

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2013

GCE History (6HI03)

Option D

The Challenge of Fascism

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.

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 our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2013

Publications Code US036165

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</p> <p>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>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</p> <p>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>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</p> <p>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>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</p> <p>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>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</p> <p>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</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| | | <p>essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</p> <p>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: AO1a and AO1b (7% - 16 marks) AO2b (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.

AO1a and AO1b (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>Low Level 1: 1 mark</p> <p>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>Mid Level 1: 2 marks</p> <p>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>High Level 1: 3 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 2: 4 marks</p> <p>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>Mid Level 2: 5 marks</p> <p>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>High Level 2: 6 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 3: 7 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 10 marks</p> <p>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</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| | | <p>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>Low Level 4: 11 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 13 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 5: 14 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 15 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform. High Level 5: 16 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed. |
|--|--|--|

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.</p> <p>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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-9 marks</p> <p>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</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| | | <p>information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</p> <p>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>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 17-19 marks</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 5: 22-24 marks</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed. |
|--|--|--|

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 Fürher: Germany, 1900-45

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 1 | <p>This question invites candidates to assess the impact of the war in either heightening or ameliorating the tensions that existed in the Second Reich. As such a variety of responses may be expected which place differing emphasis on matters prior to or during the war; such a range is valid, and should be credited where there is analysis of such tensions. Note that references to specific events or developments prior to 1914 are not required by the question, but can be made relevant to an examination of tensions in the Second Reich at the beginning of the War and should be credited where they are found. In dealing with the tensions and divisions, candidates may draw from the religious divide, the enormous social and economic differences between the North-East of the Reich and the more industrialised and urbanised West, the growing challenge to the rule of the traditional elites symbolised by the growth of the Social Democrats who became the largest party in the Reich with 110 seats in 1912, with the Centre Party in second place. Against this the Chancellor remained answerable first and foremost to the Kaiser not the Reichstag as the Zabern incident of 1913 clearly underlined. Furthermore the Prussian Landtag was far from democratic with a voting system heavily weighted to wealth. Candidates may choose to argue that tensions were easing as constitutional evolution seemed on the cards and a progressive system of social welfare eased class divisions. The war initially seemed to create a greater harmony with the 'Burgfriede' and the support given to the war by the SPD. Growing shortages and resentments of war profiteering led to fresh tensions particularly following the cut in the bread ration in April 1917. The split in the SPD in the same month and the waves of strikes in 1917-18 marked a clear end to the Burgfriede and candidates will probably explore the obvious discontent of 1918 as evidence of heightened tensions, which climaxed in November 1918.</p> <p>At Level 2 and below a narrative of the war years is likely to be on offer. At level 3 the extent of social and political tension should be explicitly addressed although the response is likely to be unbalanced with partial neglect of either the impact of the war or the situation before. At level 4 there should be a real debate although this may still not be fully balanced. In coverage of the situation before and during the war. At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion.</p> | 30 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 2 | <p>This question invites candidates to consider the extent to which the Weimar Republic was threatened in its unstable early years. Expect coverage of the left-wing challenges of 1919, the Kapp Putsch of 1920, the Munich Putsch of 1923 and the Communist disturbances of that year in Saxony and elsewhere. Candidates might also address the spate of political assassinations and the political consequences of the crisis afflicting the currency, culminating in the collapse of 1923.</p> <p>At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of 1923. At level 3 an analysis of the degree of threat posed will predominate although the response is likely to be very one-sided, probably with an acceptance that there was a very real threat. At level 4 there should be a real debate with an awareness shown of the real assets at the disposal of the Weimar governments including the support of a majority of the parties and of the largest party the SPD and its associated Trade Unions. Even the army under Groener and Reinhardt was willing to cooperate although candidates are likely to be aware of its reluctance in 1920 to stand against Luttwitz; and Reinhardt's successor, Seeckt, was somewhat less co-operative. Look for analysis also of the weaknesses of the extremists of both right and left; this could be illustrated by voting figures or illustration of the ease with which threats were countered e.g. the Nazi fiasco in Munich in 1923. At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion.</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 invites candidates to evaluate the significance of one key area of conflict during the Second World War. Candidates are likely to be aware of the controversy surrounding the bomber offensive, weighing the negative - the cost in financial and human terms, the inaccuracy, the clear failure of the late 1943-44 Battle for Berlin, against the positive - the devastation of the Ruhr and Hamburg, the massive shift in resources forced upon the Germans etc.</p> <p>At level 2 and below a narrative of the bomber offensive is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of some episode, e.g. the Dam Buster Raid. At level 3 the significance of its contribution to the ultimate defeat of Germany in the Second World War should be addressed although the response is likely to be very one-sided, e.g. the success was very qualified and the 1944 invasion was much more important. At level 4 there should be a real weighing of extent of success and failure clearly appreciating the problems in reaching a simplified conclusion. Reward those who address the Dam Buster Raid in this way possibly concluding that it was a brilliant tactical achievement but of very limited strategic significance. Better candidates will distinguish between different phases and differing degrees of success, e.g. the failure over Berlin in the spring of 1944 but the devastating effects of bombing on rail and fuel supplies in late 1944-45. Even despite this degree of success, candidates will doubtless conclude that bombing alone could not bring victory but the invasion of France and the long, hard slog up through Italy were vital in bringing about the collapse of the Third Reich in Western Europe. We cannot expect detailed knowledge of the War on the eastern front but it is legitimate to expect candidates to be aware of the vast deployment of the Third Reich's military forces against the Soviet Union. At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion.</p> | 30 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 4 | <p>This question invites candidates to examine the home front and attempt to evaluate the extent of social change during the war years. Expect extensive comment on the impact on women in terms of jobs and life-style. Candidates may address the issue of pre-war unemployment and the total transformation brought about here by war. Some may take up the theme of greater social unity brought about by shared experiences but others may choose to point up the awareness of class and social differences glaringly exposed by such approaches as the policy on evacuees. There may be comment on the strengthening of trade unions and debate on the effects of rationing on health. Some may choose to assess the impact of Anglo-American co-operation with the considerable influence of hundreds of thousands of GIs and US airmen stationed in Britain, this clearly produced liaisons as well as considerable influence on popular culture.</p> <p>At Level 2 and below a narrative of the war years is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of some minor episode. At level 3 the extent of social change should be addressed although the response is likely to be very one-sided, e.g. it liberated women. At level 4 there should be a real weighing of extent, clearly appreciating obvious areas of change but also of continuity. The case may not be fully balanced. At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion.</p> | 30 |

