



HISTORY

9769/59

Paper 5i Special Subject Germany, 1919–1945

May/June 2019

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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>To what extent does Document D corroborate the evidence in Document C about the views of those Germans who opposed the Nazi regime in the years 1942–1944?</p> <p>Similarity: Both speak of evil making opposition a moral matter rather just a political decision. C speaks of a ‘community of evil’ and D corroborates this by seeing opposition as ‘righteous enemies of evil’ D speaks of the moral worth of individuals being shown by opposition and C corroborates the view that opposition should be stirred up by emphasising the regime’s destruction of moral values and the spiritual enslavement of Germany by Nazism.</p> <p>Difference: The approach is different in tone. D is hoping that a few resisters will prevent God from destroying Germany but the grounds for resistance are more practically based in C with a reference to the hopelessness of the war, not mentioned in D. The stress in C is on effective resistance while D seems to expect any resistance to fail and the point is to show that a few righteous people can redeem Germany from punishment for its evil. The practical steps of resistance do not feature in D.</p> <p>Provenance: The general has taken part in a very different sort of resistance involving loss of life and therefore is justifying himself as an obviously religious person just before his death – therefore the religious and moral aspects are strong. The pamphlet of 1942 – before a lot of the disasters of war – are more along the lines of how to encourage widespread resistance that might impact on the regime rather than justifying a failed attempt at resistance late in the war when defeat was a far stronger probability than it had been in 1942. C is by idealistic young people at least hoping to make a difference. D is from an older person who has had much more responsibility in the Third Reich than the students who has only hope that sacrifice might not have been in vain</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that German resistance to Hitler was limited in scope because of the power of the Nazi regime? 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 refers to the power of the Gestapo being utilised against relatively mild resistance: the sabotaging of the Winter Relief programme by people not making contributions. The threat of being outside the National Community is being evoked and the power of the state being brought to bear on employers. However, at this stage, the regime seems to be relying on legal means, but then the resistance itself does not seem very severe, even though it is obviously worrying the Gauleiter, indicating a very low tolerance of even modest dissent. As the document admits failure – despite all the party’s ‘education’ there is still some resistance – then this might indicate that this is reliable evidence. The date of 1935 might be noted in the reference to ‘legal means’; this was when initial opposition had been suppressed, the economy was recovering and the repression was being reduced, and was when Germany was preparing for the Olympics in the following years. By 1937, opposition seemed to be restricted to jokes, and the obvious disquiet from Miss Hildebrandt that this joke had been repeated might be indication of fear in support of Dr Weckener telling J A Cole that ‘People can’t talk openly’. However, Miss Hildebrandt seems loyal to the regime and it is typical of the German middle class to have been worried about Bolshevism, questioning the view that opposition did not thrive simply because of the power of the regime, as opposed to its positive appeal. The restricted range of the visitor’s observations might be noted, and it could be argued that Munich, a strongly Nazi area might not be typical, especially as Document C comes from Munich as well and is very different from Miss Hildebrandt’s view. However, Document C is from later, when the war was beginning to seem unwinnable, and the repression and racial violence of the regime had increased. The document seems to give the impression that despite all this, there was a possibility of concerted resistance, including: sabotage by workers in war industries, in science labs and by failing to contribute to the activities of the Nazi state. However, this resistance is relatively low level. Also, the students were easily discovered, did not build up a network and suffered death. The pamphlet was to fulfil a moral responsibility, rather than perhaps stirring up potential discontent. In the war, the population rallied to the regime as a result of resentment of bombing and fear of the consequences of defeat. That a leading general should condemn the regime and take part in a plot to kill Hitler, might indicate that resistance was not limited and that the power of the state was more limited when it came to elite opposition. However, the general is close to execution and falls back on the despairing view that all he can do is to show an example to prevent God punishing Germany; he is also eager to justify himself, indicating that breaking with loyalty has been hard.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	In Document E, the historian suggests that it was not so much the power of the state, but the cooperation of many ordinary Germans in denouncing any non-conformity and discouraging any resistance; the people were acting as its eyes and ears. It also suggests that individual acts of resistance did not amount to threats. This view could be challenged as the bomb plot was more serious. There is evidence of youth groups and deserters being a threat, for example, in the murder of the head of the Gestapo in Cologne in 1943, but this is fragmentary and often merely a result of dislocations caused by heavy bombing. Resistance, even at the end of the war, was limited and met by savage reactions from many loyalists. The ubiquity of denunciation is well documented as is the relatively limited number of Gestapo agents.	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>'Hitler's ability to learn lessons from the failure of the 1923 Putsch was the most important political factor which brought him to office in 1933.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1/AO2 – This argument would be based on Hitler's pursuit of legality as a policy, through the need for direct leadership rather than relying on a figurehead like Ludendorff, and the need to avoid the uncertainties of a coup, and to get the support of the elites and the German <i>Mittelstand</i> by being voted in legitimately (at least outwardly) while having enough force to fall back on if needed. Aware of the power of the police and army, Hitler knew that if he were in a position to command them and use them against his enemies, this would be a more secure basis than simply attempting a takeover as some of the party suggested in the period after November 1932, when electoral progress began to be checked and the danger of falling momentum and support was evident. The legality policy had won over many of the middle class, but the fact was, as Strasser said, there were limits and Hitler had created a large paramilitary force and the party contained radical ideas. The support of the <i>Mittlestand</i> was falling away as the Nazis seemed too extreme. If economic conditions improved and the President persisted in his refusal to appoint Hitler chancellor, then the policy of legality would have been in vain. There were many in the party who saw it as a dead end and were willing to take their chance on revolutionary action backed by the large SA. With his party splitting, Hitler clung to the policy, but it would not have brought him to office without the actions of the elites and the divisions between Schleicher and Von Papen. Arguably, it was not so much the legality that Von Papen wanted to harness, rather the mass support and Hitler's unique appeal to the discontented elements of Germany. Hitler would be the mouthpiece and he would enable the elites to eradicate the left. Perhaps Hitler's legality policies encouraged a belief that they could control him, but in themselves and without the political intrigues, they could not have brought him to power. The other way to consider this is to ask what would have happened if Hitler had not adopted the policies. Would he have remained a fringe extremist? Would he have gained influential supporters? Would he have offered enough alternatives to the Communists? Would he have been able to gain middle class support after 1929 and taken advantage of economic discontents merely as a Putschist?</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>What best explains why the Nazi regime became more radical after 1937?</p> <p>AO1/AO2 – The association with Germany’s elites continued for some time after the Night of the Long Knives had weakened the Nazi’s radicals. The army had sworn an oath of loyalty on the understanding that the SA would not be a popular militia and it would keep its special position. The Nazi state unlike that of the USSR maintained much of the existing bureaucracy, imposing on it a mass of conflicting party-based authorities. The initial repression had been reduced for the 1936 Olympics. Hitler gave out an image of a European statesman and the racial persecutions seemed to have been regularised with the legal definitions of the Nuremberg Laws. However, the radicalism of the movement and its leader had not died. The four-year plan and the moves to increase rearmament accelerated from 1936. The disgrace of leading army officers Fritsch and Blomberg demonstrated the vulnerability of the army elites. The foreign policy came to be more radical after 1937 with the Anschluss, often seen as a turning point. Racial policy became more extreme after the Night of Broken Glass in 1938 and the beginnings of ghettoisation in 1939. The reasons could be the pressure from below in the party, and the influence of party leaders frustrated by the need to show legality and responsibility when there were more radical racial and geopolitical aims. The economy too was overheating with labour shortages and needed a dynamic policy of expansion. The growing power of the SS and Himmler too was a spur. The moves towards euthanasia and eliminating ‘weak elements’ in the racial makeup of the Reich, were indications that momentum was growing for a more radical and sweeping policy of racial cleansing. After 1937, progress in rearmament and the obvious unwillingness of the European powers to intervene in German affairs, or even to oppose violations of Versailles, meant that less caution had to be adopted as: Mussolini had been detached from the allied camp; Russia was embroiled in violent purges; there was little internal opposition; and, economic improvements and genuine popularity gave the regime confidence to become radical and true to the principles which it had seemed to jettison in 1934. Answers which consider the effects of war on the increased radicalisation should be credited as there was greater scope for control as the nation was militarised even more, and increasing urgency to put radical change into place especially in racial policy. By the end, the radical implications of Nazism were fully realised with summary executions and a total disregard for traditional law or morality. Answers which focus on 1937 can reach the highest marks.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Why did German racial policy become increasingly radical in the years 1938 to 1945?</p> <p>AO1/O2 – The Invasion of Austria may have given the regime the confidence to step up its racial policies. Though there have been explanations for the pogroms of November 1938 in terms of internal rivalry and Goebbels' desire to recover Hitler's favour, the assassination of Von Rath would have probably been excuse enough when the general trend in Germany was for moves towards fulfilling long-term programmes, now that possible limitations were no longer a restraint both at home and abroad. Once the violence of the take-over of power had recurred, events built up their own momentum with different leaders vying to be more radical and to put more pressure on the Jews who remained in the Reich, by a series of measures in 1939 and more determination to step up forced emigration. The outbreak of war in 1939 changed the mindset, as faced with a struggle for survival and the chance for geopolitical fantasies to be put into practice, the regime's grasp of reality and acceptable conduct were weakened. The invasion of Poland was accompanied by killings on a new scale of all sorts of potential enemies, of which Jews were often at the top of the list. Can this be explained by the needs of war, or the activities of local Nazi commanders and officials as a sort of cumulative radicalism from below? Or, was there a more centralised and directed policy?</p> <p>Once begun, the momentum of radical racial policy was hard to stop. Ghettoisation followed atrocity and generated its own 'problem', the solution of which was more organised violence. Cut off by the war, the Third Reich could not pursue its favoured policy of sending Jews to Madagascar, even if that was ever feasible or anything more than the creation of a killing ground. Faced with little objection to solving the supposed problem of large numbers of Jews under Nazi control, the solution shifted to planned extermination coupled with the exploitation of Jewish labour and resources. The balance between the policies shifted but as the war hit reverses, it does seem likely that 'the war against the Jews' became the one that Nazi Germany could be certain of winning because of the defencelessness of its enemy. War could be the major explanation, or some may see it only as facilitating long-term plans which had to be delayed or adapted before the war. The support received from many in both Germany and occupied territories was a factor. The lack of any effective opposition to genocide and the willingness of the police, army and bureaucracy to cooperate may have helped to facilitate increased radicalism. Initiatives from below may have accelerated violence, but it may be difficult for many to absolve the leaders of the regime from the ultimate responsibility for the increase in radical racial policy, as circumstances made evil dreams and vision possible to put into practice.</p>	30