5.9 The 25-Point Programme and Early Nazi Ideology, 1920: 30-minute Pack

EDEXCEL 1HI0 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions. You are advised to spend about 30 minutes on this pack.

1 Name the term that Nazi speakers and many other Germans used for the Treaty of Versailles, indicating hostility to the settlement.

(Total for Question 1 is 1 mark)

2 Give one economic policy demand from the 25-Point Programme.

(Total for Question 2 is 1 mark)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

3 Name one early Nazi leader closely associated with drafting and announcing the 25-Point Programme in 1920.

(Total for Question 3 is 1 mark)

---

4 Explain why the 25-Point Programme attacked the Treaty of Versailles, which many Germans called a 'Diktat'.

You may use the following in your answer:
- the Programme's demand to overturn territorial losses and reparations
- the appeal to national humiliation and the need to restore German honour

You must also use information of your own.

(Total for Question 4 is 12 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

5 How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into how explicitly anti-Semitic the 25-Point Programme was in 1920?

Source B: From a public handbill distributed at a DAP meeting, February 1920. 'Only citizens of German blood may hold political rights. Those who have placed themselves outside the community by religion or origin cannot claim them.'

Source C: From a letter by a small-business owner who attended the meeting, February 1920. 'The speaker spoke with anger about Bolshevism and about foreigners, especially those he named as not belonging. He said Jews had too often stood apart, but then quickly moved on to promises about cheap loans and help for craftsmen.'

(Total for Question 5 is 8 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 5.9 The 25-Point Programme and Early Nazi Ideology, 1920: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

the 'Diktat' or 'nations Diktat' **B1**

Answer: the 'Diktat', often called the 'nations Diktat'

Question 2

nationalisation of trusts or profit-sharing for employees, or confiscation of war profits **B1**

Answer: For example, nationalisation of trusts or profit-sharing for employees.

Question 3

Anton Drexler or Adolf Hitler **B1**

Answer: Anton Drexler or Adolf Hitler

Question 4

Level 1 Identifies simple reasons why the Programme attacked the Treaty, with limited supporting detail. **1-3**

Level 2 Explains one or two reasons with some supporting detail linking the Programme's demands to disagreement with Versailles. **4-6**

Level 3 Explains several reasons, including the Programme's territorial and economic claims and ideological opposition, with accurate supporting detail. **7-9**

Level 4 Offers a well-developed explanation that links the Programme's social and political aims to its denunciation of Versailles, supported throughout by precise and accurate detail and analysis of how these reasons connect. **10-12**

Indicative content:

- The Programme demanded the annulment of territorial losses and reparations, showing direct opposition to Versailles' material effects on Germany and veterans, which explains why Nazi speakers called the Treaty a Diktat.
- Authors of the Programme portrayed Versailles as an imposed humiliation, arguing it was forced on Germany by foreign powers rather than agreed, so 'Diktat' emphasised lack of consent and national insult.
- Economic burden from reparations and perceived war-profiteering by others was used to rally support among soldiers, small producers and the middle classes who felt betrayed, giving the Diktat language strong political resonance.
- Nazi propaganda linked the Treaty to foreign and domestic enemies, including blaming 'non-German' elements and Marxists for the defeat, so attacking Versailles served the broader ideological aim of purging the nation and restoring a racially defined unity.
- Students might use contextual details such as the 'stab-in-the-back' myth, veterans' anger, the presence of Allied occupation in the Rhineland, and the widespread postwar economic hardship to explain why the Diktat label was effective.

Question 5

Level 1 Simple judgement about usefulness, with limited support from content or provenance. **1-2**

Level 2 Some evaluation of the sources' usefulness, using content and some provenance, and possibly making a limited comparison. **3-5**

Level 3 Detailed evaluation of how useful both sources are for the enquiry, considering content, authorship, purpose, audience and limitations, and reaching a supported conclusion. **6-8**

Indicative content:

- Source B is direct and explicit about exclusion by 'German blood' and therefore is strong evidence of the Programme's formal racial criteria; its provenance as a public handbill suggests it was intended to state clear policy to supporters, increasing its usefulness.
- Limitations of Source B include possible rhetorical emphasis for political effect and that a handbill records an official line but not how it was to be enforced or the range of views within the movement.
- Source C is useful because it records an eyewitness reaction showing that anti-Jewish comments were part of public meetings but that speakers also mixed social promises with racist remarks; the author's perspective as a small-business owner may bias him to notice promises about loans, reducing the emphasis on anti-Semitism in his account.
- Source C's usefulness is limited by its personal and selective nature: it is not an official text and may underplay or contextualise anti-Semitic remarks, but it shows how the Programme's rhetoric could be combined with populist economic appeals.
- A balanced judgement would combine both sources: B gives clear policy language showing explicit anti-Semitism, while C shows how such language appeared in speech and was accompanied by other appeals, so both together are useful but each has limitations that must be weighed.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk