



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2019

WHI01/1C

Pearson Edexcel International GCE

In History (WHI0) Paper 1C

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

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

January 2019

Publications Code WHI01\_1C\_1901\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## **Principal Examiner Report 2019 January**

### **IA Level History (1C: Germany, 1918-45)**

#### **WHI01: International Advanced Subsidiary**

It is important that centres take on board some generic comments which are based on the marking of the January cohort, and consider and apply these when preparing candidates for future examinations in this option.

- WHI01 is both a study in depth and a study of interpretations, and it is necessary for candidates to do both, at all levels in the mark scheme, in order to score marks. Ignoring the stated view in the question, and merely writing information that may be relevant to the general focus of the question does not fully meet the criteria for Level 1, and consequently none of the other levels. Even at Level 1 the mark scheme expects simple or generalised consideration of the stated view in the question. Some candidates paid very little attention to the stated view (ignoring it completely or sometimes only referring to it in the conclusion) and narrated or described other information that was either relevant or not to the actual question.
- In candidate responses, there was very little evidence seen of planning. As the examination is two hours long, implying that candidates might divide that time equally between the two essays they choose, it would seem sensible to devote some time (possibly no more than 10 minutes per question) to planning the structure of the answer to each question. That would hopefully ensure that when the answer is written the stated view is considered (Level 2, 3 and 4 all require, to varying degrees, understanding, analysis and exploration of the given view) and then other factors/views can follow, which will then allow the candidate to establish some criteria by which they are able to consider the importance, or not, of the given view and make some judgements. Those candidates who planned (this appeared on their examination script before they answered the question) invariably scored better than candidates who had not planned. Planned answers tended to score at the top of Level 3 and into, and including the top of Level 4, whereas unplanned answers meandered and judgements tended to be stated, rather than supported by valid criteria, and often achieved marks at the Level 2 and Level 3 boundary or below.
- The need to stress to candidates that in examination situations they must read the question carefully, and not take the question as an opportunity to write all they know about the topic, or answer a question they would have preferred that is near to the actual question, but not the actual question.

- There was some evidence of candidates running out of time, but they were very few. Impressing the need to plan essays in the examination is surely the remedy to this problem.

### **Option 1C Germany, 1918-45**

- Question 1 proved very popular, followed by question 3, question 2, and question 4.
- In question 1 many candidates were able to consider whether the military impact of the Treaty of Versailles was the main consequence by comparing it against others. Many candidates challenged the stated issue and considered economic impacts to be more significant. Those that gave criteria for their judgement scored in the higher or highest mark band.
- In question 2 some candidates were able to discuss the role of Nazi Party organisation in the survival of the Party in the years 1924-28, however, some candidates saw the question as an opportunity to write about the rise of the Nazi Party from the early 1920s, and narrate the role of Hitler.
- In question 3 many candidates were able to consider the impact of the Enabling Act against other factors which allowed the Nazis to establish a dictatorship. It was the establishment of criteria for judgement which differentiated candidates in relation to marks
- In question 4 (which was the least popular) saw some candidates write extensively about the period up to 1939, rather than focus on 1939 to 1945, which was the stated period in the question and the issue. Policies that started before 1939, but continued during the 1939-45 period were credited, but specific economic or control policies that were unique to the early 1930s were not relevant to the question.
- The example below achieved a mark in Level three. It showed understanding of the issue, had knowledge but lacked some range and depth in places and there was an attempt to establish criteria for judgement but that was weak.

Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2

Question 3  Question 4

Stack 10

(This page is for your first answer) Historians differ in their judgements about the impact of the Treaty of Versailles in the years 1919-24. Some historians claim that the main consequence of the Treaty of Versailles, in the years 1919-24, was that it weakened Germany militarily. I agree with the statement to an extent, as there are other factors which have to be considered. Germany hoped that the Treaty was going to be based on the 14-points which the American president proposed, but this did not happen. When the treaty was presented, the government and the German population believed it was a diktat, yet the Reichstag could not reject it and had to sign. The treaty weakened the new government, the Republic as: Germany lost land, its military capability was reduced and the country had to pay a vast amount to the allies. Therefore, all factors had a great repercussion in Germany and not only the fact that Germany's ~~mit~~ <sup>got</sup> ~~was~~ weakened militarily.

