

Examiners' Report
June 2012

GCE History 6HI03 D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2012

Publications Code UA032431

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the third session of the 6HI03 D examination. Many candidates wrote insightful comments which placed them in the higher tier marks.

The paper was divided into two sections: Section(A) was an In-Depth Study question. Section (B) an Associated Historical Controversy question. Unfortunately some candidates continue to write too much. As a consequence of this their responses lacked factual detail. Whilst this has been commented upon previously, a significant number of candidates still follow this approach. Factual relevance is the key to achieving high marks. Examiners want to see candidates who can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the questions set.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than adequate for a candidate to gain full marks. The space provided should **not** be seen as a recommendation of the amount candidates should write.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on Option A of students having insufficient time to answer both questions. The paper catered for a wide ability range of candidates as everyone was able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination. There were also very few rubric errors. As expected, there were far more entrants for *D1 – From Kaiser to Führer: Germany 1900-45* than for *D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60*.

The paper gave candidates the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include the source material.

One apparent and in part pleasing trend is that very few students produced essays which were not at least attempting to be analytical. The main weakness in responses which scored less well tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis.

There appears to be an increasing tendency for students to analyse and produce judgements in the main body of the answer and have cursory conclusions. In the sense that candidates can indeed sustain arguments by these means, this does not in itself prevent a barrier to reaching the highest levels. However, in some cases judgements on individual issues and factors tended to be somewhat isolated, and ultimate conclusions were left as rather stated. In this sense, candidates should be minded that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

In terms of the Section B questions, a small number of candidates did seem to engage more with the general debate of the set controversy, rather than the specific demands of the question and source package. This was most evident on Question 6, although it was still a small minority. The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

This was a popular question, which produced some excellent answers, with clear understanding of the concept of 'parliamentary democracy'. Many answers showed a strong level of knowledge of the German constitution and most showed at least some ability to analyse this with common reference to events such as the Daily Telegraph and Zabern affairs, the Herero rising or consideration of the role of the Kaiser, Chancellor, Reichstag or Bundesrat. Less successful responses struggled to focus on the period in question, or had a limited grasp of the key issue. Many responses challenged the question and argued strongly that Germany was an autocracy with minimal democracy, although for the higher levels, some balance was expected. A significant number of candidates were able to address the rise of the SPD and the more democratic elements of the constitution, although in some cases, candidates found it more difficult to marshal information regarding the SPD to the issue of parliamentary democracy. Similarly whilst some made successful reference to foreign policy, in other cases this led to a digression from the question. There were also examples of candidates with a good conceptual understanding of the constitution as established under Bismarck, yet who were limited in their ability to focus this sufficiently on the period 1900-14. In summary, the evidence of scripts seen suggests that the question allowed most candidates selecting this option to structure responses in an analytical manner and at least begin to engage in debate and argument on this issue.

SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

- ~~ⓐ Yes~~ ① No - Kaiser controlled everything - personal rule - rülh
ⓑ No - constitution itself wasn't democratic
ⓒ Yes - Structuralism, chancellors etc. - Layton
ⓓ Yes - Pressure groups, AA, Pan-German League

It's clear that to no extent was Germany a parliamentary democracy in the years 1900-14. Whilst it can be argued that the roots of democracy had been sown, with universal suffrage and pressure groups, Germany was overwhelmingly dominated by the dictatorship of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Moreover, the constitution itself wasn't democratic; the Kaiser had total control over every aspect of Germany policy, as compared to the British monarch at the time, whose power was only symbolic. Whilst one can argue that the Kaiser was influenced by Chancellors, the Reichstag and pressure groups, it's still indisputable that ~~that~~ the Kaiser had the last say in anything, as was demonstrated numerous times from 1900-14.

It's unquestionable that the Kaiser had the final say in every situation. The Historian Pöhl argues that the Kaiser set up a 'personal rule', in which ~~the~~ Wilhelm II and his close circle of friends ruled German

(Section A continued)

completely, with no opposition. This is clearly demonstrated in ~~the~~ 1913; the Zabern Affair. After civilians clashed with the German military in Alsace-Lorraine, there was an outcry from the Reichstag, who protested that the military did as they pleased. The chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, ~~did~~ supported the army and received a vote of no-confidence from the Reichstag. Yet, the Kaiser did not dismiss the chancellor, supporting the army and outright ignoring the Reichstag. This screamed out the intolerance the Kaiser had for the Reichstag and clearly demonstrates the undemocratic atmosphere in Germany.

