

Examiners' Report
June 2016

GCE History 6HI03 D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 or 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2016

Publications Code 6HI03_D_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the seventh session of the 6HI03 D examination. Many candidates wrote insightful comments which placed them in the higher grade categories. The paper was divided into two sections: Section (A) was an In-Depth Study question, and Section (B) an Associated Historical Controversy question. Unfortunately, some candidates continue to write too much generalised comment. As a consequence, their responses lacked precise analytical focus and detailed supporting evidence. Examiners want to see candidates who can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the questions set.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than enough for full marks.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions. The ability range of those entering was diverse but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. There were also very few rubric errors. As expected, there were far more entrants for *D1 – From Kaiser to Fuhrer: Germany, 1900-45* than for *D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60*.

One pleasing trend is that very few candidates produced essays which were devoid of analysis. The main weakness in responses which scored less well tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis. The paper provided candidates with the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include source material as and when necessary.

There appears to be an increasing tendency for candidates to analyse and produce judgements in the main body of the answer and have cursory conclusions. Candidates can indeed sustain arguments by these means and this approach does not, in itself, prevent access to the highest levels. However, in some cases, judgements on individual issues and factors tended to be somewhat isolated, and ultimate conclusions were either only partially stated or implicit. Consequently, candidates should be aware that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a solid framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

The answers of a minority of less successful candidates in Section A suggested that they lacked the detailed knowledge base required to tackle questions such as Question 4. The best answers to these questions – and indeed those across the option – showed some impressive study of British and German history, with students producing incisive, scholarly analysis.

When attempting the Section (B) questions, a small number of candidates engaged more with the general debate of the set controversy, rather than the specific demands of the question and source package. This was most evident on Questions 5 and 7, although it was still a small minority. The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses had a sharp focus on the extent to which Germany became a democracy in the period 1900-14. High scoring answers had a clear focus on both the concept of democracy, in the context of Germany in this period, and a real debate on the extent to which Germany saw change in respect of this.

The majority of scripts broadly took one of two approaches to structuring responses, to focus primarily on the conceptual and institutional issues (e.g. Germany's constitution, the role of the Kaiser, Reichstag, elections, the development of political parties and pressure groups, etc), or to focus more on the events within this period which exemplified the features of Germany in this period (e.g. the Hottentot election, the Zabern affair, etc) be they democratic, or not. Both approaches produced successful responses, although the highest scoring responses often carefully balanced these, offering a carefully focused and exemplified analysis. Weaker responses tended to: (1) drift to description, e.g. detailing the examples without sufficient analysis geared towards the question; (2) confuse the features of the constitution, at times mixing these with the Weimar period; (3) attempt analysis with some understanding of constitutional issues, but with limited detail to support development.

- Kaiser dem ^{2A.} / ^{D.T.A.}
- TU/SDP mv. press group.
- Reichstag s/c — universal suff. X Pari. acc.
- Elites, Army — ^{Prussia}

Despite a growth in the participation in German politics and the democratically elected Reichstag holding ^{some} considerable powers in the years 1900-1914, the ~~fact that the~~ Kaiser, elites and army still held a firm grip over power. ~~the~~ This means that the Second Reich can be seen to have taken a small step towards democracy but not a ~~major~~ significant one.

A growth in the number of people actively involved in German politics indicates a step towards democracy. The SPD had 720,000 members in 1910 and 2.5 million people were ~~to~~ trade union members by 1914.

Furthermore pressure groups ^{emerged} such as the nationalist Naval League, Pan German League and German Colonial League as well as the Agrarian Leagues which focussed on rural matters. These were somewhat successful, the Navy League having a major impact on the ~~policy~~ government's 'Flottenpolitik' series of laws is an example of this. All together this growth in participation in politics does signify a step towards democracy as it shows the wider population bringing about change of what they want. Although it's not constitutionally tied or measured it is still a signal ^{of a step towards} ~~of~~ democracy, or people power for the people.

The Reichstag signalled ~~as small~~ an approach to democracy, however its shortcomings in terms of powers means it can not be judged to be a ^{significant} ~~great~~ step. This house of parliament was democratically elected on a system of universal male suffrage and had powers such as responsibility for the annual budget and

defuse budget. However ~~it~~ it had difficulty initiating legislation, which indicates that it wasn't a true representation of what the German people wanted and therefore ~~cannot~~ ~~be seen as completely democratic~~ cannot be seen

as a major step towards democracy. The fact that the Reichstag's vote of no confidence was ignored during the Tarnow Affair^{of 1913} and the lack of parliamentary accountability highlighted by the Hertze rising of 1904 highlights its insignificance at this time. Overall the Reichstag indicated a small step towards democracy but not a major one. It was elected democratically but was shown ~~to not carry much~~ to be insignificant in the running of the country and had difficulty in initiating legislation.

~~In fact~~

In the years 1900-1914 the Kaiser still held the final say and therefore ^{still} made Germany ~~still~~ an autocracy, as opposed to a democracy. The constitution firstly allowed this to happen. The Kaiser appointed the Chancellor who appointed the government, ~~therefore~~ and the Chancellor was responsible to the Kaiser.

and not the Reichstag (as seen when ^{his} vote of no confidence was ignored in 1913). This meant that the Kaiser held ultimate power. His importance is highlighted by the Daily Telegraph article in 1906. Although the Kaiser was engaged in foreign policy in a interview, he blamed the Chancellor for this. The government fell not because the Reichstag opposed the Kaiser's actions but because the Kaiser lost confidence in his Chancellor, ~~thus~~ ^{thus} highlighting his significance. Therefore Germany between 1900nd and 1914 can be seen as ~~a~~ an autocracy which means that it cannot be judged to have taken significant steps towards becoming a democracy.

