



Pearson  
Edexcel

Mark Scheme

Summer 2019

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 and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2019

Publications Code: WHI03\_1C\_1906\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## 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.

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>

## Section A: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 reasons for the Kulturkampf.</p> <p>Source 1.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The speech is by Bismarck himself and would look to reinforce his credentials as a great patriot of the new German Empire</li><li>• Dated in 1872, just after the German Empire was formed, he would be looking to defend its core principles as he perceived them</li><li>• The tone of the speech is at times conciliatory but mostly confrontational.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the Kulturkampf:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It claims that the newly formed Centre Party is disdainful of the German government ('We had hoped that it..... would display respect')</li><li>• It implies that the tension between the Catholic community and the German state is all their fault ('At first I did not judge' 'I never read anything good about the Prussian government')</li><li>• It suggests that the threat from Catholics to the German state is real and the state has to be active in dealing with them ('Legislation is needed').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 36.5 per cent of the population of the new German Empire was Catholic</li><li>• The Pope had issued the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility in 1870, which was seen by many as affirmation that the fundamental allegiance of Catholics was not to their nation-state, but to the</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="395 152 501 185">Church</p> <ul data-bbox="347 208 1390 275" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 208 1390 275">• Pope Pius IX had spoken out against the unification of Germany by Prussia in 1871.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 297 432 331">Source 2</p> <p data-bbox="300 365 1369 465">1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 510 1374 824" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 510 1374 611">• Having lived through the Kulturkampf and experienced discrimination for being a Catholic, he was a knowledgeable commentator</li> <li data-bbox="347 656 1374 723">• Writing in 1907 Hüsgens has the benefit of hindsight and can reflect on the reasons for the Kulturkampf</li> <li data-bbox="347 768 1374 824">• The tone of the source reflects his bitterness at the reasons given for the Kulturkampf and the subsequent treatment of Catholics.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 902 1369 1003">2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the Kulturkampf:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 1048 1390 1429" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 1048 1390 1149">• It claims that many Catholics were viewed as dangerous and enemies of the Reich and so needed to be dealt with ('unpatriotic, too loyal to the Pope and hostile to the fatherland')</li> <li data-bbox="347 1193 1390 1294">• It implies that all Germans should support the Kulturkampf for the unity of the new state ('engaging in the Kulturkampf was necessary, correct, and patriotic')</li> <li data-bbox="347 1339 1390 1429">• It suggests that most political parties are using the Kulturkampf to further their own political ends ('the Progressives and the National Liberals were even worse than the Conservatives').</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 1507 1390 1641">3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 1686 1374 2060" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 1686 1374 1787">• The Kulturkampf was deliberately used to reduce the influence of Catholics in education and administration through the May or Falk laws of 1873 and subsequent extensions to them</li> <li data-bbox="347 1832 1374 1933">• Bismarck used the Kulturkampf to try and limit support for the Catholic Centre Party although it was never banned and participated fully in Reichstag elections</li> <li data-bbox="347 2000 1374 2060">• The National Liberals were the dominant political party and largely supported and encouraged Bismarck in launching the Kulturkampf.</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<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"> <li>• Both sources suggest that Catholics are or are seen as being unpatriotic to the new German Empire</li> <li>• Source 1 blames the Catholics for bringing about the Kulturkampf whereas Source 2 sees its causes as a blatant political attack on Catholic values by the new German state</li> <li>• Source 1 claims to value the freedom of all religions to exist in a way that Source 2 would struggle to recognise.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

**Section B: Indicative content**

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

Question	Indicative content
<p><b>2</b></p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 how accurate it is to say that the Treaty of Versailles was the most significant reason for the support for Nazis in Germany in the years 1919–24 and 1930–33.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The signing of the Treaty undermined confidence in the newly-created democratic Weimar Republic from the start, allowing extreme parties grounds for criticism</li> <li>• The nature of the Diktat, along with the territorial and military clauses of the Treaty, fuelled nationalist beliefs and encouraged the rise of the Nazis</li> <li>• Economic consequences of the Treaty, particularly reparations, engendered hostility to the Republic, encouraging Germans to look for more extreme political solutions to their problems</li> <li>• Anti-Versailles rhetoric was underlying in Nazi actions and propaganda across both periods.</li> </ul>

Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The nature of the Weimar Constitution and especially the introduction of proportional representation for voting helped small fringe parties such as the Nazis to establish themselves electorally
- The use of article 48 to effectively bring in presidential government (1930–33) created further political instability and made the promises of the Nazis more electorally appealing
- Economic crises in both 1923 and 1930–33 had a greater impact on the growing appeal of the NSDAP
- The political manoeuvring of Von Papen and Von Schleicher, as well as others, help explain Hitler's appointment as Chancellor
- Clever propaganda and cultivation of the image of Hitler partly explain the Nazis popularity in both periods
- Events such as the Reichstag Fire gave opportunities to the Nazis to vilify their opponents and consolidate their political position.

Other relevant material must be credited.

**3**

Answers will be credited according to candidates' 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 how far they agree with the statement that the GDR state was weak from its start in 1949 and this mainly accounts for its collapse in 1989.

Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The GDR had been troubled by internal opposition since its foundation in 1949. This became stronger in the years 1985–89
- The unwillingness of Honecker in the 1980s to reform the single

party state when other countries in the region were doing so exacerbated political discontent

- The GDR had relied on Soviet support from the beginning with Soviet troops continuing to be stationed there. Weakening of this support in the 1980s undermined the integrity of its government
- The command economy of the GDR compared unfavourably with that of the FRG and was weakened by having to pay the USSR war reparations up to 1953
- The GDR was weakened from the start by a persistent exodus of workers, which was not halted by attempts to strengthen its border.

Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- From 1949 the GDR state had a strong and large internal security network that kept the populace in check until changing international circumstances in the 1980s fatally undermined it
- Political reform in the USSR meant a 50 per cent reduction in military expenditure on maintaining communist states in Eastern Europe, which undermined the security of the GDR
- Gorbachev's policies of Perestroika and Glasnost in the Soviet Union suggested that the allegiance of the USSR to the age of command economies was gone thereby undermining the GDR
- The opening up of borders by countries such as Hungary offered escape routes to citizens of the GDR, which created panic in the government of the GDR, as it felt it was losing control over its citizens
- The collapse of the Berlin Wall hastened the demise of the GDR.

Other relevant material must be credited.