Furthermore, the constitution itself in Germany was decidedly undemocratic. The Kaiser had unrivalled power, from total control of the army, to control of foreign and domestic policy. Additionally, Wilhelm II could appoint and dismiss Chancellors as he pleased (which he did - there were 5 chancellors from 1890-1917) as well as having the power to dissolve the Reichstag - though admittedly, this could not be indefinite. The Kaiser used his constitutional power on several occasions to ~~additionally~~ have an impact on foreign affairs. For instance, the Daily Telegraph affair in 1908 was an international scandal in which the Kaiser insulted Britain and worsened foreign affairs without any participation from the Reichstag. This is clear evidence that the Kaiser could do as he pleased. What is more interesting is that in both 1908 and 1913, the Reichstag did almost nothing in response to the Kaiser's actions; this was because constitutionally, they could not demand the Kaiser's resignation - again showing how undemocratic Germany was:

(Section A continued)

Yet, it can be argued that in some ways, Germany was ~~not~~ to an extent close to parliamentary democracy. Layton states that Röhl's view of a 'personal rule' is oversimplistic and argues that Germany was actually 'structuralist'. This theory removes the Kaiser from the center of power and argues that the German elite (e.g. Junkers, military figures, judiciary etc.) were able to influence German policy to an extent. There are examples of this, one being the naval Law of 1912; Admiral von Tirpitz was instrumental in pushing for a larger German Navy. Layton also argues that the Kaiser was little more than a playboy and that he was rarely in Berlin to actually influence policies. ~~Instead, it was left to~~ Instead, it was left to the Chancellors, like von Bulow and Bethmann-Hollweg. Bethmann-Hollweg attempted to reform the Prussian voting system in 1908. It was ^{an} utterly unfair, undemocratic system, with the right wing winning over 200 seats with just 16% of the vote and the SPD winning just 12 seats with 27% of the votes. Yet Bethmann-Hollweg was stopped by the German ~~elite~~ elite, and the Reichstag dissolved, showing that whilst ~~the~~ power still lay in the hands of a few, Germany was not entirely undemocratic. Also, it must be seen that compared to other major European powers like Britain, Germany was actually quite democratic in some aspects; no other country had universal suffrage which meant that all men over 25 could vote for a party.

Another way in which Germany can be seen to be close to a parliamentary democracy was the arrival of pressure groups. The theory of 'drivers from below' removes the Kaiser and German elite from

(Section A continued)

the center of power and instead argues that policy was driven by these pressure groups. ~~Groups~~ The Agrarian League was created by the Junkers in order to protect German agriculture and by 1914, had over 300,000 members. This arguably had some influence on the 1902 tariff Law which ~~helped~~ fulfilled the Agrarian League's main aim. Additionally, the Pan-German League pushed for an aggressive foreign policy which coincided with the policy of Weltpolitik. Finally, the Navy League, which was created by Admiral von Tirpitz, and had over a million members, successfully influenced the creation of the Navy Laws in 1902, 06 and 1912. Yet, it must be made clear that these pressure groups were created and led by the German elite so were these groups really representative of the whole German people? Arguably, the groups were undemocratic as they mainly protected the interests of the German Elite.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ the claim that Germany was a parliamentary democracy in the years 1900-14 is a false one. The Kaiser undeniably had dominion over all German affairs and whilst he did not use his constitutional rights in every situation, it remains clear that he was constitutionally a dictator ~~who had the~~ for who made the final decision. The view that pressure groups drove German policy in a democratic fashion is an oversimplistic one; the groups' influence fluctuated over time and simply coincided with the Kaiser's original aims, such as Weltpolitik and Flottenpolitik. Whilst it can be argued that Germany was structuralist and that the power was in the hands of the German elite, the Kaiser demonstrated time and

(Section A continued)

time again that he did as he pleased (e.g. Daily telegraph affair and the first and second Moroccan crisis). Thus, it can be seen that the Kaiser was little more than a dictator, and due to the German constitution, Germany didn't even come close to a parliamentary democracy in the years 1900-14.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The example response is a clearly argued piece, from the introduction onwards. Whilst relatively brief, it is focused, analytical, conceptually strong and with exemplification firmly tied to the demands of the question. It makes brief yet good use of historiographical support and is clearly evaluative. It achieved a level 5.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

In Section A, examining the views of historians is not essential. Often though, candidates attempting to apply historiography can lose focus from the essay. The rule of thumb should be to only attempt this if you are confident it adds to your essay, rather than feeling the need to try to interpret events through 'schools' of history.

Question 2

This was the more popular of the two questions. Option D(1) produced a range of responses that were both wide and revealing. In terms of the stated factor in the question, the discussion of Hitler's talents was at times superficially dealt with, and Hitler's ability as a gifted public speaker tended to be the key focus. In some cases, valid points were raised yet were not explicitly acknowledged as such, for example Hitler's ability to appeal to a wide range of social groups was at times seen as a totally separate factor. That said, even concentrating on this narrow aspect, there were many good responses which were able to clearly link this to party fortunes and reason over the relationship between this and other factors such as the social and political response to economic problems. Where candidates could substantiate Hitler's charisma or skills as an orator, or examine the impact in terms of the consequences of having reorganised the party, they were more successful. Other aspects examined were the appeal to specific groups such as the effectively targeting farmers and the Mittelstand and in their engagement in the constant cultivation of potential voters, or Hitler's role in the political machinations which led to his appointment. Candidates brought in a range of other factors, such as the consequences of the economic depression, the failures of other politicians or aspects of the political system. Again with these, the discriminating factor in success was often an ability to substantiate these and tie these firmly to the issue of the rise of the Nazi Party. Thus it appeared that when some candidates did less well, it was most often due to (1) a reliance on assertion without sufficient support and/or (2) a failure to focus carefully on the question, seemingly addressing a more general 'rise of Hitler' response, often ranging well beyond the date range specified.

(Section A continued)

The transformation of the fortunes of the Nazi Party 1930-33 was due to Hitler's remarkable talents as a politician.

The transformation of the fortunes of the Nazi Party was largely due to Hitler's talents as a politician and the way the Nazi party aided him in his role. Hitler's skills as an orator were supported by the extensive propaganda campaign that exceeded any that had gone before. However the Nazi party also benefited from ~~the~~ ~~economic situation~~ events and situations outside their control; the economic situation, the failure of the democratic parties to work together, and the actions of Hindenburg all played into the NSDAP hands. Even so, the extent to which the Nazi party ~~is~~ transformed between 1930 and 1933 cannot be attributed to ~~the~~ ~~other~~ those outside the party alone. The Nazi party exploited the situation in Germany and capitalised on every opportunity. Furthermore the propaganda campaign complimented, and exposed, Hitler's remarkable talents as a politician and it was this that resulted in a transformation of Nazi fortunes.

Hitler was undoubtedly a remarkable politician; ~~his talents as~~ a talented ~~speech~~ public speaker and charismatic leader, he was able to gain support from the party and public alike. His skills, however, ~~were~~ ~~could~~ ^{alone} could not have increased the Nazi vote from 2.7% of the electorate in 1928 to 37.3% in 1932. The dramatic increase in votes ~~was~~ ^{can be} largely attributed to the way Goebbels and the propaganda machine portrayed Hitler and targeted specific factions of society. Capitalising on the tough economic situation, the party promised prosperity and the restoration of Germany to its 'rightful' place as a great nation. The popular message was drilled into the German people and was hard to ignore. Furthermore the Nazi party targeted the message specifically at rural communities who were suffering badly from the economic downturn and had resented the avant-garde liberalism of the Weimar years. Moreover, the Nazi party took interest in the local issues affecting this group which allowed them to gain popular support. Hitler's role was central as it was his 'interest' in local issues that ultimately secured the rural



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response displays a sound attempt to argue, link and examine factors. There is some good substance in places, although it lacks real depth on the stated factor of Hitler's talents, and tends towards answering a more general question on the 'rise of Hitler' at times, rather than what is specifically asked. It received a good level 4.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Whilst it is valid for candidates to draw on material from outside the question (e.g. pre-1930), or examine the period of consolidation after the March 1933 elections, such material needs to be securely linked to the demands of the question.