The power held by the elites, particularly those in Prussia, further ~~highlight~~ support the view that Germany cannot be seen to have taken significant steps towards becoming a democracy in the time period. The Reichstag ~~had~~ Bundesrat had the power to veto Reichstag legislation with ~~14~~ 14 votes from its 58 members. Prussia held 17 of the seats meaning that if it had voted on-bloc it ~~was~~ could veto. Furthermore the election to the Prussian parliament further

proves the élite's monopoly over power. There was a three-tier system ~~which~~ meaning that the votes of the rich carried more weight - not a fair democratic system. Whatmore the lower



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The example response is a clearly argued piece, from the introduction onwards. It is focused, analytical, conceptually strong and with exemplification firmly tied to the demands of the question. It makes effective use of support, has a strong conceptual grasp of key issues and is clearly evaluative. It achieved a level 5.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses had a good focus on the extent to which the Nazis faced opposition, and addressed both sides of the argument. At the higher levels, candidates included consideration of: (1) the extent to which the Church's ability to cause a climb-down over policy on occasions amounted to significant opposition; (2) the potential threat from army opposition and plots, particularly as the war failed to progress, in the light of their innate strength yet institutional conservatism; (3) the degree to which groups such as the White Rose, Edelweiss Pirates, Red Orchestra, etc, could amount to significant opposition, in the face of the numerous advantages the Nazi state held. The strongest responses were able to weigh the extent to which these amounted to significant opposition, individually and/or collectively. Less successful responses tended to offer: (1) attempts to formulate argument, but with limited detail to substantiate analysis; (2) answers which struggled with the precise chronology; (3) a tendency to drift to examinations of Nazi terror, or other issues of some relevance, but with limited convincing direct analysis.

The Nazi regime was extremely efficient, there was very little opposition in the years 1939-45.

It can be argued that there was no significant opposition to the Nazi regime in the years 1939-45. Many Germans felt that the Treaty of Versailles imposed extremely harsh implications on Germany. This meant that many people were geared towards the war effort as they intended to take back land that was taken from them in the treaty. This helped to allow the regime to almost solely focus on the war and doing all they could to win.

It can be further argued as ~~any~~ most opposition that arose, was ~~swiftly~~ dealt with swiftly through the use of terror.

and concentration camps. Opposition such as the Schütz brothers and sister were both hung for speaking out against the illegality of the Nazi regime, and this continued to happen throughout these years to most that did of similar.

It could be said there was opposition to the Nazi regime in the years 1939-45, however its significance was almost always undermined by the extensive use of terror. The Nazi regime could be seen to have had opposition from the extreme left and right, however, ~~neither~~ both of them lacked organisation and the willingness to take on the Nazis for power. This meant that their opposition was not significant as no-one was willing to fully take on the Nazis for power. ~~There were~~

Other opposition came in the form of pressure groups like the Edelweiss pirates for example. However, all pressure groups lacked credibility and legitimacy meaning they were unable to exercise exactly what they would have liked to.

Many people in Germany were not happy, but content with Hitler's rule as even during the war period, he was able to avenge fair rationing enabling people to not starve ~~how they did~~ nor struggle how they previously had in WWI between 1914-18.

Overall, it is clear that there was virtually no significant opposition to Nazi regime during war-time as the implemented fear of terror and Hitler's purges in government and ~~through~~ across Germany meant that people didn't want to challenge Hitler's dictatorship. Hitler was very smart in eliminating the more significant opposition ~~before~~ pre WWII.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response shows an understanding of the question, and attempts analysis. However, these attempts are limited. It is reliant upon material which lacks depth and accuracy, and at times makes generalisations, or attempts to include material of only partial relevance.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses had a confident grasp of the contribution that the Battle of Britain made to the war effort, and offered good range and depth in assessing this, and other factors, as appropriate. At the higher levels, responses were convincing in their linkage between the Battle of Britain and ultimate victory, regardless of how significant they saw this as being. The majority of candidates examined this against other factors, most commonly the Battle of the Atlantic, the air war over Germany, the Eastern Front and the campaign from Operation Overlord until the end of the war in Europe. Weaker responses tended to: (1) answers which were to some degree 'off the peg' responses to the war was won, with limited consideration of the specific question and cursory treatment of the given issue; (2) analysis of the Battle of Britain, but with limited critical thought as to how this connected to victory over four years later (e.g. an examination of why the Battle of Britain was 'won', rather than how it contributed) and/or (3) answers which offered considerable detail on the various theatres of war in a descriptive or unfocused manner.

To a great extent the Battle of Britain 1940 contributed towards the Allies' ultimate victory in 1945 against Germany. Despite its significance it is important to recognise the contributions of the Eastern Front, the Mediterranean campaign and most significantly, the Battle of the Atlantic towards the Allies' ultimate victory in 1945.

It can be argued that the Battle of Britain in 1940 had great significance when judging the Allies' ultimate victory in 1945. The development of new planes such as the Spitfire and the Hurricane in this battle allowed for combined greater combat strength against the ME-109 (German plane), through greater agility, more capability performing in the air and greater aim when shooting in the air. This ~~development~~ development allowed the Allies to test the abilities prior to other significant campaigns contributing to ultimate victory, such as the importance of air bombardment in Strategic Bombing and Battle of the Atlantic (76,000

tens of bombs dropped on mainland France), the significance of this practice being that ~~the~~ the

Allies were more prepared due to the Battle of Britain ~~the~~ in the other campaigns that were crucial to their ultimate victory. Also, the introduction of the Dowding system using radar with 21 new stations on the British coast meant that there were 6 minute warnings of German planes and ~~the~~ statistics such as height of the planes and number of them, meaning that there was little waste in fuel and number of planes in the Battle of Britain. This tactic was used in the other campaigns ~~to~~ to contribute greatly ~~to~~ to ultimate victory as the efficiency of the air force was greater by the Battle of the Atlantic, when 12,000 planes were used in combat to secure victory. Therefore the Battle of Britain 1940 was of vital significance and contribution to ultimate Allied victory in 1945, due to the developments and practice it provided the RAF with.

It can also be argued however, that the Eastern front contributed greatly to Allied victory in 1945. With the brutal defeat at Stalingrad January 1943, Hitler was committed to keeping 150 divisions in the East, whilst only 60 in

the West. This made victory in France easier as the German forces were divided, contributing greatly to final victory. Furthermore, 250,000 German troops chose suicide over facing the Red Army, which provided greater relief to the West than the Strategic Bombing Campaign had ever achieved, contributing further to ultimate victory. The loss of Romanian oil to the Russians in 1944 further meant that the Germans were hindered in their ability to fight, stagnating the German Army. Combined, the Eastern front was a great buffer for the Germans fighting the Allies effectively due to losses of oil and men at the hands of the Red Army, leading to overall victory in 1945.

The Mediterranean Campaign also contributed to the defeat of Germany and Allied ultimate victory in 1945. In the African campaign, Axis forces were defeated ^{at Tunisia} on 13 May 1943, enabling 166,000 of 200,000 men captured to be German.

This hindered Hitler greatly with a significant loss of men in similar quantity to those lost on the Eastern front. The African Campaign showed the importance of Anglo-USA cooperation and ability to work together to be significant, and gave the USA ~~more~~ first experience fighting

Germany, both significant in the Battle of the Atlantic that would secure final victory.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The vast majority of this response is focused and analytical. There is a good range of points, mainly well developed with analysis to consider the significance of different factors, supported by accurate detail. Whilst this was not always fully consistent, the response was strong enough for a secure level 4.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses had a clear focus and sufficient depth on the issue of high morale, examining the importance of this alongside other factors contributing to the domestic war effort. High scoring responses focused clearly on the given issue and other causal factors, such as the contribution of women and government action across a range of issues, and were convincing in examining how these maintained the war effort. There were some responses displaying both excellent knowledge, and an ability to deploy this to explore the interplay of a range of factors to analyse the issue. Weaker responses tended to (1) offer limited material on the issue of moral or (2) drift to description of the home front, lacking consistent focus on the issue.

BPian

1) high morale → no rationing of workers

lunches in canteens

2) Role of woman → WAAF

WRNS

~~WRNS~~

16

3) social

~~365~~

~~160~~

~~205~~

Answer

During the years 1939 to 1945, ~~it~~ it could be said that the most important factor in maintaining the war effort on the home front. However, other factors could explain why the war effort was maintained. Such as the role of women, ^{economic state} and social and of Britain ~~and the social state~~ could explain why war effort on the home front was maintained. It appears that the role of women on the home front is the most convincing view as to why war effort was maintained.

on the home front between the years 1939-45,

high morale ~~is~~ helped to maintain the war effort on the home front. ~~by~~ This was done by propaganda e.g. dig for victory campaign which encouraged men and women to use any place they could to grow their own food. The dig for victory campaign accounted for 10% of food in Britain. ~~and~~ it also allowed Britain to feed ~~herself~~ herself for 160 days a year opposed to 120 days prior to the war. High morale was also maintained through workers being ^{and factory owners} looked after too by the Government through the Joint Commission Committee (~~JCC~~) and Joint Production Committee (JPC). ~~is~~ This is because the trade unions got on better than before the war and managers listened to workers concerns. An example of how this was effective is that by 1943 there were approximately 4,500 JPC's around Britain. ^{as a result of these} ~~However, despite~~ changes in industry, ^{strikes} ~~morale being maintained~~, were reduced apart from in the coal mines. However, despite ^{high morale} ~~morale~~ the war effort being maintained on the home front was largely due to women during the years 1939-45 due to their help in the factories and on the front line with the ~~BAWES~~.

On the other hand, the role of women on the home front can be said to be the reason for the

war effort being maintained between the years 1939-45. Women while still running the home were also working or volunteering to work in the factories in the early 1940. For example following the National Service Act 2,000,000 women volunteered to work yet 6 months later only 87,000 of them were in work. However, towards the end of the war around 1.5 million were in work. Furthermore, elderly neighbours and grandparents who couldn't work in the factories were encouraged to look after children so that young mothers could go to work. ~~So~~ Another way in which women helped to maintain the war effort on the home front is by volunteering for services such as Wrens, Womens Auxiliary Service etc. This meant that ~~to~~ towards the end of the war, the Womens Auxiliary Service had 400,000 members who did most of the driving for the British Army by 1943. Another way in which women were important in maintaining the war effort on the home front is due to their help in cracking the German Enigma code in May 1941 allowing Britain to counter the U-boat threat. For those reasons the role of women on the home front during the years 1939-45, is the most important factor in maintaining the

war effort.

Another factor which helped to maintain the war effort on the home front during the years 1939-45 is the state of Britain's economy and their lend lease agreement with the USA. Britain could not have fought a war for six years on its own without US help. By 1945 it is estimated that ~~the~~ Britain gained around £5 billion worth of materials such as weapons and food for ~~the~~ free. However despite this, women's role in maintaining the war effort on the home front is still the most important factor because if the British didn't have their support along with lend lease then they would be unable to continue with the war.

In conclusion, high morale was important to maintaining morale on the home front during the years 1939-45. However, the most important factor was the role of women as without their support Britain would have suffered higher losses due to the U-boat threat. Women also prevented production from declining during 1939-45. Therefore women are the most important factor for maintaining the war effort on the home ~~front~~ front.

Furthermore, Britain also acquired ab

least one Sherman tank for each division for use during the Battle of the Atlantic. The lend lease with the USA also provided Britain with more than ~~25%~~^{half} of the food consumed by the British people on the home front and those who were fighting. This shows that the British economy had ~~essent~~ alone would have been unable to fight a war against Germany alone ~~in both the Mediterranean~~ and the



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 3 response is broadly analytical but offers limited detail and inconsistent development. Here, for example, the candidate's assessment of the role of morale – the given issue in the question – offers some detail, but does not convincingly link this to the war effort. The response is more convincing on the role played by women, but there is limited range beyond this.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were firmly focused on the extent to which German aggression was responsible for the First World War. This was, of course, linked to the issues raised in the sources. Higher scoring responses usually displayed most or all of the following: (1) a clear recognition of the arguments in the sources; (2) a genuine discussion of these, engaging with their arguments and integrating evidence from the sources with own knowledge; (3) sufficient knowledge of events relating to the debate to confidently explore issues (e.g. common points included the Schlieffen Plan, War Council, September programme, naval race, Moroccan crises, the lapse of the Reinsurance Treaty, the 'blank cheque', although knowledge of Austria, the Balkans, as well as other actors, was less evident). What tended to distinguish the very best responses was going beyond presenting evidence to simply support (e.g. not simply using the Schlieffen Plan to suggest guilt, rather exploring this in the light of other nation's war plans) and a balanced evaluation of the given arguments, thoroughly examining the merits of these, regardless of the independent conclusion reached. Low scoring responses tended to: (1) seize upon points raised in sources at a superficial level as an opportunity to display knowledge, with limited analysis; (2) simply describe the evidence presented in the extracts, or not integrate information from the sources with own knowledge; (3) recognise arguments or historians referenced in the sources, going off at a tangent to detail these. That said, on the latter point there was a correlation between those who recognised the more recent scholarship in Source 3 (Clark), and a considered analysis of the complexities of international relations in this period.

German Aggression Primary cause?	
<u>Yes</u>	<u>No.</u>
- Morocco, 1905-6, 1911	- <u>Alliances</u>
- Naval Race	= encirclement
- Blank Cheque??	= create <u>world war</u> .
- War Council?	= provide confidence.
- Rische?	

In the years leading up to the war, Germany was in no doubt acting more aggressively than most other European nations. Paxman concludes that ~~the~~ aggression was a result of a planned policy to initiate war, driven by the Kaiser, and Germany should therefore take blame for the ~~outbreak~~ ^{planned} outbreak of war due to their aggression. Martel, whilst agreeing that the Germans were perhaps looking for a war, places emphasis on *Primat der Innerpolitik* through the ~~demand~~ desire of the elite to preserve the status quo and the fear of a seemingly unbreakable encirclement. The encirclement, possibly a result of paranoia is a theory supported also by Clark but ~~however~~ divides blame between other imperialist nations. However, as Blackburn said, the actions of Germany exceeded those of other nations and their foreign policy was the cause of the alliance system ~~and hence, the~~ which Martel and Clark ~~are~~ condone, it can be concluded that, whilst not the only contributing ~~factor~~ factor, German aggression was the primary cause of the First World War.

Germany's fear of encirclement was based on the Triple Entente 1907 which created a

power block surrounding Germany and made her over-reliant on her only ally - Austria-Hungary. This resulted in an 'imperialist paranoia' which Clark uses to explain, although not necessarily justify, Germany and Austria-Hungary's actions. In his instance, alliances could be blamed for the war whilst in some instances they prevented violence such as the 1908-9 Bosnian crisis, they made countries more confident to act aggressively. The crisis left Russia determined to back down which in the July Crisis 1914 caused them to reject Germany's ultimatum and Germany to mobilise, triggering the system of alliances which created a general European war. In his instance, it looks as though the alliances, undertaken by all countries involved were to blame and hence Clark's shared blame view could be justified. However, German aggression, stimulated by the Kaiser, caused many of these alliances. Germany refused to ally with Britain in 1901 as Britain wouldn't join the Triple Alliance of 1881. Instead, Britain ended her 'splendid isolation' with alliances with Japan 1902, France 1904 and Russia 1907. ~~The Kaiser~~ Martell claims Germany was unable to break the Triple Entente peacefully, yet it had only tried

using aggression such as the 1905 Moroccan Crisis which backhired and strengthened the Entente. The failure of the Haldane Mission 1912 was the last opportunity to better relations with Britain (which had been soured due to the rowal race, the 1897 Kruger Telegram, the support for the Boer war and the Daily Telegraph Affair). The demand for Britain to declare neutrality in a European war was unrealistic and helps support Paxman's interpretation that war was planned. Alliances clearly contributed to the war, culminating in the Blank Cheque given on July 5th, but these are noted in German aggression and so provides evidence that aggression was the primary cause.

