



# Examiners' Report June 2018

## GCE History 9HI0 1G

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2018

Publications Code 9HI0\_1G\_1806\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

# Introduction

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

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity/ difference and significance with a time frame of not less than ten years. Section B offers a further choice of essays using an extended time frame of not less than one third of that offered by the specification as a whole. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

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

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

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence offered by both the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

## **Question 1**

Question 1 asked candidates to consider how significant the problem of political extremism was in challenging effective government in the years 1919-30. This was the more popular of the essay questions in Section A. Many candidates were able to weigh the significance of the stated factor, political extremism, against a range of other serious problems facing Germany in the period 1919-30 with conviction. Weaker responses tended to narrate the series of violent putsches up to and including 1923 and offer descriptive information on the effects of hyperinflation. Most candidates argued that political extremism was less serious than other factors such as the Weimar constitution, economic crises, or the impact of the Treaty of Versailles.

Although the extreme displays of opposition and political extremism were wide ranging and undermined the Weimar government, they never prevented the government from effectively operating in the same way that economic problems ~~and~~ caused political instability.

Admittedly, the support that the Communists received did undermine the Republic. ~~The~~ ~~Gain~~ 10% of the vote in 1928, almost half of the largest democratic party, the SPD, and 50 seats made the operation of government difficult with such a significant presence in the Reichstag opposing democracy. However this alone cannot explain why the Weimar Republic was ineffective at governing. Democratic parties still retained the majority of the Reichstag and yet still required most policy to be pushed through by decree of the President Ebert and Hindenburg through the Article 48 clause. Because political extremism was still insufficient to have such an impact on the effectiveness of Weimar government,

(Section A continued)

its ineffectiveness is best realised through the other factors that made it ineffective.

~~Although the signifi~~ Economic difficulties entrapped the government in difficulty as they were unable to deal effectively with the problems, giving a root cause to political extremism and the frequency of elections that made government ineffective. Hyperinflation that reached serious levels after a newspaper that cost 1 mark in 1922 cost 700 billion marks by November 1929, highlights the severity of the problems. Unable to effectively tackle these issues because government spending needed to be high to cover the cost of reparations from the Treaty of Versailles and the 750,000 war veterans that needed welfare in 1924, for example. The economy was saturated to such a point where effective governance was impossible, and solutions, ~~were~~ such as the Young Plan of 1929, were risky and deepened Germany's problems, pushing them into the Depression in 1929. Other factors, such as the economic problems that made Weimar an ineffective government were a more significant challenge than political extremists.

(Section A continued)

Going even further, the nature of the Weimar Republic, based on a Constitution that required proportional representation means that coalitions were inevitable and would be ill-equipped to deal with the challenges. With 9 governments ~~also~~ between 1919 and 1933 alone, the Weimar Republic could hardly tackle its economic and extremist problems when the government was flawed and inefficient by design. The first coalition government of the SPD, DDP and Zentrum parties ~~rep~~ in 1919 represented such a broad coalition of left-leaning and liberal views that the government was in disagreement and largely ineffective. The primary reason for political extremism was resentment at an inefficient government, and the persistence of economic problems came largely from having ~~an ineffective~~ a weak government in disarray over how to tackle the problems. ~~the~~

The problem of political extremism was not, therefore, ~~the main~~ as significant as some of the other challenges faced between 1919-30. Because it is less significant than some of the more deeply rooted problems, in particular



(Section A continued)

The ineffective nature of the governments itself, political extremism was less of a cause of weak government and more of a symptom. Effective government was not possible under such a weak system of proportional representation, which itself caused political extremism and perpetuated economic problems.



This is a response that achieved level 3. The candidate has not dealt with the stated factor of political extremism in any depth. It is one of the very few responses that could look at this topic without mentioning the Nazis. Although the other factors looked at are dealt with quite convincingly they cannot be weighed against the stated factor as it has not been fully analysed. This response was awarded level 3, 11 marks.



Answers should always be planned. The plan should make sure that the stated factor is properly addressed so that other factors can be compared to it. This will help evaluation and make judgement more convincing.



~~Political extremism~~ fluctuated. One reason political extremism was so significant was because of its prevalence and the government's lack of popularity which already struggled to make it effective. The Government was challenged from extremely early on from both sides of the political spectrum such as the January 1919 Spartacists Revolt. The attempted communist takeover posed a significant threat to the government, forcing them to relocate to Weimar due to how dangerous the situation was in Berlin, however the revolt was eventually brutally put down by the Freikorps, suggesting there was more support to put down left wing support. However this proved a problem when the later <sup>1920</sup> Kapp Putsch, this time by right wing ~~Kapp Putsch~~ Wolfgang Kapp posed an extremely large threat to the government as it had backing from senior military figures such as General Ludendorff who commanded high levels of respect from

(Section A continued) the army and the Freikorps who refused to quash the Putsch. This was a severe challenge to the government and it looked as if they had succeeded until the workers of Berlin went on total strike, causing the Putsch to fail after 4 days. This is significant as it showed the Government couldn't command support effectively even from its army to protect itself and demonstrates the ambivalent attitude they had towards its future; they were much happier to keep out left wing opposition as seen in the Ebert-Groener pact.

Another example of political extremism challenging the effectiveness of the Government was the right wing group the 'People's Offensive and Defensive Alliance' who had upwards of 200,000 members before they were banned following the murder of Jewish foreign minister Walter Rathenau. This suggests they posed a large risk both in members and through their actual disruption of government. ~~Even~~ Before the work of Stresemann to settle the ~~gover~~ economy in 1924 after the 1923 invasion of the Ruhr, there had been 376 political murders, this suggests the sheer scale of political discontent felt in Germany, especially when the ~~economy~~ and the impact this was having on keeping together a government where assassinations are common. Arguably the most important political extremists who

(Section A continued) began to increase in popularity after the 1929 Wall Street Crash was the Nazi Party, although within this time period they probably posed a larger threat in their 1922 Munich Putsch, inspired by Mussolini's Fascist 'March on Rome'. However, the Putsch ~~was~~ didn't have the support the majority and 16 Nazis were killed in the ensuing street battle, although the Putsch is significant in that Hitler only received 5 years imprisonment for his part, suggesting there was sympathy in the Parliamentary system for right wing extremists. It also convinced Hitler he would need to come to power democratically, something that would pose a significant threat to the Weimar.

