



Examiners' Report **June 2022**

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 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 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_1G_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this Advanced Level paper 9HI0 1G.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A and B comprise a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference and significance. 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 some candidates failed to complete one of the three responses within the time allocated. This was most evident on Section C, as would be expected. Candidates who plan their responses to meet the time demands of the paper and respond directly to the questions tend to get the best outcome. For example, those who wrote direct question 5 responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given views, rather than offering extensive explanations and quotes, tended to produce an effective response. Less successful candidates often failed to exemplify any comparative analysis and evaluation of the rival interpretations. Finally, examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

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

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians. The rival interpretations were often developed and critiqued in the light of the evidence from the within 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 accurate is it to say that the weakness and eventual collapse of Weimar democracy, in the years 1919 – 33, was mainly caused by its constitution. This was by far the more popular question in Section A.

Candidates seem to have been well prepared for this question and the majority knew what the flaws in the constitution were, and why they undermined the pro-Weimar parties. Most candidates were also able to offer a range of other factors that could be weighed against the stated one. It was encouraging to see more candidates showing knowledge of the critical years 1929-33 too.

Successful candidates, who accessed level 4 and above, were able to show how the changing economic and political context made the constitution's weaknesses more important. For example, there was often a good discussion of the way President Hindenburg and his coterie of advisers used article 48 to bypass and subsequently, through Hitler, end the Republic.

Weaker responses tended to narrate the series of violent putsches up to and including 1923, and to list other factors weakening the Weimar regime, but often ignoring the later years. For example, the hyperinflation of 1923 tended to get more emphasis than the more decisive economic crisis after 1929. A few candidates lacked knowledge of the Weimar constitution and were thus unable to access the higher levels of the award.

Plan:

I don't agree

- The constitution did make for an unstable Republic although did not cause the collapse
- The economy was the main cause — Allowed ample opportunity for opposition to get in (Nazis GO)
- Other factors were opposition

P1: The constitution

- Allowed & unstable Reichstag due to PR (60000)
- Undermined democracy (Article 48)
- Undermined the government (judiciary) (Hitler)
- Stresemann used Article 48 to balance the economy
- SPD was in power for most of its lifespan
- Only faltered when economic problems were at hand

P2: Economy

- Reparations destabilised the economy (10-12% gdp) loss of coal in Saarland and Upper Silesia
- Unable to pay off debts
- Hyperinflation Crisis
- Great Depression allowed Hitler to get into power and destroy the Weimar

It ~~disagree~~ that the Weimar Constitution was the main cause of the collapse of democracy and its overall weakness. Although it did make for an unstable/weak democracy, it did not cause its collapse, the economy is responsible for that. The weak economy allowed Hitler to take advantage of the ^(Great Depression) situation and gain enough popularity to get the Chancellorship and put an end to the Weimar democracy, with other economic crisis' contributing as well. Another cause was opposition such as the NSDAP/Nazis, although they only got the opportunity through a weak economy.

The Weimar constitution was not the main cause of the collapse ~~and weakness~~ of the Weimar democracy, although it did make it unstable. The voting system in which it outlined called proportional representation and its low 60000 vote threshold made it difficult to gain a majority and governments usually ended up making uneasy coalitions that collapse such as Muller. Although this created a weak government it failed to cause any massive issues, it made it

(Section A continued) harder for extremist parties such as the KPD or NSDAP to gain a majority. Authoritarian powers such as Article 48 undermined the democracy and made it less stable because Presidents such as Hindenburg who used it over 100 times in office could violate the democratic process. However, it sometimes came in as a benefit, Stresemann for example used it numerous times to solve the Hyperinflation Crisis such as to create the Rentenmark and to push through the policy of fulfilment. Article 102 also undermined the democracy and made it weaker through giving judicial independence. The judiciary was made up of right-wing, anti-republic employees who gave lenient sentences to terrorists hostile to the republic. They did allow Hitler and lenient sentence who brought the eventual collapse, but it was him taking advantage of the economic situation which allowed him to do that. For most of the Weimar Republic's lifespan the SPD was the largest party and ruled well, laws were still passed and the republic only faltered when economic problems hit, therefore the Weimar Constitution contributed to the democracy's weakness, but not its collapse.