Paxman talks of a planned war with Germany 'waiting for an opportunity' which contradicts Clark massively. However, his interpretation holds a lot of weight. Weltpolitik had been pursued from 1897 with little effect. Despite a Constantinople to Baghdad railway and a leased port in China, few imperialistic gains had been made and Germany had failed to gain its 'place in the sun'. A war however would provide the opportunity to rectify this and it is argued that many German politicians/ army officers were looking for the opportunity to

go to war 'defensively'. The 1912 War Council is used by ~~historians~~ historians such as Fischer to justify his view with Tirpitz and Moltke discussing when the best time to go to war would be. On the contrary, some would argue that the confused and chaotic nature of Wilhelmine politics meant such forward planning was not possible but in reality, the political system was crumbling due to the Kaiser's focus on foreign policy and neglect of anything else. Even though Bethmann-Hollweg was absent, the War Council remains significant as he was not central to the push for war and even tried to apply the brakes in the July Crisis. As Paxman claims, it was the Kaiser who wanted war and there is sufficient evidence through the clear planning and the Schlieffen Plan (1905) that Germany were acting aggressively to provoke war ^{for imperial gains} and not due to the alliance system.

Clark claims that Germany was not ~~the~~ the only imperial power in Europe though and others were pushing for gains too. However, in Western Europe this was not the case as Britain especially did not wish for war*. In the east however, a series of wars in the Balkans showed the imperialistic nature of other powers like Austro-Hungary and Serbia.

Many historians like Fenig place blame on ~~the~~ politicians in Vienna but not for causing the world war but providing Germany with the opportunity to start it[^] which Paxman claims they were seeking. Irresponsible Habsburg Balkan politik is not blameless in the cause of war but the primary factor remains German Aggression because it had created tension in Europe that could no longer be resolved peacefully.

with the people's support shouting 'we want eight and we won't wait'
Britain's participation in the naval race[^] was provoked by * Germany threatening the security of their empire.
~~Despite the ongoing naval race and~~ France's ~~and~~ increase of conscription ~~a~~ from two to three years and Russia's plan to increase its army by 20% may suggest countries ^{were} wishing for war, guilty or provoking it but it was merely a response to the 1913 Army Bill in Germany which was passed as a result of aggressive welt politik and the desire to be ready for what they saw as an inevitable war. The fact that only Germany saw war as inevitable is strong evidence to support Paxman's planned war hypothesis.

Martel introduces new explanations for the German aggression aside from alliances - the domestic tensions and the wish for the elite to preserve the status quo. There is significant evidence



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths. The candidate (1) uses all three sources extensively and integrates detailed own knowledge effectively
(2) develops a sustained analysis which targets the question throughout
(3) adopts an approach to evaluate several of the claims made in the sources.

Question 6

On Question 6, stronger responses tended to have: (1) a solid grasp of the period, e.g. understanding how the Nazis established control in the early years, and the difference in experience for those who did conform when compared to those who did not; (2) clear engagement with the demands of the question, e.g. a focus on 'based on consent'; (3) a close reading of the sources and an ability to examine and cross-reference what they had to offer; (4) effective use of contextual material (e.g. the role of informers and *blockleiters*, detail on prison and camp populations and the relative numbers of Gestapo to population). The highest scoring responses tended to confidently examine the arguments and sources, with clear consideration of consent. Many of the more successful responses also seemed aware of the Gellately's research, or were at least able to appreciate the arguments, in going beyond assumptions of a regime based solely on terror.

In contrast, less successful responses tended to: (1) lack balance, e.g. focus predominantly on the role of terror; (2) spend considerable time on issues such as propaganda or the success of Nazi policies, without convincing links to the question; (3) deal with the sources sequentially, with limited discussion.

The idea that the Nazi system created a system based on consent is mainly argued in source 4 discussing the 'successful cultivation of successful popular opinion', which to some extent is supported by source 6 in that it discusses the appreciation of the 'socialism of the deed' and importance of social welfare initiatives, demonstrating that ~~there~~ the Nazis did in fact 'create(d)' a system based on consent. That said, this is ~~undoubtedly~~ ^{to some extent} undermined by the interpretation of source 6 which focuses on the 'secure base' of the SS and Gestapo ~~terror and the Law~~, undermining the idea of political consent. However it is evident that popular consent created by the system 1933-9 was important.

The most convincing argument for the role of consent can perhaps be found in source 4 which discusses how Hitler aimed for 'popular backing' for his authoritarian state, and was 'deeply concerned' about popular opinion of the regime. He

This desire for popularity has been emphasised by Ussow in the importance of Hitler's popularity. The idea that he wanted them to be 'ideally' included' fits in ~~to~~ with the idea of indoctrination, which can be supported by movements such as the Hitler Youth which by 1936 had 6,000,000 members, and other ~~unlike~~ initiatives to help broaden the success of his 'community'. This is to some extent supported by source 6 in how "Successes encouraged the majority of Germans to appreciate the regime, demonstrating how important ~~the~~ popular consent was. Indeed by 1938, 10 million people had participated in KdF holidays which improved popularity to the regime, demonstrating how the Nazis had worked on building a consensual *Völkisch Volksgemeinschaft*. This is further supported by Bellamy's idea of consensus dictatorship in that through popular policy, Hitler was able to promote popularity of his authoritarian regime. However, the source does mention how he ~~was~~ ^{was not always able to maintain} control, questioning consent

The idea of consent is further expanded by source 4's mentioning of how the regime did not need to use widespread terror' which is reiterated in source 6 by how it mentions the 'regime's terror did not directly affect' the majority of Germans, demonstrating how ~~many~~ there was little opposition

In the regime, and that ~~most~~ ^{most} did not oppose it, showing that it was not conformity ^{through} ~~terror~~ ^{terror} that encouraged the success of the regime.

Though Source 5 discusses the 'extensive use of the SS and Gestapo system of concentration camps', terror was for the most part limited, with Johnson ~~and~~ as well as Bellamy arguing how it only targeted those of opposition (associates and communists). This suggests that terror was not significant, ~~as also discussed~~, and as such the people were consenting, as seen by how the Gestapo relied ~~on~~ ^{on} 50-80% of their actions coming from public denunciations. ^{At however Source 4 does stress a bit too much on the popularity.}

Source 6 discusses how the regime builded on the 'notion of racial community' which included the 'identification, exclusion and elimination of outcasts'. This ~~too~~ is supported by Volksgemeinschaft and in how anti-semitic policy became increasing. ~~Volk~~ Indeed to some extent the KAF initiatives did 'reinforce(d) the segregation' between the victims, and the racially and politically acceptable Germans in that the regime did benefit those considered 'German'. This fits in to some extent with ~~new~~ source 4 in how many looked at the 'positive sides of the New Dictatorship', and indeed KAF was an interesting contrast to the despair

of the depression. As such ~~this~~ his popularity did go to some extent to ~~improve~~ the regime. Indeed, ~~the~~ perhaps it was these ~~clear~~ distinctions between those considered asocial and those Aryan that did contribute to changing attitudes to Nazi policies; indeed by now by 1938, many did support Kristallnacht demonstrating support to the regime. ~~That said the source does mention how the 'KdF was as in~~

That said source 6 does go on to mention how the KdF 'was as intrusive as the ~~system~~ regime that sponsored it' which does to some extent suggest that popularity ~~was~~ and consent may have been shaped (as suggested by Huttenbarger) through ~~the~~ supporting the idea of the system being created. This idea of 'consent' being created can also be identified in source 5 with how the 'total destruction' ^{of} Weimar Constitution'; Nuremberg laws and force of the terror forces may have also led to a shaped consent, demonstrating the power of the regime ~~rather~~ through ~~force~~ the principles of Nazi ~~political~~ philosophy as opposed to actual genuine popularity*. That said, source 6 does go on to say that the 'desire to have fun ~~while~~ while resisting' the discipline of the KdF does suggest that people ~~there is~~ support of the regime,

~~and that~~ did just enjoy their quality of life now
as opposed to be bygone.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response has a clear and confident focus on both the question and the views taken on this in the given extracts. It examines these, drawing on evidence from the sources and own knowledge, offering reasoned evaluation of the strengths of their arguments. Such a response is typical of a level 5 for both assessment objectives.

Question 7

On Question 7, stronger responses demonstrated a firm grasp of the controversy and assessed the source arguments confidently. Higher scoring candidates' own knowledge was often detailed and wide-ranging but this was not a definite requirement. More importantly, own knowledge was tied firmly to addressing the debate within the sources (e.g. the mistaken trust placed in Hitler, the impact of Chamberlain's approach on potential allies, the preparedness of Britain and the international community, attitudes towards war in Britain). Most candidates were able to focus to at least some degree on the key terms in the question. The highest scoring responses (1) explored these arguments carefully, using evidence to weigh the presented arguments (2) often tended to take a longer view of appeasement as a policy, assessing it in the light of British policy and the international situation throughout the 1930s. Weaker responses tended to offer (1) imbalanced responses, usually against Chamberlain, without really addressing alternative arguments (2) limited knowledge beyond the sources, or knowledge of some relevance, but not convincingly integrated into debate.

Whether or not Neville Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was shameful and mistaken has been the subject of debate for many years. It could be argued, as Source 7 does, that it was indeed shameful and mistaken, and that Chamberlain was wrong to trust and appease Hitler. Or it could be said, like in Sources 8 & 9, that appeasement was the best course of action considering Britain's military position. However, there is no doubt that Chamberlain was mistaken in his trusting of Hitler ~~and~~ and therefore in his decision to appease him.

Perhaps the policy of appeasement was not so shameful and mistaken: like Source 8 suggests, 'Chamberlain's military chiefs advised against going to war', and that the Dominions, the French and the USA were not ready for war either. This is supported by Source 9, which explicitly ~~states~~ states that 'it was vitally important that Britain's defences should not be put to the test prematurely'. It is true that in 1938 the British military standing was dire. The ~~B~~ army consisted of 2 divisions comprised of 40,000 men, and in order to mount an attack against Germany, a march through occupied France was in order. ~~But~~ Indeed, the geographical position of Czechoslovakia meant that intervention would be military suicide, and therefore ^{the decision} to appease Hitler and

postpone war, giving Britain time to rearm and gain 'striking power', was not mistaken at all. Source 9 supports this view by quoting

Chamberlain: 'if only we can keep out of war for a few years' suggests that Chamberlain had seen the futility of going to war in 1938 and was not mistaken in following appeasement. The fact that ~~GDP~~ the percentage of GDP ~~was~~ spent on rearming rose from 7% to 21% in the following years supports the view that Chamberlain was only appeasing so as to buy time to improve the military so that a successful campaign could be launched later. Even Source 7, condemnatory of Chamberlain, concedes that at Munich Chamberlain made 'the necessary sacrifices' suggesting that appeasing and maintaining peace in Europe was essential to being able to postpone war and ~~get~~ mobilise the country for it. It is also true that, as Source 9 states 'the people of Britain were simply not ready for war'. This is evident in the reaction Chamberlain got from crowds on ~~on~~ leaving to meet Hitler in Berchtesgarden and on returning from Munich with the Piece of Paper. The public were supportive of Chamberlain's attempts to appease, showing that they would not be supportive of war in 1938 and that Chamberlain was therefore not mistaken in his actions at Munich and his appeasement of Hitler.

However, these arguments can easily be countered. For example, Source 7 states that 'the terms (of Munich) were no better than before', and this is true in as much that what Hitler received at Munich was more than what he had demanded at Bad Godesberg. This suggests ~~that~~ that Chamberlain was shameful in his conduct at

Munich, clearly not caring for the effect on the Czechs. Source 8 supports in saying that Chamberlain 'proceeded to play ^{it} badly', meaning that while Britain was not ready for war, his treatment of the Czechs through his policy of Appeasement was shameful. Also, the argument expressed in Source 9 that it was 'too early to risk war' is not a strong one. There is evidence to suggest that had Britain gone to war in 1938, Germany would have been defeated then and there. While Britain was militarily weak, Germany was in a more unstable position. On the 27th of September 1938, for example, Hitler's military parade through Berlin was met with indifference from Berliners, and Hitler has been quoted as saying 'with such people I cannot wage war'. In addition to disaffection from the German public (also seen in their ^{jubilant} reaction to Chamberlain's arrival), Hitler's military leaders such as ~~Hitler~~ Goering and ~~Goebbels~~ Goebbels had advised Hitler against war prior to Munich, and there was even British intelligence reports that suggested a military coup was to take place. Had war broken out then, Hitler could well have been toppled from within, and this coupled with the fact that his 4 year rearmament plan had only begun in 1936 meant that Britain could well have seen an early victory. Therefore, appeasing instead of attacking was perhaps mistaken.

As well as this, the argument that the British public were not ready for war, ^{expressed in Source 9} is weak. An opinion poll ⁱⁿ following Munich showed only 51% satisfaction with the settlement. Therefore only half the public were in support of appeasement, and thus the policy again was perhaps mistaken. Also, the idea that Chamberlain was conscious of

rearming is questionable, as Horace Wilson in 1962 admitted that 'we were never trying to bide time, just prevent war'. This is evidence that Chamberlain was not using appeasement to enable a successful later attack, but was mistakenly thinking that war could be avoided entirely. This view is supported by Source 8 when it says that Chamberlain exhibited 'a mistaken assessment of Hitler's aims'. Source 7 supports this in saying that Hitler 'made a nonsense of all his promises': the fact that Chamberlain returned from Berchtesgaden and told his cabinet that 'Hitler's aims are strictly limited' suggests that appeasement was mistaken in the way that Chamberlain was using it under the assumption that Hitler could be stopped entirely. Chamberlain did not even see this after Munich, trusting Hitler's signing of the piece of paper promise and even later, not wanting to provoke Hitler through a Soviet Alliance, thus avoiding it. This was mistaken as clearly Hitler always had expansionist policy, shown in the desire for Lebensraum ~~to be~~ laid out in Mein Kampf and in the Hossbach Memorandum, of which the British had intelligence reports. Therefore Chamberlain was mistakenly, and blindly, following appeasement in order to 'quell his own doubts', not bide time for rearmament.

To conclude, it is clear that despite a weak British military position and the need for rearmament, Chamberlain was following appeasement, mistakenly, for different reasons - to avoid war altogether when really he should have been considering an early attack. Instead appeasement failed to stop war.

completely and instead strengthened Hitler, as Munich ensured that his concessions turned German public opinion back in his favour.

Therefore Source 9 is wrong in supporting the idea that Chamberlain was right to bide time to return, and Source 7 is correct in implying that Munich was in fact a disaster. Overall, as Source 8 suggests, appeasement was indeed shameful and mistaken, largely in part due to Chamberlain's 'mistaken assessment of Hitler's aims'.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response is in the main well-argued and makes good use of sources. It lacks real depth of evaluation and some of the subtleties and issues within the sources are not quite picked up on, but it is sufficiently structured and analytical for a secure level 4 on both assessment objectives.

Question 8

On Question 8, stronger responses had a good understanding of the controversy and assessed the source arguments (the stimulus provided by the war to social legislation and the establishment of the welfare state, the experience of wartime government intervention, 'counter-influences' regarding the ability to actually deliver on promises, diminishing support for such a programme in the post-war period, etc). High scoring responses offered (1) knowledge which was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources (2) with a clear focus on 'how far' expectations were shifted and (3) confidence in debating and evaluating the given views. Weaker responses tended to (1) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing (2) a drift from focus (3) limited knowledge to extend the debate in the sources.

The Second World War certainly acted as a catalyst for change for the British people. Life would never be the same. Economically and socially however the expectations varied, with more focus from the public's opinion being on the latter. The main supporter of this argument is Narwick who showcases the various pieces of legislation passed during and directly after the end of the Second World War. Hilson argues that while expectations may have existed, they were disappointed. And Pope, on the other hand, highlights the government's attitude at the time who were more reluctant.

Narwick the main supporter of the view in the question argues how social change was brought about through various legislation passed by Parliament, in Britain. He argues that 'Britain' was at the top of the 'list'. Labour politicians had seen the Second World War as the perfect opportunity for reconstruction of Britain, and the creation of a state that was more involved in the day-to-day affairs of its citizens. The public became motivated by this ~~thru~~ after the publication of the 'Beveridge Report' in 1942, where ~~upon~~ its release 635,000 copies were sold. And a poll the following year showed how 88% of the population supported its implementation. He argues that it was 'a vital link' whereby the 'war experience' would be used to

produce 'social legislation'. The report aimed to tackle the five bad giants of society: Ignorance, want, squalor, disease and idleness. This report combined with Harbours report 'The Old world ^{and} the New Society' would provide the broad ideological framework for the future. Marwick presents a somewhat romanticized outlook of the events, while ~~pre~~ a lot of legislation was being passed it was not foolproof and had its problems. The 1944 Education Act for example was supposed to be a good thing on the surface, the school leaving age was raised to 15 and the system was split into three tiers: Primary, Secondary and Further. But the 11+ ~~examination~~ examination meant that those of a more wealthy background were more likely to succeed. Rex Pope comments on how although those opposed to the idea 'had been defeated' in later years they would grow 'frustrated'.

Wilson tackles the problem of Nationalisation, and like Marwick and Pope also mentions the 'National Health Service' this was Bevan's personal dream to provide free healthcare and dental care for all, but while it 'was deemed to be a success, it seemed less and less affordable', tying into Pope's argument of the schemes not all necessarily being 'practicable'. But it was popular as shown by the long queues that formed outside dental practices. It's popularity shows how the war had shifted expectations socially but economically these expectations could not always be met. Following the end of lend-lease in 1945 Britain was hugely in debt the scheme alone cost £5.5 billion and ~~the~~ Britain was over-reliant on money from elsewhere. Canada gave

Britain £3 billion, which it wrote off as a gift at the end of the war. This highlights one of the many problems ~~statesmen~~ [↓] ~~now~~ were facing. The public were demanding an end to the period of austerity, but expenses were increasing. The bad winter of 1947 also made the situation worse. Nationalisation was introduced by the Labour government as a way of making the economy more effective, it would be run by the government on behalf of the people. The Bank of England was nationalised in 1946 followed by the 'coal and steel industries', the owners were compensated millions and even then it was not as efficient as the old, rich still retained their positions of power. Adding to the frustration mentioned by Pope.

21. This is reinforced by ~~Pope~~ Pope who shows how over-reliant Britain was on America; 'Churchill's concern not to promise... fear of the reaction of Britain's American bankers.' The economic situation was not looking so good and this was made worse by situation after 1945, like in 1947 India declared themselves independent, now exports ^{and} imports would be more costly.

Wilson argues that the election of Prime Minister Clement Attlee alone shows the expectations of society from the government. People wanted change and like Pope reinforces at the end of his extracts; 'governments in the 1940s and 1950s' could not ignore this fact if they were to get into power. And the continuation of this social legislation led Harold MacMillan 'Super Mac' to claim

in 1951 'you have never had it so good'. This could not have been achieved ~~to~~ without the public's determination

However, not always were shifted expectations over post-war reform met, this is particularly the case for women, who sacrificed a lot during the war yet prejudice ran deep in society and government passed no legislation on to ensure fairness. The Beveridge report reinforced this distinction; family allowances were given to ~~working~~ mothers with more than one child, increasing women child bearing number and while they were encouraged to work they were not helped and it increased reliance on husbands.

In conclusion as shown through these sources, the war created expectation from the government for post-war reform. Although expectations were not always met there were the seeds for change. Nowhere is this more the case than with women, who never gave up, finally getting equal pay in 1970.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is broadly analytical, examining some of the key issues. The response has a focus on the question and overall offers some analysis. However, some parts of the answer lack development, with points that are stated or explanations without analysis. The views of the sources are recognised, although these are often used to support points without developed discussion. Responses such as this are likely to receive level 3 for both assessment objectives.

Paper summary

The following recommendations are divided into two parts:

In Depth Study question

Candidates must provide more factual details. Candidates need to ensure their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth of analysis.

Stay within the specific boundaries of the question – for example, some candidates explored issues outside of the relevant time periods.

More candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.

In order to address the question more effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis rather than provide a descriptive or chronological account. Many candidates produced answers which were focused and developed appropriately.

Some candidates need to analyse key phrases and concepts more carefully.

Some candidates could have explored links and the interaction between issues more effectively.

Associated Historical Controversy question

It is suggested that the students who performed best on Section B tended to be those who read the sources carefully, accurately and critically; recognised themes and issues arising from the sources, then used these to address the question. Some candidates potentially limited themselves by closing off possible areas of enquiry by seeking to make the evidence of the sources fit the contention in the question, without full thought to the issues within the sources, or by using the sources to illustrate arguments without relating evidence to other sources or own knowledge.

Candidates need to treat the sources as a package to facilitate cross-referencing and advance a convincing line of argument. Many weaker candidates resorted to 'potted' summaries of each source which failed to develop a support/challenge approach.

Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little or no own knowledge was included.

Candidates should avoid memorised 'perspectives' essays and base their responses on the issues raised by the sources instead. The Associated Historical Controversy question is an exercise in interpretation not historiography.

That said, there were very few really weak responses. The impression was that the substance of the source at least enabled candidates offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases though, candidates often struggled to extend issues with own knowledge, or really analyse the given views.

There was also a correlation between those candidates who reviewed all sources in their opening paragraph and high performance. Whilst a telling introduction is not essential, the process of carefully studying the sources to ascertain how they relate to the statement in the question, prior to writing the main analysis, allows candidates to clarify and structure their arguments.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.