**Germany Sample Exam Answers**

**1. *Give two things you can infer from Source A the success of the Berlin Olympic Games in 1936.* (4 marks)**

***Inference –****the Nazis had created a good impression of their regime.* ***Evidence*** *-**it says ‘The Nazis have succeeded with their propaganda’.*

***Inference -*** *the games were better than any previous Olympic Games.* ***Evidence*** *-* *‘the Nazis have run the games on an extravagant scale never before experienced’.*

***Inference –*** *the games had helped the Nazis to gain favour with business owners.* ***Evidence*** *– ‘the Nazis have put on a good show for the general visitors, especially those who are big businessmen’.*

**2. Explain why the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment in Germany in the years 1933-1939**

**You may use the following in your answer:**

* **rearmament**
* **autobahns (12 marks)**

**You must use information of your own.**

*The Nazis were able to reduce unemployment between 1933 and 1939 due to their increased spending on public works schemes which created jobs in the construction industry. By 1938, spending on public works had increased from 18 billion to 38 billion marks which drastically helped to reduce unemployment. The greatest example of this was the building of the autobahns. In September 1933, Hitler started construction of the first autobahn as part of a plan to create a 7,000 mile network of dual carriageways to improve transport. The first section was opened in May 1935 and by 1938 3,500km were completed. The building of the autobahns created jobs in the construction industry which helped to reduce unemployment. By 1935, 125,000 men were employed on the autobahns. Better roads and bridges meant quicker and cheaper transport for industry and agriculture which in turn led to more job opportunities as this boosted sales of German goods, at home and abroad. This, the public works schemes, in particular the autobahns, enabled the Nazis to reduce unemployment as they provided direct employment and helped to boost the economy so that other jobs were also available.*

*Example question: Causation*

*This is how the mark scheme is divided*

Another reason the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment was Hitler’s decision to increase military spending and break the terms of the Treaty of Versailles by rearming Germany and increasing the size of the army through conscription. In 1935 he reintroduced conscription, meaning all men between 18 and 25 were expected to do two years military service. This reduced unemployment as these men were classed as being in work when completing their military service. By 1939 1.36 million men were in the armed forces thereby reducing unemployment. Rearmament meant there was a greater military spending on weapons and equipment. Military spending increased from 3.5 billion marks in 1933 to 26 billion in 1939, which also helped to reduce unemployment as there was greater employment in armaments factories. In 1933, 4,000 people were employed in the aircraft industry and by 1935 this had increased to 72,000. Therefore, through the increase in the size of the army and rearmament, the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment.

Another way the Nazis managed to reduce unemployment was through manipulating unemployment figures. Women and Jews were not recorded in unemployment figures, and men in the Labour Service were provided with work. The Nazis forced women to give up their jobs and their unemployment was then not recorded in unemployment figures, and some jobs could be taken by men. Jews lost their citizenship in 1935 and so were also not recorded in unemployment figures when they were fired from their jobs. Part time workers were also recorded as full time. The Labour Service also helped to reduce unemployment while not actually creating more genuine jobs. Set up in 1933, the RAD provided paid work for the unemployed such as planting trees, draining marshes and repairing roads. This was voluntary at first, but from 1935 it became compulsory to serve 6 months and membership rose to 422,000. The men serving in the RAD technically had jobs and thus the RAD helped to further reduce unemployment by providing jobs for men who would otherwise be unemployed. Thus, by manipulating employment figures and creating ‘invisible unemployed’ people, the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment between 1933 and 1939.

***Q3a. How useful are sources B & C for an enquiry into the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-1923? (8 marks)***

Source B is extremely useful in telling us about the political challenges facing the Weimar Republic as it shows Freikorps soldiers taking part in the Kapp Putsch, a right wing uprising which declared a new government, making Dr Wolfgang Kapp in charge of the country. The source clearly shows soldiers standing calmly by a gun, very near the Reichstag which shows that their challenge was serious as they were in control of the capital, appearing relaxed and there is no fighting going on, The source is also useful as it shows the weapons that were available to the Freikorps and therefore how serious a threat the Kapp Putsch posed to the Weimar Republic. The Kapp Putsch was by the Freikorps which Ebert had tried to disband in 1920 when they became uncontrollable. Fearing unemployment, members of the Freikorps marched on Berlin to gain control of the city. This shows that the source is useful as we can see members of the Freikorps who have achieved their aim of taking control of Berlin.

However, it is slightly limited because it does not show that although the Kapp Putsch succeeded in taking control of Berlin, it collapsed after a few days due to a general strike called by the Weimar government. Many workers agreed to go on strike as they were socialists and did not want the Kaiser back.

As a photograph, source A provides solid evidence of the Kapp Putsch, however as it is from a German newspaper it may have been taken to reassure people that the situation in the capital was calm and under control. In the same way, the soldiers may be posing to show how in control they were and this how successful their uprising was.

Overall, the source is very useful for showing us the initial success of the Kapp Putsch, a political challenge to the Weimar Republic, but is less useful in telling us the long term success of the uprising.

Source C is also useful for telling about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic as it shows that the people did not support the government when it says ‘people didn’t trust the government anymore.’ I know that government decisions made economic problems worse; inflation had been a problem since the end of the war, but hyperinflation became particularly serious in 1923.