Question 3

This question was generally well answered, with many drawing on evidence such as the East Fulham by-election, the Oxford Union debate and the Peace Ballot to suggest that appeasement was indeed a widely supported policy, connecting this to the legacy of WWI. Candidates also examined a range of other factors, such as Britain's military preparedness, economic factors or sympathy for Germany's demands in order to establish a debate. Discriminating factors were often an ability to substantiate these issues in detail, and at the higher levels, drawing out and analysing the relationship between these issues. Surprisingly few considered appeasement in terms of Japan and Italy, although there were excellent examples contrasting the enthusiasm for appeasement in theory against the response to the pragmatic manifestation of this with the Hoare-Laval Pact. One issue that did let down a small minority were references to Chamberlain, ranging from slips in terms of seeing him as being PM throughout this period, to detailed examinations of his activities in 1938.

SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ~~☒~~ and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

To a certain extent, 'public revulsion' towards the horrors of war is an accurate description of the mood that swept Britain in the mid 1930's. The growing threat to global peace coupled with the rise of right-wing military dictatorships led to a British public that not only desired to avoid a conflict, but demanded to avoid one. Arguably, it is this attitude which left the government with no option but to pursue the policy of appeasement. However, as with any foreign policy, appeasement was a complex issue that appeared to be motivated by multiple factors, including Britain's economic issues and severely weakened army.

Firstly, public revulsion towards the horrors of war took a moral, and even idealistic, stance during the period, with the 'Spirit of Locarno' from the 1920's developing into a sense of pacifism. Support for pressure groups, including the 'Peace Pledge Union' and the 'National Peace Council' grew steadily throughout the period clearly highlighting the public's desire to avoid a full-scale conflict. Ultimately, the policy of appeasement, which was believed to be the only method of preventing war by the government, was adopted.

Moreover, support for disarmament during the period suggests a nation that actively sought to prevent any threat to global peace. For example, in the 1933 East Fildham by-election, a Conservative candidate who favoured a more militant approach to the growing threats from fascism, saw his 14,000 majority transformed into a Labour majority of 5,000 due to the Labour candidates' strong support for rapid disarmament.

Furthermore, the 1935 'Peace Ballot' revealed that, out of the 11.5 million voters, 95% favoured support for dealing with international disputes through the League of Nations. These are both clear examples of a nation that had a widespread fear of war and who favoured a policy of pacifying and conciliating the rising powers in Europe rather than confronting them.

In addition to this, the public's unwilling nature to accept conflict, even when it became increasingly likely, can be seen clearly in the latter years of the period, notably from 1935 onwards. Hitler's reoccupation of the Rhineland in 1936 was met with a feeling from the public that he had simply addressed a legitimate grievance and retaken his own 'backyard'. During the Spanish Civil War the public, again, supported an isolationist view towards foreign policy, with great support for Baldwin's 'non-intervention' committee and the widespread feeling that it would be unwise to



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This extract is from a lower level 5 response. It is structured, argued, with clear support and analysis, and attempts to relate issues back to the stated factor in the question – 'public revulsion'. The conclusion does weigh up issues.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Returning to the focus of the question to make relative judgements – wherever possible – is a useful skill on this type of question. A greater depth of evaluation and or ongoing weighing up of issues would be likely to make this a more secure level 5.

Question 4

Most answers were good in assessing the significance of the Atlantic campaign, with a clear focus on how dependent Britain was on the supply lines to America and the consequences for opening up the western front in 1944. However, some did seem drawn towards other theatres, at times offering extensive detail on potentially relevant yet disconnected issues. In terms of the Battle of the Atlantic itself, analysis often included a good overview of the tactics used to keep the Atlantic clear, although in some cases there was drift to a focus on assessing 'why we won the Battle of Atlantic'. The better answers were able to assess the importance of other factors, notably the Battle of Britain or the contribution of the Soviet Union in taking away the rump of Hitler's forces. Where candidates did less well, this tended to be in offering extensive detail without real focus, or in offering one-sided arguments for or against the contention in the question without a balanced examination or convincing reasoning. More successful responses geared specific detail such as that concerning the supply and support from the US, to balanced arguments within a broader analysis. Of these, a number offered convincing arguments over the significance of 1943 as a turning point.

6

(Section A continued) Donitz's 'wolf packs' of U-boats. This victory proved to be crucial to Allied victory in Western Europe as it ensured that the Normandy landings were successful and continued to be well supplied.

Donitz withdrew his U-boats from attacking British and American convoys in May 1943, however the U-boats had been struggling to make an impact since February. After U-boat losses began to outstrip production in October 1942, this was largely due to advances in Allied technology, such as the Hedgehog (1942) and Short wave Radar which could be used from escort planes. In 1942 there were 7 million tons of Allied shipping sunk and ship production was struggling to meet demand. Despite ^{the success of} campaigns such as 'Dig for Victory' and the Women's Land Army (who contributed to the record harvest in 1943) it was crucial that the Allies had control of the ocean. During the Battle of the Atlantic dry goods reaching Britain fell from 68 million tons to 22 million tons annually; as Britain needed on average 55 million tons to sustain itself victory in the Atlantic was crucial not only to Allied victory in the West but also to the maintenance of Britain as a launchpad for the assault on Western Europe.

(Section A continued) It was also crucial for the Allied victory that troops and supplies continued to reach Britain from the USA. From 1942 the USAAF began to arrive in Britain and the USA produced 2/3 of Allied equipment throughout the war. Victory in the Atlantic ensured that ~~this~~ ^{those} crucial supplies got through. Furthermore US troops began to arrive in Britain in advance of the assault on mainland Europe; ~~it~~ those troops were crucial to the Allied victory in the ~~west~~ Western Europe as it was US troops who broke out and made the most progress following the D-Day landings on 6th June 1944.

In fact, it may have been impossible to launch the assault on Western Europe without control of the Atlantic; for this reason the victory was crucial. The Allies had proven during the North African campaign the devastating effect of attacking supply convoys travelling from ~~the~~ Italy and so it was crucial that the beachhead was well supplied. On the first day of Operation Overlord, 156,000 men landed on the 5 Allied beaches of Normandy, with over a million men landing in total. Furthermore supply ships ensured that by D+7 troops and equipment were flooding across the Mulberry Harbours. This would not have been possible without control of the



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response shows good knowledge and has an overall focus. There is a clear analytical structure, although sometimes the detailing of events get the better of a really focused exploration of issues. It does, however, consider the stated issue in some depth. The response achieved a good level 4.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Supporting knowledge is clearly important, but this shouldn't just be 'shown off' - it needs to be firmly linked to an analysis of the issues in the question.

Question 5

This was a very popular question and some candidates were able to write impressive answers which showed a range of reading. The sources were used reasonably well, though the difference in argument between sources 1 and 3 was not always picked up, and the final line of source 2 was at times not well deployed. Most were able to pick up on the views in the sources and link them generally to the views they knew about. The views of Fischer were well known by many candidates and were discussed in some detail. Wehler's argument that domestic considerations were the key driving force behind Germany's foreign policy were also discussed but such comments were not as widespread as Fischer's views. A common weakness in some responses was that candidates did not quite know where to place Wehler's argument – while many were conversant with his ideas, some seemed to see the argument in Source 2 as exonerating Germany rather than implicating it. Many were able to identify that Source 1 contrasted with Source 2 and entered into discussion about the significance of the Schlieffen Plan. Many strong responses used other approaches such as *Primat der Innenpolitik* and calculated risk, using these to assess the sources in relation to the question. Most candidates were able to cross-reference the sources, even at surface level. Very few took the answer source-by-source. Some, however, did analyse and cross-reference the sources first, then do all the 'knowledge bit' after. Most were able to give examples of incidents before the war, with the most popular points being the Moroccan Crisis, Schlieffen Plan and the naval race.

SECTION B

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

The issue of war guilt is a controversial topic. In source 1, Ozment suggests that it was not planned German aggression that led to the outbreak of war, ^{but that it was an inevitability.} Ozment states that 'many states beyond Germany had been willing to risk war', this is a view shared by G.P. Gooch who argues the inevitability of the outbreak of war in 1914. ^{in source 3} James Joll also suggests that war was an 'inescapable necessity' ~~so~~ implying that there was a certain inevitability about the outbreak of a European war. ^{in source 2} However, Abrams opens up another side of the debate in suggesting that Germany's planned aggression was the reason for the outbreak of war. This is in accordance with the Fischer thesis. Fischer argued that due to a dossier he discovered penned by Hallwag's secretary Germany had been planning war. ~~Abrams also~~ ~~suggests~~ Joll is also in agreement with Fischer here as he states Germany went to war to

(Section B continued) protect 'vital national interests'. Abrams suggests a further side to the debate by suggesting Wehler's argument that Germany went to war to resolve domestic issues. However, despite Fischer's claims, ~~Zimmert's argument that war was~~ ~~inevitable in 1914~~ the outbreak of war in 1914 was not primarily a result of their planned aggression and as such it can be argued that there was an inevitability about the outbreak of a European war.

In Source 2 Abrams refers to the Fischer thesis, this claims that ~~Germany's~~ Germany had aggressive expansionist desires and due to this were responsible for the outbreak of war. In a dossier prepared by Hallwieg's secretary, Fischer found plans for post war peace negotiations, Fischer argues that this coupled with Germany's welt-politik policies demonstrated their aggressive intent. Indeed, in the July Days Crisis, Germany's decision to give Austria-Hungary a blank cheque would suggest they were vying for the start of a war. Joll ~~is~~ is in agreement with Fischer in source 3 as he points to Germany's 'national interests' being at stake and suggests Germany desired the 'recovery of Alsace Lorraine' among others. Again, Germany's



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is an extract from a focused and argued response which gained full marks. It shows clear understanding of the views and the debate more generally, confidently assimilating and taking on the given views.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Set out the arguments in the introduction, emphasising the position the different sources take in relation to the question – and each other.

Question 6

Again this was a popular question which produced a range of responses. Some less successful answers seemed to think the three sources had the same or very similar arguments based on Hitler's work routine (or lack of), and there were some general answers which lacked direction and evidence, or dealt at length with Hitler's 'Bohemian lifestyle' without real argument. Some answers drifted into associated debates, seemingly eager to demonstrate knowledge of structuralism, internationalism or Kershaw, yet were not always convincingly applying these perspectives to the specifics of the question. Areas of own knowledge commonly and largely successfully applied centred on examples from foreign policy, economic policy, the T4 programme or the Nuremberg Laws for instance. Less successful application of own knowledge included the sadly untrue descriptions of Hitler's favourite film being *The Sound of Music*. The very good answers that were seen - and there were many of these - were clearly aware of the wider debate and used own knowledge to develop points from the sources. Although these varied in how extensive the own knowledge was, the key issue in doing well appeared to be a more careful and critical reading of the sources prior to writing.

(Section B continued) mundane issues, though perhaps indirectly.

Kirk continues to claim that Hitler was lazy. He points to his 'leisurely morning routine' whilst Spotts refers to the French ambassador's depiction of him as 'lazy'. Although Spotts attempts to maintain that Hitler was 'anything but' a non-interventionalist dictator, his argument is ~~not convincing as he fails to explain Hitler's~~ ~~reasons for~~ contradicted by Kirk and the mentioning of this view by Spotts, shows his recognition of the debate. Evans claims that others could 'wield considerable influence'. The rumours which resulted in the actions of the Night of Long Knives in 1934 clearly illustrate this. The ~~rumours~~ rumours were fed to Hitler in order to shut down a rival power of the SA. However, Spotts would argue that 'nothing happened', of which he was unaware' so perhaps he knew the SA were too powerful and shut them down as he saw them as a threat to his dictatorship, therefore, dictating actions and contradicting the statement.

On the other hand, it can be argued that

(Section B continued) Hitler did dictate. Spotts claims that he was 'calculating' and an 'ice-cold realist'. This would suggest that he was very clever in his management style and only dictated subtly and where needed. Evans' assertion that 'access (to Hitler) became an increasingly important key to power,' is enlightening. It would lead to an acceptance of Kershaw's 'working towards the Führer' idea. Spotts believes that Hitler was aware of his strategy. He gave knowledge of his broad policies and allowed others to carry them out, allowing people to compete for power through him. Therefore, Kirk's argument that Hitler 'conducted starkly' with the 'obsessive will to control all aspects of policy' can be rejected. Hitler had control over everything without direct orders.

