

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2011

### GCE History 6HI01 F

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

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

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

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

Alternatively, you can contact our History Subject Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on [HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk](mailto:HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk).

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

## ResultsPlus

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

January 2011

Publications Code US026439

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## Introduction

### General Comments

As in previous examination sessions the candidates for Option E were, in general, very well prepared for each Topic studied. Candidates are increasingly aware of the need to answer the question asked rather than write about the question themes in general but there is still some need to focus more on the key words. Supporting evidence is generally secure but candidates often do not select the most relevant or appropriate material, and there is still a disappointing lack of chronological awareness and an apparent lack of confidence in using dates. At the lower Levels, however, there was a tendency towards the description and explanation more appropriate to GCSE than has been seen before.

The scripts reflected the full range of levels. Most students wrote between three and five pages for each answer, though a small number were unable to write more than a few Level 1 sentences or paragraphs. The overwhelming majority of students followed instructions, writing their answers on the appropriate pages and indicating the question number in the appropriate box. Legibility was generally not an issue, and, where it was, this seems to have been about the colour and type of pen used.

Students understood the questions but some key words and phrases were misread, misunderstood or misinterpreted. Some candidates found difficulties with focussing directly on 'economic grievances' in Question 1 and 'political problems' in Question 5 apparently assuming that the question referred to grievances and problems in general. As has been commented on before, many candidates find it difficult to discriminate between political, economic and social factors or themes. Responses to the very popular Question 6, in particular, often failed to focus on the key phrase of 'growing power' assuming that the question referred to growing support.

Most candidates were able to identify and evaluate at least some key points. However, some scripts, especially for questions 7, 9 and 11/14, were conspicuous by an absence of appropriately selected factual evidence. In such scripts, worthy points were often supported by very thin detail and candidates often resorted to repetition. As suggested above, however, there were more Level 3 scripts this session with a tendency towards adequate narrative supported by brief commentary. This was particularly so in the case of Question 13 where Gustav Stresemann's contribution was described and commented on rather than analysed.

Some responses, although showing obvious evidence of knowledge, could only access Level 3 and in many cases Level 2, particularly Question 7, because of a misreading of the time period referred to in the question. For Question 1 some responses focused on the whole revolutionary period up to 1848-9, some responses to Question 3 assumed an end date of 1871, many Question 6 responses only focused on events up until 1922 and there were still problems, as noted in the summer, with knowledge of the dates and chronology of World War II in Question 14. The most significant misreading of dates, however, occurred in Question 7 where a significant number of candidates appeared to ignore the dates 1931-36 completely in favour of a discussion of the event of the Spanish Civil War.

Future candidates might consider whether a generalised 'prepared' opening is an effective way to focus on the question set with only 35 minutes available to plan and write a response. A large number of answers began by repeating the question set, prefacing this with 'To a certain extent I agree that...'. Others declared that 'many historians' agreed with the point made in the question, but were never able to substantiate their claim. Better answers avoided these approaches, producing their own opening statement which usually suggested individual confidence and a personal viewpoint.

It is highly recommended that centres read the reports and exemplification documents produced for the other Options available in 6HI01. **Please note: the majority of the exemplification scripts related to this paper are to be found in the exemplification document for Option E.**

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

Once again this was a popular and well-taught Topic. Although there were more descriptive style Level 3 answers than have been seen in past sessions, candidates have very good knowledge and are well-prepared to answer questions on all aspects of the unification process.

### *Question 1*

This was attempted by relatively few candidates. The best answers were able to refer to both the general economic grievances which developed in Italy during the 1840s and more specific references to the situation in Lombardy, Venetia and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies; these were then balanced against other relevant factors usually with some consideration of the different causes in different parts of Italy. Some candidates, however, wrote about the causes of Italian revolutions in general or wrote weak narratives of the events of 1848-9.

### *Question 2*

This was by far the most popular question and was, in general, answered very well indeed with a secure focus on the extent to which France was an obstacle to the unification process. Even Level 3 narrative responses showed a sound knowledge of events and were able to access the higher bands. Most candidates were able to identify examples of both help and hindrance to create a well-balanced answer. However, many responses chose to concentrate on the middle years of the time-period with only a brief reference to the events in Rome of 1849 and a cursory mention of the withdrawal of troops in 1870. There was no requirement to refer to other significant obstacles to Italian unification but many were able to compare effectively. Too many candidates wrote whole essays referring to the 'obstacles' to Italian unification.

## F2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

As with Italian Unification this is a popular and well-taught topic to which most candidates bring detailed knowledge. There were, again, more descriptive answers than have been seen in the past but the knowledge was usually secure and able to reach Level 3. Candidates show increasing awareness of the inter-relatedness of the key factors involved in the process of German unification.

### *Question 3*

Very few candidates attempted this question. A few candidates misread the end date of the question leading to poor responses but several candidates produced analytical and well thought out answers which were interesting to read and achieved the higher Levels. There was some good discussion of the concept of 'progress' and the extent to which the revolutionary years created the foundation for future events.

### *Question 4*

This was overwhelmingly the most popular question for this topic. There were some narrative-led responses and a significant minority which mentioned the three significant wars briefly but failed to discuss their contribution. It is vital in teaching both 'unification' topics that the chronology of events is made clear, as weaker candidates often make valid analytical and explanatory points but confuse the events. Many responses showed a very good understanding of how the different factors influencing the unification were inter-related. The best were able to suggest, with supporting evidence, that the military success of Prussia was only possible through its economic superiority over Austria combined with the diplomatic machinations of Bismarck. However, many responses were unable to move out of Level 4 because of the generalised and, often assertive, nature of the comments about the way in which factors were inter-related. It is not enough to say that there was no 'blood shed without iron' there needs to be supporting evidence focused on the comparative significance of the given factor. The very best answers also referred to the specific territorial and political gains made at each point of the unification process, for example, the creation of the North German Confederation in the wake of Austrian defeat.