Economic problems were the main cause of the republic's weakness then collapse, this was due to the lack of support for the government at times such as the 1923-24 economic crisis and the Great Depression which allowed Hitler to get in then destroy the Weimar democracy. Reparations were always a problem for the republic, they accumulated 10-12% of Germany's

(Section A continued) annual income, and greatly weakened their image. Even when the Young and Dawes plans were formulated it brought great disgruntlement to nationalists who hated the idea of the reliance of \$800000 million loans from America. It was constantly used as a reason for why the republic was weak and illegitimate. Their inability to pay off these debts led to the 60000 Franco-Belgian force occupying the Ruhr further weakening the republic. The Hyperinflation Crisis which resulted from the government's reaction of passive resistance encourage more opposition to the republic such as the Beer Hall putsch. In this time support for the democracy lowered and other extremists parties gained support. Although these hadn't caused the collapse of the republic, they greatly weakened it through encouraging opposition. The Great Depression in 1929 whereby American loans were demanded back through the Weimar Republic into turmoil. In 1930 unemployment sat at 1 million, in 1932 it went up to 5 million. Successive governments such as Brüning attempted to slash benefits but it only made it worse. Hitler's party offered scapegoats in the republic and gained forty percent of the vote, he appealed to people's national pride and managed to gain Reichstag influence. Once he was in power, he brought the collapse of democracy through enacting the enabling act and placed himself in power, all through taking advantage of the economic situation and finding a scapegoat.

(Section A continued) Another cause was opposition groups to the republic. Throughout the Weimar years they dealt with many uprisings which posed huge threats, one such party (Nazis) bringing the collapse of democracy. Other uprisings such as the Spartakist uprising (1919) was serious enough to make the government flee and use the Freikorps a paramilitary organisation to put them down, ~~another~~ It was serious enough to take over the German capital and falter the Weimar democracy. Another was the Beer Hall putsch, led by Hitler who managed to take over Germany's second largest city, Munich. These numerous attempts to takeover Germany weakened the democracy because they were through undemocratic means.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an example of some work at level 4. The candidate shows a decent range of mostly accurate knowledge, and there is quite a good focus on the question. For example, this candidate distinguishes between factors that weakened the Weimar democracy and those that caused it to collapse. There is an attempt to explain how the factors on offer worked together to create weakness, and the time frame gets covered.



Always offer a good amount of detail on the factor in the question. This is the proposition that needs to be evaluated. Once sufficient evidence is provided offer arguments for and against its importance, and bring in other factors to help make the argument stronger, and well considered. This will make for a sustained argument and a strong conclusion.

Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider how accurate is it to say that the worship of Hitler was the main consequence of Nazi educational and cultural policies in the years 1933 – 45.

Far fewer candidates opted for question 2, which is a pity because those who attempted it produced some of the most interesting answers on the paper.

Successful candidates were able to weigh the identified consequence, worship of Hitler, against a range of other outcomes such as increased racial hatred, changing perception of the role and status of women, and changing attitudes towards modern art and culture. At the top end candidates were successful in identifying the criteria by which a consequence can be judged. For example, Hitler worship was an important consequence in terms of creating a functioning dictatorship, whereas increasing racial hatred connected to laws leading to the exclusion and annihilation of Jews.

Less successful candidates mostly accepted the proposition in the question and supported it with evidence drawn in the main from Nazi education, Goebbels and the creation of the Hitler Myth.

The second order concept of consequence seems to be the hardest one to deal with for many candidates, and no doubt this is why question 2 had less take up. Obviously causation and consequence are connected and the tendency to turn a consequence focus into one of causation is an easy error to fall into. However, centres seem to have prepared candidates better to face this challenge.

The tendency to convert a consequence question into a causation one was relatively low.

Nazi educational and cultural policies had many profound effects on the wider public attitudes not only towards Hitler and the Nazi party but also the wider social attitudes of the era and those that followed. The Hitler myth and worship of Hitler undeniably was a monumental consequence of the propaganda enforced via educational and cultural policies of the time, however it cannot be said that this was the main consequence. Rather it was the creation of widespread nationalism and the emphasis on traditionalistic 'blood and soil' values that was the greatest impact of culture in the Nazi period. When considering the consistency of the Hitler myth and long term impacts it is clear that culture's role as a symbol of regressive values was a greater consequence than the worship of Hitler.

