



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel
In GCE History (9HI0/1G)
Advanced

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

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 P72278A

Publications Code 9HI0_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	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. The overall judgement is missing or asserted. There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 focus of the question. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. 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. 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.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity 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	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • 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. • A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them. • 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. • Discusses evidence provided in the extracts 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.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far they agree that opposition to democratic government was the most significant impact of the Treaty of Versailles within Germany in the years 1918-33.</p> <p>The extent to which opposition to democratic government was the most significant impact of the Treaty of Versailles in the years 1918-33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The German signatories of the Treaty of Versailles were popularly associated with the 'November Criminals,' and this had a significant impact because it was used to criticise the post-war regime and democratic politicians • Opposition to the Treaty of Versailles from the military had a significant impact on Weimar democracy's ability to function, e.g. the military refused to put down the Kapp Putsch • The Treaty of Versailles mobilised KPD opposition because they used it to argue for the workers to look to Russia for leadership rather than the western democracies • The Treaty of Versailles stoked opposition from the conservatives because they felt shackled by the military clauses that impinged on heavy industry and they therefore opposed Weimar democracy too • The Treaty of Versailles fuelled the growth of the Nazis throughout the period and, most importantly, the Nazis ended Weimar democracy. <p>The significance of other impacts of the Treaty of Versailles in the years 1918-33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 1923 hyperinflation was an important economic impact from the Treaty of Versailles because printing money to pay reparations led to a major economic crisis • The obligation to pay reparations, as stipulated by the Treaty of Versailles, had the significant impact of causing French troops to occupy the Ruhr in 1923 • A positive impact of the Treaty of Versailles was that it enabled the German government to negotiate with western governments, e.g. the Dawes and Young Plans that secured loans • The loss of land and population in the territorial clauses of the Treaty of Versailles had the significant impact of reducing Germany's economic base and creating the problematic <i>Auschlandsdeutsche</i> • The Treaty of Versailles weakened German defences and had a significant impact on foreign policy, e.g. the Treaty of Rapallo and the Locarno Pact. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the Great Depression (1929-32) was the most significant economic challenge that Germany faced in the years 1918-45.</p> <p>The extent to which the Great Depression (1929-32) was the most significant economic challenge that Germany faced in the years 1918-45 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Great Depression was significant because German trade collapsed • The Great Depression caused a significant increase in unemployment with the official record showing over six million Germans unemployed by the end of 1932 • The Great Depression caused a banking crash in 1931 which was significant enough, but this then ruined Germany's already damaged credit worthiness • The Great Depression massively affected industrial production, e.g. by 1932 it was just forty per cent of output in 1929 • The Great Depression led to Chancellor Brüning implementing austerity policies, e.g. raising taxes while cutting salaries and welfare benefits, which led to significant social outcomes, e.g. the suicide rate rose dramatically. <p>The significance of other economic challenges that Germany faced in the years 1918-45 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 1923 hyperinflation occurred when French troops were occupying the Ruhr and led to Communist and Nazi attempts at revolution, and called forth Presidential rule, which is a measure of its significance • Hitler's rearmament policies were a significant economic challenge as evidenced by the remarkable measures taken, e.g. making Goering 'economic dictator' • Making Germany self-sufficient through the policy of autarky was a significant challenge that required the mass production of ersatz goods, e.g. Buna rubber • Maintaining a war economy after 1939 was a significant challenge in many ways, e.g. phenomenal output requiring the employment of women and POWs, and maintaining output in the face of allied bombardment. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the how far they agree that democratic government was the main reason for political stability in the FRG in the years 1949-89.</p> <p>The extent to which democratic government was the main reason for political stability in the FRG in the years 1949-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new parties of the FRG broadly agreed with allied plans for reconstruction, so the new democracy had fewer issues over which to divide the country, and a stable base from which to grow • The Basic Law set out democratic rights and freedoms along with an inclusive system of government that gave Germans little reason to protest, giving the FRG stability • Adenauer's exclusion of the Socialist Reich Party and KPD turned the Bundestag into a democratic three-party house that all supported the status quo giving the government more stability • The potentially destabilising actions of Adenauer, e.g. setting up a government-controlled television station in 1961, was handled within the democratic framework, e.g. by the intervention of the Supreme Court • Democracy overcame challenges from students and the German Federation of Trade Unions through collaboration between the parties to absorb the anger and present safe