



# Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2021

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI03/1C)

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 2021

Question Paper Log Number P65830A

Publications Code WHI03\_1C\_rms\_20210604

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## 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 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 Bismarck's problems in creating a new German Empire in the years 1870-71.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></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>• Bismarck, as Prussian Minister President and Federal Chancellor of the North German Confederation, might be expected to have an in-depth knowledge of the issues confronting him</li><li>• The letter is dated from before the surrender of France and so Bismarck might be being speculative as to future events</li><li>• The language and tone of the letter is respectful and almost obsequious towards Ludwig.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Bismarck's problems in creating a new German Empire in the years 1870-71.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It indicates that Bismarck realises Bavaria needs to be seen to be playing a central part in the formation of the new German state ('its proposal should first come from Your Majesty')</li><li>• It indicates that Bismarck felt it was essential that primacy in decision making came from the princes and not the Reichstag ('Most importantly' 'not come from the Reichstag as the representative body of the people.')</li><li>• It implies that Bismarck feels compelled to present the idea of a unified German state as the wish of all the princes and people ('come from a willing transfer of authority by the German princes and peoples.').</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>• Catholic Bavaria had traditionally been hostile, and had previously fought against Prussia in 1866, but was now siding with it in the war against Catholic France</li><li>• Bavaria had contributed, by the end of September 1870, to a series of Prussian and German victories, culminating in the decisive Battle of Sedan and were looking for reward for this</li><li>• Bismarck made major concessions to Bavaria, granting it its own post and telecommunication systems, railways and army during peace time, as well as a substantial financial inducement.</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 2</b></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 writer is a participant in the meeting and, as heir to the Prussian crown, has a clear interest in and involvement with the outcome of the discussion</li> <li>• The language and tone used emphasise how unhappy the Crown Prince was with the direction of the discussion</li> <li>• The date of the diary entry indicates that divisions still existed about the nature of the new German state as late as the day before its proclamation.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Bismarck's problems in creating a new German Empire in the years 1870-71.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that Bavaria was unhappy that the new German unified state might be seen as little more than a Prussian Empire ('Bavarian representatives had not wished to permit the title of 'Emperor of Germany')</li> <li>• It provides evidence that both the Prussian King and the Crown Prince were mostly united in their opposition to some of the compromises being demanded of them ('displeased both the King and myself.')</li> <li>• It indicates that for the Prussian King certain things were sacrosanct and he was determined that Prussia would maintain control over the army ('he would not hear of an 'Imperial Army').</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>• Bavaria and the other south German states had played an influential supporting role alongside Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War and were determined to have their contribution recognised</li> <li>• The constitution of the new German Empire recognised the potential for dynastic rivalry by allowing the 22 different royal rulers to maintain some powers under the German Emperor</li> <li>• An Imperial Army was not created. The German army was made up of four separate armies from Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony and Wurttemberg.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources indicate that the title given to the head of state was contentious</li> <li>• Both sources indicate that Bismarck was the driving force behind the discussions and that he was central to the construction of compromises necessary for the formation of the new empire</li> <li>• Source 1 indicates the extent of flattery that Bismarck thought was necessary to achieve his ends. Contrastingly Source 2 highlights his more assertive approach from later on in the discussions.</li> </ul>

## 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 how accurate it is to say that the Weimar Republic faced more significant problems, in the years 1918-24, than did the FRG in the years 1949-60.</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>• Germany after 1918 faced significant political challenges from both right and left such as the Spartacist uprising and the Kapp putsch. By contrast the FRG faced no direct armed challenges</li><li>• Weimar governments faced punitive peace terms at Versailles. Contrastingly, the FRG was given substantial assistance by the allies to establish itself as a viable and democratic state</li><li>• Weimar Germany faced severe economic challenges, including hyperinflation. By contrast, the FRG experienced significant economic growth which was labelled an 'economic miracle'</li><li>• The <i>Dolchstoß</i> burdened successive Weimar governments by labelling them as betrayers of the German military. By contrast, in the FRG, there was a collective willingness to move on from the Nazi past</li><li>• Early Weimar governments found themselves diplomatically isolated. By contrast, governments of the FRG gained allied cooperation and encouragement to get involved in European integration projects.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The extent of Nazification in German politics and society meant that the FRG faced major challenges in de-Nazification. By contrast, the legacy of the <i>Kaiserreich</i> posed only intermittent political problems to Weimar</li><li>• The FRG faced the more significant challenge of existing alongside a communist GDR, tensions of the Cold War and the threat from nuclear weapons</li><li>• Both Weimar governments and those in the FRG were faced with the equally significant task of adjusting their politics and governance to the terms of a new constitution</li><li>• Both were faced with the task of managing multi-party systems within a fledgling democracy</li><li>• Both were faced with managing a federal system, where significant powers remained devolved to the <i>Länder</i>, within a democratic system.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that there were considerably more similarities than differences in the nature of the Nazi state, in the years 1933-39, than in the nature of the GDR in the years 1949-89.</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>• Both states' political and social systems were underpinned by fervent ideological zeal</li> <li>• Both Nazi Germany and the GDR were inherently repressive in their policies. The GDR, widely utilising the Stasi, and Nazi Germany the Gestapo</li> <li>• Although political parties continued to exist in the GDR, they were tightly controlled by the SED thereby effectively making the GDR a one-party state in a similar manner to Nazi Germany</li> <li>• Both Nazi Germany and the GDR pursued a range of populist economic policies over unemployment and social welfare to shore up support for their respective regimes</li> <li>• Both regimes actively pursued external support from like-minded states. Nazi Germany through the Anti-Comintern pact and the GDR through its closeness to the USSR and membership of the Warsaw Pact.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although effectively a one-party state, general elections continued in the GDR, whereas in Nazi Germany there were no elections after March 1933</li> <li>• The <i>Kinder, Küche, Kirche</i> policy in Nazi Germany promoted the values of female domestication, leading to fewer women in work. By contrast, women were encouraged to join the workforce in the GDR</li> <li>• The Nazis introduced increasingly discriminatory measures against Jews and other ethnic minorities partly to encourage emigration. Contrastingly, the GDR actively discouraged emigration to counter population decline</li> <li>• Nazi Germany's policies dealt with mass protest ruthlessly. By contrast, the increasing weakness of the GDR state was highlighted when attempts to repress mass popular protests in 1989 in the GDR failed</li> <li>• Nazi Germany used an extensive network of concentration camps to suppress and control their population. Contrastingly, these did not exist in the GDR.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