The worship of Hitler was a highly emphasised element of Nazi policy, particularly within education. Loyalty to the regime was a ~~key~~ key factor ^{for} the success of the party,

(Section A continued) hence opposition could not be tolerated. The requirement of teachers to join the Nazi Teachers League was one of the more significant elements of this, due to its changes to the curriculum - a 15% increase in sports education and the emphasis on empire and Lebensraum in Geography - and success in centering Nazism in education. It is estimated that 97% of teachers were affiliated with the league, suggesting that the idolisation of Hitler and his policies was present in the majority of classrooms across Germany. The introduction of 'Adolf Hitler schools' and the use of universities to train SS officers also increased the associations between education ~~and~~ and Nazi values. However, these schools were not common and the majority of children received the generic Nazi education. The mandatory 'Hitler salute' at the beginning and end of ~~lessons~~ ^{lessons} cemented the blind connection to Nazi ideology in education, implying that it was the worship of Hitler that dominated educational policy. This is a consistent feature as even in 1933 Hitler strongly emphasised the 'strong man' character in his efforts to consolidate public respect and support, however, in the long term this respect was not secure. Many

(Section A continued) children in Nazi times did not enthusiastically participate in Nazi activities - even in urban areas attendance at the Hitler youth was not consistent, thus suggesting that the worship of Hitler and his values were not significant consequences of policy to the people of Germany.

Cultural policy also did little to enforce the worship of Hitler, more often focusing on traditional values and references to former great empires - such as Greece and Rome. The most significant impact of Nazi cultural policy was the censorship of the arts, not the introduction of pro-Hitler works. Over the entire period of 1933-45 only 96 propaganda films were produced under the instruction of the government, 1206 non propaganda films were produced by rightwing companies with minimal censorship from Himmler, head of the Nazi Chamber of Culture. The requirement for artists, ~~writers~~ writers and musicians to join governmental chambers did not increase the amount of art glorifying Hitler, but simply reduced the amount of 'degenerate art'. Degenerate art was denounced, ~~the~~ yet the Munich exhibition gathered two million visitors, suggesting that the effects of policy to glorify traditional values

(Section A continued) did little to alter the public's desire to see the Expressionist art of Weimar. The commission of 'blood and soil' artworks - realism pieces portraying farmers and labourers intended to showcase Nazi values of ~~order~~ a return to the Second Reich - and films such as 'Olympia' did not focus on the Hitler myth but instead focused on reinstating the political intentions of the government - Lebensraum, strong empire and militarism - into the view of the general public via art. The role of culture consistently emphasised traditional values over the Hitler myth, arguably unsuccessfully, and in the long term this had a far greater impact on the enforcement of traditional views rather than the Hitler myth.

Another alternative consequence of Nazi cultural and educational policy at this time was conformity. Many would argue that the ultimate goal of Nazism was not the idolatry of the individual (Hitler) but that it was instead about creating uniform ideology across Germany. Their policy reflects this idea. It is clear that the role of Nazi education was not to fulfil

(Section A continued) the desire for public adoration of Hitler but it was to create a generation of idealistic Aryan men and women to continue to pursue Nazi goals. The emphasis on sports - particularly during the 1936 Olympics - was not about Hitler. It aimed to create the impression that Germans are strong people with strong values - a uniform generation of perfect conformists. The removal and censorship of anti-war books such as 'All quiet on the Western front' during book burning in 1933 did not serve to better Hitler's image. It simply removed ~~all~~ all ideas that went against the dominant Nazi ideology. This factor provided a long term consequence for Germany as the indoctrination of the people via education and culture led to the support for innumerable atrocities over the course of the dictatorship, and this goal was pursued for more consistency than the support for Hitler as an individual ever was.

In conclusion, although it cannot be said that the worship of Hitler was not a goal pursued by Nazi policy in this area, the far more impactful ~~factor~~ consequence -

(Section A continued) one maintained by the people – was the indoctrination into Nazi values and the removal of alternative ideologies in the public eye. This factor was present from even prior to the Nazi government, and the resurgence of Second Reich imperialism and anti-Semitism proved a far worse consequence than the Hitler Myth. Therefore, whilst it is somewhat accurate to suggest that the worship of Hitler was a consequence of cultural and educational policy, it is more accurate to say indoctrination and conformity were the main consequences, due to their longevity and continuous role in the Nazi cultural zeitgeist.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response to question 2 makes an interesting read. The candidate is clearly very knowledgeable and offers a range of good detailed evidence and a clear line of argument. The attractive feature of this response for the examiner is that the candidate has committed to an argument that is developed throughout. There is some careful consideration of the criteria used to make a judgement, and we would judge this response to have a sustained evaluative argument.



When taking on a consequence question make sure that the consequence is judged as such. The consequences of educational and cultural policy in the Third Reich were numerous. A good way of thinking about a consequence is to talk about the impact it had on the population generally, or a specific group such as women or Jews, or other policies that affected Germany, such as war. Outcomes have to be evaluated in their own terms – not what might have caused them.

Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates to consider how accurate is it to say that the nature of popular support for governments remained essentially unchanged in the years 1933 – 89.

Both questions in Section B were accessible to the majority of candidates and the take up was more or less equal. The second order concept of change and continuity was often appraised in terms of similarity and difference, but as the time period covers two contrasting forms of government this was perhaps inevitable.

Successful candidates explored the criteria by which the question could be judged. Analysis was offered on support or opposition from particular demographics and social classes, and this was often fruitful in developing a focused response. Many candidates were able to unpick 'the nature of popular support' by consideration of coercion and persuasion in the Nazi dictatorship and the FRG too. At the top end answers were often carefully considered, and took the issue of continuity into account throughout. The indicative content offered in the mark scheme was actually very well covered by these candidates.

Less successful candidates found it difficult to display their knowledge balanced between the two different regimes, and over so lengthy a time period. The most common response largely involved considerations of the different levels of control of the population by the respective regimes. At the bottom end the differences between the two regimes was the main consideration and answers tended to offer a lot on Nazi terror as compared to the FRG's attempts to win support through persuasion, and thereby these candidates abandoned the change and continuity demands of the question.

It would not be very accurate to say that the nature of popular support for governments remained essentially unchanged in the years 1933 - 1989. This is because it is very clear to see that 1933 - 1945 (the period in which the Nazi regime took place) was mostly controlled by fear whereas the support for the FRG was genuine and done via democracy. One stark difference between the two was how who was decided to be in power.

(Section B continued) The Nazi regime simply had one leader whether you liked it or not. All other political parties were banned and some even had members killed. This was in stark contrast to the FRG (1949 onwards). The difference in support is so painfully obvious here. The ~~Now~~ In the Nazi regime you had no choice to support anyone but Hitler and the Nazi regime whereas in the FRG you could choose to vote for anyone thanks to the Basic Law. Furthermore nobody would be punished for opposing the FRG's government whereas this was simply not the case for the Nazi government. Penalties such as imprisonment or even death awaited you if you even openly talked ~~the~~ about disagreeing with the Nazis. They were fundamentally different types of popular support. The Nazi support was mostly down to the fear of punishment whereas you could oppose anyone in the FRG. Due to this I would say that the nature of support changed a lot over the time period 1933 - 1989.

However it could be argued that although how they controlled was different there was no real dangerous threat to the Government in either the FRG or Nazi periods.

While Hitler would see a few assassination attempts there was usually nothing to disrupt Nazi control. People were somewhat content in both because it was arguably an improvement to what they had before.

The Weimar had seen incredibly low living standards and people were struggling to get by. Many people would of enjoyed the Nazi regime as it definitely improved the living standards of many Germans and provided jobs. Similarly the FRG saw improvements from the Nazi regime and Weimar. It was now a democracy and many of the issues had been solved. However

I don't find it very accurate to say that the support remained essentially unchanged as once again the German people under Nazi control effectively were too afraid to oppose.

(Section B continued)

However ~~the~~ another factor that would make it inaccurate to say that the nature of popular support remained essentially unchanged was the lack of propaganda and brainwashing in the FRG. The Nazis controlled ~~what~~ the popular support they did get via manipulation of the people. You could not go around the corner without seeing Hitler's face or Nazi flags. Propaganda was everywhere. Furthermore in schools especially the youth were taught how great the Nazi government was. They effectively brainwashed their people into supporting them. This simply did not happen in the FRG. Under the Basic Law many things returned including normal school. The youth could no longer be brainwashed under the FRG and propaganda for a "great and glorious" leader was not right in your face. The popular support in the FRG was genuine and not forced whereas this simply was not the case for

(Section B continued) the Nazis. ~~When~~ Overall this makes it even less accurate to say the nature of popular support for governments remained essentially unchanged in the years 1933-1989.