However, it is important to note that there were other flaws with the system of government that posed a large challenge to how effectively it ran, such as inherent flaws in the constitution. Proportional representation meant that it was possible for <sup>people</sup> parties with only 65,000 votes to gain a seat, making it very difficult to run effectively, on average there were 29 parties in the Government at a time and confused people, making them have less faith in the system. Another weakness was Article 48, allowing the country to effectively become a ~~run as a~~ dictatorship and ~~effect~~ hampered the effectiveness of the government could ~~basically~~ basically

(Section A continued) override it. This was especially significant considering the President Hindenburg favoured a more ~~also hampering~~ the autocratic style of rule and frequently undermined the Government by causing confusion and frequently changing the Chancellor and turning the people against them by creating rumours such as the 'Stab in the back.' However, evidence does show despite these factors people did have faith in the parliamentary process, voting turnout at elections was 90% suggesting a willingness to make the Government work, despite its many flaws.

Overall, I believe political extremism did pose the largest threat as especially in the earlier years and things were arguably more ~~also~~ unstable the Government couldn't command the support to put it down, or it was even difficult to establish democracy such as in Thuringia where elections weren't held until 1920 due to it being under the control of political extremists. Whilst political extremists could only be said to represent a ~~fa~~ fraction of public opinion, what is more significant is that they came from the left and the right and that, especially for the right, seemed to have the support of higher up, ~~and~~ posing the question ~~How many~~ who was willing to fight ~~ed~~ to allow government to be effective.



This is an example of a response achieving level 4 that was secure on each of the bullet point descriptors in the mark scheme. The evidence is explored rather than just presented. The knowledge is mainly accurate and of sufficient range and depth to meet the demands of the question. In this response the stated factor of political extremism is dealt with comprehensively and comparison to the importance of other factors is secure. The evaluations are convincing and allow a sustained judgement to be made. This response was awarded level 4, 16 marks.



## Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider how far Nazi censorship was the most effective method used to control the people in the years 1933-45. This one attracted fewer takers, but produced many highly intelligent and well informed responses. Some candidates found it difficult to define censorship, instead describing a range of techniques of propaganda, but there were many persuasive answers weighing the significance for control of censorship against other Nazi techniques such as terror, propaganda generally and economic and military success. At the top end candidates used the time frame fully and were able to analyse the crucial role played by censorship in the war years, as well as considering its limitations. No amount of censorship could hide the bombing. Towards the bottom end techniques for controlling the people were described with terror getting the most attention.

The main censorship in Nazi Germany was present in the media - the ~~main~~<sup>only</sup> source at the time being newspapers. Under the protection of the people and the state act, newspapers - or anyone else with a platform - couldn't say anything that could harm the Nazi government. This made all of the newspapers bias as they were all pro-dictatorship, because they would get arrested if they said <sup>or supported</sup> anything different.

A second form of censorship within the newspapers is that editors were officially responsible for the content. This led to censorship because the editors wouldn't want anything released that

(Section A continued) could get them in trouble, so content was censored by the editors themselves.

Finally, the newspapers were censored by the government as they released a list of 'acceptable' stories to publish. This controlled the newspapers as they were limited on what they could print.

Overall, censorship led to a massive control of the media as it restricted their free speech and controlled the people that worked for them. This in turn affected what and controlled the people because these newspapers were their only source of information.

Another method that was used to control the people was rewards. The first example of this was the marriage loan of 1000 marks. ~~Once a woman had a debt~~ for each child that a woman had, 300 marks would be taken off this total. This controlled women as they felt forced into having children in order to clear their marriage debt.

Another example of the rewards that the Nazi government used to control the people is medals.



(Section A continued) These were given to women based on the amount of children they had - bronze for one, silver for three and gold for five. This controlled women as they felt like they had to have more children to gain status through their medals. The government wanted more children to be born so that there would be more for people to spread their ideology on and make sure it stayed strong over time.

A final example of Nazi government rewards used to maintain control was the benefits of joining Hitler's main trade union. By joining it members could receive things like money and holidays. This controlled people because it kept other trade unions from existing and made sure everyone was under the same Nazi ideology.

Overall, rewards were given to the people to keep them ~~there~~ in line and to make sure that they continued to follow the Nazi ideology. It is a more effective method than censorship because the people would feel that they benefited from it and the government cared for

(Section A continued) them, making them willing to spread their Nazi ideology.

The third technique used by the Nazi government to maintain control of the people was terror. The first example is the elections, where ~~in~~ members of Hitler's SA would stand outside the polling stations, intimidating people to vote Nazi. This worked as in the 1933 elections the Nazi party got 80% of the votes. This controlled the people as it helped to maintain the one-party state by scaring people into <sup>only</sup> voting for the Nazi party.

A second example of the terror used by the Nazi government to maintain control is the Gestapo. These were the secret police, and Hitler's spies. As they could be anyone or anywhere they scared people into not talking against the Government as they never <sup>really</sup> knew who was listening. This maintained the control as it ensured that no one ever spoke against Hitler and the Nazi party.

A final example of terror from the Nazi government is the people's court. This was a group of officials

(Section A continued) that trialed people accused of treason. As cases could be submitted by anybody, no one trusted their neighbours out of fear of being reported for treason. This maintained control as the fear of being caught meant that the people were less likely to do something that would harm the Nazi Government.

Overall, creating terror was an effective way of control because it scared people into not going against the government. It is more effective than censorship because it had larger consequences that people were more scared of.



This is an example of a lower level 4 response. The question is organised around the focus of the question and there is an attempt to analyse relevant issues, although this is only partially successful. There is some description and this has made the attempts at evaluation only partially successful too. Nevertheless the candidate has dealt with the stated factor of censorship quite well and does compare it to the other factors. This response was awarded level 4, 13 marks.