Germany lost land, with the War Guilt Clause. The treaty arranged that more than 13% of the German territory had to become part of the allies territory or for the League of Nations. This was very damaging for Germany

(This page is for your first answer) as some of this territory was really useful and it was gone. 20% of the coal production had been taken ~~system~~ hand-by-hand with important agricultural lands. Therefore, the recovery from war was even more difficult as they had lost useful and necessary products, that is why some historians argue that the territorial loss of territories was the main consequence of the Treaty of Versailles. As important as the new territorial arrangements was the fact that ~~the~~ Germany was really weak in military terms, and they did not have enough ~~either~~ for war or for self-defence.

Germany had a very powerful army, but it was lost. In the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was blamed for starting the war and was made responsible for everything. Article 231 was very harsh, the War Guilt Clause, under this article it was decided that Germany's army could have a maximum of 100,000 men. <sup>As a consequence</sup> ~~the~~ many soldiers became unemployed and poor as the ~~country~~ government did not have money to pay for their work nor jobs for the soldiers. With so few men, the army could not even defend themselves and ~~the~~ their country in case of an attack, this lowered the moral of most Germans. Many historians <sup>therefore</sup> agree ~~therefore~~ that the main consequence of the Treaty of Versailles was that it weakened Germany's military. Though the high reparation payments also damaged even further the country as they could not recover.

(This page is for your first answer) Germany was to pay 10 billion gold marks to their allies. The government was just new and ~~coming~~ starting after a war, was not easy, but things overcomplicated when the allies demanded so high payments. Germany could not afford to give such a large quantity of money as they did not have it, therefore more money was being printed out leading to hyperinflation. In 1923, Germany could not pay so French and Belgium troops invaded the Ruhr, the most productive area in Germany, this even lowered further the moral of the people and dislike towards the new government was more frequent and common. Some historians believe that the main consequence of the treaty was the high reparation payments which totally weakened Germany but the loss of population due to the loss of territory was also a crucial factor.

Germany lost 10% of its population. We could say that Germany before World War I was an empire as it owned many territories and had an impressive population living on them. The treaty said that Poland and Alsace-Lorraine was not more part of Germany, and these two were vital in Germany as an important part of German citizens lived there. Germany became weak and much more less important after the treaty which ridiculed what had been a superpower nation. Historians

(This page is for your first answer) then link the fact that Germany lost 10% of its population and 13.5% of their territory and agree ~~that~~ <sup>at</sup> the fact that the main consequence was the territorial arrangements. The military terms were also very important as Germany was left with no ammunition.

Germany was not to have submarines, big battleships nor military aircraft. The army was reduced and furthermore it was left with no military materials, this even weakened more the government. At this point, all the other countries saw Germany as weak and poor and German citizens knew about it so their moral decreased and its anger with the "November Criminals" increased. Many soldiers had lost their jobs and now ammunition factories were also unnecessary, so unemployment increased even further. Therefore some historians agree that the main consequence of the Treaty was that it weakened Germany militarily, yet others believe that there is no ~~one~~ main consequence but the combination of all the factors.

In conclusion, I agree to an extent with the given statement that says that the main consequence of the Treaty of Versailles, in the years 1919-29, was that it weakened Germany militarily, as the other factors have ~~also~~ to be explored as they also weakened Germany deeply. The fact that Germany's army and ammunition was reduced it is important, but the ~~territor~~ loss of territory, the high



(This page is for your first answer) reparation payment and the low moral of the people are evenly as important. Therefore most historians claim that no main consequence can be attributed but all factors have to be considered & when exploring the damage caused by the Treaty of Versailles from 1919 - 29.

Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2   
Question 3  Question 4

(This page is for your second answer) Historians have different explanations for the establishment of the Nazi dictatorship in the years 1933-34. Some historians argue that the impact of the Enabling Act was the main reason why the Nazis were able to establish a dictatorship in the years 1933-34. I agree with this statement to an extent as more decisive events happened during that period which ~~helped~~<sup>benefitted</sup> the establishment of Hitler's dictatorship. The fact that he became chancellor, the Reichstag Fire and Hindenburg's death are also very important to consider in the establishment of the Nazi dictatorship, along with the Enabling Act. Historians believe that Germany was already in a dictatorship since 1930, as they consider Hindenburg a "semi-dictator," though Nazi's dictatorship started the minute after Hitler became chancellor. Nazi support was <sup>highly</sup> increasing since 1929 and finally Hindenburg did not see another option but to appoint Hitler as chancellor in 1933.