However, the source is limited as it does not tell us why the Weimar Republic was experiencing challenges as it says ‘how is it that the government can’t control this inflation’. This is because the government was responsible for the hyperinflation of 1923 because it was printing more money in order to pay the striking workers in the Ruhr.

Therefore, although the source is useful for telling us about the impact of the economic challenges facing the Weimar Republic, it does not tell us about the causes of their difficulties and is therefore is only partially useful.

***Q3b: Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views*** ***about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-1923. What is the main difference between these views? Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.*** (***4 marks)***

***The main difference between the views is that*** *the interpretations identify different starting points for the challenges to the Weimar Republic. Interpretation 1 suggests that the challenge to the existence of Weimar came from groups on the Left and Right that wanted to destroy the republic from the very start when it says ‘took against action the Republic very soon after it was created.’.* ***WHEREAS****, interpretation 2 suggests that it was hyperinflation in 1923 which threatened the existence of the Republic as this was when ‘people talked openly about removing the government.’*

***Q3c: Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-1923.. You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.***

**Example 1**

*The interpretations may differ because the historians have* ***given weight to different sources.*** *For example, Source B provides some support for Interpretation 1, which shows the dangerous threat from the Right in the form of the Freikorps.* ***WHEREAS****, source C provides support for interpretation 2, which emphasises the serious consequences of hyperinflation in undermining faith in the government when it says the Weimar Republic was in ‘fear for its own existence.’*

**Example 2**

*The two interpretations may differ because the authors have chosen to* ***place an emphasis on different details****. Interpretation 1 is dealing with the political threats from the Left and the Right from the start of the period 1919-23,* ***WHEREAS*** *Interpretation 2 deals with the economic and social challenges as a consequence of hyperinflation in 1923.*

**Example 3**

*The interpretations may differ because they are written from* ***different perspectives****. Interpretation 1 looks at the political threats from the Left and Right as it focuses on ‘powerful political groups’.* ***WHEREAS*** *Interpretation 2 focuses on the economic dangers facing the Weimar Republic as it discusses how the government ‘ruined the economy.’*

**How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23? Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context.**

Interpretation 2 gives the view that the challenges facing the Weimar Republic began in 1923 with hyperinflation, which caused economic and social discontent so that people wanted to overthrow the government. I disagree with this interpretation as interpretation 1’s view that the challenges facing the Weimar Republic existed from the start as groups from the Left and Right refused to accept its existence is more convincing.

I agree with interpretation 1’s viewpoint because although economic problems in the later period did make things worse, the unpopularity of the Weimar Republic and the association of the politicians with the Treaty of Versailles meant that there were vocal opponents of the Weimar Republic from the start. Interpretation 1 suggests that a challenge facing the Weimar Republic was the dangerous threat from the Left and Right when it says groups on both sides ‘refused to accept the existence’ of the new government. Indeed, I know that the Weimar Republic was made up of moderate parties such as the Social Democrats and Centre Party and they were not supported by extreme right (National Party) and left (Communist Party) wing parties. The Weimar Republic also faced uprisings from the Left and the Right 1919-23 which challenged the government, including the Spartacist Uprising (1919), the Kapp Putsch (1920), and the Munich Putsch (1923). While these uprisings were all defeated, they support interpretation 1’s claim that opposition groups were prepared to ‘destroy [the Weimar Republic] with force’. Indeed, the Kapp Putsch managed to force the government to leave Berlin for a few days in March 1920. The challenge of armed uprising is also supported by interpretation 2 when it says there was talk of popular revolution or a military putsch.’ Therefore, I agree with interpretation 1’s view that dangerous forces were prepared to destroy the Weimar Republic through force from the beginning.

However, interpretation 2’s claims do have some merit in that they highlight the impact of the occupation of the Ruhr as it brought discontent to the surface, causing people to question the government. Interpretation 2’s view is that it was hyperinflation that most challenged the Weimar Republic, stating that they ‘could not find a solution’, leading the government to ‘fear for its own existence.’ Indeed I know that hyperinflation was caused by the government as they ‘could not find a solution’ to the occupation of the Ruhr and so printed more money making the situation worse. Hyperinflation particularly affected the middle classes, who lost savings, and workers whose wages could no longer support them, causing them to lose faith in the government. This proves how valid interpretation 1’s argument is that the government was undermined as, had the government been stronger and able to ‘maintain order and govern Germany’, they might have been able to find a solution. Interpretation 2 is critical in tone claiming that the government ‘simply’ printed more money which ‘ruined’ the economy. The interpretation appears judgemental, blaming the economic problems on the incompetence of the Weimar Republic. In contrast, interpretation 1 is more measured in tone as it acknowledges that ‘some democratic parties’ supported the Weimar Republic, despite the challenges the new government faced.

Overall, whilst interpretation 2 is valid in its argument that hyperinflation caused economic challenges for the Weimar Republic, interpretation 1 is more convincing in its view that the Weimar Republic faced resistance from the very beginning. Although hyperinflation made things worse for the government, had they not been unpopular from the beginning, there might have been less resistance from the people from the start and therefore, when the economic problems resulting from the occupation of the Ruhr occurred in 1923, the government would have been in a strong enough position not to ‘fear for its own existence.’