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

This is a very popular topic which results in responses reflecting the whole range of levels available. It has been a pleasure to see candidates increasingly willing, able and confident enough to tackle questions on the 1896-1914/5 period; it is now only rarely that responses to these questions focus on Mussolini. Many candidates do, however, continue to make insecure statements about the number of Prime Ministers who governed Italy over this period. Many of the textbooks refer to the period from 1870-1914/15 as whole and it may be necessary to identify specifically the situation in 1896 at the beginning of the course rather than refer to general statements about the post-unification Liberal State.

### *Question 5*

Although not as popular as Question 6, a considerable number of responses were answered on the pressing political problems of Liberal Italy. Most candidates were able to identify the general, if not specifically political, problems facing Italy in the 1890s and to describe and comment on the response of Liberal government or to comment on the situation in 1914. However, fewer were able to combine these together to create an evaluation of the extent to which the problems had been solved. The best answers were able to focus on political problems such as the lack of representation, influence of the elites, challenges of nationalism and the consequent rise in socialism, determine the extent to which governments, particularly those of Giolitti, were able to deal with them and reach a judgement as to the situation in 1914 as Italy decided whether, and on whose side, to go to war.

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

This is an increasingly popular topic within centres and candidates are becoming more confident in writing about very complex situations. However, there is still a tendency for many of the weaker responses to assume that every question set on the topic that refers to the period before 1939 is about the Spanish Civil War itself. Many candidates clearly find it, understandably to some extent, difficult to distinguish between republican government in the years before the outbreak of the war and Republican forces during it. This is a topic for which a strong chronological foundation needs to be created and those candidates who do master it produce some very interesting and often thought provoking answers.

### *Question 7*

This question gave the candidates the opportunity to discuss the long term opposition to Republican government by elements of the army and the dissatisfaction with the Popular Front government in 1936 which led to the rebellion in July in relative comparison to other factors. Although the early months of the Civil War have some relevance to the question the time period specified was that of 1931-36 and it was focus on this period which was rewarded within the mark scheme. A significant number of candidates did not recognise the key themes in the question at all except as a simple Republican versus Nationalist battle and focused wholly on the Spanish Civil War itself. Responses in which there was little recognition of the period before 1936 often only achieved Level 1 or Level 2 whilst a few were written in such a way as to achieve low Level 3. Candidates who did focus on the years 1931-36 often wrote generalised answers with much detail about church reforms and political in-fighting but little about the opposition of the army except the dislike of the initial army reforms. There were, however, also a significant number of very good scripts at Level 4 and above that were able to deal admirably with not only the complexity of the chronology but gave detailed information in supporting evidence. Some responses suggested that an underlying distrust of republican government was evident throughout the period, and that pro-republican politicians did attempt to divide and rule the army hierarchy, but despite spreading them far and wide geographically significant army generals were able to use this to their advantage in the planning to overthrow the Republic in the spring/summer of 1936.



### **Question 8**

This question was designed to allow a discussion of the situation in which Franco left Spain on the occasion of his death and the extent to which the 'nature of Franco's provision for a successor' and the 'role of Juan Carlos to 1975', as stated in the content clarification, was a success. Dealing with the very end of the topic this was focused on a very specific period of time but it was expected that candidates would deal with this by a consideration of Franco's legacy and why a monarchy was acceptable to Spain at the time. This was exactly how the small number of candidates who attempted the question responded to it; the majority of responses clearly met the requirements of the mark scheme. It did not require a detailed description of the events following Franco's death or a need to question the extent to which it was 'so successful'. However, any candidates who were able to use this in their analysis were clearly rewarded. Most candidates were able to give a variety of relevant and, often very interesting reasons, as to why they felt the immediate transition to monarchy was so successful; there was a clear sense of the nature of Franco's legacy, the traditional role of the monarchy in Spain and the popular need for a new style of government. The responses were differentiated mainly through the amount of explanation, development and supporting evidence candidates were able to provide for their analysis.

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

This topic had very few entrants and the responses were either very secure in their knowledge or understanding or very weak descriptive answers.

### **Question 9**

Very few responses covered the whole of the time period involved. The best answers were able to show how the influence of the USSR both in political and economics changed over time and that East German influences were also very significant in themselves. Most answers were limited to Level 3 as they focused almost wholly on the period from 1949 to 1961 or referred to the period from 1945 through to the 1950s.

### **Question 10**

There were even fewer responses to this question and those candidates who did respond tended to concentration not on the period of re-unification but on the downfall of the East German government. A few very good answers were able to compare the role of Helmut Kohl with external influences in the international community.

This is an examples of a low Level 5 response that shows direct understanding of the focus of the question, very good coverage of the time period required and compares with other factors.

(This page is for your second answer.)

USSR Plan

Initial interference - COMECON - COMINFORM

25% of gross industry

Stalinist line

Collectivisation

Warsaw Pact

Emigration

Building of wall - trade partners.

- Gorbachev's reforms

internal - Ulbricht collectivisation - failure to

make use of foreign workers.

- 1970 Honecker

- 1977

external - 1973 oil crisis - emigration

FRG.

(This page is for your second answer.)

The USSR was a significant factor in influencing the development of the GDR's economic and political systems to a certain extent. However the USSR's influence was not the only important factor. Internally politicians within the GDR determined development and external factors also dictated certain development.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

This is a clear introduction which focuses on the question and suggests a variety of factors. However, it could have been made more relevant with some reference to the significance of the beginning and end dates of the question, briefly putting the influence of the Soviet Union into some context with some evaluation of the extent of influence.