Spotts' proposal that Hitler allowed 'broad administrative freedom' is not incorrect and the support given by Evans strengthens this argument. Evans argues that Hitler left 'details of financial management to others'. This would suggest that Hitler was not dictating and making decisions. However, Spotts mentions foreign relations which is where Hitler really



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The following extract works the sources well, relating them to each other and the debate. It is analytical, although the focus and evaluation is not always fully secure, whilst the selection and use of own knowledge is not as strong as the source analysis. It achieved a low level 5 for A02b and good level 4 for A01.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Be careful over trying to fit the views of any historian or 'school' you have studied to the specific sources or question in front of you. Study the sources carefully and critically, and work out exactly how these relate to the arguments you are considering.

Question 7

Question 7 was the more popular of the two on option D2, and produced the expected wide range of responses. Some superb answers discussed the difference between Chamberlain's public and private views, or discussed at length how and why policy changed with the offering of the Polish Guarantee. The extent of rearmament was frequently well-understood and argued. Specific detailed knowledge of the guarantees given by Chamberlain and the negotiations with the USSR were cited in the argument. At the weaker end there was often general criticism of Chamberlain - often echoing Cato and Churchill - and an assumption that the sources had the same argument. At higher levels there was some debate, though this was often still somewhat imbalanced, but with greater integration of contextual knowledge of 1939. The best answers used the sources to the full and explored the implications in the arguments. Of these, several candidates noted that if Chamberlain was 'out of touch' in March 1939, it was because his policy had been cheered up to March 1939. Some well-informed candidates could perhaps have performed better by addressing the occupation of Prague as a turning point, when instead they looked more generally at why Chamberlain was reluctant to abandon appeasement.

SECTION B

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

✓ agree

X disagree

shock to Britain

It is extremely questionable as to whether Chamberlain was reluctant to confront Hitler and abandon the policy of appeasement in 1939. With tensions mounting due to Hitler's irrational behaviour, it is difficult to determine what Chamberlain's approach was to Hitler.

It could be suggested that Chamberlain was reluctant to confront Hitler due to his erratic decision-making. This made Hitler

(Section B continued) immensely dangerous and a constant threat to Britain. Source 7 states that Chamberlain, '... ~~blame~~ blame the old scapegoat, Versailles...' This could suggest that in a quest to avoid any further conflict, Chamberlain chose to bring a contrasting matter to light, which could receive blame instead. Later he adds '... the terms I was able to secure at Munich were not those I myself would have desired...' This supports the claim that Chamberlain was reluctant to address Hitler yet does not suggest his feelings on appeasement.

Sources 8 and 9 both address the opposite view, that Hitler was to be confronted by Chamberlain as his attack on Prague was viewed as '... a direct slap in the face ~~for~~^{to} Britain'. This suggests that Chamberlain was surprised by Hitler's decision to march into Prague which in itself suggests could lead to further conflict (as we know from the beginning of world war two later that year). The statement, in source 8, '... There were few friends of Hitler or Germany,' suggests that a war was imminent from the ~~go~~ happenings.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The following excerpt shows an awareness of the question. However, the focus is intermittent and the development of issues using own knowledge is thin. Similarly, the response shows some awareness of the views within sources to some extent, but the use of these is largely illustratively. The response achieved a low level 3 / borderline level 2 for both assessment objectives.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

If you have a particularly strong view on a question, it is worth remembering the need for balance. This does not mean sitting on the fence, more that you should explore the range of alternatives.

Question 8

As in previous years, question 8 was the less popular of the two in Section B of D2. Most answers largely focused on the source material, with better responses able to deconstruct the arguments from the sources effectively, and in the main candidates tended to see the sources as offering a good range of argument. Where candidates did less well, this was often as a result of doing little more than rehearsing the sources. Many candidates did seem able to challenge the views of Source 10 and to an extent the latter aspects of Source 12, although for some this tended to be a straightforward rejection without critical analysis. In general, candidates tended to be more successful in broadening the debate on the social rather than economic side.

SECTION B

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Plan

~~1 - Social changes: Class - source 12 + 10~~

~~: Women - ~~source~~ source 12~~

~~- economic changes: positive - source 11, new industry~~

~~: negative - source 10~~

Economy - positive
- negative

Society - positive
- negative

The issue of whether or not the Second World War had a negative effect on both Britain's economy and society has been heavily debated among historians. Some, such as Barnett in Source 10, state that the war left Britain's economy in tatters and led to a deadening government control, whereas others, such as Hennessy in Source 11, point to the variety of new technologies that were spurred on by the war. Concerning the issue of society, ~~Cor Barnett in source 10~~ ^{and gender} ~~and Morgan in Source 12~~ states that the war worsened class distinctions, although Morgan also states that the war may have led to new freedoms for women.

During the war, the government had got involved in the economy in a way it had not before, through the policy of Keynesian economics, which Barnett in source 10 argues had a very negative effect. "A total war for survival had failed to remedy in British management and the British workforce that Jung, Shubert... curlock and method that had first been

(Section B continued) identified in the nineteenth century... these failings had actually been encouraged by wartime conditions." Barnett therefore takes the view that the war did not change anything in terms of British economic policy, which was in fact worsened by the war. It is debatable whether or not the economic changes brought about by the war were negative, but the statement that the war changed nothing does not seem strictly true. During the war the government implemented a policy of Keynesian economics, which was the theory that only government input into the economy could spur it on. The Conservative government after the war also introduced nationalisation of a variety of industries, whereby 20% of industries, including coal and transport were brought under government control. Barnett argues this was a bad thing - "firms on government contracts were subject to no discipline of international or even home-market competition" - however, he also states that "the workforce... enjoyed 'full employment'". The fact that unemployment lowered 5 million over the course of the war, as well as ^{quarterly} production increasing 6½ times, suggests that, although the war might have led to a too rigorous government control, the effects on the economy did not seem to be too negative.

Hennessy argues in Source 11 that, in fact, the war spurred on a variety of new industries. In disagreement with Hennessy, he argues that "new industries were spun-off by the war effort", including the "miracle industry" of electronics, and that the war supposedly "transformed the chemical industry". Indeed, experiments in creating new missiles and weapons did lead to a variety of new discoveries in the chemical industry, and a variety of technical innovations were also adapted for domestic use after the war, such as the jet engine^{, radar} and, as Hennessy states, "~~for~~ atomic energy". The war also led to a revolution in medicine through the experimentation in plastic surgery.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The following response is relatively brief, yet in the main well argued and making good use of sources. It lacks real depth of evaluation and some of the subtleties and issues within the sources were not quite picked up on, but it is sufficiently structured and analytical for a high level 4 on both assessment objectives.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Where a question has two aspects, such as the 'society' and 'economy' references in this, it is important to try to focus on and develop both of these. Some very analysis and judgements may make distinctions between the extents of change for these two issues within the same point.

Paper Summary

A general summary of the areas for improvement in the approach to the Depth Study question and the Associated Historical Controversy question on Option D may prove of benefit to centres.

In-Depth Study question

Candidates must develop their points with more specific factual details. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth.

Staying within the specific boundaries of the question – for example, some candidates explored issues outside of the relevant time periods.

More candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.

In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis not a descriptive or chronological account. Many candidates produced answers, which were focused and developed appropriately.

Some candidates need to analyse key phrases and concepts more carefully.

Some candidates could have explored links and the interaction between issues more effectively.

Associated Historical Controversy question

It is suggested that the students who perform best on Section B tended to be those who read the sources carefully, accurately and critically; recognised themes and issues arising from the sources, then used these to address the question. Some candidates potentially limited themselves by closing off potential areas of enquiry by seeking to make the evidence of the sources fit the contention in the question, without full thought to the issues within the sources, or by using the sources to illustrate arguments without relating evidence to other sources or own knowledge.

Candidates need to treat the sources as a package to facilitate cross-referencing and advance a convincing line of argument. Many weaker candidates resorted to 'potted' summaries of each source which failed to develop a support/challenge approach.

Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little or no own knowledge was included.

Candidates should avoid memorised 'perspectives' essays and base their responses on the issues raised by the sources instead. The Associated Historical Controversy question is an exercise in interpretation not historiography.

That said there were very few really weak responses. The impression was that the substance of the source at least enabled candidates offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases though, candidates often struggled to extend issues with own knowledge, or really analyse the given views.

There was also a correlation between those candidates who reviewed all sources in their opening paragraph and high performance. Whilst a telling introduction is not essential, it is suggested that the process of carefully studying the sources with a view to how they relate to the contention in the question, prior to embarking upon the bulk of essay writing, allows

candidates to clarify and structure their thoughts and arguments.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA032431 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning