



HISTORY

9769/59

Paper 5i Germany, 1919–1945

May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed 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.
- (b) Examiners will 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.
- (c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will 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 3: 8–10 marks**

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 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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 1: 1–3 marks

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.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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 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.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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 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.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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 be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

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

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 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 4 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 5: 25–30 marks

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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.

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 marks

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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 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.

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>How far does Document C corroborate the evidence in Document D about the impact of the Nazi regime?</p> <p>Similarities: Document D talks about the ‘mechanisation’ of the individual, indicating a sort of conformity. Document C refers to the ‘new human beings’ indicating a transformation and conformity – ‘the longing of the blood for its own state and justice’. Document D talks about the new language and this is certainly confirmed in Document C with its ‘longing of the blood’ and the turgid metaphor of the last sentence. The language as propaganda is certainly there in D. The racism in Document C confirms the ‘terrible system’ in D.</p> <p>Differences: Document C does not really confirm the penetration of new language into conversational usage as Gross is an ‘expert’ preaching to the masses. Also Document C’s racism is not overtly mentioned in Document D.</p> <p>Provenance: Document C is from the early days of the new regime so cannot confirm the overview of Document D. Document C is aiming to increase the impact of the regime by the promotion of ‘correct’ racial breeding. Document D has no real motive, but is an academic trying to analyse a linguistic phenomenon. Thus Document C cannot really confirm the impact as much as the intended impact, whereas Document D confirms that the use of Nazi language permeated society. It offers the very academic view that language impacts on actual values, but there is evidence from other sources to confirm that this was so.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that there was not a Nazi revolution in Germany in 1933? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>The issue here is the degree of change and the degree of continuity. The Nazi regime did not, as the Communist regime in Russia, say, come about as part of a distinct and abrupt takeover of power, and there were strong elements of continuity as shown in Documents B and E. The legality of the Enabling Act, which might have argued that there was a legal basis for the new regime, is undermined by the violent language of the Nazis and the threat of the SA (<i>Sturmabteilung</i>) and SS (<i>Schutzstaffel</i>). However, for all this, there was a debate and a vote which brought about the dictatorship. Also, candidates may mention that the Weimar democracy had not been flourishing in a healthy way before 1933, with the Reichstag not meeting for long periods and the use of Article 48.</p> <p>Document A stresses continuity with the past (part of the point of the ‘Day of Potsdam for Hitler’ was to reassure the conservative middle classes). The careful omission of his usual rants against opposition or Jews, and the stress of tradition, hid a radicalism that emerged more and more as the regime became more confident. This document needs to be put in context and its typicality assessed, particularly in the light of cumulative radicalism in the later 1930s.</p> <p>Revolutionary change is clearer in Document C, which represents a more revolutionary outlook, one based on race and not class. Calls for ‘new political forms’ and ‘a new understanding of history’ may not be revolutionary, but for ‘new human beings’ most decidedly is. The development of radical racial policies shows how seriously this was taken even though it remained rather academic propaganda in 1933. The racial policies were introduced with some caution, though there was an increase in laws for dealing with hereditary medical conditions and a euthanasia programme was underway before 1939. Some may see the eugenic programmes of the Weimar period as indicating some continuity, but the racial element is new.</p> <p>Document D sees revolution brought about by language. The widespread use of propaganda terms in everyday life can be well documented and even the ‘Heil Hitler’ greeting in place of more traditional words was significant. Brutal acts of violence being given titles ‘Kristallnacht’ or ‘resettlement’ might be used as evidence. However, this is from an academic and the link between language and changing values is only a theory.</p> <p>Document E stresses a lot of continuity and Goebbels certainly avoided too much ideology. The new society of Soviet Russia was not in evidence in Nazi Germany in the 1930s. Many economic institutions remained in private hands as before and the Nazi Party organisation did not replace the traditional state for much of the Nazi period, though an SS state was developing in the War. However, the source may stress continuities too much. Education and many social institutions were undermining traditions and change accelerated after 1939.</p>	20

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>How far does the Hitler myth explain the lack of effective resistance within Germany to the Nazi regime?</p> <p>The Hitler Myth has been analysed by Ian Kershaw and its value assessed. It set Hitler as being above the normal everyday political and administrative life, so that whatever crimes and injustices seemed to be being done, the leader was above it and would certainly act to remedy any hardships if only he knew about it. As economic and diplomatic successes increased, so the myth grew stronger and it was deliberately promoted by Goebbels. Hitler was not seen, except in careful depictions, as an ordinary man but as a mythical and infallible leader. The early successes of the War probably saw the Hitler Myth at its height and the tendency of the leader to withdraw from public utterances only increased the mystique. There is evidence that while belief in Hitler remained amazingly high after the defeats in the East and the danger that the War would be lost, there was some decline. It obviously made opposition difficult because the leader and the regime as a whole became separated, so even if the regime was unpopular, the leader was not seen as responsible. However, the alternatives of very strong repression and the sheer success of the regime might be preferred. It remained very dangerous to oppose the regime and this danger increased considerably once the War started. Also opposition was divided with little chance of the conservative groups and army resistance linking with individual acts of defiance and the underground resistance of the left. Some may discuss the view that the creation of the myth was less important than the broad agreement of many Germans with the aims and methods of the regime. No set answer is expected, but better answers will consider the whole period and assess the relative importance of the key factor.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Which was more significant in the development of racial policy by the Nazis: the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 or <i>Kristallnacht</i> in 1938?</p> <p>AO2 – The issue here is whether the improvised legislation of 1935 was the key turning point or the improvised eruption of violence in 1938. Those who favour 1935 might point out to the establishment of key principles of citizenship and racial definitions which put Jews outside the protection of the law and opened the way to discrimination on a wider level. They might point out the somewhat haphazard nature of legislation from 1933, and the way that the Nuremberg Laws codified and regularised policy, making ‘legal’ actions which were inherently unjust. This made it clear that Jews had little future in the new Germany, encouraging both emigration and further segregation, and persecution at a local level, though this was interrupted by the sanitisation prior to the 1936 Olympics. It again reassured Germans that the Nazi state was a legal one rather than one in which random persecutions and acts of violence and discrimination took place; however, the implications were considerable. The law had become an instrument for discrimination, but no more so than in the Southern States of the USA. Some Jews were even relieved that the position was now clear. The Laws may have set the context in which violence was acceptable or some may argue that the <i>Kristallnacht</i> events and subsequent acts were something new and more significant. The Laws did not permit acts of violence. Indeed one Berlin police chief actually drove off a mob intending to destroy a synagogue. However, this was untypical. Illegal violence and destruction of property were not prevented by the authorities and were incited by elements in the Party. The arrest and imprisonment of Jews set a precedent as did the murders of others. The subsequent actions in which Jews were blamed for their own persecution and fined showed the true nature of the regime. The rapid increase in anti-Semitic measures in 1938–1939 paved the way for greater and more organised violence, though some argue that the aim was still basically emigration and not destruction. There is no set answer required, but better answers will offer a balanced argument and reach a judgement.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>'It had little realistic chance of success.' How valid is this judgement on Nazi Germany's war against the USSR?</p> <p>AO1/2 – The arguments for the campaign not being likely to succeed will focus on: the delays brought about by campaigns in the Balkans; the lack of planning for an extended campaign; and, the false assumption that rapid blitzkrieg style campaigns would bring a rapid collapse of a rotten regime. Modern military historians point to the fundamental strategic error of launching another war on two fronts (attacking Russia before Britain had been defeated). The racial arrogance which prevented using discontent within the USSR with the brutal Stalin regime predisposed the Germans to have to divert forces to deal with local resistance. Notions of racial superiority contributed to decisions by Germany military and political planners not to seek to exploit internal divisions within the USSR, of which they were aware. This decision later contributed to a situation in which the Germans needed to dedicate substantial resources to fighting local resistance which might have been avoided had they utilised internal opposition. German planners' failure to account sufficiently for the sheer distances that would need to be covered, and the prevailing conditions, contributed to failure. Responses might contrast the ability of a highly centralised Russian state to mobilise resistance with the failure of Nazi Germany to declare total war.</p> <p>On the other side of the argument is: the technical and tactical superiority of the German armies which had been finely honed by the experiences of 1940–1941; the weaknesses of the Russian army hit by the purges of the 1930s; the unpopularity of the Russian regime in key areas like the Ukraine; the lack of preparation; and, the foolish faith placed by Stalin in his alliance with Hitler.</p> <p>The huge scale of prisoners taken and the rapid advances made might lead to the conclusion that it was not at all true that there was no realistic chance of success, but answers might conclude that the timing of the attack was crucial. Had the attack taken place earlier without the distractions of the campaigns in Greece and Yugoslavia then this might have been so. However, the Germans would still have faced very long supply lines, and brutally enforced and dogged resistance, from a very large Russian population.</p>	30