One way in which the Soviet Union influenced the GDR in the years 1949-50 was through the creation of COMECON and in turn COMINFORM in 1949-50. These two policies tied the GDR to the Soviet Union both economically and politically. Following the introduction of these two policies the GDR had ~~the~~ firmly become part of the Eastern Bloc and hence it is a reason why the GDR's economic and political development was due to the Soviet Union as the GDR had now been isolated with the west as well as integrated its economy with the USSR.

Another reason why the ~~Soviet~~ USSR significantly influenced the

(This page is for your second answer.) development of ~~the~~ the GDR politically and economically was the concentration of industry in 1945 and the ~~the~~ implementation of Stalinsk themes. ~~the~~ Following the end of the ~~the~~ war the Soviet Union felt justified to ~~take~~ take 25% of ~~the~~ East German industry as it had lost 24 million men during the war. ~~At~~ The process of democratisation <sup>by the USSR</sup> in the East ~~was also~~ ~~implemented~~ implemented communist rule and society was to be compelled to follow socialist rules. This is a reason why the USSR was significantly influential as the ~~political system~~ socialist political system that the USSR introduced in East Germany dominated East German Politics all the way up to 1989. Also the GDR failed to develop economically ~~the~~ following contribution by USSR and it is a reason why the GDR struggled throughout its existence. Another reason why the USSR was influential was the ~~the~~ building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. This stopped the hemorrhage of skilled labour and

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~For~~ people in general from the GDR. ~~that~~ From 1950 - 61 the GDR's population went from 18.5 million to 17.4 million. The wall eased relations between superpowers and made people within the GDR accept life within the GDR. This is a reason why the USSR was influential as ~~it resulted~~ as a consequence the GDR was able to concentrate on economic development ~~and~~ and restructuring. However the wall also separated families and so initially there was ~~a~~ ~~an~~ increased opposition to the GDR government. ~~Another~~ ~~Another~~ Most importantly, the USSR were significantly influential in the development of the GDR politically and socially ~~as~~ was Gorbachev's reform in 1985 of Glasnost and Perestroika. These reforms called for economic restructuring ~~and~~ <sup>ing</sup> and freedom of speech, free elections etc. ~~That~~ This is a reason why the ~~the~~ USSR were influential as Gorbachev's reforms gave those ~~unhappy~~ ~~with~~ ~~whom~~ were unhappy in the GDR to express their



(This page is for your second answer.) answer and in turn opposition to the GDR greatly increased. Also following the S. Gorbachev visited the GDR on the 6 October <sup>1989</sup> and said that he would not help the GDR economically. This ~~parted~~ smothered the path to reunification and the turn deepened the ~~the~~ economic crisis in the GDR.

Despite these ~~these~~ ~~the~~ examples of the GDR's misfortune there were and other internal and external influences that influenced the development of the GDR. One such influence being Ulbricht and Honecker. Ulbricht was the leader of the SED in its early years and created the basis for socialism in the GDR. Ulbricht was key for developing the SED's dominance and ~~in turn~~ made the GDR into a 'one party state'. Ulbricht also created the Stasi in 1950 and ~~the~~ collectivisation which led to the 1953 uprisings. ~~Ulbricht is a~~ ~~key~~ Honecker ~~was~~ ~~in~~ ~~power~~ came to power in 1971 and introduced a

(This page is for your second answer.) policy for Socialist and economic unity which provided the basis for the GDR's economic development and meant that it was ~~a~~ the most economically successful state in the Eastern Bloc.

- Ulbricht and Honecker ~~are~~ <sup>was</sup> both reasons why ~~the~~ USSR ~~was~~ not a significant influential factor as they played decisive roles in developing socialism and the economy and it was Honecker's reluctance to reform that contributed to the GDR's collapse in 1990.

Finally, ~~the~~ ~~the~~ GDR was influenced externally which contradicts the idea that the USSR <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ a significant influential factor. The introduction of the Marshall plan in 1947 meant ~~that~~ the FRG developed ~~an~~ economically much faster than the GDR and contributed to mass emigration. Also the FRG had later German trade with the GDR increasing GDR's economic strength.

Overall, despite the USSR having <sup>being</sup> ~~being~~ influential over the development of the GDR by the implementation of socialism etc, external and internal factors were

(This page is for your second answer.) much more significant  
as well. These external and internal  
factors developed by FRG politically  
and socially significantly and events  
such as the oil crisis of 1973 and the  
opening of Hungary's borders as well as  
the collapse of the attraction  
of FRG led to the end of the GDR  
and social, economic, and political  
reform.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Whilst not a necessarily well developed introduction it does explicitly state how the response will be developed and is clearly focused on the question asked with reference to more than one factor. The first paragraph is focused on an aspect of Soviet influenced - clearly engaging with the given factor. This is followed by further development of the given factor with reference to events across the time period with some reference to the USSR's attempt to influence events towards the end of the period. The answer then goes on to develop two alternative strands of influence - the leadership of the GDR over the time period and the influence of the FRG - which is described as an external factor. The response suggests that these may have been of greater significance towards the end of the period. Although the development of the Soviet influence may have led to a less clear development of the other factors there is an explicit understanding of the key issues and enough evaluation to warrant a low Level 5 mark. In particular, the whole period is given coverage.



## **F7 The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism**

A small but significant number of centres enter for this topic. Candidates invariably attempt questions set which cover the time period before 1979. Those candidates who attempt to address the later period often produce responses with weak analysis and detail and are often confused chronologically. A significant number of candidates appear to mistake Iran and Iraq for each other. Centres should be aware that the nature of the specification is such that questions can be asked across the whole time period and across time periods covered by individual bullet points; a lack of preparation for the period after 1979 could result in candidates being unable to meet the high Level 4 and Level 5 requirements of the mark scheme.

### ***Question 11***

This was the most popular of the two questions. Although a chronological analytical approach can result in high Level answers, with the number of wars and the time-scale needed to be covered candidates who write such responses often run out of time; a thematic approach using the discussion of different factors is usually more effective. Most candidates were able to discuss the effects and influence of foreign intervention with the very best responses showing a clear understanding of the changing circumstances over time. However, some of the weaker answers became confused between outcome and causation.

### ***Question 12***

There were very few responses indeed. Those that did attempted to show how Iraqi actions were connected to different events in the Gulf between 1979-2001 with references to the Iran-Iraq war, the invasion of Kuwait and the resultant Islamist response to the western presence in the Gulf region.

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

The vast majority of candidates entered for Option F study Topic F7 and one other Topic. As a result the scripts reflect ability at all Levels. Candidates appear to have a good general knowledge of the period but often need to provide more relevant and detailed supporting evidence to justify the analytical and explanatory statements made. There were a large number of scripts that failed to achieve above Level 3 with a tendency towards description and assertion rather than analysis and discussion. The very best scripts, however, provide balanced analysis and an acute awareness of change over time. Once again there is still evidence that candidate knowledge of the fourth bullet point in the specification, which covers Germany during World War II, is very insecure resulting obvious inaccuracies which can only place responses in Level 2.

### **Question 13**

This was by far the most popular question. Most candidates were able to outline or describe some of Stresemann's contributions and were aware of his significance in the 'golden years'. However, many of the response appeared to be more in the style of GCSE responses and, in particular, there seemed to be a significant number of scripts which did not attempt to balance his responsibility with anything more than a few references to the underlying economic problems which his policies may have caused. There was very little discussion of alternative reasons for Weimar's years of stability. At AS level also candidates should show be able more knowledge of Stresemann's political offices moving from Chancellor to Foreign Minister. A large number of candidates seemed to be under the impression that Stresemann was responsible for the social welfare schemes introduced in Weimar Germany in the later 1920s. As in previous sessions some candidates are still confused as to when hyperinflation occurred and when unemployment began to grown. The very best responses were able to evaluate with confidence, and security of knowledge, Stresemann's contribution in both economics and diplomacy and balancing it with the underlying issues that his policies in turn created and other factors that helped to bring security.

### **Question 14**

There were very few responses to this question. Many of the responses appeared to be confused as to the time period involved and many evaluated the success of Nazi economic policies up to the outbreak of war. Some candidates were able to discuss a variety of factors which contributed to the defeat of Germany but they were often imbalanced with references mainly to economic problems with a brief mention of other factors or vice versa. The chronology of the war was often confused and there was some assumption that the 4 Year Plan began during the war itself. A very small number of responses confused the Second World War with the First World War. The best answers were able to show how although apparently organised to go to war in 1939 the German economy was not able to cope with the requirements of 'guns and butter' and that German war production was slow to adapt. Once 'total war' policies did begin to gather pace the growing competitive edge of Germany's enemies and other factors put Germany in a difficult position. Candidates who were able to evaluate the failings of the Nazi economic policies in comparison to other factors and come to a reasoned judgement achieved at the higher Levels.

This is a Level 5 answer. It is focused on the question directly, shows explicit understanding of the key issues and reaches a judgement through evaluation.

**Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .**  
**If you change your mind, put a line through the box**   
**and then put a cross in another box .**

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your first answer.) ANSWER WHY MADE STABLE

Stress

- 2 ✓ started conference
- ✓ Dawes-ease rep, foreign loans 1924
- ✓ Young-changed rep amount lower 1929 decided
- ✓ appt of Schacht - new Mark in 1924
- ✓ influx of foreign loans
- ✓ 1926 LoN, Treaty of Locarno agreeing <sup>1926 Treaty of Berlin w/ Rulers Rhineland</sup> ~~recognition~~ recognition, and committee leaving demilitarisation
- ✓ French withdrawal from Ruhr - <sup>passive resistance end</sup> increased industrial output
- ✓ policy of balancing budget to decrease inflation had effects

Other

- ✓ willingness of conciliation by Allies (but impressed at German action) Müller?
- ✓ foreign investments
- ✓ return of moderates in 1924 elections (SPD) <sup>though no coalition</sup> w/ them, political instability
- ✓ political parties didn't help - <sup>80% → 50%</sup> Weimar pro parties, growth of extremism

Concl

def him

(This page is for your first answer.)

The period 1924-29 is often considered to be the Weimar Republic's 'golden years', as it enjoyed a period of relative stability, a change from its <sup>rocky</sup> founding years and steady breakdown of democracy that followed the golden years. Gustav Stresemann was Chancellor of Germany from August 1923 to November 1923, when he resigned and became Foreign Minister of the new government until his death in 1929. Both his short time as Chancellor and the following years had a resounding effect on the stability of the Republic during the Golden Years. However other figures and causes also played a role in the relative stability of the time.\*

While Stresemann was Chancellor, he made several moves that improved the economic situation in the country, particularly having effect during the Golden Years. First, he ended the passive resistance of the industrial Ruhr district, which had been encouraged by Cuno and had detrimentally affected industrial output for Germany. The increased industrial output that resulted from this reversal helped the German economy back on its feet. The German economy had been further devastated by hyperinflation from ~~the~~ late 1922, which made the Reichsmark essentially worthless. To address this, Stresemann appointed Hjalmar Schacht as head of the Reichsbank in late 1923 to restructure the Mark and

(This page is for your first answer.)

end the hyperinflation. The new Mark came in early 1924, and helped deal with the problem. Stresemann also cut government expenditure in order to ~~stop~~<sup>limit</sup> the devaluing of the Mark in late 1923. This dual strategy resulted in a drastic improvement of the status of the Mark and German economy as a whole. The improved economic situation meant the German public were more content and the increased poverty and crime from hyperinflation was muted.

Stresemann also called for an international conference to discuss Germany's future reparations payments while Chancellor. The reparations were straining the fragile German economy and were a mark of shame as they came from the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, which German people felt was unfair. The 'Dawes Plan' resulted from this conference in 1924, and it provided reduced payments of the reparations until 1928, when Germany was less on the edge of bankruptcy. This plan allowed Germany to gather itself, and as it allowed the country to avoid the bankruptcy threat, gave Germany an economic stability to sort more fundamental problems out. Because Germany was now paying reparations again, France and Belgium ended their occupation of the Ruhr district, relieving the German public of the strain of occupation and



(This page is for your first answer.)

the nationalist fervor that entailed. The Dawes Plan further provided Germany with American loans to prop up its economy, and in 1924 it was receiving more loans than it paid out in reparations.

While Foreign Minister, Stresemann achieved a recovering of Germany's diplomatic position and some economic concessions which contributed to stability. He arranged the Locarno Treaties in 1925, which allowed international (including French) recognition of the Rhineland agreement at Versailles. Germany joined the League of Nations in 1926 due to Stresemann's actions, and he orchestrated the peaceful Treaty of Berlin with the Russians the same year. In 1927, the <sup>Allied</sup> committee responsible for overseeing German demilitarisation left as well. All of these actions dramatically improved the status of Germany diplomatically as well as its proud image in the eyes of its people. The renewed faith in Germany led to an influx of foreign loans, which can indirectly be seen as coming from Stresemann's restoring of German prestige. The loans, while causing instability after the Great Depression, propped up economic growth and political action during the golden years.

Before his death Stresemann also arranged the Young Plan, a permanent reduction of reparations to a quarter of

(This page is for your first answer.)

those demanded in 1921. While it did not come into effect until 1930, and caused some divisions in Miller's grand coalition parliament, the prospect of it provided hope for <sup>most of</sup> the public and increased somewhat the economic stability of the times. Therefore, Stresemann's activities as Chancellor and Foreign Minister greatly shaped the economic and international political stability of the Weimar Republic during the golden years.

However, he is not wholly responsible for this feat. As noted before, the foreign investments from the Dawes Plan and later greatly stabilised the German economy. However, these loans came about largely as a consequence of Stresemann. Without him, the Mark may never have recovered from inflation, deterring investment, and Germany may have gone bankrupt. His restoration of the international German image also encouraged the American investment. Therefore, the investments were partially thanks to Stresemann.

The willingness of the Allied powers to conciliate is also significant. They brought about the international treaties signalling greater cooperation that encouraged foreign loans. While Stresemann's actions certainly facilitated the cooperation, it would not have been possible without the actions of the Allies, specifically France and Britain.

(This page is for your first answer.)

The recovery of moderates, specifically the SPD, in the 1924 elections also stabilised Weimar politics. ~~It~~ It briefly relieved the right-wing and communist threats from the Republic and consequently stopped some of the extremist actions such as the Consul Gans assassinations and Freikorps 'White Terror'. However, they refused to join a coalition leaving the Reichstag impotent. In the later golden years, support for extremist parties also was on the rise, specifically the communist party. The stability of Weimar therefore does not have much support from its politics during this time.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

This response has a good contextual introduction and a conclusion that reaches a judgment based on the argument put forward in the body of the essay.

Stresemann's actions had rescued the Weimar Republic. There were other factors, including the cooperation of foreign powers and the foreign investment, but these can be traced to an extent back to Stresemann's policies. The economic and relative political stability during 1924-29 may have been fleeting, but it was there. Stresemann's death marked the end of the stability, both symbolically and actually, as he was the greatest factor bringing it about.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The opening paragraphs develop a separate point with reference to Stresemann and stability. Each paragraph is developed with supporting evidence showing awareness of change over time. The response shows balance with reference to other factors which are also developed. These could have been more developed with more balance but it is clear from the judgement in the conclusion that the candidate is of the opinion that everything is connected to Stresemann.



(This page is for your second answer.)

Constantin Coudreau as foreign minister in the years 1924-29 played an important role in the stability of the Weimar Republic in those years, both politically and economically. He improved international relations substantially and brought about several economic changes that initiated the recovery of the German economy after the hyperinflation of 1923. Yet, it may be argued both that the economy was never truly stable, and that Coudreau made the Republic less stable politically, as his actions were unpopular. The real reason for the 'years of stability' was the lack of, or weakness of, political opposition.

Coudreau's role in the economic recovery following the hyperinflation of 1923 was pivotal to the survival of the Weimar Republic. During 'Coudreau's Hundred Days' as chancellor he stabilised the economy through a number of measures including the establishment of the Rentenmark. Similarly, it may be argued, as foreign minister in the 'years of stability' 1924-29, he played a vital role in keeping the republic stable. The Dawes Plan of 1924 through which the USA agreed that Germany's reparation payments be made easier with respect to their economic situation was an important step. Similarly, in 1929, the Young Plan extended this agreement that Germany's reparation total was cut by a large amount. Coudreau's role in securing

(This page is for your second answer.)

economic stability in those years was usually important. However, it may be argued that in fact, Stresemann's economic policies had little effect on economic stability. In 1929, the unemployment rate was still at nearly 2 million and Germany's dramatic economic crisis, worse than any other country's, following the Wall Street Crash in October 1929, evidence that Germany's economy was hardly stable pre-1929. Though Stresemann played no part in the economic recovery, in truth it may be argued that the economy was not stable in 1929.

In addition to economic policies, Stresemann also worked to secure the international and political stability of the Weimar Republic through smart foreign policies. The Locarno Pact of 1925 regained German borders, resulted in the demilitarisation of the Rhineland and, crucially, the French agreed to end the occupation of the Ruhr, which had caused social and economic crisis. Germany's admission into the League of Nations in 1926 was also an important step, instigated by Stresemann, as Germany was once again recognised <sup>internationally</sup> as a nation. However, although Stresemann's policies were internationally successful, in truth they were counter-productive to stability within Germany. Because of the hatred for the Treaty of Versailles, Stresemann's policies were unpopular with the German public. In

(This page is for your second answer.)

period, the League of Nations and the League of Nations did not include land that was German prior to the treaty. Therefore, though Stresemann's policies secured German international recognition, they did little to increase stability in the years 1924-29.

It may be argued that the main reason for the 'increased stability' in Germany between 1924 and 1929 was not the work of Stresemann nor the government of the Weimar Republic, nor indeed public support for the Weimar. Rather, it was the weakness and lack of political opposition in those years. Looking to pre-1924, when the Weimar had ~~to~~ the opposition from the Spartacist Revolt in 1919, the 1920 Kapp Putsch and the 1923 Munich Beer Hall Putsch, there was little to no real opposition to the Weimar coalition in the 'years of stability'. The NSDAP that would later replace the Weimar government and that instigated the 1923 Munich Beer Hall Putsch was in disarray in those years, only gaining strength as a political opponent of the Weimar by 1928 onwards. This was mainly due to Hitler's imprisonment and the use of internal disagreement as to taking power legally rather than by armed coup d'état. In addition, the KPD and other <sup>parties</sup> opposition to the Weimar was weak in those years. Therefore, it may certainly be argued that the main reason for the

(This page is for your second answer.)

stability of 1924-29 was not the work of Gustav Stresemann, but the sheer <sup>and</sup> ~~by~~ lack of real political opposition to the Weimar Republic.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Always try to use the opening sentences of paragraphs to create a discussion of the question asked - give an opinion, show comparative relevance etc.

In conclusion, Gustav Stresemann's role in the increased stability of Germany in the years 1924-29 was both vital, and in some cases counter-productive. His notable work as chancellor in 'the Hundred Days' quickly ended the flapping Weimar Republic, and his work in seeing the French exit of the Ruhr and of stabilising the Reparation situation through the Dawes and Young Plans was highly significant. However, it may also be argued that while his policies increased stability, they were highly unstable because of the legacy of the Treaty of Versailles, and Stresemann's work in fact decreased the popularity of the Weimar government. Indeed, <sup>the economy was</sup> ~~it may be argued~~ that ~~it~~ was not even stable by 1929, with the unemployment rate near 2 million. The true reason, ~~and~~ for the



'increased stability' was not Stresemann's work but the  
return of political opposition, the disillusioned NSDAP  
being a <sup>prime</sup> example. Therefore, though Stresemann's  
efforts as chancellor and foreign minister were vital to the  
survival and stability of the Weimar Republic, they were also  
counter-productive, and the main reason for the 'years of stability'  
1924-29 was the sheer lack of political opposition.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This answer is focused directly on Stresemann's responsibility. It has relatively few paragraphs but each paragraph about Stresemann has a clear integrity - it makes a point, establishes Stresemann's significance and then questions it. When addressing another factor it establishes the political problems which existed before 1924 and shows how they were less of a problem. The other factor could have been more strongly developed but this is still a high Level response.

This is an example of a low Level 4 answer. If it had been completed the conclusion suggests that it would have been a high Level response.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .  
 Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.  
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- |                                     |             |                                     |             |                                     |             |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 1  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |             |                                     |

(This page is for your second answer.)

When the Third Reich crumbled and the allies invaded Germany, there were many problems with Germany that ~~led~~<sup>led</sup> to defeat, its economic policies being one which can be argued to be the most decisive and others such as ~~Hitlers~~, Hitler's ~~style of rule~~, ~~the~~ American joining the war and the failure of Operation Barbarossa.

The ~~economy~~ Nazi economy was not in any way ~~truly~~ organised for war. For example there was no ~~standardization~~ standardization of army equipment. This ~~led~~<sup>led</sup> to different regiments demanding different ~~resources~~<sup>resources</sup>. This put a massive strain on the economy because simply the ~~resources~~<sup>resources</sup> were made ~~more~~ ~~scarce~~ <sup>scarce</sup> instead of having one type of army ~~being~~ there would be ~~3~~, this would not allow them to produce



(This page is for your second answer.) ~~War~~ War time necessities efficiency as the whole economy was just like the mentioned example, Britain used 50% less resources and still out produced Germany. This ~~led~~ led to the fall of the Third Reich because the lack of industrialisation meant vital resources were wasted and couldn't equip the army to fight for example ~~so~~ German soldiers ~~produced~~ had more tanks than they had fuel, there was no figures demanded by the army. ~~The~~ Without the vital resources being deployed ~~in~~ in an organised manner shortages became apparent for the army who couldn't fight without equipment would eventually be beaten and lead to the fall of the Reich.

The ideology v.s Economy argument is also ~~an~~ <sup>a</sup> reason why the economy suffered and led to defeat. Nazi ideology stated that women should stay at home <sup>and</sup> ~~but~~ during wartime they should do the same, this led to labour shortages ~~in the war~~ before and during the war. For example Britain used its women to flood the factories to create more armaments ~~and~~ ~~so~~ whilst Germany ~~that~~ <sup>never</sup> Hitler made ~~that~~ 1 million women stay at home. Because ideology took precedence over the economy is ~~to~~ can be seen that Germany held itself

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~Back~~, without these extra workers, food and wartime supplies would be much lower. Without the supplies the German ~~economy~~ <sup>army</sup> simply could not hold off the allies and have to retreat within Germany then eventually face defeat, which brought Austria.