Section B

D1 From Kaiser to Fürher: Germany, 1900-45

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 5 | <p>This question centres on whether or not there was German aggression which was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Two of the sources see Germany as behaving aggressively, with Source 1 referring to an offensive strategy, which many candidates will develop with contextual knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan. The inflexibility of the plan made negotiation very difficult, if not impossible after any power began to mobilise. Mobilisation was tantamount to a declaration of war instead of a threatening gesture as a prelude to talks. Source 1 asserts that Germany was partially responding to encirclement and in this sense might be considered defensive in motivation but also asserts that Germany had produced this encirclement by aggressive diplomacy. Students will develop this with contextual knowledge, either supporting the source or refuting it. Source 2 partially supports Source 1 and argues that Germany was motivated by a desire to enhance her power through war even though the two leading military figures often referred to a preventative war which might be taken as defensive. There is a nice parallel between source 1's reference to the German people's psychology and Source 2's reference to the mental outlook, both stressing aggression. This may be cross referenced and either refuted as a gross generalisation or supported. Candidates may be able to expand on both these issues with contextual knowledge, either agreeing or refuting the theses. Source 3 offers a more generous view of Germany's role with reference to tensions in the Balkans and threats to Germany's only ally. This point will probably be developed with knowledge deployed on the arms race and alliance system. The theme of encirclement is again referred to and can be cross-referenced with Source 1. Candidates can develop the clash with Britain by providing contextual knowledge on the naval race, possibly agreeing with the point made in Source 1 that this provides an example of German aggression, the decision to build a big fleet threatening Britain and thereby exciting hostility to Germany.</p> <p>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, for instance about the situation in the Balkans and why Austria was threatened. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case supporting the proposition referred to in Source 1. At level 4 there should be a real debate on whether German aggression did exist and if so, was it the decisive element in precipitating a general European war. Candidates in conducting this debate will show a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case in support of Source 1 by detailing the basic evidence that pre-war German diplomacy created the encirclement Germany complained of.</p> | 40 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 6 | <p>This question addresses the nature of the Nazi regime and the degree of support and acceptance that Hitler had. Clearly the proposition arises from Source 4, where the case is made that Hitler enjoyed basic support from German workers. Source 5 may be taken as broadly supporting Source 4 and the points made in both about the positive attributes of the Nazi Regime will be developed or refuted with extensive contextual knowledge. This line can be contradicted by inferential use of Source 6 which details the growth of the camp network, an essential part of repression, an indication that terror was a key element for the regime in securing acceptance. Source 6 might be cross referenced with Source 5, which it can be argued it basically contradicts, although it is important to recognise the reference in 5 to the failure to abolish the camps given the asserted low level of opposition. Candidates are likely to notice the dates given for numbers of camp inmates in Sources 5 and 6. Some candidates may choose to refute 5 with own knowledge by reference to the point often made by Professor Richard Evans that the camps are only part of the story of repression and intimidation and the ordinary prisons were fully used to the same effect.</p> <p>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, possibly on some aspects of the terror apparatus. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case supporting the proposition referred to in source 4. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case for or against the proposition that Hitler enjoyed wide support, also appreciating the chronology of shifting levels of popularity.</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 the controversy surrounding Chamberlain's making of the Munich Agreement in September 1938. The proposition offered arises from Source 7 which clearly offers the view that the agreement was a strategic error on Chamberlain's part in view of the subsequent shifting of the military balance. Extensive own knowledge can be deployed to enlarge on the points made in Source 7, particularly regarding the influential issue of the threat of aerial bombardment and the under-prepared nature of British air-defences in 1938. Source 7 can be countered from Source 8 regarding the state of British public opinion and the crucial attitude of the Dominions, neither of which vital strategic ingredients are touched upon in 7. Source 9 offers a different perspective and a different way of countering the proposition in 7. It draws attention to one crucial aspect at Munich i.e. Chamberlain frustrated Hitler's desire for a war in 1938- 'that man has spoiled my entry into Prague'. Own knowledge can be used to develop or counter this point but it should be set in the evaluative balance of whether Munich was a 'strategic disaster'. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or extensive own knowledge displayed possibly relating to rearmament. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case supporting the proposition referred to in Source 7. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. Here the rearmament, referred to above can be deployed to counter the proposition and defend Chamberlain as a man preparing for war, even if he still hoped to avoid it. At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge; this may be deployed on the subject of rearmament or the shift in public opinion, which it can be argued was very marked following Kristallnacht in November 1938 and it can be argued that only with a stronger position in terms of rearmament, widespread public support and the support of the Empire was it sensible to confront Hitler.</p> | 40 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 8 | <p>The question clearly targets the controversy surrounding the impact of the war on the national mood in 1945 and later and the appetite for planned social improvement - <i>a people's peace</i>. The proposition for debate clearly comes from Source 10. The assumptions and views described here will be developed possibly with reference to Beveridge, not actually mentioned, and this will be developed by contextual knowledge of his famous report and its importance in shaping the post-war world. The views of Source 10 are directly contradicted by Sources 11 and 12, where the authors draw attention to the growing reaction against a 'big state' and socialism. This could be extensively developed by much own knowledge regarding hostility to rationing and bureaucracy and possible development of the references to popular post war films such as <i>Passport to Pimlico</i> and <i>Whisky Galore</i> with their mocking of an over-regulated Britain. Candidates may of course challenge the assumptions made, pointing out the limited evidence supplied in Source 11, two films and one pressure group, and the focus of 12 on the Conservative Party. Candidates may note that Source 10 refers only to Socialist politicians' assumptions during the war, but this might be broadened by reference to the landslide victory that these politicians won in the summer of 1945, which might be taken as implying a widespread acceptance for a planned future of social improvement.</p> <p>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, possibly about the condition of Britain in the years after 1945. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case supporting the proposition supported by Source 10. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case relating to the psychological transformations encouraged by the war or the reaction to an over-powerful state shown in such works as <i>Animal Farm</i> and <i>1984</i> of Orwell, an erstwhile Socialist.</p> | 40 |

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 US036165 Summer 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

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