When dealing with a question on effective methods of control it is a good idea to put yourself in the shoes of someone at the time. Goebbels and Himmler would no doubt both have claimed that their role was indispensable. You can resolve the debate by looking at it from the point of view of the resistance, or alternatively a supporter of the regime. The advantage of thinking about it like this is that it makes you concentrate on which examples to use in your essay.



Throughout the years 1933-45, the Nazi regime faced little meaningful opposition from its people. Other than the failed Stauffenberg plot of July 1944, there was no key event that threatened the authoritarian leadership of Adolf Hitler. There is a strong argument that this effective control of the German populous in the years 1933-45 was most significantly as a result of Nazi censorship during this period of political stability. However, other factors such as state propaganda and indoctrination, in addition to repression and terror potentially limit the extent to which this was the most effective method used to control the people in the years 1933-45. Whether Nazi censorship played the most important role or not, ~~the situation~~ the regime certainly succeeded in their aim to assert full authority over the people throughout their time in power.

The censorship policies undertaken by the Nazis in the years 1933-45 were an effective method used to control the people during this period of time. From the early days of the regime, the party had an aim to remain in power through the creation of a totalitarian state through which censorship played a large role in. For example, the Editors Law of October 1933 was effective at controlling the people as by making newspaper editors accountable for their publishing, anti-Nazi articles were less likely to be ~~published~~ written, presenting only a positive viewpoint on the regime, increasing their popularity and consequently their control.

(Section A continued) over the German population. This was strengthened further by the Nazis taking control of the German News Agency, providing journalists with only one source of information, leading to further censorship such as reports during World War 2, notably at Stalingrad in 1944, never being read by the people, maintaining their effective control over the people. In addition, by 1939, the Nazi publishing company, Eher Verlag, had a 82.5% market share of the German newspaper industry. This was an successful way to control the people as by choosing which stories to let the public read, the Nazi regime was able to maintain popular support and subsequently control the population further as they trusted the state to act in their best interests. This therefore supports the argument that censorship <sup>may have been</sup> ~~was~~ the most effective method used to control the people in the years 1933-45 as it guaranteed popular support in the early years of the regime while attempting to keep morale high through the war years, maintaining authority for the Nazis over the German people.

However, as previously explained, the Nazis had other successful strategies by which they ~~maintained~~ kept control over the people in the years 1933-45, limiting the extent perhaps to which censorship was the most effective method in achieving this. One such other method was the repression and terror undertaken by the Nazis. Firstly, to maintain stability after rising to power in January 1933, the regime deployed vast numbers of SA thugs to intimidate opposition and keep control. From Goering, as minister for the interior, deploying 50,000 SA as auxiliary police in Prussia to their presence at key elections and parliament meetings, such as that to pass the enabling act in March



(Section A continued) 1933, the Nazis use of repression and terror was very effective at controlling the people. Whilst censorship may have made citizens more likely to support the regime, repression and terror by the SA and subsequently the SS ~~§~~ and Gestapo through the war years forced their submission and arguably prevented any libelous opposition to arise. This ~~was~~<sup>was</sup> therefore clearly an effective method used by the Nazis to control the people in the years 1933-45.

Propaganda and indoctrination was another effective way in which the Nazis succeeded in maintaining authority over the German people in the years 1933-45. By constantly exposing the populous, specifically the youth, to positive attitudes towards the regime and their ideologies, the people were made almost oblivious of the oppressive society they had become a part of, allowing the Nazis to keep control over the ~~the~~ German people throughout this time period. One of the ~~the~~<sup>most successful</sup> propaganda campaigns organized by minister for propaganda, Joseph Goebbels, was the Hitler myth. By portraying the Führer as an almost "God-like" figure enabled the Nazis to gain the trust of people, tightening their control over them. With ~~many~~<sup>most</sup> of the population believing Hitler to understand their problems and know how to solve them, the regime could get away with introducing more and more ~~repressive~~ oppressive measures. From the ~~actions~~<sup>violence</sup> during the Night of the Long Knives in June 1934, ~~where~~<sup>where</sup> over 1000 arrests were made in addition to 85 deaths; to the <sup>cumulative</sup> radicalization of anti-semitic policy from 1935-1945, the Nazis faced little opposition from the German people as they, for the most part, arguably turned a "blind-eye" as they trusted that Hitler was acting in their best interests. This therefore suggests that propaganda and



(Section A continued) indoctrination played an importantly successful role in the ~~real~~ control of the people in the years 1933-45, limiting the extent to which Nazi censorship was the most effective method of achieving this authority.

In conclusion, the extent to which Nazi censorship was the most effective method used to control the people during the years 1933-45 is limited. Instead, it is more persuasive an argument that the extent to which each factor evaluated previously was the most effective method changed ~~there~~ throughout the time period. At the beginning of the regime, specifically 1933-34, it is arguably repression and terror which was the most successful method ~~and~~ of controlling the people. As seen by the aggression displayed against the KPD and SPD during the enabling act vote and in Prussia to route out opposition, this was required to prevent the people overturning the regime, striking fear into anyone ~~else~~ who dared to disagree. However, from 1934-39, propaganda and indoctrination played a much greater part, gaining the trust of the people in order to gain tighter control over them. Finally, in the war years of 1939-45, it was in fact censorship that was arguably the most effective method used to control the people. By not allowing the publishing of articles on military defeats, morale remained high and questions were not asked of the state. Therefore, Nazi censorship ~~was~~ convincingly the most effective method used to control the people from 1939-45 but from 1933-39, it's extent is limited by the successful ~~of~~ nature of the repression and propaganda used to maintain support for the regime and strike terror into it's opponents, allowing the Nazis to keep authority over the German people.



This response is from one of the more successful candidates. The stated factor of censorship is dealt with well, and when combined with the treatment of other factors this analysis becomes sustained. Knowledge is very good and the evidence is well selected. The process of reasoned discussion provides the criteria by which a judgement can be made, and this is particularly well deployed in the conclusion. This response was awarded level 5, 20 marks.

### Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates to consider how far the economic policies of the Nazi regime were remarkably similar to those of the FRG. This proved to be a challenging question that led most candidates attempting it to highlight the differences, most focused on the differences between a command and a social market economy. At the top end candidates did establish key areas of similarity in both regimes seeking to address initial crisis, support heavy industry and adopt strategies to increase exports. Within these broad areas of similarity successful candidates could draw out differences too. Mid-range candidates tended to offer good analysis of differences, and at the bottom end these were asserted in the main.

I don't agree with the statement that the economic policies of the Nazi regime were similar to that of the FRG. ~~Despite the fact~~ It could be argued that their economic policies were similar as they both had to try and fix their economy as they were both in bad situations in 1933 and in ~~1948~~ 1949 due to the ~~loss of~~ Wall street crash and the loss of the second world war. However apart from this the economic policies of the Nazis and the FRG differ greatly for several reasons. The first being that when the Nazis were in control they established a command economy whereas in the FRG under Adenauer established a social market economy. Secondly the Nazi economy was firstly based on achieving autarky, and then on preparing for war whereas the FRG was focused on rebuilding and becoming a strong power in Europe again.

Firstly, I do not agree with this statement that the economic policies of the Nazi regime and

(Section B continued)

the FRG were remarkably similar because of the type of economy they put in place. In 1933 the Nazis established a command economy, where the government dictates what factories and companies should produce and sell. ~~The Nazis first wanted to~~ This is because Hitler had a set plan which he outlined in the Nazis two 4-Year Plans which were to achieve autarky so that Germany didn't have to rely on other countries resources and become self-sufficient. The FRG on the other hand under established a social market economy which effectively allows the companies and businesses to produce and sell what they wanted without interference from the government. ~~Unlike the Nazis who wanted to be in total~~ ~~of the control of what they were producing.~~ This is completely different to the approach of the Nazis who had complete control over businesses and agriculture in order to achieve their aims which leads into the second point.

Not only were their approaches different but so were their aims. Within they wanted to achieve through the economy. Although they both wanted to improve their economy, the Nazis aim of autarky through ~~setting production targets~~ is the four-year

(Section B continued) plus by setting production targets in order for factories and farms to produce as much as possible ~~as was~~ in order to achieve self-sufficiency so that Germany were able to go to war by 1943, which Hitler stated was his aim in the Hossbach conference in 1937. The FRG on the other hand were more focused on economic recovery and having a stable economy, again rather than improving their economy with the intention of going to war. ~~However it could be argued that either way, both were trying to improve~~ In addition to this Germany, war the FRG were not allowed to rearm as part of the agreement made at the end of the second world war so instead of ~~improving their military~~, were ~~forced~~ <sup>allowed</sup> to sell or use they were able to sell off raw materials ~~to others~~ which were necessary to make weapons to others, such as during the Korean War, which contributed towards the economic miracle of 1950s. The Nazis on the other hand had no intention of selling ~~the~~ <sup>raw</sup> ~~materials~~ <sup>or</sup> materials to others, solely focusing on rearming themselves.

Despite these points it could be argued that the economic policies of the Nazi regime and the FRG were quite similar as ~~they both need~~ their



(Section B continued)

economies were both in poor situations when they first took control in 1933 and 1949 respectively. The Nazi economy was needing to be improved as a result of the Wall Street Crash in 1929 as however the situation was slightly improved thanks to the work of Brüning prior to the Nazi regime who had worsened the German economy to a state where they were convinced the allies that Germany were unable to pay the reparations for the Treaty of Versailles. Despite this the aim of the Nazis was in terms of economic policies was to improve it to a stable state again. The FRG was also in a similar situation in 1949 as they the German economy was in a poor state due to damage of factories during the bombing by the allies and war reparations. So both the Nazis and the FRG had similar economic goals at the start of ~~the~~ their regime.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 4 response. The candidate does not dismiss the issue of similarities between the economic policies of the two regimes but offers little apart from the argument that there was not much similarity. This is a fair point at a general level. The differences are clearly highlighted and dealt with quite well. There is enough knowledge deployed to sustain the analysis offered. The response is well organised around the focus of the question and there is a clear judgement made. This response was awarded level 4, 16 marks.



When tackling a similarity/difference question remember there are similarities with subtle differences and differences with subtle similarities. Stark differences or similarities can be used first but be prepared to dig into the evidence.



On the outset of these two periods of German history, it is possible to claim that Nazi Germany and the FRG had a lot in common. Both had to find a way to recover from a crisis: the former the Great Depression, the latter the devastation of WWII. However, the two economies approached this task with differing ~~out~~ policies. Nazi Germany focused on decreasing unemployment through labour schemes such as the DAF and

(Section B continued) through freeing up jobs by pushing women and Jews out of their positions, notably through the April 1933 Act on the civil service and the June 1933 Act to Reduce Unemployment. Subsequently, the DAF and other public works schemes <sup>such as the Reinhardt Scheme</sup> gave workers minimal pay, attempting to reduce government deficit while also stimulating production. The FRG may initially have seemed similar as people, largely women, were enlisted to clear rubble from cities and get the economy moving again, but quickly moved to another way to stimulate the economy; currency reform. The conversion from RM to DM <sup>in 1948</sup> wrote off 90% of debt while the gift of 60 DM to all citizens as well as the 1:1 wage conversion rate led to a huge increase in both productivity and demand, clearly following the Keynesian approach to the economy. Through these examples, the differences in their policies are clear.

Another area where the economies of Nazi Germany and the FRG ~~are~~ can be compared is the outlook towards worker

(Section B continued)

welfare, though the similarities do not stretch particularly far. Strength Through Joy by the Nazis can potentially be compared to the idea of the FRG's social market economy, as both aimed to improve the lives of people. However, it can be argued that the state subsidised activities and holidays are more a social policy for controlling the workforce than welfare provision aimed at making sure everyone is secure, exemplified by the 1957 Pensions Act under the FRG. The economic policies of the Nazis can barely be compared to the FRG's social market economy, as the Nazi economy focused more heavily on rearmament, preparation for war, and autarky, shown by Schacht's New Plan and Goering's Four Year Plan, and later Germany had a total war economy under Speer. This cannot really be compared to the FRG economy that was not gearing up for war at any point 1948-1949-89. Therefore, it is clear here also that the Nazi and FRG economic policies were largely not similar.

