# Mark Scheme (Results)

## Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel
In GCE History (8HI0/1G)
Advanced Subsidiary

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

Option 1G: Germany and West Germany, 1918-89

**Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com 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.

**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

Summer 2023
Question Paper Log Number P68772
Publications Code 8HI0_1G_2306_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

**General Marking Guidance**

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors: sections A and B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|---|---|---|
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| **1** | **1–4** | • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.<br>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.<br>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.<br>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision. |
| **2** | **5–10** | • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the question.<br>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.<br>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.<br>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision. |
| **3** | **11–16** | • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.<br>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.<br>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.<br>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision. |
| **4** | **17–20** | • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.<br>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.<br>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.<br>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision. |

## Section C

**Target:** AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|---|---|---|
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| **1** | **1–4** | • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.<br>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.<br>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence |
| **2** | **5–10** | • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.<br>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.<br>• A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues |
| **3** | **11–16** | • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences<br>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.<br>• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation. |
| **4** | **17–20** | • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised by comparison of them.<br>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.<br>• Discusses evidence in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation. |

## Section A: indicative content

| Question | Indicative content |
|---|---|
| **1** | Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.<br><br>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether a lack of popular support was the main reason for the problems faced by the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-32.<br><br>The importance of a lack of popular support in the years 1919-32 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• Putsches were fed by widespread antipathy to the Versailles settlement, which was blamed on the Weimar Republic by many, e.g. the Kapp and Munich putsches<br><br>• The growth of extremist organisations, e.g. the far right thought the Weimar Republic to be too liberal and democratic, and those on the extreme left who felt the hopes of revolution in 1919 had been betrayed<br><br>• The Wall Street Crash led to industrialists, a powerful and influential minority, turning against Weimar democracy, e.g. the steel producer Thyssen funded Hitler and the Nazis<br><br>• In the July 1932 elections the majority of Germans voted for anti-Weimar parties resulting in Hitler becoming the preeminent politician.<br><br>The importance of other reasons for the problems faced by the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-32 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• The initial problems facing the Weimar Republic were caused by defeat in war, e.g. the loss of territory and economic devastation<br><br>• The crisis year of 1923 was caused mainly by France taking a belligerent attitude over Germany's inability to pay reparations and the printing of money, e.g. the invasion of the Ruhr and hyperinflation<br><br>• The German economy was export driven but with limited opportunities to export after the 1929 crisis, which led to mass unemployment and recession<br><br>• German dependence on foreign loans provided a propaganda gift to extremist parties in the elections after 1929, and limited the government's ability to deal with the crisis.<br><br>Other relevant material must be credited. |

| Question | Indicative content |
|---|---|
| **2** | Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.<br><br>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether new employment opportunities were the most important reason for improvements in the role and status of women in the years 1918-32.<br><br>Evidence that new employment opportunities were the most important reason for improvements in the role and status of women in the years 1918-32 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• By 1925 the percentage and the numbers (1.7 million) of women workers exceeded pre-war figures and took (mainly younger) women away from their traditional role of wife and mother<br><br>• Women's status was improved by opportunities to enter the economy in some of the new job markets, e.g. the retail trade with the growth of department stores and also the production of electrical goods<br><br>• Women gained more opportunities to work in the medical profession that improved their role and status, e.g. the number of female doctors almost doubled between 1925 and 1933<br><br>• The expansion of the civil service offered clerical jobs to women and a greater level of financial independence, e.g. women working as notaries and drawing up documents such as wills and contracts.<br><br>The importance of other reasons for improvement in the role and status of women in the years 1918-32 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• Women in the Weimar Republic got the right to vote and equal rights to men under Article 109 of the constitution and was therefore an important factor in improving the role and status of women<br><br>• Educational opportunities saw women gaining access to higher education and improved women's role and status by giving them a greater degree of social mobility and intellectual expression<br><br>• A vibrant urban culture saw women improve their role and status (in that milieu) through the adoption of individualistic lifestyles aimed at challenging the status quo in which men were dominant<br><br>• The increased availability of contraception and improved sexual health care gave women more control over their bodies, and prompted further demands for rights, e.g. the right to abortion in the event of pregnancy from rape.<br><br>Other relevant material must be credited. |

## Section B: indicative content

| Question | Indicative content |
|---|---|
| **3** | Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.<br><br>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the Weimar and FRG systems of government were different.<br><br>The extent to which the Weimar system of government was different from the system of government in the FRG should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• Weimar government was planned as a democratic alternative to the Kaiser Reich, whereas the system of government in the FRG was designed to effectively replace the dictatorship of the Third Reich<br><br>• The Weimar and FRG Presidential powers were different, e.g. the Weimar President had extensive powers, e.g. Article 48, whereas the President in the FRG was more of a figurehead with more restricted powers<br><br>• The voting system in the Weimar Republic led to small extremist parties gaining influence, whereas in the FRG only parties with at least five per cent of the vote could be represented<br><br>• The FRG was willing to ban political parties it considered hostile to social democracy, e.g. the banning of the Socialist Reich Party of Germany in 1952 by the Federal Court, whereas the Weimar Republic was not.<br><br>The extent to which the Weimar system of government was similar to the system of government in the FRG should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• Both upheld the key ideas of multi-party democracy, republicanism and social responsibility, e.g. both systems of government had universal suffrage<br><br>• Both the Weimar and FRG systems of government were to some extent shaped by the victorious powers, after defeat in war, who feared what they perceived as latent German authoritarianism<br><br>• Both the Weimar Republic and the FRG had a federal system of government with political power split between central government and individual state governments<br><br>• Both had a strong commitment to democratic ideals, e.g. freedom of expression, association, assembly and movement.<br><br>Other relevant material must be credited. |

| Question | Indicative content |
|---|---|
| **4** | Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.<br><br>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that recovery from the Second World War was the most significant economic challenge for Germany in the years 1933-89.<br><br>The extent to which recovery from the Second World War was the most significant economic challenge for Germany in the years 1933-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• The economic resources of West Germany were massively depleted by the loss of East Germany caused by defeat in war, e.g. many Germans faced starvation<br><br>• Allied bombing during the war created a massive infrastructure and housing problem that only large-scale state borrowing and expenditure could fix and hence the need for US aid in the Marshall Plan<br><br>• In the aftermath of war opportunities to gain access to foreign markets were restricted, e.g. in countries that had been occupied by Germany in the war and foreign markets dominated by the victorious powers<br><br>• The peace terms of the Allied Powers prevented Germany from producing weapons and meant that the massive armaments industry that had sustained the Third Reich had to be reassigned to peace-time industry.<br><br>The extent to which other economic challenges for Germany were significant in the years 1933-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• Overcoming the depression and creating a command economy (1933-9) was a massive challenge which required unorthodox economic methods, e.g. the use of MEFO bills and Goering's economic dictatorship<br><br>• The wartime economy faced huge logistical and economic challenges, e.g. transporting resources from the occupied territories while churning out armaments at an unprecedented rate<br><br>• The recession of 1966-7 and the oil crises of 1973 and 1978 were significant challenges as they threatened Germany's leading role in the EEC and created political opposition<br><br>• Lower productivity and rising unemployment in the 1980s was a significant enough challenge for Chancellor Helmut Kohl to depart from what remained of the social market consensus, and embrace neoliberal policies.<br><br>Other relevant material must be credited. |

## Section C: indicative content

| Question | Indicative content |
|---|---|
| **5** | Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.<br><br>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that Hitler invaded Poland because he thought the coming war would be a 'local conflict'. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their discussion of various views to reach a reasoned conclusion.<br><br>In considering the given view, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:<br><br>Extract 1<br><br>• Hitler thought a localised war with Poland was likely because Britain and France were ineffectual and weak and could not fight a general war<br><br>• Hitler's low opinion of British and French politicians led him to misunderstand the nature of their guarantees to Poland<br><br>• Hitler failed to see that Britain and France were prepared to make a stand over further German expansion<br><br>• Hitler was shocked when Britain and France declared war after he invaded Poland.<br><br>Extract 2<br><br>• Hitler thought Chamberlain's guarantee to Poland lacked credibility and in particular that British intervention in Poland would be difficult, which reinforced his belief in the possibility of a localised war against Poland<br><br>• Hitler told military leaders that further foreign policy successes could not be won 'without bloodshed'<br><br>• Hitler's war aims were made clear to the generals and included securing living space in the east and food supplies.<br><br>Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues to address the view that Hitler invaded Poland because he thought the coming war would be a 'local conflict'. Relevant points may include:<br><br>• Hitler's military preparations were designed to fight and win a short decisive war and not a general war<br><br>• Hitler's own memories of war in the trenches set him against any possibility of a war of attrition, which would both demoralise troops and be difficult for Germany to provision<br><br>• The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact secured Germany's eastern front and Britain and France had no land route to support Poland militarily, and therefore the theatre of war would be isolated from external interference<br><br>• Appeasement over Austria and Czechoslovakia had set a pattern of concessions that Hitler thought would continue, largely based on British distrust of the Soviet Union and approval of German expansion eastwards. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues related to the debate to address other reasons for Hitler invading Poland. Relevant points may include:<br>• Britain and France were catching up with Germany in armaments production and Hitler knew that if he waited his military advantage might dissipate<br>• Hitler was obsessed with conquest in the East and sought to maximise his opportunities in that direction. Therefore, giving up on Poland was not an option and war was the best choice to secure a front against Russia<br>• War against Poland would be the first step of restoring German dominance in the east and fulfilling the Nazi promise of lebensraum by bringing opportunities to settle Germans in conquered lands<br>• Hitler thought he was a man of history sent by God to restore Germany to greatness and his ego blinded him to the warnings of his generals about the dangers of pursuing war.<br><br>Other relevant material must be credited. |

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