

# Mark Scheme (Results)

## Summer 2010

GCE

GCE History 6HI03/D

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: 0844 576 0034

Summer 2010

Publications Code UA024101

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:
  - i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear
  - ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter
  - iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate

## GCE History Marking Guidance

### Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

### Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

### Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

### Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

The essay questions in Part (a) will have an analytical focus, requiring candidates to reach a substantiated judgement on a historical issue or problem.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There will be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

## Section B

Target: A01a and A01b (7% - 16 marks) A02b (10% - 24 marks) (40 marks)

Candidates will be provided with two or three secondary sources totalling about 350-400 words. The question will require candidates to compare the provided source material in the process of exploring an issue of historical debate and reaching substantiated judgements in the light of their own knowledge and understanding of the issues of interpretation and controversy. Students must attempt the controversy question that is embedded within the period context.

### A01a and A01b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified, on the basis of factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. Links with the presented source material will be implicit at best. The factual material will be mostly generalised and there will be few, if any, links between the statements.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1 mark</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	4-6	<p>Candidates will produce statements deriving from their own knowledge and may attempt to link this with the presented source material. Knowledge will have some accuracy and relevance. There may be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 5 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>



3	7-10	<p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	11-13	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and - as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 13 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

5	14-16	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 15 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

AO2b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-9	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question.</p> <p>When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	10-14	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to analyse some key points of the arguments offered and to reason from the evidence of the sources. Develops points of challenge and support for the stated claim from the provided source material and deploys material gained from relevant reading and knowledge of the issues under discussion. Shows clear understanding that the issue is one of interpretation.</p> <p>Focuses directly on the question when structuring the response, although, in addressing the specific enquiry, there may be some lack of balance. Reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, supported by information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 17-19 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 22-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

### Unit 3 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Section A Q	30	-	30
Section B Q	16	24	40
Total Marks	46	24	70
% weighting	20%	10%	30%

## Section A

### D1 From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900-45

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>This question addresses the reasons for Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in 1933. Candidates are likely to be able to substantiate the proposition with comments on Nazi electoral success in 1932 but they should appreciate that the question is about why Hitler was appointed by Hindenburg and not why the Nazis were able to garner in the votes. Some may choose to challenge the proposition by pointing out that Hitler was at the peak of his popularity after the July election but was not offered the Chancellorship then. His support declined in November, although he was still the leader of the most popular party in January. Clearly his popular support was a vital element in the President's decision, but candidates will doubtless appreciate that his popular support was a long way from 50%. Candidates at the higher levels will probably examine the thesis that he was levered into power by members of the old élite, frightened of growing Communist support or, in the case of the Army, worried by the prospect of a civil war that they would not be able to contain. Others may introduce the personal dimension with comment on the picque felt by Von Papen against Von Schleicher and in this sense Hitler was the happy beneficiary of petty political rivalries. At the highest levels comment on the proposition may show an awareness of the workings of the Weimar Constitution and the recourse to Presidential Decree since 1930, a situation Hindenburg saw Hitler as being able to let him escape from. At Level 2 and below a descriptive approach to the Nazi path to power is likely to be adopted. At Level 3 a case will be made either arguing for or against the proposition. At Level 4 there should be a real debate. At Level 5, look for a real balanced and evaluative analysis with sophisticated debate.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>This question targets the much debated issue of the inception of the Holocaust. It can be argued that the mass murder evolved from competing organisations and agendas and even circumstances. Look for comment on Himmler and the Generalplan Ost, the clashes between the Governor of Poland, Hans Frank, and Himmler, the initiatives of Goebbels in 1941 to worsen the position of Jews in Germany, the decision of Hitler in October 1941 to authorise the deportation of Jews from Germany, the mass murders in the Baltic States, the Wannsee conference in January 1942 and the onset of industrial mass murder in 1942. Some have argued for the key decisions being made in the autumn of 1941 but more recently Adam Tooze has argued that the key figures were Himmler and Herbert Backe, responsible for food supplies, in 1942. At Level 2 there will probably be an essentially descriptive approach but at Level 3, candidates should begin to debate the proposition and examine the chaotic nature of governmental structures, probably producing a rather one-sided case. At Level 4 there should be a real debate about the causes of the recourse to planned genocide, showing a real awareness of possible different perspectives, including both the stated factor, the chaotic nature of governmental structures, and other possible explanations such as the intentionalist view that Hitler blamed the Jews for the war and was determined to exact revenge as promised in the speech of 1939. At Level 5 there will be a sustained evaluative argument precisely supported with telling detail drawn from the whole period of the war.</p>	30

## D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>This question addresses the period from September 1939 to the autumn of 1941 and clearly there were plenty of retreats and defeats; Norway, France and Belgium, Greece, Crete and North Africa as well as setbacks at sea. Against this might be set a catalogue of successes, notably the Battle of Britain, the defeat of the Italians in both North and East Africa, the crushing of the Italian Navy at Taranto and Matapan and the sinking of key German ships such as Graf Spee (1939) and Bismarck (May 1941). Candidates may also consider the Blitz, probably as a defeat in terms of the inability to offer an effective defence at the time but also it could be considered indecisive or a failure in so far as war production rose and there was no inclination to make peace. At Level 2 and below a descriptive approach to one or more of these issues is likely to be adopted. At Level 3 a case will be made either arguing for or against the proposition. The answer is likely to be unbalanced with probably a heavy emphasis on the negative, i.e. agreement with the proposition in the question. At Level 4 there should be a real debate with consideration of the many victories and defeats on land, sea and in the air. At Level 5 look for a real balanced and evaluative analysis with an awareness of the range of variation and also possible comment on the broad issue of survival against a much stronger opponent.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>This question targets the key issue of the Home Front. Look for comment on a whole range of developments, notably illustration of 'successful war economy' by reference to the remarkable boost in arms production, particularly aircraft. Here candidates may comment not only on the volume of production which outstripped Germany till 1944 but also the quality of such aircraft as the Mosquito and the Lancaster. Even in tank production there was a remarkable boost with Britain nearly equalling Germany in 1941 and 1942. Transformation is likely to attract comment on - the utilisation of women, air raids and the development of civil defence, the boost in food production, rationing, the maintenance of morale, growth of control etc. Against this may be set the rigidities in production in some areas due both to restrictive practices and poor quality machinery and the growing and enormous dependence on Lend-Lease. Some may comment on the essential bankruptcy of Britain from 1941 onwards. At Level 2 there may be an essentially descriptive approach with some aspects of wartime Britain described. At Level 3, candidates should begin to argue a case although this may be one-sided but there should be some appreciation of what 'a successful war economy' means. At Level 4 a real awareness of the different arguments possible should be shown with real address to 'transform'. At Level 5 there will be a sustained evaluative argument precisely supported which is likely in part to be deployed with a sophisticated awareness of what constituted 'a successful war economy' and how far this produced a 'transformation'.</p>	30

## Section B

### D1 From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900-45

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question addresses responsibility for the outbreak of war in 1914 and each source adopts a different perspective. Source 1 might be said to support the notion of German aggression in broad terms and offers the opportunity to candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the Fischer thesis, either agreeing with it or refuting it, as many historians have done. Candidates will also be able to use their own knowledge to contextualise the reference to the blank cheque and the Schlieffen Plan. Source 3, in contrast, takes a broad over-view of the effects of the arms race without apportioning blame but seeing all countries as involved. The reference to Anglo-German naval rivalry is likely to be expanded upon with own knowledge and the German challenge here to Britain might be used to support the notion of German aggression. It does, however, stress the British determination to maintain their superiority whatever the cost and the German aim was deterrence not war. The focus of Source 2 is on the July Crisis and can be used to substantiate a degree of German aggression, but also points to the responsibility of France in encouraging Russian mobilisation which many already knew would lead to war. At Level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or extensive own knowledge displayed but the prevalent approach is likely to be descriptive. At Level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case either supporting the proposition or refuting it. References in the sources to such important factors as the 'blank cheque' and 'the Schlieffen Plan' may be expanded upon using own knowledge. At Level 4 and above the differing approaches of the three writers to the importance of German decisions in precipitating war will be appreciated and debated. At the highest level candidates may recognize the historiographical contexts with real awareness of the Fischer thesis in terms of both its strengths and weaknesses.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question addresses the role of Hitler in the government of the Third Reich. Source 4 clearly provides the quotation and, as might be expected, goes some way to support the proposition. Candidates will be able to develop this argument with own knowledge possibly referring to the case of Walter Darre, in charge of agriculture, who was unable to secure an interview with Hitler for many years. Source 5 can be used inferentially to support Source 4 as the clear implication of the source is the lack of close control over subordinates who went their own way. Source 6 in contrast argues for a more pro-active Hitler, 'erratic rather than lazy'. The case here can of course be extensively developed from own knowledge. At Level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or extensive own knowledge displayed on Hitler's initiatives or lack of initiatives, but the approach is likely to be essentially descriptive. At Level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case either supporting the proposition or refuting it. References in the sources to such important developments as the implementation of anti-semitic policies may be expanded upon, using own knowledge. At Level 4 and above the differing approaches of the three writers to the role and degree of control exercised by Hitler will be appreciated and debated. Candidates at this level may consider a range of policy areas appreciating the differences in terms of the interest Hitler showed, e.g. almost nil in terms of agriculture but, as Source 6 indicates, extensive in the case of the arts. At the highest level candidates may recognize the historiographical contexts and expand on the view points of both the intentionalist and structuralist schools of thought, but this is not necessary.</p>	40