One area where there are a few small similarities



(Section B continued) between the Nazi and FRG economies is the reaction to nearing full employment. While unemployment was at 6 million in 1932, it was down to barely 34,000 in 1939. A similar employment situation was evident in the FRG by 1955 and especially from 1961. The effect of recovery was a depletion of available workforce, and the policy response of both was relatively similar: turning to foreign workers. This allowed German industry to keep expanding until it reached full capacity. The methods to obtain foreign work-expansion by the Nazis and recruitment of Gastarbeiter in the FRG - is different, but the policy is arguably similar. Due to this, it is possible to argue that there was a similarity in economic policies between the FRG and Nazi Germany when it came to full employment.



This is an extract from a secure level 5 response. The candidate is able to look at areas of similarity and is prepared to discuss the evidence, subjecting it to analysis and evaluation. This is good historical writing where the candidate is keeping a tight focus on the question, selecting good detailed evidence and weighing it effectively. This response was awarded level 5, 20 marks.

## Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider the extent to which the role and status of women changed in the years 1939-89. This was the more popular question in section B. At the top end candidates did distinguish the role and status of women and kept a tight focus on the second order concept of change and continuity. It was good to see candidates well prepared to discuss the changing role of women in the war years contrasted with a continuity in their status. In the mid-range candidates often spent some time on the pre-1939 Nazi regime and were often unable to pay heed to the demands of the time frame in the question. This tendency was more evident among the less successful candidates who offered a description of the Nazi attitude to women compared to the rights granted by the Basic Law.

~~In both the Nazi period during the war (1939-1945) and the FRG period (1945-1989), economic policies were a key focus. To some extent, the aims of both regimes were different as the Nazis were ultimately gearing for war, unlike the FRG. Likewise, in terms of business and agriculture~~

To some extent, the role and status of women generally changed in the years 1939-1989. In terms of employment, women played a key role in a number of industries as war broke out in September 1939. Likewise women's domestic life did to a large extent alter as women were given more value and status during the FRG period. Lastly, in terms of Organisations and Awards, women's role and status to some degree change as their role within society was more acknowledged under the FRG period.

(Section B continued) In terms of employment, women's lives to some extent did change from the Nazi period (during the war, 1939-1945) and the FRG period (1945-1989). Under the Nazis, women's roles were valued as war broke out in September 1939. This caused men to leave for war and women to fill ~~the~~ men's occupations. For instance, industries needed women to operate specific services within factories and organise well ~~where~~ how routines would take place. Despite this, women's roles were still considered less valuable than men's roles. ~~The~~ Women were paid by 10% less for doing men's jobs during the ~~Nazi~~ Nazi regime, throughout war. But under the FRG, Adenauer introduced ~~laws~~ <sup>policies</sup> which ultimately appreciated the

role and status of women even more. In general, attitudes ~~were~~ remained similar but in reality in terms of employment, women were given a wider range of opportunities under the FRG. Therefore, to some extent in regards to employment, women's ~~role~~ ~~given~~ ~~role~~ and status did change.

Women's domestic life significantly changed from the Nazi period to the FRG period. Under the Nazis during the war, there was still the expectancy ~~of~~ of Kinde Küche Kirche, which ultimately meant



(Section B continued) women were more seen to be favourable by staying at home and taking care of their families. However, under the FRG, this ultimately changed. Attitudes towards women meant they weren't expected to stay at home and look after their families. Women under the FRG to a great extent therefore had a change in their role and status as they were seen to ~~be~~ have the same capabilities as men under the FRG. Thus in regards to ~~the~~ domestic life, women's role and status of women did to a large degree alter. ~~Women~~

~~Women~~ Women were also given awards (medals) under the Nazis to mothers who had 6 or more children, however this wasn't the case ~~for~~ under the FRG. Strength Through Joy campaigns also gave women greater maternity leave and holiday time. Thus the change in the role and status of women did to some extent change in terms of awards and organisations.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response illustrates level 3 for this question. The candidate attempts analysis on some key issues but there are also some descriptive passages. The knowledge used is generally accurate although there is not enough range or depth to access level 4. Judgements are embedded in the essay but these are weakly substantiated. This response was awarded level 3, 12 marks.





When answering a question in Section B always pay respect to the time frame that the question gives. Aim to offer evidence across the time frame and this can give a much better focus on change and continuity and allow you to make secure judgements.

Between 1939 and 1989, the role of women can be said to have changed noticeably. <sup>would say that</sup> I ~~agree~~ to a limited extent however, that the role of women did change between 1939 and 1989. Throughout the period of 1939 to 1989, the women of Germany experienced two ~~a~~ very different governments meaning that in earlier years, the woman was seen as only the mother / the center of the men and family. The further through the time period you go or the deeper into the FRG, the more the role seems to have changed when assessing policies and reform. However, these ~~init~~ changes in all aspects of the women's role between 1939 and 1989 and the changes can be said to be in some places to a large extent, a minimal extent and to no extent. Large extent mainly addressed the status of women however, the ~~small~~ minimal extent or no extent focuses mostly on the role of women.

¶ Between the years 1939 - 1989, the role of women did change to a large extent. These large changes are seen when assessing the role of women in the field of work. During the Nazi period of 1939-1945, women worked minimally and were only required to put 6 months of work in the agriculture before she could retire and return to her role as the mother / caregiver. This

(Section B continued) drastically changed ~~the~~ however inside the FRG when the number of women to men representatives in the Bundestag increased. In 1962, 5.8% of the Bundestag were female, this shows not only a large amount of progress for the period and where a woman's role could never be in politics, but also that there is a change in the acceptability of women doing white collar work. More importantly, there is a clearly large extent to the change of the role and status of women as by 1987, there were 15.2% of women in the Bundestag. This is significant as it shows the progression of the status of a woman being greater and that their role as solely the mother and carer has changed drastically. Additionally, in the late 1970's, the feminist movements ~~present~~ present in the FRG caused the successful passing of the abortion law. This law acted as a large change to <sup>the</sup> the role of women in between 1932 and 1989 as the women were no longer seen as being useful for reproduction. The law granted women the ability to abort up to 12 weeks after fertilisation and this greatly changed the role of women in society whilst also empowering the women to be more decisive and independent about their status. ~~By~~ Despite this however, the change was as drastic as that of other European countries meaning German women were still largely behind. Furthermore, the potentially most significant large change seen to the status of women between <sup>1932</sup> ~~1932~~ and 1989 was the introduction of the 1952 'Article 3'. Article 3 was set out by Adenauer's FRG to establish equal pay and working conditions for all women. ~~Thus~~ This shows that there was a large extent of change in women's position between 1932 and 1989 as they were progressing being seen as equal to men. Despite this however, there was only a

(Section B continued) Small handful of businesses that followed through with Article 3, and women were still mistreated in the workplace.

On the other hand, the role of women and their status can be seen to have only changed minimally between 1939 and 1989. This can be seen again in Article 3 or by 1954, on average, the women workers still earned 35% less than their male counterpart for the same job. This shows that these were policies put in place that would have been significant but due to the government of the FRG not enforcing them, these policies only improved women's status to a certain extent. Additionally, it can be said that the change to the status of women only improved to a limited extent as the 1939 to 1945 era of the Nazis saw women working jobs similarly to the FRG. Furthermore, women generally still were given lower end jobs in the FRG like such as working as a cleaner or shop assistant. This meant that the status of women didn't change drastically and that there were very minimal improvements from agricultural work to higher end jobs. This can be seen in the number of women university lectures in 1981. In 1981, only 5% of all lecturers were women and this figure had only increased by 2% since 1971.

Furthering this, between 1939 and 1989 there can be said to have been no extent of change to the role and status of the

(Section B continued) German women. This can be seen by a survey conducted by the National government (FRG) which enquired into the role of women in the place of work. The survey was set to test men and women and the results showed that 70% of people in Germany at the time believed that men should be at work and women should be caring for others at home. This shows no real change to the <sup>status</sup> of women throughout the period and that many believed a women's role was still that of a carer. This shows no improvement since 1939 where women at the time were reluctant to work, mostly and preferred to ~~stay~~ <sup>stay</sup> be at home. Additionally, it can be said that the <sup>status</sup> role of women changed to no extent between 1939-1989 when assessing the need for women in the workplace. During the 1939-1945 era, women were only in the workplace when it was stated as ~~to~~ essential. Furthermore, in ~~the~~ <sup>1961</sup> era when 3 million men moved from manual labour to white collar jobs, instead of filling the 2.8 million jobs with women, the FRG applied 'guest workers' from the FRG in the role. This showed that even after all ~~the~~ policies putted to equalise men and women, there was still no extent to the change of women's role and status.

In conclusion, the extent at which the role and status of women changed between ~~the~~ 1939-1989 changed vastly. There was no extent of change when assessing women's position in the workplace throughout the time due to the rejection of women in most manual jobs. Additionally, it could be argued that women's role improved to a minimal extent when assessing the ~~role~~ <sup>rather</sup> mildly positive outcomes.



(Section B continued) of the Article 3 and the number of women in work between 1939 and 1989. However, aspects the extent of change to the status and role of women was mostly to a large extent as seen through the higher freedom levels seen in the abortion act being passed and the number of women in higher end jobs (such as the Bundestag) showed by the 15.2% of women in parliament in 1987.



This is a secure level 5 response. The candidate clearly has very good knowledge of the subject and offers telling evidence that can be used in coming to a judgement. The analysis is focussed on the second order concept of change and continuity and the method of dealing first with change and then continuity is valid. The evidence makes the case for this candidate and the examiner judged that more discussion would have helped the evaluations. This response was awarded level 5, 18 marks.

## **Question 5**

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider whether Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939 because he thought that the western powers would not intervene. This question is, as last year, the one which caused some of the candidates the most problems. A number unwisely spent too long on the AO1 questions and were either unable to complete their answers or rushed them. Nevertheless, very many were well versed in the question of different interpretations of the reasons Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939. The best responses were able to point out both the strengths and weaknesses of each argument and deployed considerable knowledge to justify their preference for one or other interpretation. In the mid-range own knowledge was not well integrated with the extracts. Often these candidates felt the need to validate points within the extracts. At the bottom end a few candidates continue to use inappropriate analyses of date, origin and purpose of each of the authors to justify their preference.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939 because he thought that the Western powers would not intervene?

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

(20)

The ~~debate~~ question of what Hitler truly intended (and expected) when he invaded Poland has been the subject of much debate. ~~Some like Karl Dietrich Bracher,~~  
~~but~~ Karl Dietrich Bracher argues that Hitler believed the guarantee of defence from Britain and France to Poland ~~to be~~ Karl Dietrich Bracher argues that Hitler believed the Western powers would not intervene and would instead opt to appease him; Carolin Craig, on the other hand, takes the view that Hitler intended war and did not care if the Allies intervened or not. Both <sup>also</sup> suggest alternate reasons for the invasion; among them, pursuit of 'Lebensraum' and a desire to revise the Treaty of Versailles. While both historians make convincing points, Hitler's ultimate decision to invade Poland was probably the result of numerous intertwined factors, among them the belief that the Allies would not intervene.

Bracher plainly states that the guarantee of defence from Britain and France to Poland was perceived by Hitler to be "pure bluff" while Craig maintains that

Hitler was "not surprised" by Britain and France's declaration of war in September 1939. Both make convincing arguments ~~for~~ with regards to Hitler's beliefs concerning the invasion of Poland. Bracher's view is supported by the fact that ~~the~~ France, despite having made a similar pledge to defend Czechoslovakia, had failed to honour it; in Hitler's view, why would Poland be any different? ~~Thus unlike~~ Britain also rejected a Polish request for rearmament in Spring 1934, and despite "produc[ing] armaments on a greater scale" was in no way prepared for a major war in the imminent future. Besides, Craig maintains that Ribbentrop ~~was~~ "was of course merely reflecting the thoughts of Hitler," ~~and suggests~~ ~~that~~ indicating the foreign minister's level of closeness to the Führer (and thus influence over him). Ribbentrop believed that ~~the British~~ Britain was "spineless and decadent" (Richard Overy, who agrees with Bracher on Hitler's beliefs concerning the Allies' reaction). The anglophobic influence of Ribbentrop, <sup>and others</sup> arguably convinced Hitler that Britain and France would continue to appease him (as Bracher points out) rather than risk war. ~~Besides~~ There is most certainly a significant degree of evidence supporting Hitler's belief that the Allies would not defend Poland, arguably more so than for the contrary.

On that note, Craig's argument that Hitler was set on war and deliberately attempted to provoke one



by invading Poland has some merit. The Nazi-Soviet Pact which "struck the Western capitals with the force of a thunderbolt" may have emboldened Hitler to the extent that he believed the time was right, ~~as~~ with his eastern border secured no risk of a war on two fronts, to take on the West and win. Bracher broadly agrees with Craig's assessment that Hitler's ultimate aims were war: he tells us that to Hitler, Poland "was only an excuse for further expansion". Hitler, as Craig argues, drew his legitimacy from military success (war and expansion were fundamental to Nazism) and thus, "no triumph seemed satisfactory to Hitler unless it involved devastating military force". Both Craig and Bracher suggest that Hitler was considerably both opportunistic; the former states that Hitler was not sure how the Allies would react but welcomed the possibility of war; ~~whereas~~ Bracher similarly views Hitler's belief that the Allies would not react as "optimistic" (implying a substantial possibility of the opposite occurring). This ~~counter~~ undermines the argument that Hitler invaded Poland deliberately to start a war with the Allies (and is thus less credible than the <sup>view</sup> ~~belief~~ that Hitler miscalculated the Allies' intentions). It is more likely that Hitler was aware of all possibilities but took a gamble nonetheless.



The influence of key Nazi foreign policy aims such as Lebensraum ideas and the effects of the Treaty of Versailles were also significant in determining Hitler's motives for invading Poland. Bracher mentions Hitler announcing that "the Danzig question had to be solved"; Danzig, a <sup>Baltic</sup> port with a 96% German population in 1914, had been removed from Germany's ~~own~~ territories ~~and~~ by Versailles and declared a 'neutral' city under the jurisdiction of the League of Nations. In addition, 800,000 Germans found themselves within Polish borders after the redrawing of Europe's boundaries (with East Prussia cut off from the rest of Germany by the Polish Corridor, through which Hitler "demanded a passageway" according to Bracher). Hitler, as Bracher tells us, ~~demanded~~ was able to claim legitimate grounds for retaking Polish territory. However, the concept of Lebensraum (a 19th century phenomenon encompassing ideas of race, autarky and expansionism) was much more important in determining Hitler's reasons for invading Poland. Craig ~~Belton~~ posits that in Hitler's view, destroying the Western Allies would "clear the way for the greater war against Russia that would fulfil Germany's destiny" while Bracher argues that Hitler demanded (to his "top military leaders") that his "real motives" for invading Poland were "Lebensraum and achieving a guaranteed food supply for Germany". Such

an autarkic goal, in Hitler's opinion, could only be achieved by a "war of plunder" (Beute) that would seize the rich resources of Eastern Europe to guarantee a food supply for Germany and 'living space' for the 'Aryan' people. Craig's point links about into Hitler's ~~idea~~ 'Weltanschauung' (personal worldview); in his 'Stufenplan', a vague stage-by-stage plan his 'secret book' (published after his death), he discusses his ultimate goals in foreign policy: first dismantling the Versailles Treaty and war with the Western Allies, then the inevitable war against the moral rot of communism (represented by the USSR). It is indoubtable that these core ideas of Lebensraum and revising Versailles were significant in the invasion of Poland, but arguably less so than Hitler's conceptions of how the Allies would react (due to the difference between short and long-term aims).



This response illustrates level 5 qualities. The candidate has a comprehensive understanding of the controversy and confidently analyses the extracts in terms of their interpretations, rather than the information they contain. The quality of the interpretations is the central focus for this candidate and own knowledge is integrated with the extracts successfully. But for a weak conclusion this response would have been given full marks. It was awarded level 5, 18 marks.



Historians love argument. Historians can agree on the evidence and acknowledge common historical facts, but interpreting the evidence involves argument. Historical argument is therefore what historians do. Of course this requires good knowledge of the subject to so that the argument is anchored on evidence, but then the fun begins. The candidates that do well on Section C questions enjoy the discussion. Imagine that you are in a discussion with the authors of the extracts. Bounce their arguments off each other and help them out with your own knowledge and criticism. Then you offer a judgement on the debate over all. Learning technique and the appropriate language is important, but make it blossom with a good discussion. Don't forget - examiners are historians too - and we love a good controversy.

Extract, I argue that Hitler "did not believe" the guarantee that Chamberlain had made regarding any potential invasion of Poland, and makes several legitimate points to back



up this assessment. Most importantly, it states that he believed this guarantee was "pure bluff". I feel this is an accurate statement, as Hitler likely felt emboldened by the inaction of the League of Nations during the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 and the German remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936. The confidence that the western powers would not respond is likely a reason why he chose to invade Poland. In a similar way, the ~~same~~ <sup>text</sup> states that Hitler "still wanted appeasement" from the Western Powers. I am aware that Hitler was satisfied by his obtainment of the Sudetenland at the Munich Conference in 1938 - a deal brokered by the Western powers. To Hitler, this would've suggested that he could've easily continued occupying countries like Poland through diplomacy over war. The extract further points out that Hitler invaded Poland with the intention of revising the "terms set out in the Treaty of Versailles", and therefore not expecting any reply from the allies. This argument makes sense, as even the Weimar government were able to repeal some aspects of the Treaty of Versailles (such as a suspension of payments in 1932) without repercussions. More than this, Hitler had been able to go through the "Anglo-German naval agreement", which broke the terms of the Treaty and even publicly announce rearmament and conscription in March 1935, without any particular response from the allies. Overall,

Therefore I would agree with the ~~source~~ extract's assessment that Hitler was likely emboldened to invade Poland by the inaction of ~~the~~ the Western powers previously.

→ • he was "not surprised"

Extract 2 makes the argument that Hitler had realised the invasion of Poland would result in war and suspected that the British and French governments were likely to respond. The ~~source~~ extract certainly does make some accurate points, reminding us most significantly that the Nazi-Soviet Pact included provisions for the "next phase of his eastern plan". I am aware that the Nazi-Soviet Pact did contain a secret clause that set out an invasion of Poland by Germany and the USSR. Hitler must've been aware this would lead to large-scale international conflict. Furthermore, it is pointed out that Hitler's eastern expansion to Poland would partly <sup>→</sup> and then Russia would "salvage Germany's destiny". The idea of eastward expansion was an integral part of Nazi ideology, with Hitler believing that it was important for Lebensraum, as well as for the removal of inferior Slavic and Jewish races from Europe. The ~~source~~ <sup>extract</sup> is therefore suggestive that Hitler inevitably ~~was~~ anticipated war at some point. It goes on to suggest that Hitler had "calculated that, if Western states intervened, it would give him opportunity to destroy them". I don't believe that Hitler had the intention of war with western states, as this source



suggests, because according to Hitler's own ideology, Britains and French were not necessarily classified as inferior races. Furthermore, I would dispute the point the extract makes when it states that Hitler was "not surprised" with the decision of the British and French to go to war. I believe that Hitler's Four Year Plan, which logically dictates that Germany should be war ready by 1940, negates the idea that he wanted to go to war in 1939. ~~Further~~ <sup>in addition</sup> ~~Hitler had not~~ in almost all areas apart from explosives and coal, Germany had failed to meet its goals for the plan, which also suggests that Hitler would not want war in 1939. Overall, I would agree with some of the points made in this ~~extract~~ extract, but disagree with the general argument that Hitler wanted war with the Western powers, and knew they were going to intervene.

In conclusion, I would side more with the view expressed in extract 1 that, while Hitler did have the goals of eastward expansion and overturning the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, he did not expect the Western powers to intervene. This is backed up by the evidence of previous Western inaction and appeasement. ~~Shame~~ <sup>Shame</sup> through Hitler's rearmament announcement, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and his occupation of the Sudetenland. ~~Extract 2~~ Extract 2 does make some good points, - that Hitler's

invasion of Poland fit squarely into his policy of eastward expansion, and that the Nazi-Soviet Pact suggested goals more in line with a World War. However, I do not agree with its assessment that Hitler expected Western powers to intervene, as economic evidence shows that Germany would've only really been prepared for war in the 1940s, and previous policies of the West had likely given Hitler confidence.



This is from a response by one of the more successful candidates and is a secure level 4 response. The candidate demonstrates understanding of the extracts, and analyses issues of interpretation. Own knowledge is deployed to both develop and criticise the extracts. The extract analysis covers most of the relevant points and evaluations are secure. This response was awarded level 4, 16 marks.



- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939 because he thought that the Western powers would not intervene?

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

(20)

In extract 1, Bracher describes Hitler as 'optimistic' and claims he had every reason to be. The source implies that not only did Hitler think that the guarantee to Poland was 'pure bluff', but that the guarantee was potentially not even given. Bracher suggests that Hitler was confident and willing to take a risk to get the land he believed Germany was owed after the Treaty of Versailles and advance on his plan for living space in Russia as mentioned in Mein Kampf. Hitler had managed to invade Austria, Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia without any intervention from the Western powers such as Britain and France. As stated by Bracher, he had every reason to be optimistic because other countries

hadn't got involved before so he didn't see why they would now. It was also clear that Hitler was not aware that the western powers had been producing armaments and preparing for war, hence when Britain and France declared war on Germany in 1939, it came as a shock to Hitler.

✿

Alternatively in extract 2, Craig describes Hitler as an impulsive dictator ~~that~~ <sup>who</sup> only wanted an outcome of war. The quote 'we want war' supposedly came from Hitler, which reinforces the phrase 'no triumph seemed satisfactory to Hitler unless it involved devastating military force'. This extract suggests that Hitler was prepared for war and expected the western powers to intervene. ✿ The phrase 'clear the way for the greater war against Russia that would fulfil Germany's destiny' supports his writings in Mein Kampf about defeating Russia and the western states and creating living

space for the German people. Craig states that 'Hitler was not surprised when British and French governments responded, declaring war on Germany' which would support the concept of advancing forward to Russia.

Extracts 1 and 2 provide contrasting views on why Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 and what outcomes he expected. Where extract 1 portrays him as an opportunist who thrived on the fact that the Western powers had not intervened in his previous invasions, extract 2 describes him to have wanted war all along and for his invasions to have led to war anyway. Extract 1 implies that Hitler was not expecting the Western powers, nor Poland to be as prepared for the invasion as he was, if there was ever a ~~go~~ guarantee set by Chamberlain in the first place. Alternatively, extract 2 enlightens me with the idea that Hitler knew that Britain and France had been

preparing for war as much as he had and was ~~ready~~ ready to fight.

From my own knowledge, Hitler went against Anschluss and invaded Austria when he invaded Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia in the years prior to that, the land was easy to take. When Hitler took and demilitarised the Rhineland too he believed he could invade any country and be successful.

~~My view~~

I find the view that Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939 because he did not think the Western powers would intervene, convincing to a certain extent. I agree with extract 1 because I believe that Hitler was an opportunist and would not have even invaded other countries such as Austria and Czechoslovakia if Britain and France had declared war on Germany in the first place. I think that because Hitler had got away with invading and claiming other countries without any other intervention, he believed he



could take a risk and have the same success again. I also agree with extract 2 to some extent because I believe that part of Hitler knew that the Western powers would be prepared in case they were ever invaded. I think that both extracts show that Hitler thrived off of his successes and made irrational decisions based on his own expected ability.



This is an example of a response in level 4, but which falls short of the full descriptor for this level. The candidate both understands the interpretations in the extracts and compares them to a limited extent. Own knowledge is used to develop the idea that the appeasement of Hitler led him to believe he could invade Poland with impunity. The candidate goes about the answer in the right way but there is little discussion of the opposing interpretations. This response was awarded level 4, 14 marks.

# Paper Summary

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

## Section A/B responses:

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

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

Common issues which hindered performance:

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

## Section C responses

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification

- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

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

## Grade Boundaries

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

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





