

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2012

GCE History (6HI03/D)

Unit 3: Depth Studies & Associated  
Historical Controversies

Option D: The Challenge of Fascism

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

[www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus)

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

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2012

Publications Code UA032433

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

## 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 and 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 or 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 and 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 or 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>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><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>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent 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 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>

5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><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: A01a and A01b (7% - 16 marks) A02b (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.

### A01a and A01b (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 and 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 or 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 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 and 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 or 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>



3	7-10	<p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	11-13	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and - as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><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.*

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

4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p><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>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. 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.*

### 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.

### Unit 3 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Section A Q	30	-	30
Section B Q	16	24	40
Total Marks	46	24	70

% weighting	20%	10%	30%
-------------	-----	-----	-----

## Section A

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>This question invites candidates to consider the political nature of the Second Reich in the fourteen years before the outbreak of World War 1. Clearly candidates need to have a grasp of what a 'parliamentary democracy' is and the nature of the Reich's constitution. However it should be appreciated that changes had occurred since 1871 and Germany was evolving. On the one hand it can be argued that Germany had a parliament elected on a wide franchise and that the Reichstag enjoyed significant powers as a legislature and authoriser of additional revenue for the Imperial government. Imperial Germany was not an autocracy. In 1912, the Social Democrats became the largest party in the Reichstag, with 110 seats, with the Centre Party in second place. There were signs of constitutional change with a constitution granted to Alsace Lorraine in 1911 and the Kaiser generally following the advice of his moderate Chancellor Bethman-Hollweg and taking a lower profile part in politics after the humiliations of 1908. Against this the Chancellor was answerable first and foremost to the Kaiser not the Reichstag as the Zabern incident of 1913 clearly underlined. Furthermore the Prussian Landtag was far from democratic with a voting system heavily weighted to wealth. The role of the Bundesrat is also likely to be considered and placed with the evidence against Germany being a parliamentary democracy. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer. At level 3 the nature of the constitution should be explicitly addressed although the response is likely to be very one-sided with the case probably being made (most likely through a detailed consideration of the Zabern Affair and its aftermath) that Germany was not a parliamentary democracy. 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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>This question invites candidates to consider reasons for the amazing success of the Nazi Party between 1930 and 1933, when they grew from a fringe Reichstag party of 12 MPs to one with 196 in November 1932 (230 in July) and on the basis of this entered government with their leader as Chancellor in January 1933. The stated factor clearly requires attention and candidates should be able to illustrate Hitler's strengths as a politician in these years - his abilities as a platform performer, his dynamic electioneering, his ability to balance between different wings of the party and to appeal to different groups of Germans thereby creating a genuinely mass party which transcended class, region and faith. Many may wish to consider his skill in removing the challenge from Gregor Strasser in late 1932, his wooing of the DNVP and his out-maneuvring of them when in office in the spring of 1933. On the other hand the supplementary genius of Goebbels may be considered, although even here Hitler's ability to attract and hold such talent might be recognised. The exceedingly favourable circumstances offered by the slump in both rural and urban areas is clearly vital as is the threat from a growing Communist Party, vital in terrorising many of the German middle class into support for the Nazis. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of the coming to power. At level 3 a causal analysis will predominate although the response is likely to be very one-sided, probably with an acceptance of the proposition. 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
3	<p>This question invites candidates to evaluate the importance of one factor in explaining the British policy of appeasement of Germany in the years 1933-37. As far as the stated factor is concerned there will doubtless be coverage of the widespread and growing perception of the horrors of war, which had developed markedly at the end of the 1920s and into the early 1930s. There may be reference to the War Poets or the memoirs of Sassoon and/or the Oxford Union debate in February 1933. The Fulham by-election of September 1933 is also likely to be presented as evidence of anti-war sentiment. Some candidates may take this further with reference to the fears of mass bombing widely publicised in the film, 'The Shape of Things to Come', and by the realities of the Spanish Civil War, notably the bombing of Guernica in 1937. Some may wish to challenge the stated factor, stressing the lack of real power that Germany possessed in these years and place emphasis instead on a growing feeling that Germany had been unfairly treated, e.g. in the disarmament clauses of Versailles, and the growing sense that the French were still inclined to be unreasonable in their treatment of Germany. Look for coverage of 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. 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 a causal analysis should be offered 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
4	<p>This question invites candidates to evaluate the significance of one key area of conflict during the Second World War. Candidates are likely to appreciate the importance of the North Atlantic as a highway for food, raw materials and then weapons from North America. Without this Britain could not continue the war with the USA an ally; the security of the North Atlantic was vital for the passage of men and material to Britain for the assault on Nazi Europe. It is the appreciation of the strategic importance of the North Atlantic and the dependency of victory on the North American economy that is essential in a good response rather than details of the conflict, although doubtless the better candidates will be aware of the crucial turning point in May 1943. Candidates may be aware that as a result of victory, 96% of shipping in the North Atlantic made the crossing unharmed. Candidates will assess significance by demonstrating an awareness of the strategic importance, as indicated above, but also be able to understand that it was a pre-requisite of the defeat of Nazi Germany but not the cause of the defeat. Both the bombing campaign and the landing in France were necessary but neither of these could have taken place without victory in the North Atlantic. Do reward candidates who demonstrate an awareness of the Eastern front's importance and the war in the Mediterranean and particularly those who appreciate that even here, the North Atlantic was vital in making lend lease to the USSR possible and transferring resources to the Med. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer with possibly detailed descriptions of the war at sea. At level 3 significance should be addressed although the response is likely to be very one-sided. At level 4 there should be a real weighing of significance, clearly appreciating it as a sine qua non, but that other developments were necessary for victory. The case may not be fully balanced. At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion.</p>	30

## Section B

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>This question centres on whether or not there was planned German aggression which was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Two of the sources (1 and 3) see Germany as not behaving aggressively, although Source 1 does refer to an offensive strategy, which many candidates will develop with contextual knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan. The inflexibility of the plan made negotiation very difficult if not impossible after any power began to mobilise. Mobilisation was tantamount to a declaration of war instead of a threatening gesture as a prelude to talks. Despite this, Source 1 asserts that Germany was essentially defensive in motivation and had no plan to dominate Europe. Source 2 clearly counters source 1 explicitly and argues that Germany was motivated by a desire to enhance her power through war (reference to Fischer) or to solve her internal problems through an aggressive foreign policy (Wehler). The author here seems to express some sympathy with both points of view. Candidates will be able to expand on both theses with contextual knowledge, either agreeing or refuting the theses. Source 3 offers a more generous view of Germany's role with reference to all powers being willing to defend their perceived national interests through war, which the author argues was viewed as legitimate and even inevitable. This point will probably be developed with knowledge deployed on the arms race and alliance system.</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 planned German aggression did exist and, if so, was it the decisive element in precipitating a general European war. Candidates in conducting this debate will show a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case in support of source 2 by detailing the basic evidence that Fischer and/or Wehler deployed in the cases they made for German war guilt, or of Source 1 and why Germany felt threatened and had to fight a defensive war.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>This question addresses the nature of the Nazi regime and the degree of direction and control that Hitler exercised. Clearly the proposition arises from Source 4, where the case is made that Hitler avoided decisions and adopted a very laid-back approach to many of the aspects of government. This line is clearly contradicted by Source 5 which stresses Hitler's remarkable abilities and mastery and memory of detail. However the source does support some of the contentions in Source 4, notably the irregular work habits. Source 6 might be cross referenced with Source 4 which, it can be argued, it basically supports, although it is important to recognise the reference to Hitler's lack of interest in certain areas of policy. This clearly implies that in others there really was interest and candidates can develop this with contextual knowledge. In fact all three sources can be enlarged upon by reference to own knowledge, notably candidates are likely to point to the failure of Walter Darré to gain access to Hitler for several years despite being in charge of agriculture. Likewise the important point in Source 6 about control of access might be developed to point up the growing influence of Bormann and the implications of this for policy.</p> <p>At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or extensive own knowledge displayed, possibly on some aspects of the terror apparatus. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case supporting the proposition referred to in Source 4. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case for or against the proposition that Hitler was a 'dictator who didn't dictate', possibly appreciating the chronology of shifting agenda and initiatives.</p>	40

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>This question targets the controversy surrounding Chamberlain's response to Hitler's breaking of the Munich Agreement when German forces occupied Prague in March 1939. The proposition offered is that Chamberlain was still reluctant to confront, but public opinion shifted decisively. Source 9 clearly offers the view that there was a major shift in opinion and this shift was not led by Chamberlain. Extensive own knowledge can be deployed to enlarge on the outrage and why it was felt. Source 9 can be both countered and supported from Source 8. More support is provided for the shift in public opinion but also, the source indicates that Chamberlain too shared in this change. Source 7 largely supports Source 9 by implying that Chamberlain was not essentially willing to confront Hitler or blame him for the occupation. In this sense it makes explicit the opening line of Source 9, with which it should be cross-referenced. Candidates will probably use contextual knowledge to explain the reference to Versailles as the 'old scapegoat'. 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 rearmament which by 1939 was proceeding at a frantic pace. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case supporting the proposition supported by Source 9. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. Here the rearmament, referred to above can be deployed to counter the proposition and defend Chamberlain as a man preparing for war, even if he still hoped to avoid it. There may be debate on who was behind the clear shift to confrontation, embodied in the guarantee to Poland. Here the role of Halifax may be addressed. At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge; this may be deployed on the subject of rearmament or the shift in public opinion, which it can be argued was very marked following Kristallnacht in November 1938.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question clearly targets the controversy surrounding the impact of the war on the British economy and society: was it positive or negative? The proposition for debate clearly comes from Source 10 and some support is provided by reference to the damaging effects of war-time procurement policies which encouraged complacency and inefficiency. It also asserts that trade union power was strengthened, again harming efficiency and effort in the post-war world. The view of Source 10 is directly contradicted by Source 11, where the author draws attention to the positive stimulation the war offered to the development of new industries, notably electronics and atomic power, and also chemicals, engendered in the First War, but 'transformed' by the Second. Such developments can be expanded upon with contextual knowledge and supplemented by reference to other industries, notably aircraft, or even farming. Source 12 addresses a widely believed social development i.e. the role played by the War in promoting women's liberation. It is somewhat pessimistic in tone and in this sense lines up with source 10. It may however be challenged 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 relating to the psychological transformations encouraged by the war or the impact of lend-lease which helped modernise farming by encouraging mechanisation on a considerable scale.</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 UA032433 Summer 2012

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

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