policies, e.g. Schmidt's 1981 'cuts' budget. <p>The importance of other reasons for the political stability of the FRG in the years 1949-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committed Nazis were unable to undermine the FRG in the way they had the Weimar Republic because they were excluded from positions of power, and were discredited by the Nuremburg Trials • The social-market economy provided a modicum of contentment in terms of labour relations and this in turn gave political stability to the FRG, and membership of the EEC (1957) strengthened this trend • New economic opportunities opened up after the FRG joined NATO in 1955 and declining unemployment combined with rising wages contributed to political stability • In the years 1955-65, exports consistently exceeded imports leading to investment in new-builds, research and development and a high tech manufacturing economy that contributed to political stability • Brandt, Schmidt and Kohl used <i>Ostpolitik</i> to deflect criticism and gain international approval in the years 1965-89, which was a stabilising factor. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far they agree that Germans maintained a generally hostile attitude to cultural change in the years 1918-89.</p> <p>The extent to which Germans did maintain a generally hostile attitude to cultural change in the years 1918-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most conservatively-minded Germans, especially outside the big cities, viewed Weimar cultural change as immoral, and un-German, e.g. the Centre Party's warnings about women's dress and behaviour • The Nazis outlawed so-called degenerate culture and promoted traditional German culture through 'Strength Through Joy', which seems to have been widely approved of, e.g. at the Wagner Festival at Bayreuth • Anti-Nazi and radical culture in the Third Reich catered for a small minority of people who formed a particular niche, e.g. the Swing culture that attracted a young middle class audience • The FRG embraced consumerism, which lessened cultural tensions, but the dominant cultural choices remained conservative, e.g. <i>Heimatfilm</i> and classic US films such as westerns and Charlie Chaplin comedies • German classical music and literature remained popular with educated Germans who wanted to resist the Americanisation of film and popular music. <p>The extent to which Germans did not maintain a generally hostile attitude to cultural change in the years 1918-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural tastes in Weimar Germany were often demarcated along political lines, and radical thinkers celebrated cultural innovation readily, e.g. Bauhaus and the New Objectivity • In Weimar Germany overtly, and the Third Reich covertly, many otherwise loyal Nazis enjoyed night clubs, burlesque and the dance scene, including Goebbels, suggesting cultural hostility was not maintained • The cultural offerings of the RKK, despite Goebbels insistence to be entertaining, were considered boring and unworthy of German standards by many Germans who read forbidden books and listened to the BBC in secret • Cultural inclinations often reflected generational tensions, and young Germans willingly explored radical culture throughout the period • Cultural boundaries in the FRG were pushed by young Germans in film, literature and art to explore Germany's Nazi past and understand their history and heritage, e.g. after the 1962 Oberhausen Manifesto • The 1980s saw changing political and cultural attitudes in the younger generation, e.g. anarchism and punk culture suited opposition to NATO and <i>Neue Deutsche Welle</i> influenced the popular music scene. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The attempt to blame Hitler for everything that led to war overlooks the mistakes made by Britain and France • The unfairness of the Treaty of Versailles created a guilt-complex, in Britain especially, that Hitler used to blackmail the West with • Britain and France worked to avoid war, but every concession to Hitler led to him upping his demands, as blackmailers do • When Britain and France realised Hitler was a bad-faith negotiator, Hitler was already too powerful to control. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hitler's racial ideology was the driver for his expansionist policies • Hitler believed in the existence of a racial hierarchy with Aryans at the top, and war was the means by which Hitler would secure Germans their rightful place in the world • Hitler's racial views were linked to the need for Germany to secure living space • German foreign policy had a continuity in the years 1890-1933, but Hitler abandoned it in favour a policy based on war. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early opportunities to maintain the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were not taken, e.g. over German rearmament, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, and British complicity in the Anglo-German Naval Agreement • Anschluss and the Munich Agreement gave Hitler the opportunity to take Czechoslovakia completely, which gave him the Czech arms industry and secured his southern border • Britain dithered about whether to ally with the Soviet Union and allowed Hitler to take the initiative with the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact • The British guarantee to safeguard Poland was not backed up with any preparations and thus invited Hitler to act. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Britain and France assisted Hitler's desire for war. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As leading members of the League of Nations, which also lacked US

Question	Indicative content
	<p>involvement, Britain and France had responsibilities outside Europe that distracted them, e.g. the expansionist aims of Italy and Japan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • France was politically unstable and faced a major crisis in 1936, which compounded French caution and made France a weak ally for Britain • A lack of military preparedness on the part of Britain encouraged Hitler to act quickly and meant appeasement was a necessary delaying tactic for Britain • Hitler had based his entire political career on, as he saw it, righting the wrongs of German defeat in 1918, and the subsequent settlement. He could not be seen to back down • Stalin was seemingly oblivious to Hitler's intention to destroy 'Jewish Bolshevism' in Russia, and opened the door to an invasion of Poland with the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact.