



HISTORY

9769/59

Paper 5i Germany, 1919–1945

May/June 2018

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 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 **14** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

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 E corroborate the views in Document D about the need of the Nazi leadership to curb the pace of change in Germany?</p> <p>Similarities – Hitler is quoted in Document D as being against a ‘so-called second revolution’ and is in accord with the view in Document E that a state of permanent uprising from below was not something a nation can afford. Document D thought that a priority was to get capitalism going again and to protect the economic system and, while this is not mentioned directly, it does accord with the view that ‘a ceaseless dynamic creates nothing’. Document D says that the ‘armed rabble ... of the uprooted and disinherited’ were disappointed, while Document E confirms that social revolution, which would have benefited them, was not the way forward.</p> <p>Differences – Though implied, Document E does not specifically say that the revolution must stop because it endangers economic stability. The real reason is a need for a firm a social structure and a secure legal system, which are under challenge. In Document D, it is Hitler himself who is seeing the need to stop change. In Document E, it is his ally von Papen coming at the issue from a different perspective.</p> <p>Provenance – Heiden is talking of the period when the elements of dictatorship had been established but the Hitler regime was still vulnerable to pressure from the elites and the army, and unemployment was still high. His aim was to interpret Hitler’s change of mind. Papen is writing with a distinct purpose, that is to bring Hitler to the point of ending the continuing pressures of the SA and its influence. It led to the purge of the night of the Long Knives as well as the death of its author, Jung, and the demotion of Papen. The stress is different in Document E because it represents the views of the German elites. This is not evident in Document D which is more anxious to show Hitler bowing to economic circumstances, possibly to show that Hitler put principles second to economic needs.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the changes made in Germany between January 1933 and June 1934 did not amount to a revolution? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Document A sees a rebirth and a radical change in emotions. There is the language of radical change – ‘reorientation’, ‘a new German state’ and a moral revolution involving ‘honour, cleanliness and loyalty’ – a revolution in values. However, the extent of commitment to this revolution is seen as variable. Catholic leaders and elements have not played a part and the stress is on what the people must do to make the revolution a reality. The key words may be ‘a new developing German nation’, but it was only two months since Hitler came to office and the effects of the Enabling Law and the Concordat had yet to be fully felt. Because this is a Catholic voice, the stress is on moral issues; for example, the ‘un-German spirit’. The Catholic centre supported Hitler as a barrier to ungodly Communism and socialism, and in fact the document is more about a counter-revolution to the republic of 1918, but nevertheless its rhetoric is that of quite profound possible change.</p> <p>In Document B, the fear is of revolution going to sleep or being betrayed, and the source argues that it was far from complete by June 1933. There is a distinction between a ‘national uprising’ and a ‘German Revolution’. In fact, it is difficult to see the events of 1933. Hitler was losing support and was shoehorned into power by backstairs intrigue, not the uprising that Röhm and the SA hoped for. Quite where the ‘bloodstained Marxist frenzy coming from the depth of Asia’ had manifested itself is not clear, and there is an air of apocalyptic fantasy here. However, it is true that the revolution was not as complete as say the Bolshevik revolution, with major elements of the old state apparatus still there and the Nazi elements being merely juxtaposed. The coordination was perhaps more widespread than Röhm suggests, but there had not been a bloodbath of Jews or, as Document D suggests, a major economic revolution which would have endangered employment and rearmament.</p> <p>However, for the author of Document C, the changes had been more revolutionary than Röhm suggests with local Nazi functionaries asserting authority and undermining traditional authorities (state ministries, regional government and police). There was a state of chaos, which could be seen either as revolutionary or the prelude to a revolution, with political arrests and pressure on businesses to dismiss employees. There is a hint too of social upheaval with ‘every little street cleaner’ getting above himself or herself. There are certainly grounds for this concern with wild camps, brutal beatings, killings of opponents, disregard for legal procedures, and with local SA rampant in the aftermath of victory. However, this was to stop as there was pressure on Hitler, as is seen in Document D, to rein in his followers, and eventually in 1934 to purge them and control them brutally. Also, the disturbances seemed to lack the coordinated ideology of a true revolution and appeared to be locally driven excesses. Document D shows Hitler trying to control them and bring about counter-revolution for economic reasons. There is some justification in this argument.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>There was concern that the Nazis were popular because they had promised to restore employment and prosperity. Disruption of hated targets like department stores would seriously threaten this. It would harm foreign trade and investment and make rearmament difficult. The state had been used to destroy the left, and to impose controls and greater centralisation, which was not in itself revolutionary and met many of the demands of the military and the conservatives. But the Nazi state was more than just a dictatorship, even by July 1933, and economic considerations did not govern ideological and racial developments entirely. The potential for the more radical developments, which emerged from 1938, were there. Document E sees the threat of revolution: 'permanent uprising from below'; pressure on the legal system; undermining of the social system; threats to the legal system; and, a Germany 'hurtling into the blue' like a runaway train. There is the threat of a second revolution despite Hitler's command in 1933. The speech may have exaggerated the disruptions and may have been a means of persuading Hitler to end the possible power and influence of the SA, whose large numbers certainly worried the leading conservatives and the military chiefs. That Papen could make the case for the need for stability suggests that there was, however, quite a limited revolution and that Hitler was still subject to pressure from the elites who had put him into office. Ironically Hitler's response in the Night of the Long Knives had a comeback for the conservatives as well, with the murder of Schleicher and Jung the writer of the speech. Papen was very nearly killed. The massive illegality and brutal murders to stop a second revolution were something of a revolution in themselves and pointed the way to a dark future.</p>	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>What best accounts for the limited electoral progress of the NSDAP before 1929?</p> <p>AO1 – Though it has been argued that the party was poised for a breakthrough by 1928, the progress after 1929 was considerably greater than before, even though the message and the methods of the party remained fairly constant. Before 1929, the mass support that was particularly evident by 1932 did not exist. Candidates could explain the competition among nationalist groups in the early part of the period and the lack of a specific programme, effective organisation and focus until Hitler transformed the party. Still, the party remained regional rather than national until the publicity gained by the Putsch. However, much of that was negative and the evident illegality and revolutionary aspects of the party alienated the Mittelstand. The socialist aspect could not offer much alternative to the SPD. After 1923, the party faced splits and the challenge faced by the economic recovery of Weimar, and the association of the Republic with trusted conservative figures like Hindenburg (president 1926) and Stresemann. With the changing position of Germany's place in Europe and hopes for modifying Versailles; with the restoration of a stable currency; with high levels of government spending and economic recovery, at least in some sectors, the radical appeal of Nazism lessened. Though Hitler imposed his leadership at Bamberg, gained influential backing, he played down the radical side and emphasised legal methods; this did not translate into electoral success until the economic downturn revealed the flaws of the so-called Golden Years. There were indications of a possible breakthrough in rural areas in 1928 and the organisational changes were beginning to have an impact, but the internal divisions and contradictions had not gone away and opposition both from the left and from the centre, and conservative groups, was strong.</p> <p>AO2 – Answers might balance the effects of improvements in living standards, and the success of some key Weimar policies and leaders, against the internal problems within the Nazi party, and the contradictions between an avowed policy of legalism with a paramilitary organisation, and violent racist and revanchist rhetoric. Industrial areas in the 1920s were committed to the left, and many urban areas such as Berlin found the movement provincial and unsophisticated during a period where hopes for recovery were high. Discontented groups such as the lower middle class, or some rural communities, together with ultra-nationalists and those who had suffered from the inflation, were not strong enough as a basis for electoral breakthrough. Also, the Nazis faced competition from other extreme groups which divided possible support.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>What were the main obstacles to effective resistance within Germany against the Nazi regime in the years 1933 to 1945?</p> <p>AO1/2 – Candidates might consider: the divided nature of the opposition on the left; and, the fatalistic belief that Nazism would somehow decline as the last vestige of capitalism, together with no support from the USSR. The long traditions of the SPD and Unions not opposing the state, and the lack of effective armed groups within the KPD, could be set against the considerable power of the alliance between the state police and the Nazi security services, and the severity of repression. Conservative opposition was limited by concepts of legality, and the deals done between the regime and the army and the churches. Not until 1944 did the military leaders give up their oath and then support was limited, and the execution of the plotting was inept. The successes of the regime and its genuine popular support, bolstered by propaganda made opposition difficult. The danger from spies, informers and block wardens was ubiquitous, even if the power and numbers of the Gestapo were smaller than imagined. The association of the regime with the German cause after 1939, and the dangers of defeat after 1941 from a vengeful Russia, bound people and regime. Opposition in wartime was emotionally problematic as more and more fell for Führer and Fatherland. The constant propaganda was a factor, but this may be questioned, as propaganda probably strengthened genuine approval for many aspects of the regime's domestic successes in the 1930s. Candidates may balance the limitations of opposition which, if often heroic, lacked organisation and a real alternative, with the ability of the regime to gain real support and to inspire considerable fear of punishment for opposition.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>'More propaganda than reality.' Assess this view of the Nazi Volksgemeinschaft (racial policy).</p> <p>AO1/2 – The racial policy was a key concept. The bonds of Aryanism were proclaimed to be greater than the divisions of class. The community would be one of shared 'German-ness' with all elements working together to fulfil the mission of the Nazi state. Workers and employers would cooperate in councils of trust. Women would work for the greater good by their roles as wives and mothers. Young people would learn unselfish devotion to the needs of the fatherland. The community would exclude and marginalise alien elements but celebrate the culture which bound it together. Value in society would depend not on wealth and status but on commitment to the community. Propaganda stressed the concept continually and the rallies were a celebration of the commitment of the national community to the leader who embodied its values. There is evidence that there was a sense of community.</p> <p>The growth of organisations, the support for the ideals of the regime, the contributions to Winter Aid, and, some see, the early successes of the war, then the need to work together to avoid Russian invasion, could be seen as actually creating a community. However, the persistence of class divisions and the greater opportunities for the middle classes, suggests that a genuine community was more of an aspiration. However, the isolation of the working class from the mainstream of German life which had been characteristic of Imperial Germany remained, as commented on by both SOPADE and Nazi party evidence. Sullen acceptance rather than commitment to a community may have been more common. There is evidence that juvenile delinquency and rejection of conformism existed among young people, and the elites' support for the regime unravelled when the war began to go badly. By the end of the war, divisions had reappeared with horrific consequences as Nazi diehards took revenge against previous opponents and any sign of defeatism.</p>	30