

# Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
in History (6HI01) Paper F

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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).

## **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)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43882

All the material in this publication is  
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## **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>

## **6HI01 F – The Expansion and Challenge of Nationalism**

### **Introduction**

#### **General Comments – 6HI01**

The June 2016 6HI01 examination session produced a wide variety of responses and overall the majority of candidates were able to produce organised responses with at least some sound analysis and relevant supporting material. Most candidates produced responses within Levels 3-5 but there were a few candidates who misunderstood questions or who provided responses with predominantly irrelevant material. Examiners commented on the quality of argument in many of the Level 5 responses and there were many interesting responses to read. Centres and their candidates are once again to be commended on the hard work and effort that clearly goes into the preparation for the 6HI01 examination.

Please note: 6HI01 is standardised across the Option papers and so it is recommended that Centres read the reports and exemplification for all of the Options as comments made generally apply to all papers. In the case of Option E and F exemplification, where there are identical questions, this is particularly the case.

#### **General Comments – Option F**

As in previous sessions an overwhelming number of candidates answer questions relating to Germany 1918-1945 along with one other topic. As usual most candidates were well prepared and many were able to select and deploy relevant supporting material to great effect in answering their chosen questions. In the higher Levels, examiners noted some outstanding answers commenting both on the quality of the responses and how engaging many of the responses were. At the lower Levels, however, there were some responses which showed some understanding expressed in simple developed statements (L2) rather than attempted analysis (L3).

#### **The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815–70**

**Q1.** This was the less popular of the two questions but many candidates actively engaged with concept of the legacy of the 1848-49 revolutions in relation to the eventual process of Italian unification producing some very engaging problems. Most responses suggested that although Italian unification was influenced by lessons learned from 1848-49 there were also factors specific to the later period which were of great significance. A range of influences were offered, but the position of Austria was frequently cited; either from the point of view that foreign intervention was actively sought to combat Austrian influence due to the lessons learned from the failed revolutions; or because Austria had become politically and economically weaker by 1870.

**Q2.** This was by far the more popular of the two questions producing a variety of responses of variable quality. However, there were very few response that achieved less than Level 3. As one examiner commented, at Level 3 there was a tendency to embark on a chronological journey through the geographic milestones of Italian unification without addressing ‘how

far'. Across all levels, there was recognition that although geographical unity had been all but achieved by 1870, there were still cultural, religious, and economic barriers that existed. Better responses at Level 4 and above analysed these factors on a thematic basis and weighed them accordingly.

### **The Unification of Germany, 1848–90**

**Q3.** This was by far the more popular of the two questions. Most of the responses were able to weigh up the significance of economic strength in relation to military strength effectively, with the majority achieving at least Level 3. The question focus led to some interesting discussions with many responses suggesting that although military strength was ultimately more significant it was underpinned by the economic strength developed in previous decades. Some candidates attempted a more multi-factored response which was less relevant to the question focus. However some higher Level responses were able to integrate the role of Bismarck's diplomacy very effectively into the discussion.

**Q4.** Very few candidates provided responses to this question. Several responses were unsure of the focus and provided a commentary on Bismarck's policies in the 1850s. However, there were some very good responses which explored a variety of key issues with regard to the development of a national identity such as the constitution of the German Empire, the creation of 'national symbols', unified economic policies and Bismarck's policy of *Kulturkampf*.

### **The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896–1943**

**Q5.** This was a popular question that was well understood by most candidates. The 'mutilated victory' and subsequent events with regard to Fiume, along with the economic impact of the First World War, were common factors across most answers in supporting the given factor, but the inherent weaknesses of the government, and the communist threat were frequently cited as 'other' factors. Better answers established sound causal links between the effects of war, and 'other' factors, for example, the economic crisis and the failure of the Liberal governments. Mussolini's role and leadership qualities were often discussed, but not perhaps as much as has been the case for similarly focused questions in previous years. It was not uncommon to see reference to the role of the king in the rise of the Fascists. Some candidates were unsure where to place the end of the rise of Fascism within the time period of the topic but most chose a year from 1922-25. Responses which continued after 1925 often included irrelevant material and wandered away from causal factors.

**Q6.** A significant number of candidates answered the question which was generally well understood. The primary focus for most candidates was foreign policy, although a significant number tackled domestic issues, with the 'Battles' being most frequently cited. A few candidates made a clear distinction between 'feared' and 'respected' in their analysis of Mussolini's foreign policy decisions, but generally most candidates treated them as different aspects of the same issue. The time period provided candidates with a range of foreign policy to consider and the best responses were able to select relevant examples from across the time period. Most responses concentrated on the exemplification from the 1930s with brief reference to either the 1920s or the period post-Abysinia.

## **Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931–75**

During the lifetime of the qualification candidates have increasingly become more prepared to answer questions across the whole time period of this topic. It has been a pleasure to see candidates become more confident in deploying knowledge of the history of Spain in the years immediately before the Spanish Civil War and the years of Franco's rule post-1939.

**Q7.** This was the less popular of the two questions but the focus of the question was generally well understood and candidates had a good knowledge of the history of the Second Republic in the years before the outbreak of the Civil War. Most candidates were able to discuss the initial reforms of the Second Republic and give a variety of reasons for the growing political instability. Many suggested that political instability was caused mainly by a combination of the failure of the left to meet the raised expectations of many ordinary Spaniards and the hostile reaction of the right wing political elite led by landowners, the army and the Catholic Church.

**Q8.** This was by far the more popular question and most candidates were generally well prepared. Key issues discussed included the role of Franco as a unifying figure, military support for the Nationalists from Italy and Germany and the impact of the various factions within the Republican forces. The majority of candidates across all levels tended to analyse Republican weakness and Nationalist strength separately, although the best answers did adopt a more synthesised approach. However, Level 5 responses were seen that did not necessarily employ a wholly comparative analysis throughout.

## **Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945–91**

**Q9.** There was a small entry for this topic this session and Q9 was the less popular of the two questions. Most responses were able to focus on the contrasting development of the 'two Germanies' in the years to 1962 and to develop the given factor – the emergence of Cold War attitudes. However, some weaker responses were unable to provide a range of other causal factors. Better responses often discussed the impact of the Second World War, the role of underlying economic factors, the domestic politics of the FRG and the GDR, and/or contrasting political leadership.

**Q10.** This was the more popular question and most responses were able to discuss both the physical and symbolic significance of the Berlin Wall in the process of reunification. Many responses suggested that, although the fall of the Berlin Wall was significant in a symbolic sense, long-term factors were more significant in the process leading to reunification itself. Some of the best responses suggest that the significance of the fall of the Berlin Wall was that it signalled the collapse of communism within the GDR which, in turn, began the actual process of reunification itself.

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

**Q11.** This was the more popular of the two questions. Most candidates were able to offer factors relevant to the question but overall depth and range relating to the stated factor was limited. Weaker responses tended to produce a limited narrative commentary on the reasons for Arab-Israeli hostility focusing on a limited time period up to the 1960s. As in previous

sessions many of the weaker responses also spent too much time discussing the origins of Arab-Israeli hostility rather than focusing on events during the given time period. The best responses were able to address the changing nature of Arab support for the Palestinian cause across the time period in relation to other factors influencing hostility such as Cold War attitudes, the ambitions of individual Arab nations and the actions of Israel.

**Q12.** Although this was the less popular of the two questions, most of the candidates choosing to answer this question were well prepared and there were some interesting and thought provoking responses. Candidates are much better prepared to answer questions on Arab nationalism and the causes of radical Islamist activity than they were at the beginning of the qualification and this is being reflected in the quality of the responses. Most responses were able to discuss the role of Western involvement in the Gulf region in the development of increasing radical Islamist activity citing the Western response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the Western relations with Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states. Other causal influences discussed included the long-term impact of the Iranian revolution, the decline of pan-Arab nationalism and developments within Palestinian politics.

### **From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany, 1918–45**

**Q13.** This was the less popular of the two questions. Many responses discussed the reasons for Hitler's rise to power but there were relatively few that focused on the inability of Nazi political opponents to prevent his rise to power. There was a disappointing general lack of knowledge relating to political opposition with the time period. Communists and socialists were frequently mentioned, but often in the context of pre-1929. Other factors such as the impact of the Wall Street Crash, the weakness of Weimar constitution, Hitler's charisma, and Nazi organisation and propaganda were frequently asserted as contributing to the inability of political opponents to prevent Hitler's rise to power but without justification. A few responses did manage to satisfactorily relate these factors to the weakness of opposition, but on the whole attempts to do this were unconvincing and in the more extreme cases contrived into the analysis. Political intrigue was generally referred to, and although few fully grasped the complexity of the manoeuvres surrounding Hitler's appointment as Chancellor some of the best responses did deal with this very effectively

**Q14.** This was by far the more popular of the two questions and on the whole was answered effectively. Generally there was a good understanding of the focus of the question and most candidates were able to develop the given factor – poor decisions taken by Hitler - and provide a range of other factors from both during war itself and in the pre-war period. Poor decisions discussed included the Blitzkrieg economic policies and the lack of economic readiness by 1939, the decision to declare war on USA and to attack Russia, and the unwillingness to involve women in the wartime economy. Other factors discussed included Allied bombing, and the military/economic strength of allies. Better responses often illustrated the inter-relationship of various different factors or differentiated between mistakes and poor decisions. There were very few responses with a narrative trend and most candidates seemed well informed on the reasons for Germany's defeat in the war.

## **Paper Summary**

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

- Well-reasoned conclusions which refer to the criteria used to establish the line of argument being developed provide evidence for substantiated judgements on the question asked.
- Candidates should read the question carefully and acquaint themselves with the focus of the question, taking particular regard of the timescale.
- Candidates should be prepared to select and deploy their knowledge and understanding for the question set, not the question they hope for, and, indeed, they should always be prepared for the unexpected.



## **Example of Level 5**

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 indicate your new question with a cross .

- 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 first answer.)

### Plan

Great and respected - Success up till 1938 then failed

### Expansionism

China - 1923

Abyssinia - 1936,

Enter war in 1939.

↳ Unprepared.

### Treaties

Be like Britain and France

- Locarno Treaty 1925

- Kellogg Briand Pact 1928

- Rome Berlin Axis 1936

- Anti-Comintern 1937.

- Pact of Steel 1936

### Comintern

- Speak Trooppe Volunteers

- Pact and 7.5 billion

File.



(This page is for your first answer.)

How successful was Mussolini in making Italy a great and respected nation in the years 1922-43?

Throughout the period of 1922-43, Mussolini went about a foreign policy to make Italy "great respected and feared". One method of achieving this was via: rapid expansionism, as this made Italy an increasing force in the international relations. Another method was via: diplomatic methods, this was in order to make Italy increasingly respected in diplomatic relations. Whilst the spread of Fascism was also initiated, alongside expansionism to make Italy a great. In terms of success, whilst making Italy increasingly great and respected throughout the period of 1922-39, Mussolini would counteract this with his actions in 1939-43 which ultimately did not make Italy great and respected.

In terms of expansionism, the crucial relative success success. ~~both~~ During the Corfu incident of 1923, when 3 Italians were killed, this led to Mussolini demanding 50 million lire in compensation. When Corfu refused, Mussolini took over Corfu but after gaining passage for Italy and France left the area. In terms



(This page is for your first answer.)

making Italy great and respected, Mussolini achieved some success but ultimately his was relatively superficial. A high point of making Italy great and respected was demonstrated in his 1935 Campaign over Abyssinia, in order to avenge the defeat of 1896. After 50 Italian were killed in what was known as the "Walwal Incident", Mussolini responded by sending over 500,000 troops to invade the nation. After sending over 14,000 trucks, 700 motor cars and 7000 tons of supplies, Mussolini achieved success in expanding to Abyssinia. This was a key step of making Italy great and respected, with Mussolini succeeding where other leaders had failed. Nevertheless, when looking at the period of as a whole Mussolini would fail in making Italy great and respected. After the period of 1939, Italy entered the Second World War on the side of Germany, with initial success in Egypt, and playing a role in the defeat of France and contributing 300 planes to the Battle of Britain. Italy failed miserably in the war. Major losses in Stalingrad and Africa, meant Italy was invaded by the



(This page is for your first answer.)

allies over Sicily in 1943. This was a huge loss for Mussolini, with the Italian soldiers ill-prepared for winter and many not even having basic uniforms. Overall, whilst Mussolini achieved initial success in making Italy respected and great in the period of 1922-31, he ~~was not~~ ultimately dragged Italy into a war that he could not win. Here, the losses would outweigh any superficial gains and mean that Mussolini failed in making Italy great and respected.

Mussolini further attempted to make Italy respected via increased diplomatic relations with countries. In this he achieved relative success.

Mussolini wanted to have similar influence to Britain and France, who dictated the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, as well as having large influence over the Mediterranean and Africa. The 1927 Locarno Pact consolidated the border with France and Germany but did very little to make Italy great and respected. Whilst, the Kellogg Briand Pact of 1928 stated that 53 nations would resolve disputes via negotiations rather than conflict. This



(This page is for your first answer.)

Succeeded in making Italy great and respected, with Britain and France acknowledging Mussolini's attempts to maintain peace. The Rome-Berlin Axis of 1938 marked a high point of Mussolini's policies, with Germany and Italy agreeing on friendship and a mutual understanding that Germany would focus on Eastern Europe, whilst Italy would focus on the Mediterranean. This marked a high point of Mussolini making Italy great and respected, with other nations acknowledging the importance of Italy in world politics. This was consolidated by the 1937 Anti-Comintern Pact between Germany, Japan and Italy which created an axis of global influence. The 1939 Pact of Steel between Italy and Germany, cemented even closer ties and although would mark a high point of Mussolini making Italy great and respected. It would also ~~lead~~ lead to its downfall as it ultimately committed Italy into a war it could not win. Here, Mussolini failed at making Italy great and respected despite initial success from



(This page is for your first answer.)

1922-39.

Mussolini also aimed to make Italy great and respected by expanding and supporting fascist causes. In 1936 he sent troops to support the nationalists in Spain. Committing over 7.5 billion lire in resources to the war.

This would ultimately lead to success in 1939, which was portrayed as a propaganda campaign for Fascism against communism and socialism. Nevertheless, Mussolini failed to make Italy great and respected as the war was considered a major military success compared to the 1936 expansion of Abyssinia. With many Italians disliking the campaign as it achieved very little for Italian territories and committed Italy into a 3 1/2 year war.

This was exacerbated as Spain proved to be a poor ally in the Second World War, as it failed to allow Italy to use its ports. In addition, the cost of 7.5 billion lire, illustrated a superficial gain for Italy ~~on~~ for Italy on the global scale and hence Mussolini's failed at making Italy great great and respected.



(This page is for your first answer.)

In conclusion, Mussolini's desire to make Italy great, great and respected failed. Despite initial gains in global diplomatic stature in influence and impotence ~~the~~ demonstrated by the events in Abyssinia and the Rome-Berlin Axis in 1936, Mussolini's ~~overall~~ ultimate failure in his goals, with his admission in 1939 for Italy to enter the war, which humiliated Italy and hence did not make it great and respected.





## **Example of Level 5**

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 indicate your new question with a cross .

- 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 first answer.) PLAN: <sup>why were</sup> political opponents <sup>of Nazis</sup> unable to prevent Hitler's rise to power 1929-33?

Political opponents KPD - were sig. threat - banned 1933 emergency decree  
 - Hindenburg - 's manipulation Reichstag fire  
 - Hindenburg political intrigue - von Papen / von Schleicher

Nazi's role - <sup>electing</sup> 22 1928, 337. Jan 1933, 47% March. <sup>with</sup> propaganda - mobil & organization - Gaul

↳ eradicated opposition after enabling act and trade union / 1.5 1929 other parties banned

Other factors - WSC 1929 - unemployed 6.1m 1933  
 communists A. 48

Hitler's rise to power between 1919-33 rapidly came into being with the ultimate dismantling of the Weimar Republic as the March 1933 Enabling Act was passed. His political opponents such as the Communist Party (KPD), successors of coalitions with the largest party of <sup>The SPD</sup> ~~Social~~ and President Hindenburg were unable to defeat Hitler's ~~own~~ eventual attainment of total power. This was arguably achieved through ~~mistaken~~ and flawed political decisions from Hindenburg 1932-33, Hitler's manipulation of the Communist Party after the Reichstag Fire and the overall strength of the Nazi's policy



(This page is for your first answer.) of 'legality'

The KPD became a significant threat to Hitler's rise to power after noteworthy gains in elections from 1929-32 in particular. In the January 1933 elections, the KPD received 27% of the national vote and were therefore the largest threatening opponents to the Nazis (excluding the SPD). Their success in elections, however, was overturned by the Nazis' active role in eradicating this opposition, as evidenced by Hitler asking for an emergency decree to ban the Communist Party following the accusation, based on wild speculation, that the Reichstag Fire, <sup>the previous day</sup> was the result of a Communist. When passed, this decree removed a substantial portion of Hitler's political opposition and entirely removed the KPD's ability to prevent his rise to <sup>ultimate</sup> power between February and March 1933.

Furthermore, ~~the KPD~~ <sup>Paul von Hindenburg</sup> was unable to prevent the Nazis' attainment of power through <sup>the Weimar Republic's</sup> ~~Hindenburg's~~ constitutional framework. Article 48 allowed for emergency decrees (such as the one above) and due to the vague and broad nature that permitted its use (public disorder), this strengthened the Nazis' pathway to power while damaging the capacity of the opposition to prevent this. The use of Article 48 undermined the strength of the constitution to combat such political manipulation as it became overused; in 1928, Hindenburg passed 8 emergency decrees while in 1932, this had risen to 61. At the same time, Reichstag laws



(This page is for your first answer.) fell from 91 in 1928 to just 5 in 1932.

This demonstrates that the reliance <sup>by</sup> on the chancellor of the President's powers removed democratic opposition to laws and hindered active debate and beneficial legislation for political opponents. This is illustrated in the Weimar Republic's failure to address the issue of the right-wing bias; judiciary - advantageous to ~~the~~ Hitler and the Nazis in his 1924 treason trial <sup>he</sup> as <sup>he</sup> received a light sentence of 5 years and served just one. The constitution and in particular the Presidential power <sup>in the context</sup> allowed for a previously authoritarian leadership of the Kaiser reduced the ability of political opposition in the Reichstag to affect the Nazis rise to power.

Hindenburg's failure to prevent the Nazis rise to power is also evident in the political intrigue of 1932-33 alongside the roles of von Papen and von Schleicher. While Hindenburg was persuaded to appoint Hitler as Chancellor in <sup>January</sup> 1933, it was on the condition that "we'll push him into the corner so far that he'll be ~~spoon~~ squeaking." However, the role of these three key politicians failed to prevent Hitler's manipulation as on the evening of the announcement as Chancellor Hitler's parade gained huge publicity. An increase in his share of the votes followed from 33% in 19 January to 44% in March demonstrating a rise in public support, directly related to Hindenburg's appointment of Hitler. The underestimation of Hitler's role as a demagogue and



(This page is for your first answer.) ~~an~~ ability to win public support was ~~at~~ the most significant factor in their ~~lack of~~ <sup>inability</sup> to prevent ~~the~~ Hitler's rise to power in 1933.

However, the external economic factor of the Wall Street crash in <sup>October</sup> 1929 also prevented political opponents being able to prevent Hitler's rise to power. This is due to the loss of public support for the Weimar Republic and its succession of coalitions that had now seen its second period of economic instability (since 1923 hyperinflation) in its short time in action. Unemployment had risen from 1.5 million in 1929 to 6.1 million in 1933 and the direct correlation of increased votes for politically extreme groups indicates that in times of such hardship, the German public became disillusioned with the success of democracy and searched for an alternative. Therefore, the Wall Street Crash proved <sup>to be</sup> a hugely destabilising factor that prevented the SPD and coalition governments to be in a strong position to tackle the <sup>increasing popularity of</sup> extremism demonstrated by the Nazis surge in votes.

Overall, it is evident that political opponents were unable to prevent Hitler's rise to power largely due to Hitler's successful manipulation of events as with the Reichstag fire eradicating the communist opposition and the Wall Street crash for attacking Republican parties. Although, Hitler too did exploit the powers of the constitution and Hindenburg allowing the final move into ultimate power.



(This page is for your first answer.) Arguably, without Hitler, the Nazis' ~~successful~~ <sup>successful</sup> attainment <sup>of power</sup> would not have been possible and his political opposition would have been able to prevent the Nazis rise to power.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA  
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA  
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



## **Example of 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 indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number:    Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
   Question 4       Question 5       Question 6   
   Question 7       Question 8       Question 9   
   Question 10       Question 11       Question 12   
   Question 13       Question 14

(This page is for your first answer.) Despite Hitler's drive to prepare Germany for war and her initial victories in the early 40s the German war effort deteriorated significantly, undermined by a number of factors, namely the Allied bombing campaign. As the Allied turn around, Germany's weak economy and, most importantly, Hitler's fundamental mistakes, which go a long way to causing the German defeat.

~~Hitler~~ ~~is~~ Examples of Hitler's mistakes are abundant, he consistently underestimated and miscalculated, costing Germany the war. Most notably, he viewed Russia as being ~~fact~~ racially inferior and thus an easily defeated enemy, a miscalculation which would come to fruition when Hitler fled from the oncoming Russian forces in 1945. Had he better estimated





(This page is for your first answer.) Their strength, Germany may not have lost the war. This is compounded by his underestimation of how long it would take the USA to mobilise in Europe, believing it would take years when in actual fact it took months, leaving Germany to fight on multiple fronts. Moreover, his arrogant persistence at Stalingrad would prove to be one of his biggest mistakes, directly costing the lives of over 100,000 German soldiers and injuring 150,000. The conflict was hugely costly on the strength and morale of the German Army and Hitler had pursued it purely for ~~it~~ the status of ~~its~~<sup>its</sup> name. On the whole, Hitler's mistakes went a long way to weakening the German war effort.

Moreover, the Allied bombing campaign would also play a significant role in Germany's defeat. The relentless campaign involved a 24-hour barrage in which the British would bomb by day and the US by night. It would cost the lives of over



(This page is for your first answer.) 300,000 German civilians and, importantly to the war effort, cut ~~of~~ industrial output by 20%. These meaning resources became scarce, undermining the strength of the Army. This was exacerbated by the fact that the Luftwaffe had to stay to protect German ships and not support the ground troops elsewhere in Europe, again undermining the strength of the German ~~Army~~ Army. On the whole, the Allied bombing campaign was significant in weakening weakening Germany, contributing to their defeat in 1945.

In addition, the Allied turn around must also be considered. Germany had taken the upper hand in the early years of the conflict, inflicting heavy defeats on the Allies, particularly Russia, who had lost over 4 million men by 1943. They would, however, learn from their mistakes, especially Britain and ~~France~~ <sup>Russia</sup>, who stepped-up training <sup>and</sup> <sub>3</sub> armament and changed



(This page is for your first answer.) ~~Their tactics.~~ tactics. It would prove to ~~survive~~ turn the tide of the war, <sup>against Germany</sup> as, crucially, Germany failed to adapt, instead regressing on account of ~~Hitler's~~ Hitler's mistakes and their economic shortcomings. Thus, on the whole, while the Allied turns around ~~was~~ a significant factor in pushing Germany to defeat, it was perhaps only as significant as it was because of the role of other factors.

~~The ~~one~~ second most significant factor, then~~  
It was Germany's economic situation which played a major role in undermining her war effort. Hitler ~~firm~~ firmly held the belief of Herrenvolk - the idea that the Aryans would ultimately ~~succeed~~ succeed as a result, genetics and ~~the~~ armament was prioritised above the economy.\* Failure to achieve by 1939 ~~did~~ was fatal, they had fewer factories than their enemies, ~~few~~ fewer resources and as a result fewer resources. ~~While they had~~  
This weakness would be exposed by the Allied bombing, ~~and~~ their strength



(This page is for your first answer.) and their turn around. On the whole, the German economy was not strong enough to sustain a major war, as the Allies exposed. However, the economic failings were borne from another of Hitler's misgivings; thus, while incredibly significant, ~~Germany's economic weaknesses were less significant than the role of Hitler in~~ contributing to Germany's defeat, to a lesser extent than Hitler's mistakes, which played the biggest role.

In conclusion, the factors that contributed to Germany's defeat are inextricably linked, all contributing and ~~and~~ ~~and~~ ~~exacerbating~~ exacerbating each other, especially the Allied bombing campaign in to catalysing Germany's economic woe. The factor that links them all however, was Hitler's mistakes, which undermined the entire war effort.

\* Although Albert Speer did much to rectify the economic troubles - he made factories more efficient and



(This page is for your first answer.)

increased production - it  
would prove to be too little, too  
late.



P 4 3 8 8 2 A 0 9 2 0

## **Example of Level 3**

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 indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number:    Question 1       Question 2       Question 3   
   Question 4       Question 5       Question 6   
   Question 7       Question 8       Question 9   
   Question 10       Question 11       Question 12   
   Question 13       Question 14

(This page is for your first answer.) Why were the political opponents of the <sup>Nazi</sup> ~~Weimar~~ party unable to prevent Hitler's rise to power in the years 1929-33? From 1929 onwards, gaining a majority vote in the Weimar felt to be extremely difficult, due to the harsh restrictions of proportional representation. The Nazi party went from having a 2% of the 1928 elections to having 44% in 1933. Other political parties couldn't restrict this increase as the party leader Hitler, had a charismatic personality, was a manipulator of the masses and played the collapse of the Weimar to favour the party's electoral growth.

Opponents that tried to come up against the Nazi party were often crushed by force. The Brown and later followed by the black shirts worked together to stop uprisings from the left. The left parties, trying to promote a greater need for communism through Germany.



(This page is for your first answer.) were stopped with violence.

The Nazi party strength over the other left wing parties proved that communism was weak. Middle class voters turned to the Nazi party as they were disillusioned with the unstable constitution and feared a communist Putsch. The fear led them to voting for a socialist party in order to prevent this. Contrastingly, working class voters went to the Nazi party for their promise of 'bread and work'. The Nazi party used these to their favour and kept exploiting workers policies in order to gain wider variety of votes. The weakness of the communist party and other parties in the Weimar led to Hitler's growth in power.

Goebbels, minister of propaganda under Hitler's rule helped to manipulate all types of media to ensure that the Nazi message was being broadcast everywhere. One aspect of the propaganda used shows the effect of targetting specific policies. For instance, farmers had to pay less tax, ensuring that if food prices changed they would not go bankrupt. Policies placed through propaganda often fell through but by this time the Nazi party were already gaining enough votes. On the other hand, Hitler went out personally





(This page is for your first answer.) to rallies and events to promote the party. These methods prevented other parties involvement for the propaganda only humiliated their policies. Hitler's use of manipulative propaganda and the ideological message being forced through to all homes via radio, oppositional parties were undermined and sidelined.

Hitler also used methods pseudo legally, meaning that under the rule of Article 48 he could enforce different actions promoting his party. The collapse of the Weimar and the Great Depression from 1929 played into the hands of Hitler as he could promote the weimar and past parties involved in it as weak and unstable. Much of Germany's society believed the only way to overcome the issues facing Germany was to gain a solo leader, Fuhrer, Hitler. Although actions of the past such as the 1923 Munich Putsch were disliked due to the mass violence, this had now changed and the idea of a strong force against other allies proved to be a prominent force. The use of pseudo legal methods that helped the Nazi party and Hitler gain support proved to block political opponents.

Coinciding with all of this, one of the largest factors that prevented political opponents



(This page is for your first answer.) Stopping a Nazi rise was the personal popularity of Hitler. After the Beer Hall Putsch of 1923 the tactics of the Nazi party changed and Hitler used his power of speed to promote his "one party". His charismatic personality, but most of all the fact he admitted Germany had problems left him with extravagant support from all. His main policy of Volksgemeinschaft, a National community brought all of Germany together and united all organs. This helped the communities feel as if this party was to save them when in power. Hitler personally undermined political opponents as he was liked more than other Weimar politicians, gaining more support than other parties.

Although other political opponents could not prevent Hitler's rise to power in the years 1929-33 it was not solely down to the actions of the party itself for the parallel collapse of the Weimar, the fall in support of communism and personal likeability of Hitler all played an active role in the increased support of the Nazi party.



