majority of candidates were able to offer a range of evidence about education and cultural policies, although there was usually more on education. Candidates found little trouble in identifying other drivers of policy including Hitler worship, militarism and traditional German values.

Successful candidates were able to develop the criteria upon which a judgement could be made and did so by looking at the Nazi goal of building a racial peoples' community, preparation for war and the need to instil obedience in the population. At the top end the time frame was covered and the demands of the war years on the population were included.

At level 3 cultural policies such as art, literature and music were often missing. However, the cultural and educational role of the Hitler Youth was often there, and this was duly rewarded.

Less successful candidates tended to offer something on education in a broad sense or describe attacks on Jews and/or policies on women.

In the years 1933-45, the Nazi government completely transformed education and culture to reflect their racial, domestic and political ideologies. Whilst their views on ~~the~~ women and the family and devotion to the Führer and the Third Reich did largely contribute to their transformation of culture, all policies were ultimately rooted in racial ideology, and this was at the forefront of ~~the~~ Nazi beliefs.

Nazi racial prejudice, specifically anti-Semitism and superiority of the Herrenvolk, ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> the main driving factor of their education and cultural policies. As soon as the Nazis consolidated their power, they transformed the education system to reflect their racial ideology. Race studies and eugenics began to be taught, whereby children were taught how to identify members of different races, and who to ~~breed~~ marry so that they can produce a 'racially pure' child. The Nazis also began to publish children's books that had summaries of anti-Semitism, such

as the 'poisonous mushroom', to indoctrinate children from a young age to align with their racial prejudice, showcasing how important their racial ideology was in shaping Nazi education. Their racial policy also reflected in their cultural transformation of Germany. They in the book burning of May 1933, they specifically targeted books by Jewish authors to eliminate them from society. ~~They also propagated~~ Goebbels, propaganda minister, also propagated their anti-Semitism through movies such as the 'Eternal Jew', which depicted Jews living in slums, comparing them to rats and saying they spread disease. Ultimately, Nazi racial prejudice was deep-rooted in culture and education, and was the most long-lasting and definite factor in their policies as it was prominent in all aspects of life, and can be seen to culminate right up to the end of Nazi rule through the Final Solution.

Nazi ideology of women and the family was still a prominent theme in their education and culture. The Nazi government ensured to teach women from a young age that their role in

the Third Reich was that of a mother and housewife. In schools, they were taught childcare and housework, and this was the same in the youth groups such as the League of German Maidens. This was all so that the message of women defined to be good mothers was drilled into young minds. Their domestic news did link back to racial prejudice, as women had to ensure that they raised a 'pure' Aryan family. Culture was also reflective of their domestic news, such as propaganda often depicting Aryan women with children, and the 'ABC of National Socialism' also depicted the Hitler Maiden, the Nazi ideal woman who was Aryan and a good mother. Hitler also implemented various reward schemes to ensure the culture of women being inextricably linked to domesticity remained rife. One example would be the Mother's Cross, whereby women received a medal for having children, bronze would be for at least 4, silver for 6 children and gold for 8. These sorts of schemes were widely popular, and ensured to reaffirm Nazi beliefs on motherhood. Therefore, Nazi ideology on women and motherhood were a key driving factor

behind educational and ~~future~~ cultural policies, however they were all deep-rooted in racial prejudice, as the ideal mother and family in Nazism could only be 'pure' Aryans.

Devotion to the superiority of the Führer and the Third Reich was also another key aspect that shaped Nazi education and culture. Hitler enforced to propagate the Volksgemeinschaft, peoples community, in all educational and cultural aspects, to ensure to raise and shape the German population to be loyal to the thousand year Reich. All lessons started and ended with the Hitler salute, and Mein Kampf became a standard text to push Hitler's ideology and ensure the younger generation were devoted to him. The Hitler Youth for boys also taught loyalty to Hitler and military skills to train them to be future SS officers and fight for the Führer. In terms of culture, Hitler favoured neo-classicism above all else in order to portray Germany as a great empire just ~~as~~ the first and second Reich before him. Him and Albert Speer cultivated the 1934 Berlin Master Plan, which would transform Berlin into the ideal city to

showcase the superiority of the Third Reich. This involved the building of a Führer palace that would glorify Hitler, and ~~the~~ the widening of roads for military parades, in order to showcase the military strength of Germany. The idea of Hitler and Germany being portrayed as strong <sup>and</sup> superior ~~and~~ in hopes of creating a loyal and devoted population was definitely a significant aspect of Nazi cultural and educational policies. However, it does overall link back to racial prejudice as the Third Reich had to only consist of the 'master race', and people such as Jews were rejected, ~~from~~ ~~the~~ not fitting into the image of Hitler leading a glorious German nation.

Ultimately, Nazi racial prejudice was the most prominent driving force behind educational and cultural policies. It was taught from a young age and led to the isolation and attacking of ~~thousands~~ countless people. It was also deep-rooted in other cultural themes, such as creating the perfect German family and building the Third Reich, ~~and~~ thus making it the most important factor.



This is an example of work at level 4. The response covers the given factor of education and compares this to other factors of building a peoples' community and Hitler worship. There is sufficient material on education, but the candidate considers culture mainly as a way of life, although there are limited references to literature, film and architecture. The temptation to write at length about policies affecting women is ever present in a question on culture. This candidate does, however, tie policies on women and the family to education and culture.

Overall, this is a competent piece of work that was awarded 16 marks.



Be clear about what the demands of the question are. 'Cultural policies' or 'culture' refers to the arts. Social policy refers to policies that affect life, such as the role of women, or policies affecting ethnic minorities.

### Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates to consider whether Germans continued to favour authoritarian government in the years 1918-45. This was by far the more popular question in section B. Candidates generally understood 'authoritarian' and the majority could handle the change and continuity demand in the question.

Successful candidates exemplified continuity either by looking at particular demographics that continued to favour authoritarian rule such as the Catholic Church, Prussian Junkers and industrialists; or, by looking at the general liking for order, notably by the middle class. Change was considered by considering attitudes during periods of calm and chaos.

At the top end there were some very good answers, especially from those who saw that Germans as a whole did not neatly fit into authoritarian/democratic stereotypes and gave a thoughtful and nuanced analysis. Consideration of the complexities of ascertaining the preferences of German opinion in the Third Reich, where submission to the regime was demanded, provided good discussion and sharp argument.

At level 3 candidates sometimes lost sight of the demand for an analysis of change and continuity and turned the question into one of similarity/difference, comparing Weimar and the Third Reich. The war years were also often missing from mid-range responses.

Less successful candidates generally failed to offer enough material to allow them to make a supported judgement and focussed on selected periods that prevented consideration of the period as a whole.

In order to assess whether Germans favoured an authoritarian government between 1918 and 1945, support for both the Weimar Constitution and the Nazi dictatorship must be compared through factors such as voting turnout, levels of opposition, support of legislation and the level of living standards. However, it must be acknowledged that the Weimar Constitution inherited Germany ~~was~~ in the midst of an intense economic downturn and the Nazis imposed stern legislation that prohibited opposition.

so therefore measuring consent proves to be difficult.

It can be argued that the German citizens' sustained expressions of discontent throughout the Weimar period prove that the people preferred an authoritarian regime in replacement of democracy. The Weimar constitution proved to be an unstable and weak democracy due to the constant disputes within the Reichstag and disagreeing coalitions that resulted from proportional representation. It only took 60,000 votes for a political party to gain a seat in the Reichstag and at one point there were 29 differing parties present. Between 1919 and 1923, there were 9 different coalition governments, therefore the inconsistency of government caused by the constantly changing coalitions resulted in many Germans turning away from democracy and supporting extremist parties instead like the NSDAP. The level of opposition in Weimar was also high, with uprisings such as the Spartacist Revolt and Kapp Putsch attacking the democratic government from polar opposite sides of the political spectrum. Furthermore, the lack of stability in the Weimar government caused ineffective decisions during times of great economic downturn, such as during the hyperinflation crisis in 1923 and the Great Depression in 1929. However, arguably this fails to prove. Additionally, it can be argued that the prejudice most people had against left wing parties, such as the KPD proves that people preferred an authoritarian regime to communism.

as the government and judiciary condemned left wing uprisings more than right wing. However, this argument does not provide valid proof of the German people preferring an authoritarian regime as the Weimar exemplified a failed, unstable and weak democracy and so there is the possibility that the German people would have preferred democracy if it had been successful. This can be supported by the consistent level of voting turnout, which was 89% in 1918, suggesting that people consented to and took advantage of democracy. Overall, there was evident discontent and opposition during the years 1918-32 but it cannot be asserted that people preferred an authoritarian regime.

In support of the statement that the German people preferred an authoritarian regime, it can be debated that the Nazi party was voted in by the people and Hitler had a lot of support, therefore proving the people wanted to replace democracy with an authoritarian regime. In 1932<sup>and 1933</sup> the Nazi party had the highest number of seats within the Reichstag - they had 139 seats. Hitler had come second in the presidential elections and was one of the reasons Hindenburg felt compelled to appoint him as Chancellor, as previously Von Papen and Von Schleicher had minimal support within the Reichstag and had to resort to governing by emergency decree. There was undoubtedly some

support for the Nazis throughout their dictatorship, mainly from wealthy industrialists and prejudiced people, but also up until 1936 from many ordinary citizens, as the Nazis had increased living standards for the 'Aryan' race to a certain extent, by decreasing unemployment through RAD schemes and creating more part-time jobs, as well as providing social welfare through benefits to mothers and marriage loans. However, ~~it must also be~~ the Nazis were notorious for creating an illusion of support, for example at one of the Nazis pep rallies, the ministry of Propaganda edited <sup>an</sup> audience's cheers and claps to create the illusion of support. Therefore, ~~at the~~ although the Nazis had a noticeable amount of support, it must be judged critically due to the created facade and also not mistaken for the German people simply supporting the economic stability.

In order to assess if the German people truly preferred an ~~dictatorist~~ authoritarian regime, the validity of the measurement of support has to be assessed, as well as ~~but~~ other factors that may have led to the people seeming to prefer the Nazis to Weimar. During the Nazis' reign, the reason for low levels of opposition was undoubtedly the high levels of control through censorship and propaganda and punishment. The ministry of Propaganda led by Goebbels ensured newspapers and all media sources only presented positive aspects of the dictatorship.

as well as creating a reward system and strength through joy trips as a result of ~~the~~ complying, thereby making it difficult to accurately judge consent to the authoritarian regime. The Gestapo were appointed to find and punish anyone who spoke against the government, so fear was always high. Although there were still minority groups that displayed opposition, such as the Edelweiss Pirates and Youth Swing Bands and even the Catholic Church which ran a helpline for Jews to escape. Furthermore, during the years 1924-28, when there was an economic improvement in Weimar, support for democracy increased and decreased for extremist parties. After Stresemann developed the Young and Dawes Plan and changed the currency to the Reichsmark in 1924, opposition settled. This could therefore imply that the people did prefer democracy when it was executed properly and also infers that many people disliked the authoritarian regime but feared to oppose it.

In conclusion, it is inaccurate to state that Germans continued to favour an authoritarian government as it is too complicated to judge the level of consent between 1933-45 ~~as~~ due to tight control and regulation of Nazi forces such as the Gestapo, and the support for the Nazis may have just been a relief after the economic downturn during the

Great Depression. The discontent for Weimar does not equate to discontent for democracy as it was unstable for the majority, although when carried out efficiently, it was supported.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at level 5. The strong point of the essay is the way expressions of support for authoritarian rule and democracy are analysed. The response is nuanced and carefully considered.

The consideration of change and continuity is not as clear as it should be. Most of the time frame is covered, however, and change and recurring themes are evident.

This response was awarded 19 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Change and continuity questions should always have a clear judgement in the conclusion about whether the period in question saw more change, or more continuity.

## Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider whether Ludwig Erhard made a more significant contribution to the success of the FRG than other politicians in the years 1949-89.

Most candidates were able to identify factors to show how Erhard did make the most significant contribution and formed a clear judgement on the role of other significant politicians of the period (usually Adenauer and Brandt).

Successful candidates addressed the full span of the time frame, and offered responses that had clear criteria by which they could make a judgement. For example, Erhard's contribution to the 'economic miracle' was compared to the handling of the economy by Brandt and Kohl. Most candidates argued that Erhard's role, notable as it was, was overshadowed by that of Adenauer.

At level 3 candidates found it difficult to separate the roles of Erhard and Adenauer, although this was sometimes (helpfully) acknowledged by the candidate. Mid-range responses tended to be focussed almost entirely on the first two decades of the time frame, and this weakened their ability to make a judgement.

Less successful candidates took the question as a cue to explain the 'economic miracle' with substantial information on the role of *Gastarbeiter*.

The FRG, established after the end of the Nazi regime and World War II was ultimately successful in maintaining political and economic stability. Erhard, who was economic minister and later chancellor, was responsible for contributing to the stability. However, it is also important to consider how Adenauer's ~~and~~ policies and <sup>economic</sup> recovery in the 1970s under Brandt <sup>and Kohl</sup> were also contributing factors to the success of the FRG.

Erhard's economic policies were shaped by his ~~not~~ idea of 'social market economy' that aimed to promote a capitalist and consumerist economy that <sup>fill</sup> provided a safety net for the poorest in society. Erhard initially marked the new currency reform, that would strengthen opportunities for foreign ~~to~~ trade, and removed rationing on necessities. This marked the beginning of post World War II economic recovery. He also realized the importance of workers' rights and good working environments that could help lower unemployment and boost labour productivity. Erhard's support of trade unions, as well as the introduction of

the co-determination law of 1951 that placed employee representatives on managerial boards reflected this. Furthermore, the removal of cartels that were used for price fixing reflected the move from the previous Nazi command economy to the free social market economy. It is arguable that such policies were crucial for the FRG's economic recovery, as well as creating more public support for the <sup>first</sup> "democratic government post" World War II.

However, Erhard was still met with opposition as economic minister and as chancellor. His initial reforms caused dispute with the industrialists who wanted to reintroduce cartels for price fixing, ~~or~~ The far left also wanted to see more state control and nationalisation of industries. As chancellor, he ultimately lost support from FDP liberals who were not supportive of his economic policies, which led to his resignation.

Adenauer, who was chancellor from 1949 to 1963 was also a considerably important figure in the success of the FRG. Whilst he cannot be personally accredited for the successful nature of the FRG government, his CDU government were responsible

(Section B continued) and promoting the creation

for introducing "notable policies. The atlanticist nature of Adenauer's policies meant that European integration was a key ~~area~~<sup>success</sup>. Although the 1945 statute meant that the FRG wasn't a fully sovereign state, the joining of the ECSC in 1951, and later the EEC in 1957 showed success of German European economic integration.

This was crucial considering how such organisations provided trade links and bettered diplomatic relations that would benefit the FRG economy. These policies were opposed by those who followed Ostpolitik and the idea of German unification, but overall Adenauer's atlanticist policies garnered popular support from Germans who did not want diplomatic relations with communist states. Adenauer's atlanticist stance ~~is~~ can further be seen through the banning of the Communist party<sup>in 1956</sup> who weren't represented as they didn't meet the 5% rule and were ultimately deemed unconstitutional.

Similar to Erhard, Adenauer was also subject to opposition and criticism. Many called his reign a 'chancellor democracy' and believed he had more power as a chancellor than the constitution allowed. Furthermore, his ultimate resignation was triggered by the Der Spiegel ~~of~~ affair, where

(Section B continued)

Adenauer suppressed the dissent of journalists who reported on the FRG's poor performance in NATO activities. This is suggestive that Adenauer was not considered favourably by ~~most~~ German and other political opposition.

Economic recovery in the 1970s under ~~FRG~~ chancellors such as Brandt<sup>CDU</sup> and Kohl can also be credited to the overall success of the FRG. The 1973 and 1978 oil crises were triggered by OPEC who was affected by the 4<sup>th</sup> Arab-Israeli War.

~~It~~ Through methods of recovery, including the removal of employment opportunities for guest workers and encouraging less oil consumption through 'car-free Sundays' and speed limits on the Autobahn, the economy recovered from the crisis. Following the oil crisis recovery, recession was still a pit to the economy; Kohl was responsible for continuing social welfare cuts including maternity benefits and public holidays. This ~~was~~ was also ultimately successful in preventing more economic failure as public spending was decreased and the government ~~as~~ had less to pay for. However, it is important to note how the 1970s saw heightened political opposition and

growth of terrorism.

In the late 1960s the SDS (Student Socialist Union) saw a repudiation from the SPD under the argument that they were no longer representative of their socialist views and were becoming too moderate. This led to continued student and militant protests against the government. Furthermore the activities of terrorist groups such as the Red Army Faction is reflective of the dissent towards the government. Kohl's continuation of cutting mass social welfare was arguably undermining of the social market economy, and the responsibility of the government to continue providing safety net ~~for~~ for the poor. Therefore increasing socialist and communist opposition in this time period suggests that there was discontent with the government.

It is also important to note that the 1970s and 80s governments were ultimately successful in putting down opposition and terrorism through increased policing (establishment of BND and BfV) and formation of GSG-9 to combat extremism.

To conclude, it is arguable that both Erhard and Adenauer were responsible for contributing to the FRG's initial economic recovery and ~~the~~ establishment of political stability. However, later governments were still subject to economic and political turmoil, which suggests that there was opposition to Erhard and Adenauer. Arguably, the later governments led by Brandt and Kohl were more successful in recovering from economic difficulties and repressing political opposition.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The candidate does a good job of explaining some of the main positives associated with Erhard, and offering a critique based on his German opponents. The material on Erhard lays the basis for a good comparison with Adenauer, Brandt and Kohl. There is good detail and a good range of evidence is considered. The candidate has focussed on some of the main features of the period to establish the criteria by which the question can be judged, eg the economy, and relations with the USA and the Soviet Union, as well as social policies.

This response was awarded 18 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

A good way to revise for questions on the FRG is to prepare a brief biography on the main characters. The changing personnel will take you through the changing political landscape of the FRG from its foundations to the fall of the Berlin Wall.

## Question 5

Question 5 asked candidates to consider whether Hitler's invasion of Poland was not part of a well-thought-out-plan.

This was an accessible question. The majority of candidates were able to grasp that the extracts offered rival interpretations concerning the reasons for Hitler's invasion of Poland. Candidates clearly understood that Weinberg in Extract 1 believed that it was improvised and opportunistic, while Hauner in Extract 2 believed that Hitler's ideology meant that he was always intent on war, and that Poland was always an early target.

Candidates usually analysed the extracts in turn and then offered some discussion of the rival interpretations before making a final judgement. This generally achieved level 4.

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 Hitler's willingness to wait for the opportunity to exploit the mistakes of others, especially with regards to appeasement. Similarly, candidates were well prepared about Hitler's strong ideological convictions and intentionalist arguments about these.

At mid-range candidates tended to either let their answers be driven entirely by the extracts, or, for a minority, answers were driven by their own knowledge with not enough focus on the interpretations in the extracts. The desire to explain what the extracts meant pulled 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.

When discussing reasons for the outbreak of the war and the invasion of Poland, opinions tend to be divided between those who believe Hitler didn't follow a set plan and those with an intentionalist viewpoint that Hitler strove for world domination. In Extract 1, Weinberg more convincingly suggests that Hitler's strategy evolved and it wasn't a 'well thought out plan'. In Extract 2, Hanning suggests that Hitler strove for world domination, and Poland was part of that plan.

In Extract 1, Weinberg presents the view that Hitler didn't invade Poland ~~at~~ following a plan, and that he instead changed his strategy. Weinberg argues that "when the Poles refused to submit to Hitler's demands, he then decided that a war was necessary". Indeed, ~~the decision~~ ~~the decision~~ the war ~~was~~ with Poland was not decided as part of a long-term plan, as Hitler made the decision to invade Poland in August 1939, the month before Germany invaded.

However, Weinberg perhaps overlooks that Hitler evidently had some form of plan to invade Poland, even if it wasn't concrete. As seen in the Hossbach Memorandum, there were clear ideas that Poland would be invaded by Germany in the near future. Moreover, in the 25-point-programme in 1920, it notes Germany's desire for 'Lebensraum' and expansion in the East. Evidently, Hitler did have ideas to invade Poland, even if the decision was made upon short notice. Weinberg also argues that 'working with the Soviets to partition Poland' appeared to offer Germany a number of advantages. Indeed, as part of a secret agreement during the Molotov - Ribbentrop pact, Germany and the Soviet Union agreed to divide up Poland after invasion. This was an advantage for Hitler as it meant he ~~could~~ avoided a war on two fronts, meaning he could focus on Britain and France if they decided to invade. Overall in Extract 1, Weinberg convincingly implies that ~~Germany's~~ Hitler's strategy evolved, particularly through the 'opportunistic chance' in Germany's relationship with the Soviet Union.

In contrast, Hawner presents the idea that

Hitler wanted to achieve German domination of the European continent. Hawner argues that "German-speaking groups were to be brought together." Indeed, the idea of 'pan Germanism' - uniting the German speakers was a strong theme in both German history and Nazi-party ideology. ~~The~~ The idea was prominent, particularly under Otto von Bismarck, who aimed to unite the German states. However, ~~the~~ Hawner perhaps overlooks the other reasons for invasion, particularly in Poland. Hitler strove for 'Lebensraum' but also to solve the Jewish question and the idea of Judeo-Bolshevism. Poland had a strong Jewish population and as seen in Mein Kampf, Hitler aimed to 'resolve' the Jewish question. Hawner also argues that "Hitler was convinced Britain and France would remain passive" in the acquisition of Czechoslovakia, which was a stage of his plan towards Poland. Indeed, Britain and France followed a policy of 'appeasement' which aimed to prevent war with Germany by pleasing Hitler. For example, the Munich Agreement of ~~1938~~ September 1938 allowed Hitler to take the Sudetenland, with British Prime Minister Chamberlain saying this would 'bring peace for our time'. However, Hawner overlooks

reasons for his appeasement. France had a very unstable government and Britain were not ~~not~~ prepared in terms of military. However after 1937, Britain spent £1.5 billion on rearmament. Overall, Harner presents a less convincing view that Hitler followed a plan in his aim of world domination, which included uniting ~~the~~ German speakers and taking advantage of the passiveness of Britain and France, with the first stage of Hitler's plan being the invasion of Poland.

⊗ In conclusion, Harner's viewpoint in Extract 2 is unconvincing. It is unlikely that Hitler followed a strict plan for world domination. As Weinberg in Extract 1 <sup>more convincing</sup> suggests, there was opportunistic change in Hitler's strategy, seen by ~~his~~ the change in relationship with Russia. Hitler had previously stated that Germany would acquire 'southern soil' yet had just signed a pact with the Soviet Union. Harner's view that Hitler knew Britain and France would be passive overlooks the reasons why. As a result, Weinberg's view that Hitler's invasion of Poland was not a 'well-thought out plan' is much more convincing than Harner's view of a 'masterplan'.



This is an example of work at level 4. The candidate understands that the extracts offer different interpretations and uses them in forming a critical analysis.

Extract 1 is considered favourably but is judged to be limited if we take into account Hitler's intentions as expressed in *Mein Kampf* and the Hossbach Memorandum. Extract 2 needs a fuller analysis to bring out Hauner's view that Hitler was indeed someone with a well-thought-out plan. However, the main points are there and there is the addition of own knowledge and a judgement.

This response meets all the criteria for level 4 and was awarded 16 marks.



Focus your analysis on the points of interpretation in the extracts, and bring out the way in which they contradict each other. It is also desirable to show the analysis of one can complement the analysis of the other once they are properly understood.

There are disputes between historians surrounding the view that Hitler's invasion of Poland was not part of a 'well thought out plan'. Historians such as Weinberg argue this was the case, arguing war was not inevitable, crucially because Hitler's strategy 'evolved' and therefore Hitler did not initially intend to invade Poland with military force. However, I strongly disagree that Hitler's invasion was not thought out, as suggested by Hauner that Hitler intended to invade Poland since the beginning due to his wider 'stowpen plan' that Poland was needed to gain Lebensraum in the Soviet Union, therefore war was inevitable.

Weinberg argued that Hitler's path to invading Poland evolved instead of being ~~well~~ carefully planned, shown by his argument that 'Hitler did not invade Poland as part of a well-thought out plan'. This is quite convincing because initially Hitler may not have planned the Polish invasion to be violent, just like he hadn't with Austria and therefore Weinberg's argument that Poland 'did not want to surrender its

independence was ground. The key reason for this was because Poland had its own plans for European dominance, which crucially Hitler underestimated. Valid evidence for this is by the mid 1930s the government in Poland was spending half of its expenditure on the military. This was significant because it suggests Hitler had no other choice but to invade, as suggested by Weinberg, importantly because Poland would not concede to Germany's demands such as the 'anti-comintern pact'. As a result, a valid argument can be made that Hitler's invasion strategy did in fact evolve because he underestimated the strength of Poland's military might. Crucially, this meant the plan he initially had to not invade Poland with force, was unworkable because of his underestimation. Important evidence for this is that Hitler was 'shocked' when Britain declared war on Germany as a result of his Polish invasion, and therefore argument can be made that he didn't expect this due to his severe miscalculation. Therefore, Weinberg does ~~make~~ make a valid point that ultimately Hitler's strategy evolved because he underestimated the resolve of Poland to defend itself as well as Britain and consequently, the invasion was 'necessary' rather than desired. Yet, I don't believe this to a very large degree.

~~Plutarch~~ Weinberg also argues that Hitler's strategy of gaining better relations with the Soviet Union was crucial in ensuring the success of his Polish invasion, shown by his argument that 'Hitler now required an opportunistic change in Germany's relationship with the Soviet Union'. This is relatively convincing because in order to achieve Hitler's wider goal of 'world domination', *Lebensraum* in the Soviet Union was necessary, crucially in order to get this Poland would need to be under German control. Valid evidence for this was the Nazi Soviet Pact signed on the 23rd August 1939, which crucially, as suggested by Weinberg, was not inevitable. Instead as he implies this pact was more 'opportunistic'. I agree with this to an extent, importantly because Britain and France were not presenting themselves as serious about an alliance with Russia and therefore it can be argued Stalin had no alternative choice other than to form an alliance with Germany. Valid evidence for this is that Britain had little faith in Russian military might and thus was not proactive in wanting an alliance, but most importantly Britain thought the appearance of making an alliance with Russia would be enough to scare Germany into conforming. Therefore, a lack of action by the allies to deal with the

Soviet Union clearly posed the most important reason as to why the Nazi-Soviet Pact was formed which crucially was not inevitable just like Weinberg said. Therefore the invasion of Poland may not have been a well thought plan because the pact which encouraged it was not inevitable. However, Weinberg's argument is limited for two main reasons. Weinberg fails to consider that Britain and France was not likely to be 'deterred' from coming to Poland's aid. The most important reason for this was that after Chamberlain finally recognized Hitler's ideological goal of Lebensraum he pledged to do everything in his power to protect Poland. Valid evidence is shown by Chamberlain's public pledge to ensure Polish independence on the 31st of March 1939. This is significant in disproving the point the Polish invasion was inevitable, hence the point it was omitted by Weinberg was a pivotal limitation. Yet the most important limitation, is that Weinberg failed to consider important evidence which could have proved the Polish invasion was actually part of a thought out plan, (believe this to a large degree therefore the fact this isn't included is a vitally important limitation of his argument.

Constitutionally. However, it is clear that the invasion of

Poland was actually part of a 'well thought out plan', shown by his argument that 'during the first stage of his plan Hitler wanted Germany to achieve European domination'. This is very convincing, crucially because argument can be made that Hitler had a wider plan for 'world domination', which was completely ignored by Weinberg, and importantly, this plan had been in place since the start. Valid evidence for this was Hitler's 'stapfen plan' published in his secret book published after his death. This was of vital importance in highlighting that Hitler had a stage by stage plan in place from the beginning, crucially because in order to gain the Soviet Union which was the penultimate stage of his plan, Poland would have to be seized. Therefore the fact this was put in place from the beginning disproves substantially, Weinberg's argument that Hitler's strategy evolved, importantly because war was clearly inevitable because ~~the~~ the invasion of Poland was a part of Hitler's 'stapfen plan since the beginning'. Further important evidence for this referenced by Hawner, is the union of all German speaking lands as proven by Mein Kampf in 1925 which made this clear. Ultimately, Hawner argues the invasion of Poland was inevitable, contrary to

Hanner, importantly because the invasion fitted in with his wider plan of domination highlighted in his books, I am most supportive of this view to a considerable extent.

Hanner also argues, contrary to Weinberg that the invasion of Poland played a vital role in enabling Hitler to move onto the next stage of the plan, the invasion of Russia, shown by Hanner's argument that 'Poland would give Hitler's armed forces an important land base from which to attack Russia'. This is highly convincing crucially because Russia was necessary to fulfill the main aspect of Hitler's plan that Hitler would fight a 'Judeo-Bolshevik Regime over with the USSR'. A key reason for this was that Hitler viewed it as his mission, crucially since the start, to rid the world of Jews and the communist threat. Valid evidence for this is Hitler's strong belief in 'social darwinism' that the constant struggle between races and nations would lead to the invasion of a better system. Consequently, through invading Poland, Hitler would achieve his mission, which importantly was set out in Mein Kampf and therefore war ~~was~~ with Poland was an inevitable event to pursue Hitler's

ideological beliefs. However, Howner's argument is limited for the vital reason that he argues Hitler was 'convinced Britain and France would remain passive'. Crucially, this belief was also shared by Weinberg who argues Britain and France would be deterred', thus emphasising fundamental similarities between the two arguments. However, I do not find this relatively convincing, crucially because Britain had given Hitler multiple warnings encouraging him not to invade Poland, yet they had been ignored continuously. Valid evidence for this was Chamberlain's letter to Hitler on the day the Nazi Soviet pact was signed, saying 'if he thought this would weaken Britain's resolve to protect Poland, no greater mistake could be made'. This is highly significant in proving the Polish invasion was inevitable because if Hitler was not fundamentally planning an expansionist war, why did he ignore continuous warnings, thus this is a serious limitation of both arguments.

In conclusion, I find the view that the invasion of Poland was not a well thought out plan not very convincing. The

most important reason is because I believe the invasion was inevitable because, as suggested by Hower it was part of his wider 'Aufbau' - therefore, strongly disagree with the view his strategy evolved and as a result find Warburg's argument substantially less convincing.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at level 5. Each of the extracts are analysed in full. There is excellent contextual knowledge deployed, such as the changing attitude of Chamberlain to German expansion, and the difficulties Polish independence caused Hitler. The focus is on the rival interpretations and the own knowledge deployed by the candidate tests those interpretations.

Both extracts get the full treatment, and this enables the candidate to come to a sustained judgement at the end.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Most candidates deal with the extracts in turn and offer some comparison and discussion towards the end of the essay. This is fine and is the usual way to access level 4. However, if the analysis of the first extract gets discussed in the light of the interpretation in the other extract, as this response shows, it helps to develop the analysis and makes the selection of own knowledge easier and more effective.

## 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 (eg 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 – eg 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, eg 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 (eg looking at other causes/consequences with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg 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, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, eg 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, eg 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, eg 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, eg 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>