Overall in conclusion it is very clear to see that the nature of popular support changed drastically ~~compared~~ in the years 1933 to 1989. The Nazi period of this timespan compared to the FRG period has such drastic change they are hardly even remotely related. The Nazis used brainwashing and propaganda as well as fear to bring forth an aspect of popular support however this was simply not the case with the FRG. The change ~~of~~ over this period is so drastic that there is not a hint of the Nazi ways to gain popular support in the FRG. Therefore it is not at all accurate to say that the nature of popular support for governments remained essentially unchanged in the years 1933-1989.



This is an example of work at level 3. The candidate provides an argument and makes a case that is valid and quite well argued. However, the question focus should be on change and continuity, and the candidate has turned this into a focus on similarity and difference. A number of candidates did this, and that is why we have chosen this example to illustrate the issue.

This example has no evidence of change and continuity over the period. There was change and continuity within the period 1933-45, and also 1945 - 89. The changes in the nature of popular support for the Nazis were huge as Germany started to lose the war. There was also a continuity of popular support from certain demographics that spanned the two periods, such as the support both regimes got from industrialists.

If the argument in this clip was focused on the demands of the question and illustrated with some evidence it would access level 4 quite easily. As it is the criteria by which to arrive at a judgement are missing.



When planning a change and continuity response it should be done in two parts. Firstly, depending on the wording of the question, deal with the main feature of change. Develop the theme with evidence from across the time frame of the question. Then do the same for continuity. This will allow for a discussion and evaluation, and should get the response into level 4.

Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider how accurate is it to say that integration into the European economy was the most significant economic achievement of the FRG in the years 1949 – 89.

Candidates attempting question 4 were, on the whole, well prepared. The majority of candidates were able to focus on the second order concept of significance and to develop the criteria by which this might be judged.

Successful candidates benefited from having a wide range of evidence that covered the time frame at their disposal. At the top end candidates offered a very convincing analysis of why integration into the European economy was significant. Many argued that it was indeed not only significant for Germany but was a hugely significant factor in European relations as a whole. It was also understood in terms of Germany actually becoming the leading force in the affairs of the EEC. Other factors candidates used to weigh significance were the 'economic miracle' and the social market economy. At the top end, candidates were able to demonstrate how these factors overlapped and reinforced each other too.

Less successful candidates generally understood what integration meant but lacked the detail that was needed to make a clear judgement. At the bottom end answers generally involved a weak description of the social market economy, or how immigrant labour helped overcome the devastation of war. Many focused on Germany's ability to overcome crises too. The main feature of these responses was that a lack of considered evidence led to an asserted judgement.

While the integration of the FRG into the European Economy through the ECSC and the EEC is notable in transforming ^{the} FRG into a key player in global trade, founding the basis for German export growth and the economic miracle, I would argue that government intervention to bring about swift recovery from war and the other ~~to~~ domestic policies which led to the economic miracle was the most notable achievement. Even though the FRG's impressive recovery from ~~at~~ recession in the 60s and the oil crisis in ~~the~~ 1974 highlights the important achievement of the social market economy, it is ultimately the post-war revival and domestic growth in the economic miracle which is ~~its~~ most significant achievement.

The integration of the FRG into the European economy is significant as it establishes FRG as a main player in global trade, on which the FRG economy rests upon. Started first in the European coal and steel Community where the FRG, Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands engaged in ~~for~~ a barrierless trade for coal and iron materials, the trade of coal rose by 10 times for the FRG, important in writing FRG's first steps in liberalisation. ^{Importantly,} the FRG's integration into the EEC transforms FRG's ^{position in} trade. As the FRG was seen as the "honest broker" who supplied most of ~~the~~ the EEC's funds, providing 56.7 Billion in the development of the EEC and providing 25% of its budget. The FRG ~~had~~

(Section B continued) reversed 25% of the GDP of the EEC in return, in allowing providing 14% EEC's vehicles trade and 10% steel. The trade surplus of the FRG rose to over 100 DM Billion, demonstrating the incredible growth in ^{the} FRG's export sector ~~and it was known for its~~ as the exports took up 19% of FRG's GDP. ~~was~~ The crucial reason why economic integration with Europe is key is that even when the currency ~~devalued~~ appreciated by 10% in 1970s and the US dollar devalued by 10% to supposedly raise export prices of Germany and reduce demand for their goods, Germany, having established its key role as a major exporter in ^{the} European community, was able to retain demand and earn even more from trade due to the higher prices of goods, providing funds for social welfare by Willy Brandt. Economic integration ^{was} an important achievement not only because Germany achieved immediate returns from the EEC or its 70 associate states, but due to the long term identity as a reliable exporter allowing a long term flourishing of their export sector. However, would anyone that simply integration and flourishing of Germany's exports would not have been possible had the FRG economy not recovered from the war to eventually produce high quality goods attractive to other countries, making integration less important than domestic recovery.

