



EDX.WN8 The 25-Point Programme and Early Nazi Ideology, 1920

EDEXCEL 1HI0 · Calculators not allowed · about 75 minutes

Total Marks

--

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / ____

Answer ALL questions. Write in full sentences for Questions 13, 16 and 17. You are advised to spend about 75 minutes on this pack. Four marks are available for spelling, punctuation, grammar and the use of specialist terms in Question 17.

- 1** Give the year the National Socialist German Workers Party published its 25-Point Programme.

(Total for Question 1 is 1 mark)

- 2** Name the city where the 25-Point Programme was proclaimed in February 1920.

(Total for Question 2 is 1 mark)

- 3** Give one clause in the 25-Point Programme that shows its extreme German nationalism.

(Total for Question 3 is 1 mark)

- 4** Name the term the Programme used to refer to the Treaty of Versailles, indicating its hostility to the settlement.

(Total for Question 4 is 1 mark)

- 5** State one way the 25-Point Programme expressed anti-communism.

(Total for Question 5 is 2 marks)

- 6** Name two groups or categories the 25-Point Programme excluded from full citizenship by reference to 'German blood' or non-German status.

(Total for Question 6 is 2 marks)

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

(Total for Question 7 is 1 mark)

- 8** State one way the Programme appealed to the idea of a unified Volksgemeinschaft, or 'people's community'.

(Total for Question 8 is 2 marks)

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

(Total for Question 9 is 1 mark)

- 10** State two social or political aims in the Programme that reveal its populist appeal to ordinary Germans.

(Total for Question 10 is 2 marks)

- 11** Give one way the 25-Point Programme tied national identity to racial criteria.

(Total for Question 11 is 1 mark)

- 12** Give two things you can infer from Source A about the attitudes of the 25-Point Programme's authors towards foreigners and wartime losses.

Source A: From a speech text summarised in a local Munich DAP leaflet, February 1920. 'We will reject those who have no blood with us from all public life. The shame of the war must be washed away: the strangers who profited from our defeat, the forced payments, the loss of territory, all must be undone by a people united.'

(Total for Question 12 is 4 marks)

- 13** Explain why the 25-Point Programme attacked the Treaty of Versailles and called it 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 13 is 12 marks)

14 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 14 is 8 marks)

- 15** Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about how radical the 25-Point Programme was in 1920. What is the main difference between these views?

Interpretation 1: From Klaus Meier, *A Short History of the Early Nazi Movement*, 2015. 'The 25-Point Programme was an extreme manifesto. Its racial clauses and demand to overturn Versailles set it well outside mainstream politics in 1920. The Programme's radical social measures were designed to attract the desperate, but its core was a violent and exclusionary nationalism that marked it as a dangerous fringe radicalism.'

Interpretation 2: From Anna Becker, *Popular Politics in Postwar Germany*, 2018. 'The 25-Point Programme combined nationalist rhetoric with concrete social policies aimed at workers and small proprietors. Many of its demands were familiar to other populist parties of the period. In 1920 the Programme can be seen as a competitive attempt to win mass support rather than as purely radical, since it mixed exclusionary ideas with promises of social relief.'

(Total for Question 15 is 4 marks)

- 16** Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about how radical the 25-Point Programme was in 1920.

(Total for Question 16 is 4 marks)

- 17** 'The 25-Point Programme was mainly a populist platform aimed at winning votes, not a coherent radical ideological statement.' How far do you agree with this interpretation? Explain your answer. Four marks are available for spelling, punctuation, grammar and the accurate use of specialist terms.

(Total for Question 17 is 20 marks)

Mark scheme · EDX.WN8 The 25-Point Programme and Early Nazi Ideology, 1920

Question 1

- **B1** 1920
- **Answer:** 1920

Question 2

- **B1** Munchen (Munich)
- **Answer:** Munchen (Munich)

Question 3

- **B1** any valid clause such as the demand for the union of all Germans in a Greater Germany
- **Answer:** For example, the demand for the union of all Germans in a Greater Germany.

Question 4

- **B1** the 'Diktat' or 'nations Diktat'
- **Answer:** the 'Diktat', often called the 'nations Diktat'

Question 5

- **B1** identifies an anti-communist element, e.g. the call to combat Marxism
- **B1** supporting detail, e.g. clauses demanded removal of 'Marxists' from public office and the suppression of revolutionary socialism
- **Answer:** It called for fighting Marxism and removing Marxists from positions of influence, aiming to suppress revolutionary socialism.

Question 6

- **B1** Jews
- **B1** other non-Germans (foreigners) or those not of 'German blood'
- **Answer:** Jews, and other non-Germans or those not of 'German blood'.

Question 7

- **B1** nationalisation of trusts or profit-sharing for employees, or confiscation of war profits
- **Answer:** For example, nationalisation of trusts or profit-sharing for employees.

Question 8

- **B1** identifies an appeal to unity, e.g. exclusion of elements seen as not belonging to 'German blood'
- **B1** supporting detail, e.g. the promise of equal rights for 'Germans' and social measures aimed at creating national solidarity
- **Answer:** By excluding those not of 'German blood' and promising social measures for 'Germans', it promoted a single national community, the Volksgemeinschaft.