The New Plan of 1936 ~~which~~ <sup>which brought Austria</sup> which was supposed to make Germany independent failed to meet requirements. They could not produce enough raw materials. For example they ~~only~~ had 9.50 of oil that they needed in 1934 so how was it going to run its autobahn. In addition the ~~the~~ failure of autarky ~~and~~, Blitzkrieg and the fact that Germany was ~~not~~ taking up so <sup>many</sup> ~~much~~ resources made it so the only way for Germany to survive was ~~the~~ through conquest and plunder neutral resources from its invasions which made the economy and therefore war machine reliant on conquest which was a bad economic decision because later on in the war ~~when~~ when the lightning war came to a halt and Operation Barbarossa failed to gain the resources needed now ~~was~~ <sup>the</sup> was the economy going to cope, it didn't so the army became under equipped and in some points couldn't fight therefore retreated and led to defeat.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Hitler can be blamed for the ~~the~~ defeat because he wanted to take over countries at points when he didn't need to and eventually went insane and led them straight to defeat because he did not know how to control an army as he was not qualified ~~and all~~

In conclusion with out a <sup>a good</sup> economy to run the war machine the army simply could not be equipped and could not win wars however if Hitler was not obsessed with conquests it may not ~~have~~ ended in defeat as he wanted the invasion of russia which was a failure and if he were not in charge of the army the war may be ~~very~~ different.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

This is a good example of the importance of bringing an answer together with a conclusion even if you have not finished. The conclusion outlines the argument and comes to an integrated judgement.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This essay is not completed leading to an imbalance in the discussion of the essay but it does provide a good example of how a discussion of the failure of Nazi economic policy could be used to produce an integrated discussion of the reasons for the defeat of Germany in war.

This is an example of a high Level script - the first answer is a Level 5 response whilst the second is a high Level 4.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .  
If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your first answer.)

yes - papal states, Roman Republic  
no - Franco-Prussia war  
helped in other way

The involvement of the French in the years 1848-70 was an obstacle to the unification of Italy. This is apparent from the Roman Republic set up in February 1849, which saw revolutionaries take control of Rome, however, the French intervened and defeated the republic. This suggests that French involvement was an obstacle as it blatantly hindered the efforts towards unification as it prevented the revolutionary control of Rome. However, as the Pope fled to Naples during the republic's taking of Rome, he sought after help from the French under Louis Napoleon. This ~~thing it would~~ Thus, it would be argued that it was first the Catholic Church (through the Pope's request for help) that was the obstacle preventing the efforts towards a unified Italy, and French involvement was a way



(This page is for your first answer.) for the Catholic Church to hinder the attempts for unification. Nonetheless, the French were undoubtedly an obstacle as it can be argued that without ~~the~~ <sup>their involvement</sup> ~~Catholic~~ Rome would have been under control of the revolutionaries such as Mazzini, indicating that French involvement was definitely an obstacle to the unification of Italy.<sup>as</sup>

This is also apparent through Garibaldi's attempt to take Rome in 1867 and 1862, as in 1862, Garibaldi needed help from the French in order for him to be able to take Rome, however the French did not give their consent and ultimately defeated Garibaldi in Aspromonte in 1862. ~~The evidence~~ Therefore French involvement was definitely an obstacle hindering unification as the fact that the French army defeated a revolutionary march on Rome in an attempt to unify Italy explicitly suggests that France <sup>was</sup> were an obstacle preventing unification. This is also evident due to the fact that Rome and thus the Papal States were only enabled to be united because French troops withdrew due to the looming Franco-Prussian war in 1870. Again this suggests that France were a definite obstacle to the unification of Italy.

However, France did in some ~~ways~~ ways help the <sup>as the process of unification wasn't enabled due to France's occupation of Rome.</sup> unification process. In the war of 1866, Louis Napoleon agreed with Piedmont Prime Minister Cavour that if they went to war with ~~Prussia~~ Prussia against Austria, ~~they~~ <sup>Prussia</sup> would cede Venetia, which was one of the states to be united, to France, who would then give it to Piedmont. This shows that France did help the unification process and

(This page is for your first answer.) <sup>was</sup> ~~were~~ not an obstacle to the unification, as Louis Napoleon also made a secret agreement with Austria that they would cede Venetia to France if they won. Due to Venetia's eventual being given to ~~Austria~~ Piedmont by France, it again shows that they were not ~~an~~ only an obstacle to some extent, as they did aid the process of unification. Although ~~the~~ France's intentions were not to help the unification, instead they were to simply enfeeble Austria, ~~the~~ aiding the process of unification was a by-product of this, and therefore suggests that they were only an obstacle to some extent. This can also be evidenced through the meeting at Plombières in 1858, in which it was agreed that Piedmont would give Nice and Savoy to France in exchange for France's help in the War of 1859 against Austria. As the Austrians were defeated at Magenta on the 4<sup>th</sup> June 1859 and later at Solferino ~~the~~ 20 days later Piedmont were ceded Lombardy, therefore France's help in the wars of both 1859 and 1866, helped the process of unification suggesting that they were only an obstacle to some extent.

