

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/73

Paper 5I (Special Subject: Germany, 1919–1945),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

Nominated topic: Nazi racial policies

- 1 (a) How far does Document D corroborate the evidence in Document C for the attitudes of the Nazi leadership towards Jews in 1938–39? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. The documents both present a hostile view of Jews by leading Nazis in the period after Kristallnacht. The views of Hitler are stated in a speech in D and are present by proxy in C. Both see ‘the Jewish Question’ as something which needs to be resolved. Both see the Jews as something outside the mainstream of German life – parasitic in D and a body of people to be removed from ‘the normal routine of German life’. The difference is in the nature of the documents and their purpose. C is a meeting held to discuss how to isolate the Jews more – badges and ghettos are mentioned. The end target is emigration. D is a speech which does not discuss practicalities or the topic of emigration. It suggests that Jews must work and that there is a possibility of annihilation if they plunge the world into war. The tone is very different here and includes reasons for anti-Semitism not in C – the Jews as originators of wars and the Jews as unwilling to do respectable work. C more rationally suggests that it is the Nazi policies of Aryanisation that have made Jews unemployed. C is essentially about Germany and wants to avoid molesting foreign Jews. D is more global and includes reference to the Jewish race in Europe. Essentially Hitler is looking to a forthcoming war in which emigration policies would be an irrelevance while the minions in C are considering the problem of how to increase emigration and see isolation as the prelude. Both documents display the increase in radical thinking about race 1938-39, but Hitler offers one of his most extreme public statements since becoming leader.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided in this set of documents that from 1933 onwards the Nazis intended to annihilate the Jews?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. The debate is whether there was a clear line between the policies of 1933 and the Final Solution or whether the intention to physically annihilate Jews emerged as part of the growing radicalism of the regime and the heightened tensions and opportunities of war. A and C might indicate that whatever the hatred of Jews was, the intentions were not entirely clear. A urges restraint at a time when Hitler was establishing himself in power and needed the continued support of the elites and had to avoid gaining a bad international reputation. The need to be aware of foreign opinion appears again in C and even after the violence indicated in B, the policy remains isolation and emigration – there is no direct reference to annihilation even in a private meeting among top Nazis not known for their rationality or restraint. B might seem to indicate that below the surface there was such a violent impulse against Jews that there was an intention to murder. However, this may be a sort of grass-root activism of the type being discouraged in A and though there were deaths, most of those imprisoned in concentration camps were released. The origins, too, have been widely discussed and may have resulted from short-term factors such as Goebbels' desire to be in Hitler's favour. Against this is the imprisonment of Jews on purely racial basis – not as threats to security and the general radicalisation of the regime after the Anschluss of 1938. Much turns on the reference to annihilation ('Vernichtung') in the famous Hitler speech in January 1939. By then the Nazi state had control of the army leadership, it had a string of foreign policy successes behind it and the prospect of war. Historians like Dawidowicz and Fleming have found violent and annihilationist vocabulary in Hitler's utterances post-1919 and there were extreme eugenic policies under way. So this could be evidence that the true intentions masked by the need to appear more moderate (A) and to appear to be considering merely emigration (C) had appeared by January 1939. This is certainly supported by E who sees a pervasive anti-Semitism and a leadership using war to pursue long-term violent aims. This depends on the emigration policies developed by the SS since 1938 and the Madagascar Plan being mere alternatives or camouflage for the real desire for mass slaughter and the war being really 'a war against the Jews' rather than an unleashing of violence against all opponents. The random slaughters of 1939-41 might be evidence against this and the clarification of objectives at Wannsee in 1942 might indicate that it was the pressures of war and the local initiatives of radical Nazis that were the driving force and that hatred in the 1930s had to be separated from planned genocide; or the violence of B and the plans for ghettoisation in C together with Hitler's explicit reference to annihilation in D might seem compelling evidence for an alternative view.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

2 What best explains the establishment of a Nazi dictatorship in Germany between January 1933 and August 1934? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Hitler was in office in January 1933 but not in power. That was consolidated by taking legal powers as a result of the Reichstag Fire and obtaining an Enabling Law from a reduced Reichstag. The federal constitution was changed to end the power of the individual states and the essential elements of dictatorship – removal of press freedom, control of communications, banning of other political parties, arrest and imprisonment of enemies, the establishment of a strong political police and the ending of trade unions - were established. Hitler was still Chancellor and could still be removed by the President with the support of the armed forces. The coup against the Nazi radicals in June 1934 and the murder of SA leaders ensured the army’s support and in August 1934 Hitler became Führer rather than Chancellor and the recipient of an oath of loyalty from the armed forces.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. There should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them. Many may see the key element the legality which allowed for the continuing support of elite elements. The Reichstag Decree and the Enabling Law gave Hitler dictatorial powers to continue the rule by decree that Germans had become used to since 1930. He did not undermine a flourishing democracy – the Reichstag had not met for long periods. Army leaders stood by and watched the suppression of the left. The legality also undermined potential resistance; the splits between the left were crucial here; the SPD watched Nazism as a sort of last stage of capitalism and did not initiate the sort of resistance that it had to the Kapp Putsch. The Nazi repression was efficient and had the backing of a powerful state with a history of political repression. The German middle classes seemed more pleased to see the end of the threat from the left and were reassured by the presence of Hindenburg and traditional elites mitigating the ‘revolutionary’ side of Nazism. Hitler emphasised his respect for President and Army and the purge of the SA far from being alarming was seen by many as a sign of conservatism and stability. Behind all this was effective propaganda and a sense of moving out of depression – though this should not be over-emphasised. Hitler’s ability to appeal to different groups continued after January 1933 and racist radicalism was enough to show anti-Semites that something was being done, but not enough to alienate the conservatives and suggest unrestrained lawlessness. Answers may veer more to the weakness of opposition or more to the political skills of Hitler and the Nazis.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

3 To what extent was Nazi economic policy more successful before September 1939 than afterwards? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. This covers the whole of economic policy from 1933 to 1945. Candidates could consider the measures taken to promote demand within Germany and to offer a solution to unemployment such as public works, Labour service, the removal of certain groups from the workforce. The new Plan was an alternative to this and aimed to restore the economy by the less interventionist policy of trade promotion. However, the economic aims were linked to the need to finance rearmament – by acquiring capital and by covert financial schemes like the Mefo Bills. By 1936, with the recovery of world trade and the effects of rearmament and public projects, there was a labour shortage. Women were returning to the work place and more direct planning for rearmament was introduced with the ending of the economic primacy of Schacht and the installation of Goering as the coordinator of the Four-Year Plan. By 1940 Germany was some way from having a full war economy but it had managed a substantial rearmament and the shortages were made up by booty and plundered from the occupied territories. The standards of living were high for ordinary Germans. The expansion of territory offered raw materials and markets, but the long-term economic growth was seen to depend on further expansion. However, the protracted war in the east meant a full scale war economy and eventually total war and allied bombing created a substantial challenge. Speer and Todt's efforts to maintain the ever-growing demands of the German war machine were impressive in economic terms, but the waste of resources in destruction and racial and political oppression and the superior economic resources of the USA and USSR meant failure. The sheer destruction of the later part of the war had a devastating effect on the German economy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. There should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them. The reduction of unemployment; the recovery of trade; the large-scale rearmament may seem to be evidence of successful economic policies and standing contrast to the devastating effects of war. However, there were elements of instability before 1939 – reduced unemployment depended on discrimination against certain groups; on low wages and taking thousands of young people out of the labour market. Rearmament and foreign exchange control helped some sectors of the economy at the expense of others; attempts at ersatz materials and the creation of more ore were uneconomic; labour shortages of skilled workers introduced an element of inflation into the economy despite price controls; real wages fell and standards of living were compromised. The German economy was over-heating and really needed war and foreign conquest – but that was likely to lead to escalation and competition with stronger economies. Thus the roseate picture of the economy before 1939 may need critical consideration. There is no denying the devastating effects of the last phase of the war; but the huge gains of 1939-41 were beneficial economically and the economic controls and production strategies of the wartime Reich might be considered to be more major achievements per se than the limited trade policies of Schacht and the patchy administration of the Four-Year Plan by Goering. No set response is expected.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	73

4 'In his foreign policy from 1933 to 1939, Hitler was a master improviser rather than a master planner.' How convincing is this view? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Hitler offered a mixture of aggression and reassurance in his early policy by leaving the League and the Disarmament policy and reintroducing conscription, but signing a peace pact with Poland in 1934 and not pushing support for an Austrian Nazi coup. He did appear to be a statesman rather than an ideologue and stressed Germany's legitimate demands in a way that his predecessors had done. He judged international reactions successfully in the remilitarisation of the Rhine and like any other statesman recognised the need for potential allies in Italy and Japan. The key question is how far of a preconceived agenda Hitler was following and how far he was simply gambling and improvising. The long term aim of unifying Austria was clear; but circumstances were favourable both in terms of the changing attitudes of Italy; the distraction of the West by the Spanish Civil War; the dominance of Chamberlain over British and to an extent French policy. The decision of Schuschnigg to launch a plebiscite may have made the decision for Anschluss inevitable; or it may have affected the timing. It seemed that the elimination of Czechoslovakia had been an objective; but did Hitler simply respond to the initiatives of Chamberlain and take advantage of a very favourable international situation in 1938? Was the war with Poland being planned even though Germany had not yet reached the stage in war preparation that would allow her to wage a war against Britain and France? Or did the gamble and improvisation of policy simply not work as well in 1939?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. There should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them. There is evidence at various conferences of plans for war and much has been discussed about the Hossbach Memorandum. Also, the priority that Hitler gave to rearmament and the wider geopolitical ideologies held, seem to indicate that there was an intention for war and expansion. However, the circumstances that shaped policy could not always have been foreseen and German policy did depend a lot on the international circumstances and the initiatives of others. Without the alienation of Italy; without the distraction of Britain and the USA by the renewed war in China from 1937; without the commitment of Chamberlain in taking the initiative to resolve international problems; without the bloodbath of the USSR's military leaders much of German policy would have remained difficult to achieve, whatever the long-term intentions. The existence of military plans may not have as much significance as it appears – it was often in Hitler's interests to offer seemingly inflexible plans; the subdued reaction to the declaration of war by Britain in 1939 by the Nazi leaders did not reveal a confidence that the plan was now being fulfilled. There was no certainty that France would adopt the disastrous military policies of 1939-40. Many will see a mixture of broad aims and response to circumstance and there is no need to avoid this sort of synthesis or produce any particular response.

AO3 – .[Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.