



Examiners' Report

June 2019

GCE History 9HI0 37

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 or 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.



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. 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.

June 2019

Publications Code 9HI0_37_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates continue to be able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 37 which deals with The changing nature of warfare, 1859-1991 (37.1) and Germany, 1871-1990: united, divided and reunited.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1). Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated this summer. Examiners continued to comment on the fact that a significant minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is pleasing to note that last summer's advice was taken on board by many candidates and there were fewer examples this summer of candidates suggesting that weight can be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. This summer there was some evidence of more candidates using often extensive contextual knowledge to drive an answer to the enquiry, rather than using it to illuminate and discuss the source. This resulted in candidates not dealing with the source adequately.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. However, it continues to be the case that weaker candidates often wanted to turn questions into a main factor/other factors approach, even where this was not appropriate to the focus of the question. Candidates should 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, most candidates were able to engage with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. This is a breadth question and the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded again that this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at Level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any Section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at Level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology.

In both Sections B and C when dealing with AO1, not all candidates demonstrated a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of

reaching that judgement. There was some tendency this summer, in all sections of the paper, for some candidates to replicate the words and phrases of the mark scheme in their responses. It is the application of the requirements of the mark scheme that is crucial.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

A source question focused on the qualities of Von Moltke as a commander and the contribution made by technology in the wars of 1866 and 1870. Stronger candidates recognised the link between the two enquiries.

Most candidates made use of the attribution in developing their evaluation and engaged with the source to identify a range of key points, eg Von Moltke's stress on the importance of effective training to equip commanders for the rapidly changing nature of warfare.

There was much effective deployment of contextual knowledge to facilitate substantial answers, eg the development of the railway and the telegraph.

Question 2

A mainstream source question on Bismarck's attitude to the Reichstag and the political problems he faced.

The majority of candidates rooted their responses in the source and identified and illustrated a range of points which indicated Bismarck's attitude to the Reichstag.

Most candidates also deployed contextual knowledge to emphasise the political challenges inherent in governing in a multi part state and the underlying apprehensions about the rise of Socialist politics.

An inference from the source that can be made about the problems that Bismarck faced politically would be that he felt the National Liberals had run their course and that he sought new political allies. This can be inferred by constant reference to actions undertaken by the National Liberals, such as the attempt to 'persuade the German government' and 'dictate policy'. This inference would hold weight, because it is clear that Bismarck in 1879 favoured economic policies such as 'protectionism', a more conservative concept in which tariffs are established on foreign imports to help protect the German domestic market, something which the National Liberals opposed in their desire for free trade. It is also true that Bismarck would believe the use of 'correct policies', because of his desire to establish Germany in Europe ~~and~~ (as shown by treaties with Austria and Russia) and instill a sense of national feeling in Germany, as shown by the pursuit of the Kulturkampf. When Bismarck revealed these ambitions, it was only a natural reaction for the dominant National Liberals to push back against this by asserting authority in the Reichstag. As a result, Bismarck would later leave the National Liberals, causing a split in the party and as a result the Conservatives. The source, which reports on the speech roughly 10 days after Bismarck's speech, would ultimately hold of good provenance as it is directly referencing and quoting what Bismarck says and ~~the source~~ has the sole purpose to inform, and therefore would provide an accurate view on what problems Bismarck faced politically, especially in regard to

his search for a new party after opposition from the National Liberals. Therefore, the source holds a good value in this regard due to its accuracy upon interrogation of the points made.

In regard to Bismarck's view on the Reichstag, it can be inferred that he believed the Reichstag was not being used effectively to combat issues that posed a threat to the state. In inferring this, phrases like 'left isolated' when speaking in regard to the battle against the rise of socialism in industrial workers are used. Furthermore, Bismarck quotes that politics must 'act in the interest of the State' which suggests that he believes opposition in the Reichstag was too great for him to implement his policies. This inference also holds relative weight; although an anti-socialist bill was passed in 1878, restricting socialist propaganda e.g. through banning 45/47 socialist newspapers, there would still be a rise in voting for socialist parties in government, ~~erect~~ undermining the traditional influence and power of the Prussian Junker class.