~~Because~~ Although, it can be argued that the Catholic Church were ~~against~~ more of an obstacle than France. Due to the Papal allocation in 1849 the Catholic Church was ~~against~~ unification, <sup>and</sup> the last state to ~~join~~ be taken of by Piedmont <sup>as</sup> ~~completing~~ <sup>as the Pope states thus</sup> the unification process, it suggests that ~~the~~ the Catholic Church was the greater obstacle, as although France were an obstacle in that they

(This page is for your first answer.) helped prevent the unification in the Papal States, it was only because of the power of the Catholic Church, as France had entered in the Church as the majority of the French population were Catholic. So whilst France's involvement was an obstacle, ~~for~~ it was because the Catholic Church was against the unification, suggesting that the Church was the greater obstacle, highlighting that France was only an obstacle <sup>it decreases</sup> decreasing the extent to which France was an obstacle hindering unification.

It can be concluded that France was an obstacle, but only to some extent, as not only did they help the unification process at times, through the Meeting at Plombières and the wars of 1859 and 1866 (they were albeit this was not their main aim but still helped) they ~~also~~ were heavily influenced by the Catholic Church as France stopped the Roman Republic. However, France were still an obstacle to the unification because of this, and ultimately their withdrawal from Rome in 1870 resulted in the complete unification of Italy.



Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.  
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.  
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒  
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

he was - league of nations, Kellogg Brand Pact, Dawes Plan (counter)

ended passive resistance - ended French occupation of Ruhr.  
there was no stability - still bad economy, - Wall Street Crash - impacted by

↑  
Dawes Plan. ↓ Great Depression war guilt.

he wasn't - economy counter - ended France with Ruhr.

It can be argued that Stresemann was heavily responsible for the increased stability between the years 1924-29. During this period, Germany was fast becoming a 'normal' state, partly due to the improvement in the economy, which can be seen through Germany's admittance into the League of Nations in 1926. This was orchestrated by Stresemann and saw diplomatic activities between Germany and other countries. This increased stability in Germany as people were made to realise that Germany was moving on from the troubled times embedded in their past. As Stresemann was foreign minister at the time, thus had a big involvement in getting Germany admitted into the League of Nations it shows he is responsible for the

(This page is for your second answer.) period of stability in Germany as the country was overcoming problems created from WW1. As Germany were involved in diplomatic activities several pacts were signed. The Locarno Pact <sup>signed with France</sup> ~~signed in 1923~~ increased stability in Germany as it set out the borders of the country that had been in dispute. Therefore stopped the ambiguity surrounding German borders, this producing stability as this dispute had concluded. As it was Stresemann who initiated the negotiations with France it can be argued that he was somewhat responsible for the political stability in Germany. Also Stresemann was at the forefront in signing the Kellogg Brand Pact in 1928 which prohibited the use of war as an instrument of national policy which produced stability as it ensured peace with between Germany and its past enemies during World War One. This again indicates that Stresemann was responsible for political stability increased stability as he was involved in signing the Pact.

However, it can be argued that Stresemann was not the only one involved in producing increased stability in France. After the hyperinflation in 1923, Germany's economy was suffering badly which led to the Dawes Plan in 1924. Although Stresemann did play some part in this, he was not the only one, and as the Dawes Plan produced stability by recovering the economy, ~~putt~~ signifying the end of hyperinflation. However it can be argued that Stresemann did in fact play a major role in stabilising the economy.

(This page is for your second answer.) as he was involved in the planning, therefore further reinforcing that he was <sup>heavily</sup> responsible for the increased stability during 1924-29.\* However, as the Dawes Plan involved borrowing money from America, it only caused stability in the short term, as it increased the impact of the Wall Street Crash in 1929, therefore indicating that Stresemann was only in some ways not responsible, as effectively, he played a part in decreasing the stability in Germany after the Wall Street Crash.

\* Also Stresemann was involved in ending French occupation of the Ruhr, as previous to this, the Weimar government had ordered the workers to go on strike, and they would be paid by the government, thus worsening the economic crisis as they couldn't afford to do so. Therefore as Stresemann ended the passive resistance in the Ruhr which in 1925, which was costing the government money, he can be said to be responsible for the stability in Germany as he played a major role in stabilising the economy.

It can be argued that there was in fact no stability in Germany between this period. As Germany were forced to face the war guilt through the treaty of Versailles and thus pay reparations to other countries which the country could in no way afford, there was no stability as although Stresemann did go to some way to increase in attempting to increase stability, it could be argued that the economy was still in turmoil, and this ended with the Wall Street Crash in 1929. As it can

(This page is for your second answer.) He argued that there was no stability within Germany between the period. Stresemann could in no part be responsible for the increased stability in Germany. ~~He~~ Despite this, on the surface, German people did believe the country had stabilised, mainly due to the work of Stresemann, therefore ~~no~~ it could be argued that Stresemann was responsible for the stability, as this was in the mind set of the people, despite the fact that perhaps it can be said that Germany was in fact unstable.

Stresemann was responsible for the stability ~~in~~ between 1924-29, as he worked for Germany to become a normal state, and did achieve this in the time period due to the nation's admittance into the League of Nations and the signing of the Locarno and Kellogg Briand Pact. However, there was evident instability in 1929 due to the Wall Street Crash, ~~which~~ ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~it~~ produced a bigger impact ~~in~~ due to the Dawes Plan in 1924. So whilst Stresemann did go to great lengths to produce increased stability in the time period, and thus can be said to be in a large way responsible for the stability, he also contributed to the instability in time period through Germany's fragile economy.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Both responses address the question directly and create a discussion through the opening sentences of each paragraph and establish a judgement in the conclusion. The second response is well focused but has some areas of insecurity putting it at the top of Level 4.



## Page Summary

Overall, once again, however, centres should be commended for the preparation and obvious enthusiasm with which they approach the Topics; the knowledge of candidates is more tailored to the themes each year. The best responses are analytical, detailed and reach interesting, well-supported judgements.



## Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US026439 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