## D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>This question targets two related issues, the credibility of the guarantee to Poland and the degree of serious preparation for war with Germany. Source 7 offers the view that it was not credible because British rearmament was inadequate and Chamberlain unwilling to face the reality of War. In other words it is the source of the question and supports the proposition contained in it. Candidates are likely to use own knowledge to contextualise the circumstances giving rise to the Guarantee in the spring of 1939. Source 8 by comparison, whilst not addressing the issue of the guarantee, refutes the assertions in Source 7 about the limited nature of rearmament in 1939, stressing the massive leap in the scale of war preparations. Source 9 makes the point that the guarantee was seriously meant to convince Hitler of Britain's intentions and in this sense it refutes 7 but it does emphasise Halifax's role not Chamberlain's and candidates may use own knowledge to expand on the influence Halifax exerted in March upon the Prime Minister in reversing the policy of appeasement, itself possibly the root of the failure to convince Hitler the guarantee was meant. At Level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge. At Level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or extensive own knowledge displayed but a descriptive narrative of the events of 1939 are likely to predominate. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case agreeing with either 8 or 7. At level 4 there should be a real debate about the nature of the differing analyses showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. There should be an appreciation of the difference between the central thrust of 8, which leaves little doubt about the seriousness of war preparations, and the assertions in 7 about Chamberlain's hopes for the avoidance of war. At Level 5 there will be a sustained evaluative argument precisely supported from both sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter is likely to be deployed in making a case about the state of rearmament disputed between 8 and 7 and the credibility of the guarantee, which, it might be argued, suffered more from past British behaviour rather than the state of rearmament in 1939.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>This question addresses some of the social consequences of the Second World War and the expectations that it gave rise to. Source 10 clearly supports the proposition in the question and this is largely contradicted by the points made in Source 11. Source 12 takes a more nuanced approach both in terms of changing levels of expectation and interest in change and in identifying which groups contributed to the formulation of 'public opinion'. Candidates will probably seek to illustrate the debate with own knowledge on the growing role of government during the war, the deliberate encouragement of debate on post-war reconstruction and the question of growing sentiments of egalitarianism. Some may refer to the very influential book eventually published in 1950 by Richard Titmus, <i>Problems of Social Policy</i>, which did much to create the belief that there was a climate of expectation for welfare and social reform. At Level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge. At Level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or extensive own knowledge displayed, but a descriptive approach of Britain at the end of the war is likely to predominate. At Level 3 a case will be made either arguing for or against one side of the proposition. The answer is likely to be unbalanced, with probably a heavy emphasis on the assumption of government-induced welfare reforms. At this level, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably as indicated, producing a rather one-sided case agreeing with Source 10. At Level 4 there should be a real debate with consideration of the nature of the differing analyses showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. Clearly 10 sees the war as engendering a positive spirit of innovation and 11 as encouraging apathy and a desire to return to a world gone by. Candidates may use their own knowledge to expand on this with reference to increased role of government and egalitarianism. At Level 5 look for a real balanced and evaluative analysis with an awareness of the complex interplay of social developments and war-time experiences and the bearing these had on post-war expectations .</p>	40



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA024101 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH