

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 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 2014 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 2014 | 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 met.

Question 1 (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 2014 | 9769 | 73 |

Question 1 (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 a 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 2014 | 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 met.

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 2014 | 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 2014 | 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 2014 | 9769 | 73 |

1 (a) How far does Document C corroborate Document A's view of civil servants in the Third Reich? [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. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Differences: **A** sees advantages in working towards the Führer. Those who work towards their goal will earn the finest reward in legal approval. **C** sees negative consequences of people working towards the Führer in projects being submitted prematurely and without proper consultation.

Similarities: It is not the Führer dictating to the civil servants – **A** says he cannot dictate everything and **C** confirms this by departments bringing him projects for approval and draft legislation. **A** sees wholesome initiative; **C** sees resentment and lack of proper consultation resulting in administrative problems. Both, however, see the Führer as crucial in the long run, (working towards the Führer in **A** and decisions being secured from the Führer in **C**).

Provenance: One is nearer the start of the Nazi period. By 1938, as more economic planning and preparation for war had taken place, the chances for administrative overlap and confusion are greater. One is from agriculture where policies were more coherent, one is from transport which worked with a number of other ministries. One is a memorandum establishing what was to be practice in a time of transition, one is a complaint when it was clear that the new regime was not a finely tuned administrative machine.

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2014 | 9769 | 73 |

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the nature of the Nazi state led to weaknesses that reduced the effectiveness of Hitler’s dictatorship?** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each, although, depending on 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 and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in 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.

A and **B** do not see weaknesses but the development of a new type of government, more fluid and organic than that of the traditional state. In **A** the nature of the dictatorship determines this government – Hitler cannot do everything but is in supreme power, so he sets the general lines and the government works towards his will. This is not weakness but a particular feature of the new regime. In **B** the argument is that the state must safeguard the nation – there is a higher purpose: to overcome the Bolshevik threat and make the nation strong. So forms and procedures are less important; even, by implication, traditional administration might seem to be undermined. The meeting of the aim of the NS State is a strength not a weakness. Both these may be challenged by knowledge of the administrative problems caused by competing authorities – and candidates may know the overlap between aspects of the security services and in economic and labour affairs. Both are documents for Party consumption and not private analyses. Willikens offers a memorandum and Hitler is speaking to the faithful at Nuremberg. Both, too, are relatively early in the regime.

The cracks are showing more in the letter in **C**. By 1938, the Four Year Plan Administration had been overlaid on existing economic institutions such as the Labour Front, and there was greater administrative overlap. The strains between Party and state were greater. As transport was a common element in many policies, the Minister is understandably annoyed at decisions being made without consultation, and this reflects the personalised nature of decision making where access to the leader was essential.

D, looking back, confirms the competing agencies and candidates may know examples to support this. The Third Reich certainly did have a lack of clarity about some policies, for example, the Jewish question and economic policy. The degree of intentional ‘divide and rule’ has been debated – if true, then the diversity actually strengthened the effectiveness of the dictatorship, but the competing agencies did introduce an element of ‘weak dictatorship’.

E is less sympathetic to the view of some sort of deliberate policy, seeing Hitler merely as a lazy leader with limited interest in domestic affairs. However, the weakness brought about by the administrative chaos is seen here as over stressed as it is a feature of modern government and business and is not as Dietrich, who was close to Hitler, argues. However, this is written in hindsight and Dietrich may be influenced by the defeat and collapse of the Nazi System and the more orderly administration of West Germany in 1955. Burleigh’s dismissal of the ‘endless squabbles’ may be challenged. The lack of a total war policy until well into the war and the reliance on short-term solutions may be all too symptomatic of a relatively disorganised state, but, having said that, there is little evidence that the state could not deliver any of Hitler’s internal aims, particularly the violent and destructive ones. This is a well developed debate and examiners should not look for a particular approach.

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2014 | 9769 | 73 |

2 What best explains the development of the NSDAP to 1929?

[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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The progress from a small racist group to a well organised political movement poised to enjoy a large electoral upsurge in 1930 can be explained by the context of Weimar and also by the nature of the party and its leadership.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Contextual explanations may focus on the severe disruptions caused by economic crisis, defeat and perhaps a lack of securely-based parliamentary traditions. Fear of the left caused key elements in the establishment to aid Hitler – for example, the judges in 1923 and Hugenberg in 1929. The crisis of the Mittelstand offered a constituency at which the party could aim its propaganda.

However, the question is focused on development and not merely support. Hitler's own abilities and ambitions allowed a leader-based party to develop. The ability of the party propaganda to appeal to different sections led to a variety of interest groups linking to the party; regional issues helped the party to appeal to local grievances; the militarism and the experience of the Freikorps helped the SA to grow. The policy of legality meant that the party was not simply a group of dangerous putschists but could appeal to a wider constituency who were anti-Communist but adhered to the concepts of established forms and procedures. The question does firmly say 'to 1929' so some reference to the economic crash may be relevant, but the major effects were not felt until later, so economic explanations should focus on the inflation and the unequal growth of the economy in the so-called 'golden years' after 1925. The mixture of the charismatic leader and the careful grass roots organisation and all-embracing propaganda, together with favourable circumstances with important sections alienated from the apparent economic and social progress of the years of recovery could be analysed.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 2014 | 9769 | 73 |

3 How far can the limited German opposition to the Nazi regime be explained by the repressive power of the state? [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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. There were underground activities by the left and individual acts of resistance, but the only major example of internal resistance which aimed to eliminate Hitler and set up an alternative regime was the 1944 bomb plot. The regime’s popularity may well explain the problems of opposition at least until 1941. Thereafter, the identification of the regime with national survival became increasingly close.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The question requires some judgements about the relative importance of different factors. The ‘legalism’ of the regime and the skilful way in which the Nazis used the powers of the state in 1933–34 may be considered. The opposition was divided and the Communists lacked support from Russia which might have produced a situation akin to the Spanish Civil War. However, the German left lacked militancy and were nurtured by an erroneous belief that somehow the Nazi regime would collapse of its own accord. The disillusion with the performance of parliamentary government undermined the moderate groups and the Concordat gained catholic support as did fear of communism.

The debate is often between the repression, which was considerable, and the genuine consent of many Germans supporting major elements of a national revival and perhaps the racism of the regime. The relatively limited numbers of the Gestapo may indicate consent but the regime was adept at creating an atmosphere of fear. Hitler did generate much personal support and the successes of the regime both at home and abroad made opposition difficult. Not until the war was clearly lost did the conservative elements attempt a coup. However, the weaknesses in planning and the real support that Hitler had as the best hope in a dark time led to failure. Individual acts without organisation or much support were heroic but futile as, by 1942, the Germans were bound to Hitler by fears of failure and common hardships from bombing. Better answers will assess the different explanations.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 11 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2014 | 9769 | 73 |

**4 ‘The Holocaust was only possible because of anti-Semitic measures taken before 1939.’
Discuss. [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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The anti-Semitism of the 1930s certainly marginalised Jews, and accustomed the Germans to discrimination and even violence. However, whether it would really have made mass murder possible without the circumstances of a major war is the subject of debate. The regime aimed to eliminate Jews from German life and encouraged emigration. The key elements were probably the deprivation of the rights of citizenship in 1935 and the open toleration of violence, even its encouragement, in 1938. The measures of 1938–39 do seem, in retrospect, to open a path to the Holocaust. However, the radicalisation of war has been seen as more significant.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. An analysis of pre-war measures might focus on the unyielding propaganda against Jews, their exclusion from many opportunities and amenities, their loss of citizenship, the increasing violence against them, the confiscations of property and the beginnings of ghettoisation.

However, the war opened up the chance for much more violence and more radical racial policies as the rapid successes made racial geopolitics less of a remote fantasy and more of a real possibility. Random massacres, concentration of Jews in ghettos and then deportation to camps, and a more defined ‘Final Solution’ may seem unlikely policies to be merely improvised under pressure of war and more likely to follow from the verbal violence and hateful propaganda of the 1920s, which inured the German people to racial discrimination. On the other hand, the war ended any semblance of normality and ended hopes of emigration alone making Germany a totally Aryan state. Even in wartime there were some protests, and the murders were done in the remote east rather than in the homeland to allow Germans to turn a blind eye. There is a considerable debate here and no set approach is required, but the anti-Semitic measures must be the focus.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.