|  |
| --- |
| Source A‘We have failed to take over the Weimar Government!!!! This plan should have worked, we have been betrayed by our own people and outnumbered by the army. This is outrageous, the people need a strong leader. The Nazi Party is doomed. We will end up in prison!’*Member of the Nazi Party, speaking about the Munich Putsch, 1923 (day after the event).*  |

|  |
| --- |
| Source BAlthough the Nazi Party had failed to take over the government after the Munich Putsch this was not a failure. During Hitler’s trial he became a well known name in months and this even led to his autobiography becoming a best seller. Hitler won over the jury with his amazing ability to speak in front of crowds and gained lots of support. His prison sentence should have been life but he only served 9 months. *V. Gray, British historian ‘’The Munich Putsch’, 2011.*  |

**Which of the sources are more useful to an historian studying the consequences of the Munich Putsch? [12]**

Candidate A

Source A is useful to an historian studying the consequences of the Munich Putsch as it suggests the Nazis are ‘doomed’ the day after. It describes the putsch as a failure for the Nazi Party and, as well as this, the source suggests the author has serious concerns they will now all ‘end up prison’. It is however limited in its coverage of the consequences because it was written the day after the event. But despite this it does suggest what happened was so serious the author knows it will result in members of the Nazis going to prison. It is a primary source and gives us an interesting perspective from someone who experienced the failed revolution. It also talks about the Nazis being betrayed. We do not know who the Nazi member is talking to, he could be talking to the media and therefore he could be over exaggerating the disaster to entertain the audience.

Source B is also useful to an historian because it suggests the author is shocked at Hitler’s jail sentence. Hitler ‘only served nine months’ despite an act of treason. The source is useful because it is accurate as he did serve this term. I do know though that Hitler served this term in luxurious circumstances with relative freedom and good treatment. The source also suggests Hitler ‘gained lots of support’ and ‘his autobiography became a big seller’. This is useful because it shows us that despite the Munich Putsch being a failure, it did have positive consequences. Adolf Hitler gained great support by using the media to gain attention and rally support, he used his enthusiasm and defended himself in court in order to look like a martyr for his cause. This source was written in 2011 by an historian for a book about the Munich Putsch. Obviously it was written decades after the event when the full consequences of the Putsch were known. Its author would have an informed response to the Putsch and the book’s audience would be historians, students and those interested in history or the subject. It would be clearly well researched.

Overall, both sources are useful in studying the Putsch’s consequences. Source A offers an eyewitness account which also shows the overwhelming feelings of failure after the event. Source B is also useful because it is based on research gathered after the event. I believe Source B to be more useful because it was written at a time when the full impact of the event was known.