



Pearson

Mark scheme (Results)

June 2017

Pearson Edexcel International
Advanced Level in History (WHI03)

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

June 2017

Publication Code WHI03_1C_1706_MS

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 investigate the main reasons for German reunification in 1990.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Wörner, as a former West German Defence Minister and senior diplomat, would be expected to be informed as to the key issues of reunificationThe title of the speech suggests that reunification is being openly discussed at an international forumThe timing of the speech, coming shortly after the fall of the Berlin Wall, gives credence to the idea that support for reunification is gathering pace.The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the main reasons for German reunification in 1990.<ul style="list-style-type: none">By claiming, with a degree of certainty, that 'German unity will come' Wörner, in early 1990, believes the process cannot be stoppedIt implies that reunification has to happen, as the issue is of international geostrategic importance to all the NATO alliesThe tone is calming, recognising the fast pace of changing events and the uncertainty they are producingIt claims that the momentum towards reunification is being driven by the decisions of the people in East Germany.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:<ul style="list-style-type: none">The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 represented the end of a physical barrier to reunificationThe lack of Soviet support for the GDR signalled the end of the Cold War and the need for realignment in European affairs

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kohl's 'Ten Point Plan' tentatively suggested a timetable towards reunification. <p>Source 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title of the telegram suggests that the issue of reunification was being considered by the USA • The ambassador would be considered to have considerable knowledge of the issues and difficulties pertaining to reunification • The date of the telegram shows that the issue was being considered over a year before reunification happened. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the main reasons for German reunification in 1990: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It claims that the rapid unfolding of events is placing the future of the GDR in doubt • It suggests that the failure of communism has placed the future of the GDR in question • It implies that East Germans would prefer association with a 'market oriented economy'. 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The growing exodus of East Germans to the West continued into 1990 • 'Two plus Four' negotiations started in March 1990 to consider 'the German Question' • The success of the 'Alliance for Germany' in the March 1990 elections in the GDR brought a pro reunification majority to the GDR parliament. <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 imply that reunification seems only a matter of time • Both imply that it will be a victory for democracy

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 159 1417 230">• Both suggest that events in East Germany have been paramount in giving momentum to calls for reunification<li data-bbox="347 297 1417 362">• Both suggest that dealing with 'the German Question' is of international geostrategic importance.

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 question how accurate is it to say that Germany in the years 1870 - 79 was less democratic but more united than it was in the years 1918-24.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that Germany in the years 1870 -79 was less democratic but more united than it was in the years 1918-24. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Political power of the Kaiser was entrenched in the Imperial constitution but the role had been replaced by 1919 by an elected president• Adult male suffrage was used for Reichstag elections after 1871 but universal suffrage was introduced by the Weimar constitution• The Prussian three tier voting system effectively ensured a conservative dominance of the Prussian Landtag. This indirectly gave it dominance over the Bundesrat. This ended in 1918• Germany after 1919 was physically divided with East Prussia being separate• Bismarck sought to generate a manufactured unity by focusing on 'Germanisation.' In the years 1918-24 there was tolerance of divergent minority views enshrined in the Bill of Rights. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that Germany in the years 1870 -79 was less democratic but more united than it was in the years 1918-24 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The extensive powers of the president under the Weimar Constitution led some to conclude he was an 'ersatz Kaiser'• Both periods had similar anti-democratic features eg Important institutions such as the Judiciary, in the Weimar period, retained many judges from the Kaiserreich who were hostile to democracy• After 1918 political parties such as the DNVP were hostile to democracy and openly campaigned to restore the monarchy

- The loss of territories such as Alsace in 1919 reduced the divisions caused by national minorities, which had been a feature of the early Kaiserreich
- Prussian Junkers retained their dominance of key institutions such as the army throughout the years 1918-24
- Symbols of unity such as a national army and national anthem were absent in the 1870s but present in the years 1918-24.

Other relevant material must be credited.

3

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.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the nazification of Germany between 1933-39 was so extensive that this accounts for the limitations of de-Nazification in the FRG after 1949.

Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the nazification of Germany between 1933-39 was so extensive that this accounts for the limitations of de-Nazification in the FRG after 1949 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Massive popular support as shown through the March 1933 election and various plebiscites in the 1930s showed the depth of nazification
- Extensive use of selective terror had popular support and highlighted the success of the regime in persuading Germans of its values
- Millions of Germans had, in the 1930s, associated with the Nazis, whether as party members, members of the Hitler Youth or participants in Nazi worker holiday programmes
- The difficulty in identifying Nazis and the sheer scale of numbers of those involved made it difficult to fulfil the promise of the allies at Potsdam to completely destroy all traces of Nazism
- The official US policy of using the Fragebogen was such a crude method of determining who were die-hard Nazis that it developed considerable opposition to it in the fledgling FRG and so was ended.

Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the nazification of Germany between 1933-9 was so extensive that this accounts for the limitations of denazification in the FRG after 1949 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Opposition to both Nazism in general and specific Nazi policies such as anti-semitism continued throughout the 1930s
- The lack of total success in building a Volksgemeinschaft amongst key groups such as Catholics and working class suggested that the

process of nazification was not complete

- The emphasis placed on the importance of propaganda by the Nazis implied that many elements of nazification were manufactured imagery rather than reality
- Adenauer's government, after 1951, pursued more flexible policies to help integrate ex-Nazis into FRG society
- Adenauer's government acted firmly with any persisting examples of right wing extremism and, in 1952, banned the neo-Nazi Socialist Reich party
- By 1949, the Cold War was clearly in progress and the threat from the Eastern Bloc rather than latent Nazism within West Germany became of more concern to the government.

Other relevant material must be credited.