



Pearson

Mark scheme

January 2020

Pearson Edexcel International
Advanced Level in History
(WHI03/1C)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with
Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Germany: United,
Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

January 2020

Publication Code: WHI03_1C_2001_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

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.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level.
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level.

The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

Section A

Target: AO2 (25 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	<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	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.• 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 support 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	9–14	<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 some mainly 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 or precision.
4	15–20	<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.• 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 or precision.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.• 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 A: Indicative content

Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to investigate the problems facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–20.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Being a proclamation to the German people it might be expected to be widely distributed• Kapp was closely involved with the events of 1920 and so might be expected to be well informed as to the problems facing Germany• The language and tone of the proclamation are apocalyptic and designed to emphasise the need for radical solutions to be taken to solve Germany's problems. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the problems facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It claims that the political system is corrupt and in need of replacement ('The ineffective national government, lacking authority and tied to corruption, is not capable of dealing with the danger.')• It implies that the threat to the German state and people is an existential one• It indicates that the restoration of traditional values is needed to solve Germany's problems ('German honour and honesty are to be restored'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The putsch was led by the general in charge of Freikorps units in Berlin Walther von Lüttwitz, following government attempts to ban them• The problem posed to the government of the republic was such that it had to flee Berlin for Dresden• Despite government demands, the Reichswehr refused to put the putsch down. <p>Source 2</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Being a personal letter, it might be expected to be candid in its content• Ebert, as President of the Weimar Republic, might be expected to be

Question	Indicative content
	<p>knowledgeable as to the problems it faced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tone of the letter is determined in its desire to defend democracy. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the problems facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It indicates that the republic faced attempted uprisings from both right and left ('have to defend our German democratic republic... against attack not only from the Right but also from the Left.') • It implies that the belligerent attitudes of foreign powers, as shown through the Versailles Treaty, is creating fertile ground for political disaffection • It claims that parts of the education system were turning the young against the government ('our universities and high schools are the breeding ground for opponents of social democracy.'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Spartacist uprising in January 1919 had threatened a Communist overthrow of the fledgling republic • The punitive territorial clauses of the Versailles Treaty fuelled nationalist resentment of the Weimar Republic • Demands for the restoration of Kaiser Wilhelm II were commonplace. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sources emphasise the gravity of the political problems faced by the Weimar Republic • Both sources suggest that communism is a major threat to Germany • Source 2 is more supportive of the concept of democracy than Source 1.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which Adenauer's approach to government in the years 1949–60 was different from Hitler's approach to government in the years 1933–39.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adenauer strongly supported the constitution of the FRG. Hitler, by contrast, supported the undermining and dismantling of the Weimar constitution• Adenauer supported parliamentary democracy. Hitler used the Enabling Act to marginalise and undermine the Reichstag• Adenauer worked alongside the President of the FRG. Hitler took the presidential powers for himself in 1934• Adenauer encouraged Erhard to develop 'social free market' economics, which was fundamentally different to Hitler's belief in a command economy• Adenauer was prepared to work with ex-Nazis and even appoint them to his cabinet. Hitler looked to purge or imprison potential political opponents including those from within his own party. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both looked to impose their dominance over German politics and served as Chancellor for the whole of the respective periods• Both dealt firmly with potential political opponents. Hitler encouraged the banning of political parties, as did Adenauer with his ban on the Socialist Reich Party• Both projected themselves as being a strong and stable presence for turbulent times; Hitler to restore Germany's political stability following the depression and Adenauer following the Second World War• Both promoted the desire to restore Germany's economic fortunes by maintaining tight price controls• Both took an active role in attempting to restore Germany's standing abroad. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that given the deep divisions between the FRG and the GDR from 1949, the speed with which Germany was reunified in 1990 was surprising.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deep ideological differences between the newly-formed communist GDR and the capitalist FRG were a serious impediment to reunification from 1949 • Western allied support for the FRG and Soviet support for the GDR acted as a hindrance to any demands for reunification • The divergence between the economies of the FRG and the GDR enhanced divisions between the two states thus making any consideration of reunification difficult • Both Britain and France were surprised by the speed of the reunification process as both President Mitterrand and Prime Minister Thatcher had made statements in 1989 stating that it was unrealistic at that time • Chancellor Kohl's announcement of a detailed 'Ten Point Programme for Overcoming the Division of Germany and Europe' took the FRG allies by surprise and helped speed up the reunification process. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Basic Law of the FRG (1949) looked forward explicitly to a future when there was a constitutional, free and united German state • The Hallstein doctrine of the FRG recognised the concept of a united German people and refused to maintain diplomatic relations with states that recognised the GDR • The swift collapse of authority in the GDR and the dismantling of the Berlin Wall called into question the viability of the GDR to exist as an independent state • The unfurling refugee crisis from the GDR to the FRG helped to create a groundswell of support for reunification • The withdrawal of Soviet support for the GDR made the prospect of reunification highly likely as without it the viability of the GDR as an independent state was undermined • American support for reunification emboldened Chancellor Kohl to speed up his efforts to accomplish it. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>