Due to the lack of momentum for the anti-socialist movement, which Bismarck references, it is clear that he does not see the Reichstag as fully functional due to this as his wishes and demands as head of the 'government of state' were not met. This also gives valid reason as to why government ~~was~~ ^{was} be asked to 'limit its own authority' and that a more direct form of government through the coronator will be pursued. Therefore, the source again holds significant weight in establishing Bismarck's views on the Reichstag as a body that is limited in its function or ~~is~~ implementing Bismarck's nationalistic, anti-socialist policies.

The source, as a newspaper designed only to inform, represents this view neutrally and clearly, ~~showing~~ meaning that an accurate representation of Bismarck's thought and ideologies can be produced.

~~The~~ A final inference that can be made for political problems facing Bismarck is that he was being labelled as an almost domineering absolutist, rather than just the Chancellor that he was. This can be seen through ^{him having done} ~~it~~ his ~~desire~~ or sacrificing correct policies for 'political advantage' and the fact he 'asserted' he never used his military prestige to gain advantage. In this, if Bismarck is clearly being to defend himself as for his actions to suspend the Reichstag as it is clear from the public and opposition questioned his tactics. It is true that ~~may perhaps~~ why he had the full support of the Kaiser and those greater influence, however this inference truly doesn't hold weight, as shown by his dismissal in the 1890s the next decade.

Overall, the source is extremely valuable in assessing the attitude of Bismarck towards the Reichstag and the political problems he faced. This is due to it being a direct report of his speech which would naturally reflect his views of the Reichstag as a fading body and the political problems he believed he faced. Therefore, the value of the source is great.



The response engages with the source and identifies and illustrates points relevant to both enquiries. There is some effective deployment of contextual knowledge, eg Bismarck's reaction to what he regarded as the threat from Socialism.

There is some basic evaluation and this aspect could be developed with address to the attribution and with some more application of contextual knowledge.

Overall a sound response which merits Level 4.

Question 3

This question was answered by the majority of candidates for this option. There was sound address by most to the stated factor with specific illustration and explanation of the importance of Guderian's role in the military fall of France in 1940. Generally these points were measured against a range of other factors, eg the 'Maginot mentality', the failings of Gamelin and the contributions of other German commanders including Manstein and Rommel.

Question 4

This was the least popular choice in Section B for this option. The responses were lacking in development. A high proportion of candidates did not go beyond generalised comments on the differences in the physical environment. Some began to describe the role of air power in the two conflicts but there was little substantial illustration and explanation of the points. Consequently there was a lack of the informed debate required for higher level rewards.

Question 5

This was the least popular of the Section B questions on this option but the majority of candidates showed a sound knowledge of Ebert's policies and actions, eg his role in framing the Constitution and his deal with Groener to counter the threat of extremism. Many of the stronger responses brought out the debate about Ebert actually betrayed democracy in the methods he was prepared to employ against what he regarded as threats from the Left.

The stronger candidates measured the work of Ebert against other factors, eg the roles of Max of Baden and Ludendorff. Some substantial and balanced debates ensued.

Although Brest was the focal point of the new democratic state, ultimately his impact was limited in the origins of its creation. Instead it was the popular desire for the end of autocracy in its entirety that caused the creation of a new democratic state, demonstrated by the General Revolution of 1917-19 in which the population soundly rejected the substance of the old order. Further cause was the actions of Prince Alex on Brest in conjunction with the Kaiser, however like Brest his policies were simply a reaction to his developments at the grass-roots level, thus limiting their significance.