Domestic recovery from the war and domestic policies enabling the economic miracle is the most significant achievement by the FRG economy. Having started at Year Zero in 1948 with only 50% of output as pre-war levels, the German economy still had to rely on

(Section B continued) ~~barter~~ bartering and that citizens had to live on 1500 calories a day. with rapid reconstruction loans in the 1950 providing grants to build 4 million new homes, improving social welfare too by introducing the co-determination law in 1951 to enable more worker participation in the economy and coordination with trade unions, number of strikes and disruptions to the FRG economy was 200 times lower than that in the UK. As tax reforms lowering taxes from 85% to 10% granted citizens more ~~over~~ disposable income to spend in the domestic economy as stimulus, by 1950, salaries had risen by 80% to ~~signal~~ and industrial growth rates had risen to 25% to highlight the economy's swift recovery from war and complete ^{initial} devaluation. The economic miracle is importantly brought about by domestic policies like the Investment Allowance of 1952 which granted 3.2 billion DM business grants to firms to resolve bottlenecks in production to enable a quick ~~return~~ transition from war to peacetime economy, where the establishment of the Bundesbank then allowed the ~~economy~~ ^{government} smoother and more effective control over monetary policy to prevent ^{uncontrolled} inflation, highlighting the construction of a well-rounded, effective and ^{sustainable} productive peacetime economy. With strong stimulus from the government, the FRG saw itself grow at an impressive 8% to become the world's third largest economy, with falling unemployment to 1.1% from initial 10% highlights the effective employment of resources, and that as living standards rose by 48% as national morale ^{was} troubled, the economic recovery and miracle is the most dramatic ^{the} significant achievement of the FRG economy. This is more so in comparison to the economic growth in Europe - though the EEC and trade had an undoubted

(Section B continued) contribution to ~~the~~ the economic miracle as well. I would argue it is crucially domestic growth that ensures the quality of exports the FRG is producing is high, that trade can be fostered. Had the FRG domestic economy been struggling to overcome bottlenecks in production, it would not have been able to provide the motor vehicles which the European community demands, thus making domestic economy to the period before the 60s the most notable achievement.



This is an example of work in level 5. The candidate has a clear line of argument and a very good grasp of the necessary detail. Responses do not actually need the amount of statistical support on offer here, and it could be argued that the response would be better with more discussion and less numerical evidence. Nevertheless this is an authoritative essay with obvious strengths. There is good understanding shown of the importance of integration into the European economy, and this is weighed against other factors. The candidate covers the time frame very effectively and there is a clear focus on the second order concept of significance.



When answering a question centred on significance the criteria by which it can be judged are important. In this case significance can be argued in terms of the outcome each factor had on the FRG's economic success and consequent political stability. This is why it is good advice to make a quick plan that is focused on the central concept of significance.

Question 5

In Section C, question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that the Second World War was caused by Hitler's racist ideology.

Centres seem to have prepared candidates well overall. The vast majority of candidates were able to identify that the two extracts offered different interpretations. A considerable number of candidates feel the need to label the extracts as 'intentionalist' and 'structuralist' and this can lead them to force the content of the extracts into these boxes. The extracts proved to be accessible and there was little evidence that they could be easily misinterpreted.

Successful candidates at level 4 and above were able to analyse extract 1's claim that Hitler's racist ideology was a key reason for war in 1939. Even at the top end, the preferred method is to develop and critique extract 1 without reference extract 2. This meant most candidates could expand on Hitler's thoughts in *Mein Kampf*, his other writings and his speeches. This line of development often produced the valid criticism that too much emphasis can be laid on ideology, and this set the scene for an analysis of extract 2. Most of the candidates at the top end favoured extract 2, largely because it offered what they perceived as a more multi-causal approach. Only a few candidates seemed to be aware of AJP Taylor's particular contribution to the historiography, and were thereby able to either criticise his argument as sounding like a partial justification for Hitler's actions, or defend it in terms of its potential as a critical tool to use on extract 1. Nevertheless, successful candidates were able to take up the thrust of Taylor's points concerning 'other powers' and German history and develop an analysis.

Less successful candidates spent much of their time on extract 1 and using their own knowledge to expand on Hitler's attitude to Jews and Slavs. This often left them short of time to deal with extract 2 and led to a judgement asserted in support of the statement in the question. A further point should be made about candidates' own knowledge. A few chose to write about the Second World War and the Holocaust as evidence of Hitler's views rather than use material relevant to the question. A few candidates continue to use inappropriate analyses of data, 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 the Second World War was caused by Hitler's racist ideology?

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

(20)

The reasons for the outbreak of the Second World War have been widely debated by historians. ~~Historians~~ Many historians, such as Richard J. Evans, argue that war was caused by racist ideology, influenced by pre-existing ideas in German history and a step in the plan for world domination. Others disagree, such as AJP Taylor, arguing, while driven by Hitler, war was inevitable.

Evans argues that World War Two was a racial war for Hitler, driven by desires for ~~subjugation~~ 'racial conquest, subjugation and extermination'. Hitler's actions were likely to have been driven by his racist ideology that Judaism needed to be eliminated and that the 'Aryan' race was the master race. Evidence of this can be found in Hitler's 1924 book, *Mein Kampf*, ~~in~~ in which he outlines his desire to unite all German-speaking people ^{through gaining 'lebensraum'} and destroy the 'Judeo-Bolshevik' conspiracy, in which he believed Jews and communists were threatening Germany and the world. However, many argue that *Mein Kampf* cannot be seen as concrete evidence for Hitler's plans for war as it included many different ideas and had been described as Hitler's stream of consciousness. The plans outlined in *Mein Kampf* were ~~followed~~ ^{echoed} with the ~~invasion of the~~ ^{invasion} ~~unification of~~ the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia, which was justified as the

unification of German-speaking people. It could be argued that the invasion of Poland in 1939 was driven by Hitler's racist ideology as there were many Jewish people in Poland and it was the ~~next~~ logical next step for world domination.

~~Historians~~ Evans also takes the globalist view that Hitler's ^{foreign policy} ~~policy~~ from 1933, up until the invasion of Poland ~~in 1939~~ ~~was~~ was part of a plan for 'European, and eventually world domination for Germany'. In Hitler's Second Book, historians such as Hillgruber have identified a 'Stufen Plan', or step-by-step plan, in which Hitler outlines his plans to expand East and eventually achieve world domination. Furthermore, in 1926, Hitler stated "either Germany will be a world power, or there will be no Germany". Hitler's foreign policy, from his public announcement of rearmament and cancellation in 1935, explicitly breaking the Treaty of Versailles, shows a preparation for war and him following the plans he had earlier outlined. In 1937, Hitler went against his generals' advice and outlined his plans for war with the Soviet Union in the Hossbach Memorandum. It could be argued that World War Two broke out due to Hitler following a master plan driven by racist ideology and the ~~destruction~~ ~~of~~ elimination of what he saw as the Jewish threat.

Taylor places less emphasis on the role of Hitler as ^{indispensable} ~~essential~~ part of the outbreak of the Second World War, and argues he was following a path that was bound to happen and not uncommon in Europe at this time. ~~For~~ Taylor sees Hitler

as 'only contributing to a process that was already underway' and the 'creation of German history'. Taylor's argument has validity in that Hitler's racist ideology ^{and expansionist foreign policy} was not new and had been prevalent throughout German history. The 2nd Reich followed a foreign policy of 'Weltpolitik', which was making Germany a world power through sea expansion and colonialism. Furthermore, eugenics and racial pseudo-sciences based on social Darwinism were common, notably in the works of German scientists such as Haeckel and Ratzel. Ratzel wrote about ideal of ~~the~~ Lebensraum and German expansion based on a common German community, or 'Volksgeist', and Haeckel outlined a racial hierarchy which placed the 'Aryan' German 'Volk' at the top, and the 'sub-human' slavs at the bottom. ~~Because~~ ~~these~~ this racist ideology ~~from~~ influenced many and the thinking of Hitler would not have been unusual at his time.

Taylor also highlights that 'Hitler's foreign policy was not remarkably different from other powers in Europe', which directly contrasts Evans' view that the Nazis actions were 'without parallel'. Hitler, along with Second Reich Chancellors, were known to admire British expansion and colonialism, and social Darwinist ideas were attempted to justify the British subjugation of India. ~~It could be argued~~ Taylor goes on to suggest that the onset of German expansion made Britain and France oppose Hitler. The Allied appeasement in the lead up to war, in instances such as the lack of reaction to the remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936 and the 1938

Munich Agreement after Hitler took the Sudetenland, showed their willingness to allow Hitler to violently expand ~~based~~ ^{on} the basis of racist ideology. Furthermore, it could be argued that Britain saw Hitler as a barrier between Communism and the west and therefore allowed some expansion. Only when Germany threatened Britain and France's dominance in Europe ~~did~~ did they declare war. Therefore, it could be argued it was not Hitler's racist ideology that caused the Second World War, but ~~his~~ Germany's increasing threat due to expansion, ~~to~~.

~~Both~~ Overall, it is clear both Evans and Taylor agree that racism and ideology was important in driving the Second World War. However, ~~Evans~~ Evans believes Hitler was remarkable in his ruthless desire to expand and destroy 'Jewry' and without this war may not have happened.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at the top of level 4, and, but for a weak conclusion, could have been level 5. The candidate deals with the extracts in turn and develops both the evidence required to make the interpretation more convincing, and offers a pretty solid critique. The handling of extract 1 is very effective. The candidate also makes a good comparison of the rival interpretations and it is a pity that the conclusion is not as robust as the preceding argument. The response leaves the examiner in no doubt the needs of the question have been met.



Think carefully about the conclusion. A good idea is to write a paragraph that recaps and discusses the main points of the essay, and then write a conclusion that directly answers the question.

From when Hitler became fuhrer he outlined ~~or~~ the idea of world dominance. Extract 1 states 'war had been the objective of the Third Reich' this is valuable as Hitler

had hoped to get revenge ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~war~~
~~was~~ ~~through~~ ~~using~~ ^{write} all German
speaking people in Germany ~~was~~ ^{this}
would require war. The source
states that Hitler's thinking was
underpinned by 'Aryan Racial Theory',
~~that~~ ~~he~~ ~~was~~ ~~aimed~~ ~~to~~ ~~write~~
gain control of Aryan countries
and segregate Jews and minorities.
Hitler's racial ideology was a
driving force in the invasion of
Poland ^{and} Austria but a lot of
his motivation was from destroying
the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler
wanted to 'articulate the feelings
of the German people' by getting
'Lebensraum' and building up a
large army. Hitler's racist ideology
was not the main cause of
war as he knew attacking Poland
would most likely lead to Britain
and France intervening ^{and} Hitler ~~did~~
did not see Britain and France as
racially inferior. It was caused by
Hitler's need for revenge on Britain
and France ~~while~~ whilst attempting to

world dominance.

In ~~the~~ contrast, Extract 2 argues that Hitler's foreign policy was derived from the Treaty of Versailles. Taylor argues 'Hitler was in part the creation of Versailles' ~~was~~ the act of limiting the army to 100,000 men, ~~and~~ demilitarising the Rhineland and the loss of the Saarland only shaped Hitler's foreign policy and German need for revenge. The extract states 'Hitler was, to a large extent, articulating the feelings of the German people' ~~which~~ The feelings were that the Treaty was too harsh and Britain and France deserved to pay more for the war. Britain and France were NOT massively ~~not~~ impacted by the drive to war by ~~the~~ Hitler's racial policies it was the 'threat of German expansion' that triggered Britain and France to prevent Hitler from gaining more power. The Treaty of Versailles is

main driving force in Hitler's
German expansion leading to war.
Whilst Hitler's racial policy ^{was a factor} ~~was~~
~~the~~ the invasion of Austria, and
how ~~at the~~ the Germans wanted
a pure Aryan race it was not
what led him to want revenge on
Britain and France. Britain's allegiance
to Poland, fear of Germany and
German need of ~~revenge~~ world
dominance were very crucial to
the outbreak of war.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This clip shows work at level 3. The candidate does understand that the two extracts offer different interpretations, but these are not the focus of the response. The extracts are used as a stimulus for the candidate's own explanation, which rests on the importance of the Treaty of Versailles. There is a little development of the extracts but this is adding own knowledge rather than discussing interpretations.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Always plan a response by carefully reading the extracts and picking out points of interpretation. Then look at how the extracts are potentially discussing the statement in the question. Contrast the points in the extracts, supplement them by own knowledge, then discuss and evaluate the merits of each case.

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
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three 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:

- Pay 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
- Answer 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.

Grade boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