The appointment of Hitler <sup>as</sup> chancellor, started the Nazi dictatorship. Goebbels, used a wide variety of publicity <sup>and</sup> media to advert the Nazi Party and Hitler itself, so its popularity increased, therefore president Hindenburg was convinced

(This page is for your second answer) by Von Papen to make Hitler the new chancellor. Von Papen believed he would be able to control Hitler, but things happened the other way round as Hitler seemed unstoppable and he established the dictatorship legally. As a consequence, some historians claim that the establishment of Hitler as chancellor was the main reason why the Nazis were able to establish their dictatorship. Other events of ~~note~~<sup>notable</sup> importance have to be considered, as the Reichstag fire and its consequences, the Enabling Act.

Once the Enabling Act was implemented, the dictatorship was fully working. Hitler convinced Hindenburg to issue Article 48, the Enabling Act; as the country was in chaos, Hindenburg accepted and now Hitler was able to do whatever he desired, as laws did not <sup>had</sup> to pass through the Reichstag. The ban on other political parties was passed in 1933, so the only legal party were the Nazis and freedom of speech and meeting ~~was~~<sup>were</sup> also made illegal. Hitler enjoyed the power he desired as he was able to establish his dictatorship legally. Therefore, historians agree with the statement as the Enabling Act was crucial for the establishment of the dictatorship. Moreover, as the Enabling Act was passed so easily, we can see how easy <sup>was</sup> for Hitler to ~~to~~ engage Hindenburg in his plan. The Enabling Act was the consequence of the Reichstag Fire, ~~A~~ so that event was also crucial in the establishment of the dictatorship.

(This page is for your second answer) The Reichstag Fire was vital in the establishment of the dictatorship. In February 1933, the Reichstag was set on fire and a Dutch communist was found inside the building. This event brought revolt and chaos into Germany and more support for the Nazi Party. Communists were blamed for conspiring against the government and that same night many important members of the KPD were arrested, making weak the party. As a punishment, the KPD was made illegal, so the only other important rival for the Nazis was dead. With the Reichstag Fire, laws which Hitler believed <sup>that</sup> were important were passed, this focused on dominating the country and ending with Nazi opponents or rivals. As a consequence, some historians believe that the Reichstag fire was the main reason which facilitated the establishment of ~~a dictat~~ the Nazi dictatorship. The Enabling Act was the consequence of the Reichstag Fire.

With the Enabling Act, Hitler's ~~power~~ decision-power was unlimited. The act was supposed to be an emergency decree, for extreme situations and Hindenburg agreed with Hitler that the Reichstag fire was an extreme circumstance which needed extreme laws, for the protection of everyone. With the Enabling Act, Hitler's use of terror was legal, he used intimidation tactics to end with his opponents and to make him look fearfull. Hitler wan

(This page is for your second answer) both power and respect with the Enabling Act, so there is no doubt to say that at this point ~~that~~ the Nazi dictatorship was established and fully working. As a consequence, historians claim that the Enabling Act was the main reason why the Nazis were able to establish a dictatorship in the years 1933-34. Moreover, Hindenburg was severely ill and Hitler was only waiting for his death, so in 1934, when Hindenburg died, Hitler became also the president apart from chancellor, becoming known as the Führer ~~Hitler~~. In 1934, Germany was on Hitler's hand and the Nazi dictatorship was finally completely established.

In conclusion, I agree with the explanation to an extent, as I believe that there was no single main reason but the combination of all the events which helped in the establishment of the Nazi dictatorship. From the appointment of Hitler as chancellor, the Reichstag fire resulting in the Enabling Act to the death of Hindenburg, all benefited equally in the establishment of the dictatorship. Even though some historians believe that the Enabling Act was the main reason, many others agree that all the events were of vital importance and that without one of them the dictatorship could not have been established by 1934.

