



# **Mark Scheme (Results)**

Summer 2018

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 2018

Publications Code: WHI03\_1C\_History\_53584\_1806\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## 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 data-bbox="408 253 1390 383">• 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 data-bbox="408 398 1398 562">• 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 data-bbox="408 577 1406 734">• 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>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<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
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 approach of the FRG, in the years 1949-60, to dealing with its Nazi past.</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>• As US Commissioner for Germany McCloy would have seen at first hand the de-Nazification process in operation</li> <li>• The tone is quite positive and praiseworthy of the efforts to deal with Germany's Nazi past</li> <li>• It is an official report for the US government produced by a non-German who is likely to be as objective as possible.</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 approach of the FRG, in the years 1949-60, to dealing with its Nazi past:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It implies that the original intention was both moral and just and that no time limit for achieving their aims were set</li> <li>• It suggests that the policy of de-Nazification has proved more difficult to achieve than initially envisaged</li> <li>• It suggests that the government of the FRG took a more realistic and practical approach to the problem than the Allies.</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>• The official US programme of de-Nazification was ending thereby leaving policy up to the government of the FRG</li> <li>• Extensive use of the Fragebogen had led to administrative chaos and the trying of over 170,000 de-Nazification cases</li> <li>• Adenauer's government believed the US policy to be too harsh and so embarked on a 'politics for the past' approach which looked to annul many of the allied punishments imposed on former Nazis.</li> </ul> <p>Source 2</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>• Writing in 1960 Lindhurst has the benefit of hindsight when it comes to how the policy of de-Nazification has worked</li> <li>• Having been in Germany since 1945 he has witnessed the workings of the FRG government for himself</li> </ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting for an American newspaper might allow a more neutral perspective on events.</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 approach of the FRG, 1949-1960, to dealing with its Nazi past:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that, in the interests of political unity, Adenauer was content to bring de-Nazification to an end</li> <li>• It implies that there was political advantage in bringing de-Nazification to an end</li> <li>• It implies that the policy helped to fuel neo-Nazi extremism.</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>• Adenauer's priorities were more focused on constructing the FRG as a stable democratic society rather than prosecuting Germans for their Nazi past</li> <li>• Adenauer's government passed two Amnesty Laws in 1951 and 1954 which effectively annulled the process of de-Nazification</li> <li>• Adenauer appointed Hans Globke, who had been involved in the legal process of drafting Nazi laws such as the Enabling and Nuremberg Laws, to head his own Chancellery.</li> </ul> <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 question the extent of the success of the de-Nazification programme</li> <li>• Source 1 has a more idealistic tone than source 2</li> <li>• Both sources suggest that the protection of the FRG's stability as a fledgling democracy is more important than punishing every ex-Nazi.</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
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 statement that the governments of early Weimar Germany in the years 1919-24 faced essentially the same problems as those faced by Bismarck's Germany in the years 1870-79.</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 Bismarck's Germany and Weimar Germany were faced with politically adjusting to new constitutions</li> <li>• Both Bismarck's Germany and Weimar Germany were faced with managing hostile diplomatic relations with France</li> <li>• Both were faced with the difficulties of administering a federal state where considerable power was held by the Länder</li> <li>• Both were faced with managing a multi-party political system</li> <li>• Both were faced with challenges from the left. Bismarck's Germany from the Socialists and Weimar from the Communists.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Germany after 1918 faced real considerable political challenges such as the Spartacist uprising and the Kapp putsch. Bismarck's 'Reichsfeinde' were less tangible</li> <li>• Germany benefitted from the terms of the treaty of Frankfurt 1871 but was hard hit by the treaty of Versailles in 1919</li> <li>• Bismarck faced considerable hostility from the Catholic community because of the Kulturkampf. Catholics were more reconciled to Weimar with the Zentrum playing a key role in all governments</li> <li>• Germany experienced an economic recession from 1873 onwards but it was less intense than the problems caused by the loss of major coalfields, reparations and currency collapse in 1923</li> <li>• The loss of Alsace Lorraine and the Polish Corridor meant that Weimar governments were not faced with the same problem of what to do with national minorities that Bismarck faced.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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 how accurate it is to say that political repression in Nazi Germany was more effective than it was in the GDR.

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

- Nazi Germany used an extensive system of concentration camps to help control their population in a way not evident in the GDR
- After July 1933 Nazi Germany was a one party state whereas the GDR allowed a number of different parties throughout its existence
- Nazi Germany dealt with mass protest such as the SPD riots at Kopenick 1933 ruthlessly. The GDR had to call on assistance from the USSR to quell popular protests in 1953
- Attempts to repress mass popular protests in 1989 in the GDR failed and showed up the increasing weakness of the state
- Protest groups especially in the 1980s continued to meet in the GDR unlike Nazi Germany.

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

- Although political parties continued to exist in the GDR and elections held they were tightly controlled by the SED thereby effectively rendering the GDR a one party state
- Both Nazi Germany and the GDR felt compelled to introduce populist economic policies over unemployment reduction and social welfare to maintain popular support for their regimes
- Political control was much more evident in the NVA than in the Wehrmacht with the proportion of SED members in the officer corps rising steadily eventually reaching almost 95 percent
- The Stasi in the GDR grew to over 100,000 full time employees and 300,000 IMs by the 1980s. By contrast the Gestapo was much smaller in size
- Ulbricht used the 1953 uprising to justify a purge of the SED and to strengthen his political position like Hitler after the 'Night of the Long Knives' June 1934.

Other relevant material must be credited.