Indeed Brest was certainly significant to the creation of democracy however limited relative to the popular desire. Although ~~not~~ ^{the main} significant in preventing a Communist revolution like by through the neighbors, a & paramilitary organization like Central Socialism, comprised of ex-soldiers who were used by Brest to crush the Spartacist rising in January 1919 March rising in Berlin and the German Soviet Republic. This ~~is~~ allowed the creation of the National Assembly in 1919 and therein the Weimar Constitution ~~and~~ as the parties elected by the assembly created the Constitution however, which during the process and preventing external threats, his impact was limited if ultimately it was a reaction to and not the cause of calls for democracy. Indeed, Brest was

reluctant to create a new democratic republic, instead being a
constituted democracy because this was made impossible by the
action of Scheidegger a 19th century who declared a firm republic
the credits who had assembled outside the Reichstag on the first
day of Bismarck's Chancellorship to demand democracy - this example
circumstances the fact that Bismarck was first selected to create
a new total democracy and second his role was a reaction to
a power that was already in place, created by the popular desire for
democratic state. Although Bismarck gave it a political direction - a
criteria for this question - the general movement of the workers
(with public support as another criteria) had caused this greater
participation of calls for democracy and establishment of the constituent
and therefore Bismarck was simply a product of a grass-roots
movement, limiting his significance.

Of primary significance was the work now united with the
concept of constituent parties arose among the popular, especially
with industrial workers, in creating a democratic state. It says
since it was the initiative of the workers both created,
amplified and completed the process of its creation it must
be of far greater significance than Bismarck who only guided processes
and did not already exist existing mechanism. The beginning of the
process, the Union's abolition, was caused by grass-roots
action as and not the German revolution in 1848 and was
clear that ~~his~~ due to the fact government that abolition
was the only way to end the unrest; by 8 March a general

the ~~last~~ had been called, Soviet-inspired Revolutionary councils had spread to every town and city and the country was in chaos. Thus the government led by Prince Alex von Bode resolved that the only way to avert a takeover was concession to the workers' demands. On 9 November he announced the Union's abolition and the franchise of his parents. Thus the first social Chancellor - again, this disaster how that's not was symptomatic of and subject to the demands of the worker. Moreover, that only gained support to oversee the creation of the new democratic state or ~~be~~ the public voted the SPD as the largest party of the National Assembly with 37% giving his making him Provisional President with which he could appoint the new cabinet and supervise the creation of the new constitution - therefore that's not was caused by a product of and subject to mass and popular movements; had the public voted for an alternative party in the National Assembly, that would have been only Chancellor for two months and not been able to contribute to the creation of a new democratic state.

of tertiary significance was the role of the Union in conjunction with Prince Alex von Bode. The Union's proclamation of parliamentary government on 30 September, asking Prince Alex to form a government on 1 October did begin the path to democracy, however it was ultimately decided by the public will. The constitutional reforms from above, in which the Union and Chancellors were made accountable to the franchise which

an military force did begin the path of democracy and caused the emergence of that in Alex's Cabinet. However, their ancillary aspects relative to the public desire for democracy demonstrated by the fact that they were rejected by the military masses for their limited impact, as the issue was still on the table and also their insignificant.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A focused response which identifies, illustrates and explains a range of factors and weighs up their relative significance. The stated factor is addressed and specific evidence is identified and exemplified, eg Ebert's formal political role and his policies towards what were regarded as extremist challenges. The answer is well structured and clearly expressed meriting a Level 5 award.

Question 6

This was by far the most popular question in Section C and some candidates appeared to select it on the basis of the topic rather than the specific question. On the other hand, there were many excellent answers which recognised the role of the Nuremberg Laws in providing a legal framework whilst making it clear the anti Semitic ideology and policy had been present in the Nazi movement from the start.

Many candidates focused on the Nuremberg Laws and deployed specific knowledge of the legislation placing the measures into context. A significant minority showed a confused grasp of chronology and often produced a narrative account of why Hitler hated the Jews with an often random set of measures.

Some candidates strayed outside the timeframe and revealed correct knowledge which was not tied into the question asked.

The Nuremberg Laws, although significant, was not the most significant change in policy of the Nazi regime towards Jews, as it occurred over 2 years after Hitler's acceptance of chancellorship, with a number of events contributing to Jewish policy occurring beforehand. The most significant is the Enabling Act of 1933 ~~as~~ ^{indirectly} it underpins following events, as it is the reason for them happening. Other factors to consider are the use of violence and the establishment of concentration camps. A set of criteria for evaluation are the extent of the policy, harshness of policy and justifications of policy.

The Nuremberg Laws were a prominent set of laws arising in September 1935, that both ~~barred~~ ~~marriages~~ ~~between~~ Jews and non-Jews as well as removing citizenship from all Jews. This affected all of the Jewish community, even children, and so the impact is quite huge. By 1935, 120,000 Jews had left Germany after there being 500,000 in total in 1933. The significance is increased as it was the first piece of legislation that actively ~~and~~ ~~actually~~ portrayed Hitler as believing Jews were alien to Germany and far inferior - denying citizenship was very crushing and demoralising for the Jewish community. It is not the most significant change in policy, as the attitudes towards Jews had been the same since Hitler's appointment. Furthermore, the Enabling Act was the start

of the dominant effect that crushed Jews, and so outweighs the Nuremberg Laws. These laws had a huge extent as it affected the whole Jewish community, as well as a huge degree of severity. There was little justification and did not alter the Nazi outlook on Jews in any way.

Violence used by SA and SS officers on Jews was destructive and is a key change of policy of 1933 towards Jews. Within ~~next~~ months of becoming Chancellor, Hitler passed laws such as one that banned Jews from public office and many other anti-Semitic laws. This was supported by constant violence towards the Jewish community - Jews were publicly beaten up and properties destroyed by SA and SS officers (40,000 homes destroyed 1933-35) and shops were boycotted by all. This constant violence from Hitler's regime reduced his government to one built out of fear. Although this violence was terrible, its extent must be scrutinised as many SA officers were openly against Hitler, including Ernst Röhm, and so didn't carry out attacks. However, this led to the Night of the Long Knives on 30th June 1934, in which 200 SA officers (including Röhm) were killed. This highlights the criterion of justification - Hitler didn't really have justification for anything he did, he was just power hungry. The severity was high as many Jews affected and some died, despite it not being carried out throughout Germany. The factor is underpinned by the Enabling Act, because Hitler's actions prior to that would not have happened if it wasn't for the Enabling Act.

The introduction of concentration camps was a huge establishment and saw many Jews perish there. This policy arose in 1933 with the setting up of Dachau concentration camp for 'enemies of the ~~state~~ state' (mainly Jews). This was set up in May 1933 and by August, 25,000 Jews had been sent there, manifesting the extent to which this new policy crippled Jews. Hundreds of 'death camps' were set up in Germany and other controlled states and did not stop until the end of the Second World War. Concerning criteria, this policy was severe ^{and} had a large extent, but was justified by Hitler as work camps to help with military production. The impact of concentration camps is reduced, as the long term effects were much deeper than the short-term ones, as a whole path of life had been destroyed. However, the Enabling Act precedes the introduction of camps, and allowed him to do so.

The Enabling Act of March 1933 was the most significant change in policy towards Jews, even though its impact is indirect. This act gave Hitler huge power as it allowed him to create laws without consultation of the Reichstag and therefore handed him totalitarian authority. This act essentially allowed Hitler to do as he pleased, such as the mass Anti-Semitism through violence, Nuremberg Laws and Concentration camps. ~~The~~ The act came after the Reichstag Fire occurred - Communists admitted the attack and ~~so~~ Hitler needed an excuse to clamp down on 'state enemies'. Furthermore, the Enabling Act is the

only ~~as~~ substantial change in policy, as Hitler was anti-Semitic from day one, and so the other factors ~~are~~ cannot be considered changes as such. Regarding criteria, it had the largest extent as anyone in Germany (over 30 million) was subject to 'attack' and severity as it lifted all restrictions - ~~abolished~~ the Reichstag Fire Decree suspended civil liberties, and so added to create dismay. The justification was to suppress 'enemies of the state', but this was just Jews and the disabled mainly, and was very unjust.

Nazi policy towards Jews ~~was~~ ^{was} the most significant with the Enabling Act, as it gave Hitler unlimited totalitarian authority, which ~~also~~ allowed his persecution of Jews to take place so severely.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The response addresses the stated factor with some effective illustration and explanation of its significance. The implication that the Nuremberg Laws cemented and formalised existing practice is clear although there could have been some reference to the historical context in which the Laws were introduced.

The answer provides a general review of pre Nuremberg Law policies and attitudes which, although some could be more precise, provides evidence for the argument that the essential attitudes were already evident. There could be some consideration of the political constraints during the initial period.

Overall a sound address to the question meriting Level 4.

Question 7

This was the least popular of the questions in Section C. The strongest candidates identified a range of literature with some consideration of poetry and drama as well as novels. They also measured the impact of their chosen points against other means of conveying the nature of war, eg photographers and film makers.

However, the majority of responses were very limited and there was a good deal of thinly supported assertion.

Question 8

This was clearly the most popular question in Section C on this option. The majority of candidates provided a range of specific evidence regarding the stated factor, the graphic reporting of events in Saigon during the Tet Offensive and the impact of the report by Walter Cronkite after his visit to Vietnam. There was also some effective comment in answers about television coverage of events in the United States itself, notably regarding the events at Kent State University. Many candidates also discussed the impact of instantaneous coverage by CNN during the Gulf War.

The strongest responses saw the stated factor weighed up against others with comment ranging from the work of war correspondents such as Russell during the American Civil War to the very powerful photo journalism typified by Picture Post during the Korean War.

Question 9

This was another popular Section C question. The majority of candidates addressed the stated factor and developed a wide ranging and effectively developed comparative argument spanning the timeframe or a substantial proportion of it. This often started with Bismarck's development of industrial cartels to the implementation of the Marshall Plan during Erhard's time as Finance Minister and the policies of the EEC in the latter years of the period.

The Nazi government's policies had the least significant impact on

Impact:	Type of industry	long-term Other Employment Changes	Growth of Ger Other
Bismarck	✓ the Electricity	✗ Migration	✓ Railways/ imports/ exports
Nazis	✗ war Korea 50-53	✗ DAF = 22 million	✗ autobahn temporary
Post-war	✓ 49-63 cars	✓ service	✓ 3rd 1st

The policies of the post-war government under Adenauer and Erhard had the most significant impact on the German industry 1871-1990, with ~~the~~ the Nazis being the least significant and Bismarck's policies occupying the middle ground. The significance of government policies in affecting impacting industry can be seen through the extent to which they

impact: the focus on Germany industry, ~~impact~~ the growth of the German Economy and the long-term effects of the implemented changes.

At the time the Nazi policies had a vast impact on industry, reversing the huge unemployment figure of 6 million through the DAF ^{622 million workers} and public work schemes to rebuild Germany after the Great Depression. However, this didn't have a very significant impact as the majority of changes made were either reversed by later contradictory Nazi policies or the impact of the loss of WW2. Firstly, the Nazis impacted the type of industry by focusing on a war-driven economy after 1936, preparing to be ready for war by 1948. This included Schacht's initially careful planning whilst trying to maintain consumer spending, until Todt took over in 1940 to shut-down over essential industries like housebuilding to focus on the military economy, with Speer later improving efficiency by narrowing model range and rationing floor space in factories. Obviously, these major changes to a fully-military economy were short lived

as the ~~the~~ FRG was officially an occupied state and forbidden to have an army following WW2, with a ^{small} army only introduced from UN pressure in the 1950s - certainly not the focus of industry. Similarly, the changes made during this period to improve ~~the~~ Germany's economy, for example the building of a national autobahn by the DAF's 22 million workers short-lived with the economy swiftly forgetting these projects at the start of the war and much of the progress being damaged by bombing. Hence, the Nazi period was the least significant time period to impact industry as any changes implemented were reversed, so insignificant.

The impact of Bismarck's government policies was more significant. This can be seen in the type of industry as Bismarck's government sought to modernise through the use of railways (which had increase more than sixfold from 3000 km to 20,000 km (1845-70) rather than traditional waterways. Also, Bismarck focused his industry on electricity and new techniques to suit Germany's raw materials. As Germany

had 2/3 of European coal, they were able to invest in the electrical industry, producing more electricity than Britain, France and Italy combined by 1890. This is significant as these changes in the focus of industry helped to modernise German industry - a long-term change as this modernised structure would be the basis of all future changes. Moreover, this led to further long-term changes in the form of migration: as rural workers increasingly moved to towns where there was an increasing amount of work to be done to fuel the new industrial focus of industry, a migration trend that would continue with the decline of the rural population 1871-1990 with 76% living in rural areas in 1871 compared to 25% in 1945. Hence, this is more significant than the time of the Nazis as the growth of the German economy by focusing on industrial modernisation ~~was~~ was a long-term impact, setting the foundations for all later work to be built upon. However, it isn't the most significant as it doesn't fully reflect German industry today, meaning it

cannot be the most significant change, 1871-1990.

The post-war period under Adenauer and Erhard is the most significant government policy on German industry, 1871-1990.

~~Adenauer~~ Erhard, Adenauer's finance minister from 1953, shrewdly invested the \$66 million of Marshall Aid received, following a Keynesian model of re-investment to ensure the economy recovered. ~~These policies~~ This recovery included a focus ~~on~~ ~~on~~ incorporating artisan quality with the efficiency of factories by putting artisans in leadership positions in factories, leading to the development of the luxury car business in Germany - ~~or~~ the industry which drove the 1949-63 'economic miracle' and continues to be the basis of their economy today. This new focus on the service / tertiary sector without their arable lands to rely on after the war led to ^{west} Germany becoming the largest ~~post~~ economy in Europe by the 1980s, and 3rd largest in the world - a similar position to Germany today. Though it can be argued that this was

confined to the West, this economic prosperity through the service industry was extended to the East after 1989 unification, continuing to still be the basis of German economy.

To conclude, the policies of the Nazi government ~~were~~ ^{did not} ^{have} the most significant impact on German industry, 1871-1918, as many of the changes the policies initiated were reversed by the war. Whereas, the changes made from the government policies post-war to focus on quality of products in the service sector are still seen today, making this the most significant time period of government policy.



The essay engages with the debate and is well informed. There is a clear judgement in the opening paragraph that states that the post 1945 period was of greater significance than the proposition in the question.

There is a strong paragraph on the stated factor which points out some achievements but also shows awareness of the contradictions that were inherent in Nazi policy. Other factors are also advanced, notably the Bismarck period.

Overall coverage is not totally comprehensive but the lively, thoughtful and substantial debate certainly merits Level 5.

Question 10

This was the least popular of the questions in Section C on this option. The majority of responses identified and illustrated a sound range of points from across the timeframe. There was some effective deployment of specific detail but a significant number of responses did not use their material effectively enough in considering the issue of 'steady decline'.

Within 1871 $\frac{3}{4}$ of the German population worked within rural areas in agriculture. By the time of unification in the early 1870s this figure had depreciated to just 4% of Germans. However, despite the ~~also~~ substantial drop in agricultural employment being near, whether or not it took place in a state of steady decline between 1871-1890 is controversial. Many events took place that seemed to either speed up or decrease the country's agricultural input, meaning it wasn't as simplistic as a 'downwards spiral'.

In 1871, under the rule of the Kaiser the German population sat at 41 million. Those who were amongst the 5% of the upper class was due to ownership of land provided to them by William I. Despite a German industry beginning to launch, and alternative ^{employment} ~~jobs~~ such as shop ownership & artisanism, ~~it was~~ ~~some~~ many ~~workers~~ men searching for income would have little ^{but} alternative to work in agriculture.

The lead up to the first world war changed this indefinitely. By 1914 the population had increased to 68 million (a 60% increase since 1880). In order for Germany to sustain such a large

economy industrial production was vital. Prior to the start of the first world war $\frac{3}{4}$ of the population now lived in towns or city due to the attractiveness of urban employment. This caused agricultural employment to fall from 75% to 25% in the matter of just over 30 years. Agricultural production would continue to decrease throughout the war as due to the fact that 17 million men being forced into military conscription had caused a mass ^{surplus} ~~lack~~ ⁱⁿ of agricultural workers and a further bad year of harvest between 1915 & 16 meant that even less employment opportunities in agriculture took place.

Despite the vacuum of agricultural workers being filled after the first world war by returning men and by women, the Nazi regime again saw a decline in agriculture. Adolf Hitler & his ministers prioritised rearmament in preparation of war and therefore most employment was delayed to industrial employment. Only a mere 3% of employment was delayed towards agriculture under the Nazi regime. Throughout the second world war much of Germany's crops were imported from the nations of which Germany had conquered at the start of the war. ~~Due to~~ These factors combined with the loss of 15% of Germany's arable land after a peace agreement brought an end to the

~~second~~^{first} world war demonstrates how German agriculture was in a state of yet even more decline.

Agriculture within West Germany however witnessed a relatively large increase in comparison to previous decades. This was largely due to the rehabilitation of foreign relationships under Chancellor Adenauer. Also due to Germany becoming a member of European alliances such as Nato and ~~was a~~ for one of the founding nations of the EEC (European economic community), Germany was thus able to agree on the Common agricultural policy in 1959. This policy essentially allowed the free and unhindered trading of agricultural products within agreed borders in Europe. Despite being perceived as ~~an~~ a use of the GDR ~~the~~ slipping into the French market in exchange for West Germany to provide French farmers with subsidies it ~~was~~ nevertheless allowed for agriculture in Germany to become more profitable, thus leading to the increase in agricultural employment towards the end of 1960.

As Germany became more united, agriculture again witnessed a decline, however this time more harmoniously and less drastic ~~as~~ as early pre/pro war decades. ~~1950~~ By 1940 Germany was ~~the~~ best known as ~~the~~ Europe's industrial powerhouse and was recognised as ~~the~~ being the world

4th largest industrial producer. This combined with the fact that modern enterprises & business opportunities ~~to~~ were becoming much more realistic than to earn a living in agriculture meant that agricultural employment again decreased.

In conclusion, ~~to state~~ as forementioned events support, to state that Germany's ~~agricultural~~ agriculture declined at a steady rate is incorrect. A number of circumstances such as the first World War or the reintegration building of international relationship caused ~~to~~ the decrease in German agriculture to decline in a predominantly sporadic ~~the~~ fashion. A steady decline would suggest a constant decrease from the year 1871 to 1940, which wasn't the case.



The response addresses the specific issue of 'steady decline' and argues an overall judgement. There is sound overall coverage of the timeframe and some effective statistical evidence is advanced, eg the proportion of the working population involved in agriculture at the beginning and end of the period. There is also some effective use of historical context, eg the impact of war and preparation for war and the massive demographic change. The impact of the European movement post 1945 is touched on but could be developed. Merits sound Level 4.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension of the sources.
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Comments about this should be specific to the provided sources rather than generic comments that might apply to any source.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry.
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer.

Sections B and C

- Candidates should not assume that every question will require a main factor/other factors approach.
- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range.
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels.
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision.
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors.

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>

