

Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option E

**E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–  
1941**

**SOURCES  
ACCOMPANYING  
SECTION B**

**SOURCE 1**

*From A. Bullock, 'Hitler a Study in Tyranny' (1962) in A. Kitson, Germany 1858–1990: Hope, Terror and Revival*

He displayed a skill in propaganda and mastery of deceit, a finesse in exploiting the weakness of his opponents and a crudeness in exploiting the strength of his own position which he had learned in the struggle for power in Germany and which he now applied to international relations with even more remarkable results. This is not to suggest that Hitler ... foresaw in 1933 exactly how events would develop in the course of the next decade. No man was more of an opportunist, as the Nazi Soviet Pact shows. No man had more luck. But Hitler knew how to turn events to his advantage. He knew what he wanted and he held the initiative. His principal opponents, Great Britain and France, knew only what they did not want – war – and were always on the defensive. The fact that Hitler was ready to risk war, and started preparing it from the day he came to power, gave him still a greater advantage.

**SOURCE 2**

*From I. Kershaw, 'Hitler' (1991) in A. Kitson, Germany 1858–1990: Hope, Terror and Revival*

Hitler had no ready-made programme for proceeding (in foreign policy), no blueprint for action. The general thrust of policy was to appear conciliatory, tread warily, but rearm with all speed in order to be ready to seize the main chance when it presented itself. Germany's military weakness and diplomatic isolation offered in any case little alternative to such a strategy ... Hitler's hallmark in the early years was less the nature of the foreign policy itself than his capacity to perceive the weakest point of opposition and to push diplomatic relations into completely new terrain through a bold forward move.

**SOURCE 3**

*From R. Henig, 'The Origins of the Second World War in Europe' (1991) in G. Layton, Germany: The Third Reich 1933–45, 3rd edition*

'... the ambitions of Hitler constitute the major element in the outbreak of war in 1939. His was the primary, if not the sole, responsibility. Considerable room for argument remains, however, about Hitler's aims and methods, about the degree to which he cold-bloodedly planned for war in pursuit of a German empire in the east, or seized opportunities that came to him, or was a compulsive gambler who took risks for ever higher stakes.'

Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option E

**E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–  
1941**

**SECTION A**

**Examiner’s Specific Advice**

The exam is divided into two sections, A and B. The length of the exam is two hours. In Section A, you must answer one question from a choice of two. You are not required to evaluate historical sources in your answer. Section A is marked out of 30. In Section A you should spend five minutes planning and then 50 minutes writing your answer.

Section A answers require you to recall and use historical knowledge. You will be expected to present historical explanations which show a clear understanding of history. You could be asked questions on the causes or consequences of events; or you may be asked to make a historical judgement about the significance of an important historical event or individual.

**Exemplar Question**

‘The formation of European alliances and the arms race between 1879 and 1914 made the outbreak of the First World War inevitable.’

How far do you agree with this view?

**(30 marks)**

**Planning Your Response**

You should always plan your answers. You should identify the key words in the question. In this case, ‘how far’, ‘alliances’, ‘arms race’ and ‘inevitable’. Your plan should focus on the period 1879–1914. One effective and quick way to plan your answer is to create a brief mind map identifying the key factors which contributed to the First World War. On your mind map attempt to link different issues. Then code the different factors in order of significance by using numbers. This will then allow you to explore ‘how far’ you agree that ‘alliances’ made the outbreak of the First World War inevitable.

**Examiner’s Exemplar Answer 1**

<p><b>Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <u>Key factor: Alliances Triple Alliance/Germany Austria–Hungary/Triple Entente Russia/France/GB 1902</u></li><li>▪ <u>Key factor: Naval race; dreadnoughts</u></li><li>▪ <u>Military plans: Schlieffen Plan</u></li><li>▪ <u>Other factors: Colonial rivalry; tensions between Austria and Serbia; economic rivalry; Africa and imperialism (1)</u></li></ul> <p><b>Essay</b></p> <p><u>The development of various alliances in the period 1879 to 1914 did cause increased tensions in Europe. Therefore it could be argued that war in 1914 was inevitable. However, a range of issues, not just the formation of the alliances and competition in the arms race, made the outbreak of war in 1914 inevitable (2).</u></p> <p><u>It could be argued that war could have been avoided in 1914. After the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914 in Sarajevo, which resulted in the Austrian–Hungarian Empire declaring war on Serbia and Russia then supporting Serbia raised tensions considerably within Europe. Germany, due to its treaty obligations, implemented the Schlieffen Plan and attacked France through Belgium. Britain had signed a treaty with Belgium guaranteeing their neutrality and declared war on Germany. Therefore we can see that the alliance system did make war inevitable at this point (3).</u></p> <p><u>The build-up of the arms race before 1914 further heightened tensions between the European powers. The decision by the British to launch the Dreadnought Battleships in 1906, which made German naval ships inferior and Germany had a smaller navy resulted in Germany developing dreadnoughts as well. This resulted in a direct naval arms race between Germany and Britain, raising tensions and making war more likely but not inevitable. The British Government knew that the Germans could not overtake Britain’s navy in terms of size (4).</u></p> <p><u>It could be argued that economic and imperial rivalry were key factors in making the First World War inevitable. That German businessmen wanted</u></p>	<p>(1) The plan reveals recognition of some of the key issues. However, in five minutes the plan could be more extensive.</p> <p>(2) The introduction reveals an analytical understanding of the question. However, more specific factual points could be included.</p> <p>(3) The paragraph has a relevant analytical focus. It considers the issue of inevitability. The candidate deploys factual examples to develop the arguments.</p> <p>(4) The opening sentence could be improved by having a more explicit focus on ‘how far’. Towards the end of the paragraph there is consideration of inevitability. The candidate could have linked the arms race more effectively to other issues such as the arms race or alliances to develop the argument further.</p> <p>(5) This paragraph has an explicit analytical focus. The candidate needs to select more</p>
---	---

war with Britain to give Germany the chance to take over Britain's domination of overseas trade through her Empire. However, this is unlikely because Germany was expanding rapidly in economic terms and did not need to declare war on Britain to expand further (5).

One key factor, which arguably made war inevitable, was Russia's relationship with Serbia. Russia feared the growing influence of Germany in south-eastern Europe. She feared Germany would block her shipping through the Dardenelles and threaten Russia's economic development. Therefore Russia viewed Austria's declaration of war on Serbia as an attempt by Germany to expand their power and influence in Europe at the expense of Russia. Germany's determination to support Austria in 1914 did make war inevitable (6).

Germany had long feared being encircled in Europe. Germany feared the growing size of Britain's navy. That the growth of Russia's military convinced German Generals that war was inevitable. Other historians have argued that Germany deliberately wanted a war in 1914 to achieve world domination. However, it could be argued that the Kaiser believed strong support for Austria would cause the Russians to withdraw their support from Serbia. Therefore all these differing arguments undermine the view that alliances made war inevitable (7).

The major European powers had military plans. The German Schlieffen Plan was developed in 1905. This plan called for attacking France quickly through neutral Belgium to avoid fighting a war on two fronts. German troops entered Belgium on 4 August. As mentioned earlier, this resulted in Britain supporting Belgium and declaring war on Germany. On 30 July the German Kaiser and Chancellor urged Austria to negotiate with Serbia but the Austrians refused (8).

In the period 1905–14 there was a series of crises in Europe. In 1905 there was the Moroccan Crisis where Germany attempted to undermine French influence in Morocco and wanted to test the new relationship between France and Britain. Morocco was one of the last independent areas of North Africa. The Germans called for a conference to discuss the independence of Morocco. However, Britain supported French demands to control

precise facts to support the points made. Again, the arguments could be developed further.

(6) The candidate begins to recognise that Radical Reconstruction was not completely successful. However, the answer is quite implicit and needs to be more explicit in terms of analytical focus.

(7) This paragraph explores 'encirclement'. Again the point could be explored in more depth. However, the candidate attempts to link 'encirclement' to the role of the 'alliances'.

(8) A good selection of precise factual examples. However, this paragraph lacks a clear analytical focus. More emphasis is needed on 'how far' and 'inevitable'.

Morocco's financial system and police. This represented a diplomatic defeat for Germany and confirmed that Britain, France and Russia were attempting to encircle Germany. In 1911 French troops occupied Fez, the capital of Morocco. Germany sent a gunboat to Morocco and demanded more territory in Africa. The French, supported by Britain, refused to back down. The French troops remained within Morocco but Germany was given territory in the French Congo. This was seen as a victory for Britain and France. The German public became more anti-British. Also the British now had eight powerful dreadnoughts compared to Germany's four (9).

In 1908 Austria annexed the Turkish province of Bosnia. Bosnia contained millions of Serbs and again this heightened tensions. Britain and France were unwilling to go to war over Bosnia and refused to support Russian demands for a conference. After this Russia accelerated the build-up of their military forces (10).

Recent rivalries in the Balkans had caused growing tensions. The Balkan league attacked Turkey in 1912. The Germans and British arranged a peace conference in London. The peace agreement resulted in an independent Albania supported by Austria. The Serbs believed the Austrians had supported this move to weaken Serbia. The Bulgarians were angered because the Serbs gained control over Macedonia. In 1913 Bulgaria attacked Serbia, causing the second Balkan War. Serbia was supported by Greece and Turkey during this war. Germany persuaded Austria not to attack Serbia during this conflict. However, Serbia was becoming more confident (11).

Therefore we can see that a range of related factors contributed to the outbreak of the First World War. War at some point was inevitable. The alliance system and the arms race were not the only factors which caused the war. The military plans and the failure of European powers to communicate effectively contributed to the war. Politicians and military leaders in Germany, Russia and Austria-Hungary failed to see that mass mobilisation of troops would lead to war (12).

### **Examiner's Assessment**

This Level 3 answer attempts analysis and shows

(9) A very good selection of precise factual examples. However, as in the previous paragraph, the points are not deployed to support focused analysis. Instead the candidate lists sources of tension without exploring 'how far' and 'inevitable'.

(10) Again the candidate adopts a narrative approach.

(11) A narrative approach, which lacks analysis. However, there is a good selection of precise facts.

(12) The candidate reaches a clear causal conclusion. However, there needs to be more emphasis on 'how far' and 'inevitable'.

some understanding of the question. In places it is generalised. The answer also drifts into narrative in places and points are not developed fully. The answer needs to have a more sustained analytical focus, clearly centred on exploring 'how far' and 'inevitable'. The candidate needs to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed interpretation more fully. For these reasons the answer doesn't make Level 4, but reaches Mid Level 3 (15–16 marks).

### Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

#### Plan

- Key terms: 'How far' and 'inevitable'
- Key given factor: 'Alliances' and 'arms race' Triple Alliance/Germany Austria–Hungary/Triple Entente Russia/France/GB 1902
- Links to: Naval race; dreadnoughts; military plans: Schlieffen Plan; role of Moltke 1911; Belgium's neutrality
- Alliances/arms race not 'inevitable' war would break out in 1914
- Other factors: Colonial rivalry and imperialism; tensions between Austria and Serbia; economic rivalry; Africa; Morocco; Balkans War; Agadir Crisis (13)
- Conclusion: Turner 'a tragedy of miscalculation' (13)

#### Essay

The extent various alliances contributed to the inevitability of war in 1914 is debatable. The formation of alliances in the period 1879 to 1914 did cause increased tensions in Europe. Therefore it could be argued that this made war inevitable in 1914. However, a range of issues, not just the formation of the alliances and competition in the arms race, made the outbreak of war in 1914 inevitable. There were serious of crises in the early twentieth century, such as the Agadir Crisis of 1911, which did not result in war. Even in 1914 no country actually declared war because of an alliance (14).

The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914 in Sarajevo resulted in the Austrian–Hungarian Empire declaring war on Serbia. Russia then supported Serbia, which raised tensions within Europe. Germany, due to its treaty

(13) The plan reveals a clear emphasis on 'how far' and 'inevitable'. There is a clear structure as compared to the plan for Exemplar Answer 1. This plan incorporates a clear conclusion. The candidate has selected more precise details to support the arguments.

(14) The introduction has an explicit analytical focus. Precise factual examples have been selected to support the arguments. The candidate begins to debate the interpretation.

(15) Again, this shows a good

obligations, implemented the Schlieffen Plan and attacked France through Belgium. Britain had signed a treaty with Belgium guaranteeing their neutrality and declared war on Germany. However, Serbia and not the alliance system could be viewed as the key factor in making war inevitable. Serbian intelligence had supported the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The Serbs were determined to gain control of Bosnia from Austria. Therefore we can see that it was not just the alliance system or the arms race that made war inevitable (15).

The build-up of the arms race before 1914 did heighten tensions between the European powers but whether this made war inevitable can be disputed. The decision by the British to launch the Dreadnought Battleships in 1906, which made German naval ships inferior, resulted in Germany developing dreadnoughts as well. This resulted in a direct naval arms race between Germany and Britain, raising tensions and making war more likely but not inevitable. The British Government knew that the Germans could not overtake Britain's navy in terms of size. However, the arms race, combined with issues such as expanding empires and rivalry for influence in south-east Europe, especially with the decline of the Turkish Empire, arguably did make war more likely. It could be argued that rivalry was further stimulated by economic and imperial competition; that German businessmen wanted war with Britain to give Germany the chance to take over Britain's domination of overseas trade through her Empire. Hence, from this perspective, war became inevitable. However, this interpretation is weakened because Germany was expanding rapidly in economic terms and did not need to declare war on Britain to expand further (16).

One key factor, which arguably made war inevitable, was Russia's relationship with Serbia. Russia feared the growing influence of Germany in south-eastern Europe. She feared Germany would block her shipping through the Dardenelles and threaten Russia's economic development. Therefore Russia viewed Austria's declaration of war on Serbia as an attempt by Germany to expand their power and influence in Europe at the expense of Russia. Additionally, if Russia abandoned Serbia, her prestige as the leader of the Slav nations in Europe would have been seriously damaged. Moreover Germany's

focus on discussing 'inevitable'  
The candidate begins to link different issues to develop the points.

(16) Good analytical focus and deployment of specific factual examples. The candidate explores differing historical views and begins to consider the weakness of differing interpretations.

(17) Here the candidate explores the role of Russia and Serbia, showing very good historical understanding of the relationship between differing European powers and how this contributed to war. Again, the candidate considers weaknesses of the given interpretation.



determination to support Austria in 1914 did make war inevitable. Therefore this weakens the arguments that the alliance system alone made war inevitable (17).

Germany had long feared being encircled in Europe. Germany feared the growing size of Britain's navy. That the growth of Russia's military convinced German Generals that war was inevitable. Other historians have argued that Germany deliberately wanted a war in 1914 to achieve world domination. However, it could be argued that the Kaiser believed strong support for Austria would cause the Russians to withdraw their support from Serbia. Therefore all these differing arguments undermine the view that alliances made war inevitable. Furthermore, the military plans of the major powers played a significant role in the outbreak of war. The German Schlieffen Plan was developed in 1905. This plan called for attacking France quickly through neutral Belgium to avoid fighting a war on two fronts. German troops entered Belgium on 4 August. As mentioned earlier, this resulted in Britain supporting Belgium and declaring war on Germany. On 30 July the German Kaiser and Chancellor urged Austria to negotiate with Serbia but the Austrians refused. Again this seems to suggest a range of factors contributed to the outbreak of war and the arms race and alliances alone did not make war inevitable (18).

Indeed, it could be argued that a series of problems in the period 1905–14 between the European powers made war inevitable. In 1905 there was the Moroccan Crisis where Germany attempted to undermine French influence in Morocco and wanted to test the new relationship between France and Britain. Morocco was one of the last independent areas of North Africa. The Germans called for a conference to discuss the independence of Morocco. However, Britain supported French demands to control Morocco's financial system and police. This represented a diplomatic defeat for Germany and confirmed that Britain, France and Russia were attempting to encircle Germany. In 1911 French troops occupied Fez, the capital of Morocco. Germany sent a gunboat to Morocco and demanded more territory in Africa. The French, supported by Britain, refused to back down. The French troops remained within Morocco but Germany was given territory in the French Congo. This was seen as a

(18) A good discussion of differing factors which contributed to the First World War. Importantly, the candidate links issues effectively to discuss the validity of the given interpretation.

(19) Again the candidate links

victory for Britain and France. The German public became more anti British. Also the British now had eight powerful dreadnoughts compared to Germany's four. In 1908 Austria annexed the Turkish province of Bosnia, which contained millions of Serbs, and again this heightened tensions. Importantly, Britain and France refused to support Russian demands for a conference on Bosnia. Therefore this suggests that the alliance system did not make war inevitable because the alliances had not resulted in war during previous years (19).

The system of alliances and the arms race did not result in war in 1912. Recent rivalries in the Balkans had caused growing tensions. The Balkan league attacked Turkey in 1912. The Germans and British arranged a peace conference in London. The peace agreement resulted in an independent Albania supported by Austria. The Serbs believed the Austrians had supported this move to weaken Serbia. The Bulgarians were angered because the Serbs gained control over Macedonia. In 1913 Bulgaria attacked Serbia causing, the second Balkan War. Serbia was supported by Greece and Turkey during this war. Again the alliance system did not make war between the major powers inevitable. Germany persuaded Austria not to attack Serbia during this conflict. However, Serbia was becoming more confident and aggressive – as seen with the involvement of Serbian intelligence in the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand (20).

Therefore we can see that a range of related factors contributed to the outbreak of the First World War. Arguably, war at some point was inevitable. However, the alliance system and the arms race were not the only factors which made war inevitable. The military plans and the failure of European powers to communicate effectively contributed to the inevitability of war. Turner argues that the war was caused by 'a tragedy of miscalculation'; that politicians and military leaders in Germany, Russia and Austria-Hungary failed to see that mass mobilisation of troops would lead to war once started. Hence, to a certain extent, alliances and the arms race made war more likely but not completely inevitable (21).

### **Examiner's Assessment**

issues effectively to explore the interpretation. There is a very good selection of facts to support points. The candidate argues that the alliance system had not resulted in war during disputes prior to 1914.

(20) A clear and explicit analytical focus. Again, issues are linked effectively. The candidate remains focused on discussing the interpretation. Possibly, the candidate here and in previous paragraphs could give more consideration to the strengths of the given interpretation.

(21) The candidate reaches a clear conclusion, finishing a focused answer which emphasises that the alliance system and arms race did not necessarily make war inevitable.

**Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941**

<p>This is a very good answer, worthy of Level 5. It has a clear, explicit and sustained analytical focus. The candidate has explored a range of relevant issues and supported the arguments with precise examples. The candidate has also explored a range of views and considered the weaknesses of the given interpretation. The facts used are accurate and are deployed effectively. Issues are linked very effectively to further develop the arguments. Points are clearly communicated and the answer is structured effectively. In places, more consideration could be paid to the strengths of the given interpretation. Overall, this answer would be awarded 26/30 marks, a Low Level 5.</p>	
--	--

**Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option E**

**E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–  
1941**

**Mark Scheme  
for Section A**

‘The formation of European alliances and the arms race between 1879 and 1914 made the outbreak of the First World War inevitable.’

How far do you agree with this view?