Question 9

- **B1** Anton Drexler or Adolf Hitler
- **Answer:** Anton Drexler or Adolf Hitler

Question 10

- **B1** identifies one aim, e.g. confiscation of war profits or profit-sharing for employees
- **B1** identifies a second aim, e.g. pension provision or support for small businesses
- **Answer:** Confiscation of war profits and support for small businesses or pensions for elderly citizens.

Question 11

- **B1** citizenship restricted to those of 'German blood' and exclusion of Jews and other non-Germans
- **Answer:** By restricting citizenship to those of 'German blood' and excluding Jews and other non-Germans.

Question 12

- **B1** Inference 1, e.g. the authors believed foreigners or those not of German blood should be excluded from public life
- **B1** Support for Inference 1, quoting or referencing 'reject those who have no blood with us from all public life'
- **B1** Inference 2, e.g. they viewed the Treaty and wartime settlements as a national humiliation that must be reversed
- **B1** Support for Inference 2, quoting or referencing 'The shame of the war must be washed away' and undoing forced payments and loss of territory
- **Answer: Box 1: Inference - The authors wanted to exclude foreigners or those not of 'German blood' from public life, supported by the line 'reject those who have no blood with us from all public life'. Box 2: Inference - They saw the postwar settlements as a shame to be reversed, supported by 'The shame of the war must be washed away' and references to undoing forced payments and loss of territory.**

Question 13

- **Level 1** (1-3): Identifies simple reasons why the Programme attacked the Treaty, with limited supporting detail.
- **Level 2** (4-6): Explains one or two reasons with some supporting detail linking the Programme's demands to disagreement with Versailles.
- **Level 3** (7-9): Explains several reasons, including the Programme's territorial and economic claims and ideological opposition, with accurate supporting detail.
- **Level 4** (10-12): 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.
- **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 it 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.
 - The Programme 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 14

- **Level 1** (1-2): Simple judgement about usefulness, with limited support from content or provenance.
- **Level 2** (3-5): Some evaluation of the sources' usefulness, using content and some provenance, and possibly making a limited comparison.
- **Level 3** (6-8): Detailed evaluation of how useful both sources are for the enquiry, considering content, authorship, purpose, audience and limitations, and reaching a supported conclusion.
- **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

Question 15

- **Level 1** (1-2): Identifies a basic difference between the interpretations, with little supporting detail.
- **Level 2** (3-4): Clearly states the main difference and supports it with reference to both interpretations and some contextual knowledge.
- **Indicative content:**
 - Interpretation 1 emphasises the Programme's radical, exclusionary, and violent nationalist core, seeing it as outside mainstream politics in 1920.
 - Interpretation 2 emphasises the Programme's populist, mass-appeal elements and its similarity to other contemporary social-populist demands, portraying it as a competitive attempt to win support rather than only an extreme fringe manifesto.
 - A clear answer states that the main difference is whether the Programme should be seen primarily as radical ideology aimed at marginal politics (Interpretation 1) or as a pragmatic populist platform seeking broad support (Interpretation 2).

Question 16

- **Level 1** (1-2): Offers a basic plausible reason with limited explanation.
- **Level 2** (3-4): Offers a plausible reason and explains how it could lead the authors to different conclusions, with some supporting detail.
- **Indicative content:**
 - They may use different sources: Interpretation 1 may rely on official texts and radical slogans emphasising racial clauses, while Interpretation 2 may draw on meeting reports and letters showing social appeals, leading to different emphases.
 - They may prioritise different aspects: one historian focuses on ideology and long-term danger, the other on immediate political strategy and social measures that appealed to voters.
 - Different authors' aims and backgrounds can shape emphasis: a historian concerned with radicalisation highlights exclusionary elements, while a social historian studying mass politics emphasises promises aimed at workers and small proprietors.

Question 17

- **Level 1** (1-4): Offers a simple and undeveloped judgement, with limited supporting factual knowledge and little analysis.
- **Level 2** (5-8): Shows some relevant knowledge and offers a partially developed argument, but analysis and judgement are limited.
- **Level 3** (9-12): Shows sound knowledge and analysis of both the populist and ideological elements, reaching a supported judgement.
- **Level 4** (13-16): Shows precise and well-selected knowledge, analyses the competing interpretations in depth and reaches a sustained, balanced judgement focused on the evidence.
- **Indicative content:**
 - Arguments supporting the statement, with evidence: the Programme contained many practical social and economic demands such as profit-sharing, pensions and support for small traders, which can be seen as designed to attract veterans, workers and small proprietors and win mass support.
 - Evidence that it functioned as a populist platform includes meeting reports showing speakers switching between nationalist rhetoric and promises of cheap credit or pensions, and the Programme's blend of social promises alongside nationalist demands.
 - Arguments against the statement, with evidence: the racial clauses and the linkage of citizenship to 'German blood' were an explicit ideological commitment that went beyond mere vote-winning and laid an exclusionary, racist foundation for the movement.
 - The demand to overturn Versailles, the focus on racial purity and the explicit anti-Semitic language in several clauses indicate a coherent ideological core aimed at redefining the nation, not only short-term electoral gain.
 - A balanced judgement explains that the Programme was both populist and ideological: its social measures gave it immediate appeal while its racial and nationalist demands provided a radical ideological framework that made it more than a simple vote-catching manifesto.
 - Students may use contextual knowledge such as the unstable postwar political environment, the presence of rival populist and radical movements, and the DAP/NSDAP's need to attract broad support to show why the Programme combined both elements.