

# Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2011

GCE History (6HI03/D)

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

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

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

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

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:  
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on  
[HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk](mailto:HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk)

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

June 2011

Publications Code UA028162

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which, strands of QWC are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## **GCE History Marking Guidance**

### **Marking of Questions: Levels of Response**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Deciding on the Mark Point within a Level**

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

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3

criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

### Section A

#### Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

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

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

		<p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>13-18</b>	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>19-24</b>	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less</p>

		<p>convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>5</b>	<b>25-30</b>	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

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

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

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by



a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

## Section B

### Target: 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><b>Low Level 1: 1 mark</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	4-6	<p>Candidates will produce statements deriving from their own knowledge and may attempt to link this with the presented source material. Knowledge will have some accuracy and relevance. There may be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent</p>

		<p>syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 5 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
--	--	---

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

		<p>interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 13 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	14-16	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 15 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

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

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

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

### AO2b (24 marks)

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

		<b>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.
--	--	--

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

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

### Unit 3 Assessment Grid

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





## Section A

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>This question invites candidates to consider the impact of the Weimar Constitution on the conduct of politics within Germany during the years 1919 to 1933, and as such responses may focus predominantly on the constitution, or consider this in relation to other issues. Both approaches are valid, provided responses address the question. Candidates are likely to be aware of its salient features, namely the use of proportional representation in the election of the Reichstag, the powers conferred on the elected President and the continuation of a Federal system in which various powers were devolved to the different states. It can be argued that the system of PR made coalition government essential and that this contributed to the rapid change over in chancellors in these years. There were twenty-one different governments and 13 different chancellors. It has been argued that the nature of coalition government made the taking of difficult decisions almost impossible, e.g. to raise taxes or cut expenditure and contributed to the tendency to solve financial problems by apparently painless expedients which in fact in the long term led to serious problems, e.g. printing money 1922-23 and borrowing heavily to finance programmes in the 1925-29 period. The Emergency Presidential powers were used extensively between March 1930 and 1933 and culminated in the appointment of Hitler, partly in an attempt to escape from their use and return to constitutional rule. On the other hand it can be argued that the Weimar Constitution did not cause the fundamental problems afflicting Germany and for much of the time provided effective and successful government in which the instability was more apparent than real and there was considerable continuity in personnel even if the person of the Chancellor changed, e.g. the Centre Party and the DDP as well as the DVP usually provided the bedrock of most coalitions and extremism was excluded. It can be argued that the constitution kept Hitler out of power as others would not work with him and the President was opposed to appointing him Chancellor. In this sense Weimar can be defended as a practical solution to a bitterly divided society which any system would find difficult to govern effectively, especially in</p>	30

	<p>view of the intense economic problems and the legacy of Versailles. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer. At Level 3 the impact of the constitution on the effectiveness of government should be addressed although the response is likely to be very one-sided with the case being made that effective government was handicapped. At Level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At Level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion.</p>	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>2</b>	<p>This question invites candidates to consider the seriousness of opposition to the Nazi Regime during the war years. There will doubtless be coverage of the opposition from the left, most successfully showing itself in the spy network known as the Red Orchestra, from the Churches, from youth groups like the Edelweiss pirates and the White Rose Group and most dangerously within the army and the Abwehr. On the other hand it can be argued that the opposition in all its forms was never serious enough to threaten the regime, although the likes of Himmler took it seriously and the consequent repression was one of the reasons why it remained largely ineffective. Points raised on this side of the argument might be the handicap raised for the Communists by the Nazi-Soviet Pact from 1939 to 1941, the oath of loyalty taken seriously by many serving officers and the widespread consensual support that the regime appeared to enjoy from broad swathes of the public. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of the July Plot. At Level 3 the serious extent of opposition and effectiveness should be addressed although the response is likely to be very one-sided. At Level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. 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
<b>3</b>	<p>This question invites candidates to evaluate the importance of one factor in explaining the British policy of appeasement of Germany in the years 1925-37. As far as the stated factor is concerned there will likely be coverage of the issue of reparations, the disarmament clauses of Versailles and the growing sense in both cases that the French were inclined to be unreasonable in their treatment of Germany. Look for coverage of Locarno, the Young Plan, the withdrawal of troops in 1930, the Disarmament Conference of 1933, the response to German rearmament and the occupation of the Rhineland and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. In consideration of other factors it can be argued that the state of the British economy and the desire to boost trade with Germany was equally important as was the anti-war sentiment so prevalent from the late 20s onwards. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of the Treaty of Versailles. At Level 3 the extent to which there was a widespread feeling in Britain that Germany had been badly treated should be addressed, although the response is likely to be very one-sided. At Level 4 there should be a real debate setting the stated factor against alternatives, although this may not be fully balanced. At Level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>4</b>	<p>This question invites candidates to evaluate one key area of British strategy during the Second World War. Candidates are likely to appreciate the deployment of a significant proportion of the army and naval forces to the Mediterranean littoral. Look for coverage of the War in North Africa, the Greek diversion in 1941, the war in Italy 1943-44 and the constant naval warfare centred on Malta. In defence of the strategy it can be argued that it was the only place where Britain could take on the Axis on near equal terms and where British maritime supremacy would tell most effectively. North Africa, it can be argued, was a useful training ground for British and US troops and Italy a vulnerable target in a way that Germany was not. Germany was drawn into deploying a significant proportion of her scarce motorised transport in an area not of vital importance to her and a significant proportion of her air power, both of which could have made a real difference on the vital Eastern Front. On the other side critics have argued that Britain deployed far more man power in the Mediterranean theatre than Germany did and such forces would have been better used in an earlier direct assault on Western Europe, as the US wanted. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of the war in North Africa and the Battle of El Alamein. At Level 3 the extent to which the commitment of massive resources to the Mediterranean was a mistake should be addressed, although the response is likely to be very one-sided. At Level 4 there should be a real debate setting the advantages of fighting in and around the Mediterranean against the alternative use of scarce British resources. 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 one way in which Germany was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Two of the sources see Germany as primarily responsible for the outbreak of war but in very different ways. The question puts forward the proposition that it was the nature of the Schlieffen Plan that made war inevitable during the July Crisis of 1914. This is clearly the argument of AJP Taylor in Source 1. 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. Candidates may bring their contextual knowledge to this, possibly recalling the famous scene between the Kaiser and Moltke where the Kaiser asked if the mobilisation could be halted whilst talks took place only to receive a firm negative. Source 2 clearly counters Source 1 explicitly and argues that Germany was motivated by a desire to defend Austria whom Germany could not afford to see defeated. Candidates will probably explain the Balkan imbroglio and the crisis involving Austria, Russia and Serbia and the role of the German blank cheque of early July. Source 3 offers a more generous view of Germany's role with reference to all powers expanding their armies and France's solid support for Russia. Clearly the Russian decision to mobilise was crucial and the last line of Source 3 can be linked to Source 1 and the primacy of the Schlieffen plan.</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 the Schlieffen Plan was the decisive element in precipitating a general European war, 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 in support of Source 2 by detailing the Balkan situation or in expounding extensively</p>	40

	on Russian initiatives and rearmament, about which Germany was much concerned.	
--	--	--



Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>This question addresses the nature of the Nazi regime and the degree of support it enjoyed. Clearly the proposition arises from Source 4, where the case is made that the Nazi regime did not essentially rely on terror but sought a consensus of support. Some candidates might recognise Robert Gellately as the author of previous books arguing this case, notably <i>Backing Hitler</i> and his studies of the Gestapo and the emphasis he placed on popular collaboration with them. This line is clearly contradicted by Source 5, which stresses the terroristic elements of Nazi Germany and the deliberate and widespread attempts to intimidate all opposition. The implications of this are clearly a regime relying not on consensus but fear. Source 6 might be cross referenced with Source 4 which it can be argued that it basically supports although there is a clear acceptance of the role of terror in brow beating the minority who did oppose. All three sources can be enlarged upon by reference to own knowledge, notably the role of the SD alluded to in Source 5 and the Gellately thesis that the Germans policed themselves or the popularity of Nazis policies mentioned in Source 6. The focus should be predominantly on the stated controversy of 1933-9, although candidates may draw upon some material from the period of WWII, provided this is made relevant.</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 an 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 primary role of terror within the Nazi state, possibly appreciating the chronology of shifting reliance evidenced by the changing number of concentration camp inmates.</p>	40

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>7</b>	<p>This question targets the controversy surrounding Chamberlain's handling of the Munich or Czech Crisis of September 1938. The proposition offered is that Chamberlain was shrewd and not Hitler's dupe, which comes from Source 7 which clearly offers some supporting arguments, notably that concession was the inevitable consequence of military weakness and Chamberlain avoided an unwinnable war in 1938. Extensive own knowledge can be deployed to enlarge on the words of Ironside quoted in Source 7. This is likely to relate to the state of the RAF and the growing radar network. Source 7 can be both countered and supported from Source 8. Hitler is referred to as being irritated and he clearly felt cheated of his prey but the source also makes the point that he gave up very little, a point made to him at the time by Ribbentrop when Hitler famously lamented that Chamberlain had spoiled his entry into Prague. Source 9 largely contradicts Source 7 by implying that Chamberlain was not essentially doing a deal to buy time or because of the moral merits of the case but because he wanted peace almost at any price and he fooled himself that it was possible. Candidates may enlarge on this by reference to the 30<sup>th</sup> September meeting when Chamberlain got Hitler to sign his declaration of peaceful intent.</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 relating to the balance of forces in 1938. 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. 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 either that the destruction of Czechoslovakia, which followed inevitably from Munich, was a strategic disaster, as a third of Germany's modern tanks used in the invasion of France in 1940 came from the Czech Republic or that it was a brilliant delaying tactic making possible victory in the Battle of Britain in 1940.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question clearly targets the controversy surrounding the mood and expectations in Britain in 1945. The proposition for debate clearly comes from Source 10 and some support is provided by reference to the enlarged nature of wartime government in Britain. This can of course be developed through reference to extensive own knowledge. The view of Source 10 is directly contradicted by Source 12, where the national mood is portrayed as one of tiredness and cynicism. Source 11 is more ambivalent and can be used to support both points of view in the sense that Attlee appears to be promising and, by inference, responding to a demand for a radical transformation and promising that Labour will execute such a course. Candidates will be able to make the connection using own knowledge between the socialist principles of the Labour Party and the belief in 'big government' mentioned by Marr. On the other hand, Source 11 hints at the dire economic circumstances which might justify the cynicism of Source 12. Candidates will probably be able to flesh out these circumstances from own knowledge.</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 economic condition of Britain in 1945. 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 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 that, as with Attlee, an awareness of extensive problems to come cohabited with the hope of a radical transformation of Britain in the aftermath of war.</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](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA028162 June 2011

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