**(30 marks)**

**Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%) (30 marks)**

The essay questions in Section A will have an analytical focus, requiring candidates to reach a substantiated judgement on a historical issue or problem.

<p><b>Level 1</b></p>	<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. 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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less</p>	<p><b>(1–6)</b></p>
-----------------------	---	---------------------

Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

	<p>convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3–4 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 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 1: 5–6 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>	
<b>Level 2</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 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 2: 9–10 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 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 2: 11–12 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(7–12)</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<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. 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>	<b>(13–18)</b>

Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

	<p><b>Low Level 3: 13–14 marks</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(19–24)</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<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. The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not</p>	

**Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941**

	<p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>	
--	---	--

Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option E

**E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–  
1941**

**SECTION B**

**Examiner's Specific Advice**

Section B of the exam focuses on the use of sources and historical controversies. The controversies you should focus on for Option E: War and Peace: 20th Century International Relations are as follows:

- a. Why was the League of Nations not more successful?
- b. Why did armed conflict between the major world powers break out in the years 1937–41?

You are required to answer one question out of a choice of two. There will be one question on each controversy. This question is marked out of 40. Twenty-four marks are awarded for analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations and representations of history. Sixteen marks are awarded for the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge.

You will be assessed on your ability to establish links between your own knowledge and two to three secondary sources presenting the interpretations of historians on the above controversies. You will be required to explore an issue of historical debate and reach substantiated judgements. Again, you should use your own knowledge and understanding of the historical context to discuss the value of different historical interpretations. You will be expected to compare, contrast and evaluate the views stated within the sources.

Answers should be driven by the sources. Candidates who fail to use the sources fully and whose answer is driven by their own factual knowledge will not score highly. You need to focus on discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the historical interpretations you have been presented with. You are not required to recognise the historians within the sources. In fact you are not required to revise lists of historians and categorise their arguments. However, being aware of different historians and their views could be helpful.

**Exemplar Question**

How far do you agree that Hitler's determination to conquer territory explains why

war broke out in Europe in 1939?

Explain your answer, using the evidence of Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(40 marks)

### Planning Your Response

You will need to plan your answer carefully. You need to ensure your plan incorporates the sources and your own knowledge. It is not unusual for examination candidates to produce a very good plan, but then fail to fully utilise it in their response. This may be for the following reasons:

- The plan is too ambitious.
- The candidate's argument drifts away from the plan.
- The candidate runs out of time.

### Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

#### Plan

Key issues:

- Role of GB and France
- German foreign policy and the Treaty of Versailles
- Czechoslovakia and Munich Conference
- Poland and Polish corridor
- Anschluss and Austria
- Chamberlain and appeasement
- Hitler and Lebensraum

Sources:

- S1 = 'opportunist'
- S2 = 'no blueprint'
- S3 = 'compulsive gambler' (1)

#### Essay

Hitler was a key factor in explaining why war broke out in 1939. His support for Lebensraum was going to result in war at some point. However, this does not mean we should ignore the role of Britain, France and Russia. Other key events such as the Munich Conference of 1938 are also important in understanding the reasons for war in 1939 (2).

Hitler's desire for expansion of German territory and reversing the Treaty of Versailles is outlined in his book Mein Kampf and in the Nazi 25 point programme, both written in the 1920s. Source 3 argues that '... the ambitions of Hitler constitute the major element in the outbreak of war ...' Hitler's desire to expand can be seen as early as 1936 when Hitler sent troops into the Rhineland. From

(1) The plan highlights a range of relevant issues. There is some recognition of source content. However, the plan does not place the sources at the heart of the answer and does not incorporate a clear structure to the essay.

(2) The introduction recognises the key phrases within the question. The candidate has considered the given factor of 'Hitler' and acknowledged the importance of other factors. However, a source reference should be integrated into the introduction.

(3) The candidate fails to



<p><u>1933 onwards he also broke the terms of the Treaty of Versailles by expanding the German armed forces. From this perspective we can see that Hitler did play a key role in the outbreak of the Second World War (3).</u></p> <p><u>Hitler's determination to pursue German expansion can be seen in his attempts to build closer relations with Fascist Italy and Mussolini. In 1936 the Rome Berlin Axis was signed, which increased ties between Germany and Italy. Both countries co-operated in supporting Franco in the Spanish Civil War. Hitler even authorised the use of German aircraft to bomb the Spanish city of Guernica, which was not strongly opposed by the British and French Governments. In March 1938 Hitler sent German troops into Austria and Anschluss between Germany and Austria was declared (4).</u></p> <p><u>To an extent other factors also contributed to the war. The foreign policies of Britain in the 1930s also caused the Second World War to begin in 1939. Neville Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, supported the policy of appeasement which meant giving in to Hitler's demands to avoid war in Europe. The high point of appeasement was in 1938 with the Munich Conference. At the conference Britain and France supported the return of the Sudetenland to Germany on condition that Hitler guaranteed the independence of Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately Hitler, after receiving the Sudetenland, broke the terms of the agreement by invading the rest of Czechoslovakia. If Britain and France had taken a firmer stance against Germany before 1938 war might have been prevented in 1939 (5).</u></p> <p><u>Before 1938 Britain could have taken a stronger position against Germany. In 1935 Britain could have refused to co-operate over the signing of the Anglo-German naval agreement. In 1933 Britain and France could have placed more pressure on Hitler to participate in the Geneva Disarmament Conference. However, because they did not take a stronger stance against Hitler as Source 1 argues this encouraged him to become more of an 'opportunist', which inevitably led to war (6).</u></p> <p><u>Every success Hitler had in his foreign policy meant he became bolder in his actions. After gaining the successful return of the Saarland in 1935 he then introduced conscription to the German army in 1935. He then sent troops into the Rhineland in</u></p>	<p>cross-reference sources effectively. The analysis of the interpretation could be more focused.</p> <p>(4) The candidate fails to integrate the sources. Points need to be linked more closely to discussing the validity of the interpretation.</p> <p>(5) This paragraph contains some causal analysis and discusses the role of Britain and France. Again points need to be more closely linked to the interpretation. Additionally, this paragraph does not contain any source references. Stronger answers will be driven by the sources instead of own knowledge. However, the own knowledge here is precise and accurate.</p> <p>(6) Again, relevant causal analysis and own knowledge are included. The candidate makes a valid source reference. However, once again, there is no cross-referencing of sources.</p>
---	--

1936. At this point his expansionist plans could have been more easily stopped by Britain and France, which may have prevented the Second World War beginning in 1939. Kershaw recognises that in the early 1930s Germany suffered from '... military weakness ...' (S2). It should be noted that there was widespread support for appeasement within Britain and France during the early to mid 1930s. Many felt that Germany had been treated harshly by the Treaty of Versailles. Consequently Chamberlain and the British government supported appeasement, which allowed Hitler to become more confident and aggressive, resulting in war in September 1939. Importantly, as Source 3 argues, Hitler '... seized opportunities ...' (7).

However, despite these arguments Hitler was determined to increase German territory. Even though Source 2 argues that Hitler had '... no blueprint for action ...', he was still the key cause of the Second World War. His decision to invade the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 clearly supports this argument. He then made demands for the return of the Polish corridor. He knew that Britain and France had guaranteed to support Poland against German military action. Therefore his decision to ignore Britain and France was the main cause of the war. (8).

It could be argued that the decision of the USSR to sign the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in August 1939 was also a key factor in causing the outbreak of war. As Source 1 argues, Hitler had a '... mastery of deceit ...'. This decision to compromise with the USSR in 1939 emboldened him to invade Poland. He knew that in 1939 it would be difficult for Germany to sustain a war on two fronts. Therefore this non-aggression pact made Hitler more confident, which resulted in the German invasion of Poland on 1 September 1939 and subsequently the declaration of war on Germany by Britain on 3 September. Hence Russia also played a key part in the beginning of the Second World War (9).

Therefore we can see a range of factors contributed to the Second World War beginning in September 1939. Hitler's determination to expand German territory was a very important cause. However, the failure of Britain and France to take a firmer stance against Hitler allowed him to become more confident and Germany to become stronger militarily. This confidence was boosted by the signing of the Ten Year Non Aggression Pact.

(7) Here the candidate recognises the role of Britain and appeasement. There is some discussion of the interpretation. This is the only paragraph with two source references. However, the sources could be linked more effectively.

(8) This paragraph is more focused on evaluating the interpretation. However, there is no cross-referencing of the sources which would allow the candidate to explore/develop the arguments in more depth.

(9) This paragraph contains causal analysis. The candidate has recognised the importance of the USSR and linked this to Hitler. Appropriate source references are included. Again there is no linking of sources.

(10) The essay reaches a clear conclusion and considers the 'given' interpretation. It also emphasises the role of the USSR. It ends with an appropriate source reference.

Therefore, as Source 3 argues, Hitler being a 'compulsive gambler' invaded Poland which resulted in war (10).

### Examiner's Assessment

This essay overall reaches High Level 3 (10/16 marks) for AO1 and Low Level 4 (15/24 marks) for AO2. Total marks: 25/40. Candidates are awarded 24 marks for analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations and representations of history; 16 marks are awarded for the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge.

Here the candidate has explored a range of relevant issues; included relevant causal analysis and attempted to discuss the validity of the interpretation.

However, the answer is not driven by the sources. The candidate has not cross-referenced sources effectively to discuss the interpretation. The candidate has included a range of relevant factual points to support the arguments and does reach a clear conclusion. But the answer needs to have a more sustained focus on discussing the interpretation and the sources need to be linked more closely to own knowledge. This will allow the candidate to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the interpretation more effectively.

### Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

#### Plan

Key issues/source links:

- P1 = Intro: given interpretation – Lebensraum; other views?
- P1 = S1 'finesse'; S3 'ambitions'
- P2 = Rhineland; Treaty of Versailles
- P2 = S3 'major'; S1 'advantage'
- P3 = Italy; Spain
- P3 = S2 'appear conciliatory'; S3 'ready to risk war'
- P4 = Czechoslovakia; Munich Conference; Chamberlain and appeasement
- P4 = S2 'had no ready programme'; S1 'defensive'
- P5 = early 1930s foreign policy
- P5 = S3 'ambitions'; S1 'opportunist'
- P6 & P7 = Conscription; Saarland; naval agreement
- P6 & P7 = S1 'military weakness'

(11) As compared to the plan for Exemplar Answer 1, this plan is more effective. The candidate highlights key issues and has also included some specific factual points to support the arguments. The plan is also more driven by the sources. The candidate identifies key phrases from the sources, which will help in

- P8 & P9 = Poland and Polish corridor
- P8 & P9 = S1 'mastery of deceit'; S2 'no blueprint for action'
- Conclusion = S3 'compulsive gambler'; differing views; emphasise role of GB; USSR (11)

### Essay

Hitler performed a key role in causing the Second World War in 1939. His support for Lebensraum and his 'ambitions' (S3) were going to result in war at some point. However, this does not mean we should ignore the role of Britain, France and Russia in contributing to the war in 1939. As Source 1 argues, he had a 'finesse in exploiting the weakness of his opponents'. These 'weaknesses' arguably could be seen at events such as the Munich Conference of 1938. That Britain and France were always on the 'defensive' (S1). These issues are very important in understanding the reasons for war in 1939. Placing all the emphasis on Hitler would not fully explain the reasons for war in 1939 (12).

The main historical view is that Hitler and his desire for territory was the main cause of the Second World War. This desire for expansion and reversing the Treaty of Versailles is outlined in Mein Kampf, written by Hitler whilst in prison after the failed Munich Putsch of 1923. This desire to destroy the Treaty of Versailles and expand Germany can also be seen in the Nazi 25 point programme. Source 3 argues that '... the ambitions of Hitler constitute the major element in the outbreak of war ...'. Hitler's desire to expand can be seen as early as 1936 when Hitler sent troops into the Rhineland. From 1933 onwards he also broke the terms of the Treaty of Versailles by expanding the German armed forces. From this perspective we can see that Hitler did play a key role in the outbreak of the Second World War and often turned events to his 'greater advantage' (S1) (13).

Source 2 argues that Hitler attempted to 'appear conciliatory' in the early 1930s. However, this does not mean he was not a key factor in causing the Second World War. Hitler's determination to pursue German expansion can be seen in his attempts to build closer relations with Fascist Italy and Mussolini. As Bullock argues, Hitler was 'ready to risk war' (S1). This supports the view that Hitler was the key reason for war in 1939. In 1936 the

developing the arguments. Importantly, the candidate has tried to structure the answer by identifying key points for each paragraph.

(12) The introduction highlights the key issues and reveals a clear understanding of the essay title. Significantly, the introduction includes focused source references which are linked to discussing historical interpretations.

(13) The candidate includes precise factual examples to support the arguments. These facts are also used to support points drawn from the sources. However, the sources could be linked more effectively to support the arguments.

(14) The candidate continues to explore a range of relevant

Rome Berlin Axis was signed, which increased ties between Germany and Italy. Both countries co-operated in supporting Franco in the Spanish Civil War. Hitler even authorised the use of German aircraft to bomb the Spanish city of Guernica, which was not strongly opposed by the British and French governments. In March 1938 Hitler sent German troops into Austria. Anschluss between Germany and Austria was declared, which clearly violated the Treaty of Versailles. As Source 3 states, Hitler wanted to establish a 'German empire' (14).

To an extent other factors also contributed to the war. As Kershaw reveals, Hitler 'had no ready-made programme' for war (S2). The foreign policies of Britain in the 1930s also caused the Second World War to begin in 1939. Neville Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, supported the policy of appeasement, which meant giving into Hitler's demands to avoid war in Europe. As Bullock argues, Britain and France 'did not want – war' (S1). The high point of appeasement was in 1938 with the Munich Conference. At the conference Britain and France supported the return of the Sudetenland to Germany on condition that Hitler guaranteed the independence of Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately Hitler, after receiving the Sudetenland, broke the terms of the agreement by invading the rest of Czechoslovakia. If Britain and France had taken a firmer stance against Germany before 1938, war might have been prevented in 1939. Instead Britain and France were always on the 'defensive' (S1) which made Hitler more confident and aggressive (15).

Before 1938 Britain could have taken a stronger position against Germany instead of arguably encouraging his 'ambitions' (S3). In 1935 Britain could have refused to co-operate over the signing of the Anglo-German naval agreement. In 1933 Britain and France could have placed more pressure on Hitler to participate in the Geneva Disarmament Conference. However, because they did not take a stronger stance against Hitler, as Source 1 argues, this encouraged him to become more of an 'opportunist', which inevitably led to war (16).

Every success Hitler had in his foreign policy meant he became bolder in his actions. After gaining the successful return of the Saarland in 1935 he then introduced conscription to the German army in 1935. He then sent troops into the Rhineland in 1936. At this point his expansionist plans could

issues. In this paragraph the focus is on Hitler's role in causing the Second World War. The candidate weaves in the sources to support the arguments.

(15) Again this paragraph is driven by the sources and links different issues effectively. The candidate has deployed own historical knowledge to further develop the arguments. The candidate here is considering differing views by analysing the role of appeasement.

(16) Very precise facts are used here to further explore the validity of the interpretation. The candidate is using differing sources to explore the validity of the 'given' interpretation which emphasises the key role of Hitler.

(17) More emphasis is placed

have been more easily stopped by Britain and France, which may have prevented the Second World War beginning in 1939. Kershaw recognises that in the early 1930s Germany suffered from 'military weakness' (S2). It should be noted that there was widespread support for appeasement within Britain and France during the early to mid 1930s. Many felt that Germany had been treated harshly by the Treaty of Versailles. Consequently, Chamberlain and the British government supported appeasement, which allowed Hitler to become more confident and aggressive, resulting in war in September 1939. Importantly, as Henig argues, Hitler 'seized opportunities' (S3) (17).

However, despite these arguments, Hitler was determined to increase German territory. Even though Source 2 argues that Hitler had 'no blueprint for action', he was still the key cause of the Second World War. His decision to invade the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 clearly supports this argument. He then made demands for the return of the Polish corridor. He knew that Britain and France had guaranteed to support Poland against German military action. Therefore, his decision to ignore Britain and France was the main cause of the war. Even though there is historical dispute over whether Hitler had a 'cold bloodedly planned for war' (S3) his actions and ideological commitment to Lebensraum made war inevitable in 1939 (18).

It could be argued that the decision of the USSR to sign the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in August 1939 was also a key factor in causing the outbreak of war. As Source 1 argues, Hitler had a 'mastery of deceit'. This decision to compromise with the USSR in 1939 emboldened him to invade Poland. He knew that in 1939 it would be difficult for Germany to sustain a war on two fronts. As Kershaw argues, Hitler had the ability to 'tread warily' (S2). Therefore this non-aggression pact made Hitler more confident, which resulted in the German invasion of Poland on 1 September 1939 and subsequently the declaration of war on Germany by Britain on 3 September. Hence Russia also played a key part in the beginning of the Second World War (19).

Hence a range of factors contributed to the Second World War beginning in September 1939. Hitler's determination from 1933 to expand German territory was a very important cause. As Kershaw argues, his plan from the beginning was to 'rearm

on the significance of the role of Britain and France as compared to Hitler. Good awareness of the historical context. Precise factual points are used to support the arguments. Again the paragraph is driven by the sources and not just own knowledge.

(18) Here the candidate highlights factors which support the view that Hitler was the key factor in causing the Second World War, emphasising Hitler's policies towards Czechoslovakia in 1938/39. The sources are used to develop the arguments.

(19) Here the emphasis is on the role of the USSR. The candidate argues that the 10 Year Non Aggression Pact provided Hitler with the confidence to invade Poland, which started the Second World War. Good source inference skills are displayed; as is good awareness of the historical context in 1939.



with all speed' (S2). However, the failure of Britain and France to take a firmer stance against Hitler allowed him to become more confident and Germany to become stronger militarily. This confidence was boosted by the signing of the Ten Year Non Aggression Pact. Therefore, as Source 3 argues, Hitler, being a 'compulsive gambler', invaded Poland, which resulted in war (20).

### Examiner's Assessment

This essay is more effective because the answer is driven by the sources. The essay contains a range of key skills required by the mark scheme. Overall it scores a Low Level 5: 14/16 marks for AO1 and 21/24 marks for AO2. Total marks: 35/40. Candidates are awarded 24 marks for analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations and representations of history; 16 marks are awarded for the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge.

Here the candidate has explored a range of relevant issues; included relevant causal analysis and discussed the validity of the interpretation.

As stated above, the answer is driven by the sources. Accurate and appropriate source references are made in every paragraph. Sources are cross-referenced effectively to discuss the interpretation. A range of relevant factual points are included to support the arguments and a clear conclusion is reached. The candidate has explored the strengths and weaknesses of the interpretation.

In places, however, more specific factual points could be linked to the sources. This would allow the arguments to be developed in more depth. In some paragraphs the sources could be linked more effectively. This would result in higher marks being awarded for this answer.

(20) This is a clear conclusion. The candidate recognises the importance of Hitler but argues that the policies of Britain, France and the USSR encouraged Hitler to become more aggressive, which explains why war broke out in 1939.

How far do you agree that Hitler’s determination to conquer territory explains why war broke out in Europe in 1939?

Explain your answer, using the evidence of Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

**(40 marks)**

**Target: AO1a and AO1b (16 marks); AO2b (24 marks) (40 marks)**

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.

**AO1a and AO1b (16 marks)**

<p><b>Level 1</b></p>	<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. 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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 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 1: 2 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 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 1: 3 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>	<p><b>(1–3)</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p>	<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.</p>	<p><b>(4–6)</b></p>



Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

	<p>Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far. 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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 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 2: 5 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 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 2: 6 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>	
<p><b>Level 3</b></p>	<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. 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></p> <p>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: 8–9 marks</b></p> <p>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: 10 marks</b></p>	<p><b>(7–10)</b></p>

Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

	The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.	
<b>Level 4</b>	<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. 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: 11 marks</b></p> <p>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: 12 marks</b></p> <p>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: 13 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(11–13)</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less</p>	<b>(14–16)</b>

Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

	<p>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>	
--	--	--

**AO2b (24 marks)**

<b>Level 1</b>	<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>	<b>(1–4)</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<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. 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>	<b>(5–6)</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to</p>	<b>(10–14)</b>

Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

	<p>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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>	
<p><b>Level 4</b></p>	<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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>	<p><b>(15–19)</b></p>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p>	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the authors' 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>(20–24)</b></p>

**Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941**

	<p><b>Low Level 5: 20–21 marks</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>	
--	---	--

Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option E

**E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–  
1941**

**Chronology**

**Chronology: Key Events in *War and Peace: 20th Century  
International Relations: The World in Crisis, 1879–1941***

Year	Month	Event
1878		European negotiators meet at the Berlin Conference and agree to the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire's European possessions and a reduction of Russia's wartime gains at the end of the Russo-Turkish War
1879		Dual Alliance: Germany and Austria
1881		In Europe, reactionary Alexander III (1845-94) begins a thirteen-year reign as Russian Tsar following the assassination of his father Alexander II
1881		Three Emperors' Alliance: Germany, Russia and Austria
1882		In Europe, Italy joins an alliance with Germany and Austria and each agrees to come to the aid of the other if attacked by Russia or France under the terms of the 'Triple Alliance'
1883		In Africa, Germany establishes a settlement in the south west
1884		In Europe, the major powers agree that any power claiming a protectorate over an area in Africa must organise and administer the area under the terms of the 'Treaty of Berlin'
1884		Three Emperors' Alliance is renewed
1884		Germany begins programme of colonial expansion
1885		In Asia, China signs the Treaty of Annam, in which China recognises French control of central Vietnam and France returns Taiwan/Formosa to China
1885		War breaks out between Bulgaria and Serbia
1887		Reinsurance Treaty between Germany and Russia
1888		In Europe, William II becomes Emperor of Germany
1890		In Germany, Emperor Wilhelm II (1859-1941) forces Otto von Bismarck (1815-98) to resign as Chancellor of Germany
1894		In Asia, Japanese naval forces defeat a Chinese naval squadron near Pyongyang, drive Chinese land forces from Korea, invade China and capture Port Arthur during the Sino-Japanese War
1894		Dual Alliance between France and Russia
1897		Bulow appointed foreign minister of Germany and a policy of Weltpolitik is pursued

Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

1899		In Europe, diplomats meet in the Hague and sign the Hague Convention, which bans bombing from the air and the use of chemical weapons and establishes the International Court of Arbitration (The Hague Tribunal)
1900		In China, Allied forces capture Peking and suppress the Boxer Rebellion, in which rebels and parts of the Chinese army had attempted to drive all foreigners from the country
1901		In Asia, the Boxer Rebellion ends with the 'Boxer Protocol', in which China is forced to grant additional trade concessions and pay an indemnity to the European powers and the USA
1902		Britain and Japan sign the Anglo-Japanese alliance, in which they agree to come to the aid of the other in time of war
1904		In Asia, Japanese naval forces attack and destroy the Russian Far Eastern Fleet at Port Arthur during the Russo-Japanese War
1904		Entente Cordiale between France and Britain
1905		First Moroccan Crisis
1906		In Britain, the navy launches <i>HMS Dreadnought</i> , which revolutionises naval design and results in a German decision to increase the size of its battleships
1907		Entente Cordiale is extended to include Russia
1907		In the USA, President Theodore Roosevelt orders the American 'Great White Fleet' around the world as a show of American power
1909		In the Ottoman Empire, Turkish rebels, known as the 'Young Turks' under Mustafa Kemal (1881–1938) depose Sultan Abdul-Hamid II (1842–1918) and replace him with a figurehead sultan, Muhammad V Rehad
1909		Failed negotiations between Germany and Britain over naval forces
1911		Second Moroccan Crisis
1912		In Europe, Montenegrin, Serbian and Bulgarian forces drive Ottoman troops out of most of Turkish-held Europe
1913		In Europe, a second Balkan war erupts between Bulgaria, and Serbia, Greece and Romania in which the Bulgarians are defeated and are forced to abandon many of the gains from the First Balkan War
1914		In Europe, Austria-Hungary declares war on Serbia after Gavrilo Princip (1895–1918) assassinates Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife, marking the beginning of the First World War in which Austria-Hungary, Germany, the Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria battle France, England, Russia, Serbia, Belgium, Italy, the USA and over twenty other allies
1915		In the North Atlantic, German U-Boat U-20 torpedoes the passenger liner <i>Lusitania</i> , which sinks in a matter of minutes with the loss of over 1,200 lives
1916		In Europe, British forces under Henry Seymour Rawlinson launch an attack on German positions at the

Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

		beginning of the Battle of the Somme, the bloodiest battle in history
1917		In Russia, Bolshevik revolutionaries under Vladimir Lenin (1870–1924) and Leon Trotsky (1879–1940) oust Alexander Kerensky's (1881–1970) provisional government that had replaced the Romanov Dynasty
1918		In the USA, President Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924) announces his 'Fourteen Points', in which he calls for open covenants, self determination and a League of Nations
1919		In Europe, Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924), George Clemenceau (1841–1929), David Lloyd George (1863–1945) and Vittorio Orlando (1860–1952) forge the 'Treaty of Versailles', which forces Germany to admit war guilt, pay reparations and lose territory and which establishes the League of Nations
1920		Under the terms of the 'Treaty of San Remo', portions of the former Ottoman Empire are placed under European 'protection'; France takes control of Syria and Lebanon; Britain dominates Iraq, Palestine and Transjordan
1921		In the USA, Italy, Britain, France, Japan and the USA agree to limit naval armaments and not use poison gas at the Washington Conference on Arms Limitation
1922		In Italy, Benito Mussolini (1883–1945) 'Marches on Rome' and Victor Emmanuel III (1869–1947) asks him to become premier
1922		Treaty of Rapallo between Germany and Russia
1923		In Europe, the Allies sign the Treaty of Lausanne; the Republic of Turkey is founded with Mustafa Kemal (1881–1938) as president
1923		Occupation of the Ruhr by French and Belgian Forces
1925		In Europe, diplomats from Britain, France, Germany and other countries sign the Locarno Treaties and agree to guarantee Germany's western border and normalise relations with Germany
1926		Berlin Treaty concluded between Germany and Russia
1928		In Europe, 63 nations sign the Kellogg-Briand Pact, in which they renounce war as national policy
1929		In the USA, the New York stock market experiences record declines in stock values in what is the first phase of a world-wide economic depression
1930		In Europe, British, French, Italian, American and Japanese diplomats sign the 'London Naval Treaty', in which they agree to limit submarine development and scrap some existing warships
1931		In China, Japanese forces occupy Manchuria following a bomb explosion on the track of the Japanese-owned South Manchuria Railroad
1933	January	Adolf Hitler becomes the Chancellor of Germany
1933	October	International disarmament conference. Hitler walks out of the conference
1934	January	Ten Year Non Aggression Pact between Germany and



Access to History – Online Edexcel Unit 3 – E1 The World in Crisis, 1879–1941

		Poland
1935	October	In Africa, Italian forces under Marshall Pietro Badoglio (1871–1956) invade Ethiopia and oust Emperor Haile Selassie
1935	June	Anglo-German Naval Agreement
1935	December	Hoare-Laval Pact: an attempt to end the Abyssinian Crisis by reaching a deal with Italy
1936	February	France signs the Franco-Russian Mutual Assistance Pact
1936	July	Spanish Civil War begins
1936	March	Remilitarisation of the Rhineland
1936	November	Rome-Berlin Axis signed. Lord Halifax visits Germany to set out British policy
1937		In Asia, Japanese forces under the command of General Iwane Matsue (1878–1948) attack mainland China, capture and 'rape' the capital at Nanking
1938	March	German troops enter Austria and Anschluss is declared
1938	September	In Europe, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain (1869–1940), German Chancellor Adolf Hitler (1889–1945), French President Edouard Daladier (1884–1970) and Italian Duce Benito Mussolini (1883–1945) agree in Munich to allow Germany to annex the Sudetenland portion of Czechoslovakia
1939	March	German troops occupy the rest of Czechoslovakia
1939	May	Pact of Steel between Germany and Italy
1939	August	Ten Year Non-Aggression Pact between Germany and USSR. Also known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact
1939	September	In Europe, German forces under General Gerd von Rundstedt (1875–1953), General Walter von Reichenau (1884–1942) and others invade and conquer Poland in 35 days
1939		Spanish Civil War ends with the victory of the Fascists under the leadership of General Franco
1940		In Europe, German forces overrun Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands and France. British troops are evacuated from Dunkirk
1941	June	Operation Barbarossa – the name given to Nazi Germany's invasion of Russia
1941	December	In an event that brings the USA into the Second World War, Japanese air and naval forces under the command of Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto (1884–1943) attack the US naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, damaging much of the Pacific fleet under admiral Husband Kimmel (1882–1968)

Teaching Activity

**How far do you agree that Hitler's determination to conquer territory explains why war broke out in Europe in 1939?**

Explain your answer, using the evidence of Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

The candidate in Section B, Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1, gained a total mark of only 25/40, scoring 10/16 and 15/40.

**Step 1**

Read the question and identify the key phrases. In this case, they are 'how far', and 'Hitler's determination' and 'why'.

**Step 2**

Identify the 'given interpretation'. In this case, the interpretation emphasises the role of Hitler in causing the Second World War. You need to consider and identify other possible factors which undermine the view that Hitler was the most significant cause of the Second World War.

**Step 3**

Read the sources and identify key points within the sources which will help you answer/discuss the question. Think of the 'key points' as launch pads which will help you discuss and answer the question.

**Step 4**

Try to link precise factual details to the sources to help you develop your arguments.

**Step 5**

Now try to establish links between the sources to help you answer the question. This is also known as cross-referencing.

**Step 6**

Produce a plan which is driven by the sources.

Now follow Steps 1–6, using the three sources below:

**SOURCE 1**

*From A. Bullock, 'Hitler a Study in Tyranny' (1962) in A. Kitson, Germany 1858–1990: Hope, Terror and Revival*

He displayed a skill in propaganda and mastery of deceit, a finesse in exploiting the weakness of his opponents and a crudeness in exploiting the strength of his own position which he had learned in the struggle for power in Germany and which he now applied to

international relations with even more remarkable results. This is not to suggest that Hitler...foresaw in 1933 exactly how events would develop in the course of the next decade. No man was more of an opportunist, as the Nazi Soviet Pact shows. No man had more luck. But Hitler knew how to turn events to his advantage. He knew what he wanted and he held the initiative. His principal opponents, Great Britain and France, knew only what they did not want – war – and were always on the defensive. The fact that Hitler was ready to risk war, and started preparing it from the day he came to power, gave him still a greater advantage.

**SOURCE 2**

*From I. Kershaw, 'Hitler' (1991) in A. Kitson, Germany 1858–1990: Hope, Terror and Revival*

Hitler had no ready-made programme for proceeding (in foreign policy), no blueprint for action. The general thrust of policy was to appear conciliatory, tread warily, but rearm with all speed in order to be ready to seize the main chance when it presented itself. Germany's military weakness and diplomatic isolation offered in any case little alternative to such a strategy... Hitler's hallmark in the early years was less the nature of the foreign policy itself than his capacity to perceive the weakest point of opposition and to push diplomatic relations into completely new terrain through a bold forward move.

**SOURCE 3**

*From R. Henig, 'The Origins of the Second World War in Europe' (1991) in G. Layton, Germany: The Third Reich 1933–45, 3rd edition*

'... the ambitions of Hitler constitute the major element in the outbreak of war in 1939. His was the primary, if not the sole, responsibility. Considerable room for argument remains, however, about Hitler's aims and methods, about the degree to which he cold-bloodedly planned for war in pursuit of a German empire in the east, or seized opportunities that came to him, or was a compulsive gambler who took risks for ever higher stakes.'