

Mark scheme

International Advanced
Level in History (WHI03/1C)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with
Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Germany: United,
Divided and Reunited,
1870–
1990

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

October 2017

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- 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.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- 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.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

Section A

Target: AO2 (25 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the divisions within Germany in 1917 regarding the desirability of continuing with the war.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <p>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Erzberger was a senior figure in the Reichstag and would understand the controversial nature of his proposals• The timing of his speech is devastating to the survival of the incumbent government• The tone of the speech is one of both conciliation and patriotism. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the divisions within Germany in 1917 regarding the desirability of continuing with the war:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It claims that his proposals are no different to the original intentions of the Kaiser at the outset of the war• It implies that the political mood in Germany is becoming more conciliatory and positive about bringing the war to a conclusion• It suggests that peace discussions must be fair and equitable and that Germany was in no mood to capitulate on any terms. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Peace Resolution was submitted after Erzberger became convinced that unrestricted submarine warfare would not produce victory• The entry of the USA into the war in April 1917 had altered the probable outcome of the war for Germany• The Peace Resolution followed the Kreuznach declaration, which showed a desire for an annexationist outcome to the war for Germany.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 2</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ludendorff, along with Hindenburg, was in control of the military and by 1917 effective <u>a</u> military dictators of Germany • The language used indicates that he believes those in favour of immediate peace are unpatriotic • The timing of the speech is designed to both challenge the Reichstag and align his viewpoint with that of the victories of Bismarck. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the divisions within Germany in 1917 regarding the desirability of continuing the war:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It suggests that, contrary to the view of some in the Reichstag, Germany is in a good military position • It suggests that the Reichstag is out of touch with the views of the majority • It indicates that a new political movement, carrying on the traditions of Prussian militarism, is needed to help propel Germany to victory. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ludendorff was behind the Kreuznach declaration, which was an explicit statement of Siegfrieden • Ludendorff was behind the July plot to oust Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg and assume political control of Germany • Ludendorff allowed the army to finance the Fatherland Party and by 1918 it had over 1 million members. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both claim that their stance on peace is the patriotic one • Both claim the desire to unite the German people behind one policy • Whilst source 1 takes a more conciliatory view of future international relations, source 2 is belligerent seeing a negotiated peace as a stain on national honour.

Question	Indicative content
	Other relevant material must be credited.

Section B: Indicative content
Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

Question	Indicative content
2.	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the political consequences of the economic problems Germany experienced in the years 1919-24 were not as great as the political consequences of the economic problems Germany experienced in the years 1930-33.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic crisis 1930-33 helped to weaken the functioning of parliamentary democracy, as evidenced through the use of Presidential Decrees, in a way that had not happened earlier • One consequence of economic hardship was the polarisation of politics and the drift towards Nazi dictatorship by the end of 1933. The Nazi threat had been easily dealt with in 1923 • The international community, through such initiatives as the Dawes Plan, were prepared to help Germany economically in 1924. 1930-33, with the withdrawal of American loans to Germany, was very different • Unlike the economic crisis of 1923, growing unemployment between 1930-33, led to both growing working-class support for a communist uprising and middle-class fears that it was imminent • The economic crisis of 1930-33 quickly became a political crisis as the social insurance system became overloaded in a way that did not happen 1919-24. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hyperinflation of 1923 had a devastating impact on the fortunes of the Mittelstand and weakened their support for democratic parties • Failure to pay reparations led to the occupation of the Ruhr by France in January 1923, which was partly responsible for Hitler's putsch. In 1932 the international community helped Germany by scrapping reparations • Both periods, partly as a result of economic hardship, witnessed violent street fighting between political paramilitary groups • Economic grievances partly explain why between 1919 and 1924

Germany had eight different Chancellors, suggesting instability. In contrast, Brüning was the Chancellor for much of the later period

- There were a number of high profile attempted putsches in the period 1919-24. This was not the case between 1930-33
- Economic instability helped to cause the numerous political assassinations in the years 1919-24 but much less so in 1930-33.

Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that 'the greatest challenge facing both the newly established FRG between 1949-60 and the GDR in the years 1985-90 was achieving prosperity.'</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a need to rebuild a prosperous economy in the FRG following the devastation of the Second World War • Ludwig Erhard oversaw the 'post war economic miracle' in the FRG. He promoted free market economics and freedom of competition which<u>that</u> would serve to bring about 'prosperity for all' • The Allies understood the political importance of economic prosperity for the FRG and so provided around 1.4 billion US dollars through Marshall Aid • Economic stagnation in the GDR in the 1980's and rising national debt led to calls for reform to boost the economy of the GDR • Honecker allowed many skilled workers to visit relatives in the FRG. This was partly designed to appease them and, in the hope of stabilising the GDR, convince them not to emigrate. <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Producing an effective and democratic constitution for the FRG in 1949 was their<u>its</u> greatest challenge • Maintaining national unity in the FRG, especially with regard to the policies of de-nazification, was a huge challenge in the FRG • Rebuilding international relations through greater moves towards European integration was a significant challenge for the FRG • Maintaining the dominance of the c<u>o</u>mmunist regime, in the light of the fluctuation <u>in</u> support from the USSR, became the overriding priority in the GDR 1985-90 • The issue of reunification was a great challenge to the GDR in 1990. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>