



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY

9769/59

Paper 5i Special Subject: Germany, 1919–1945

May/June 2016

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

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.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

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.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

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.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

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.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

Section A

- 1 (a) **How far does Document A challenge the view offered by Document B on the options open to Hitler to gain power by December 1932?** [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.

Similarities

Both agree that options are limited by the clever tactics of von Papen, mentioned in A and clarified in B. B's acute analysis of the potential trap that Hitler might have fallen into had he accepted the post of Vice Chancellor might support the view of A that there is no immediate chance of his being offered the Chancellorship.

Differences

The main difference lies not in the analysis of the situation but in the best options. Hitler in B is resolutely against the seizure of power, arguing that this had failed in 1923 and would lead to suppression by the army and police. A rejects this view of the options and argues that, given the support of the SS and SA, 'the conquest of power' would have a chance. A is also more sanguine about possible consequences of accepting the Vice Chancellorship, suggesting an effort might have been made to gain places in the cabinet. Hitler is more realistic about the likely success of any collaboration.

Provenance

Both views are in the difficult period for the movement in 1932 with support starting to decline and there seeming to be no chance of making the leap from successful protest party to actually achieving power. Weimar democracy had virtually ceased to exist with few meetings of the Reichstag, rule by decree and control passing to a small clique. Strasser represents the radical grass roots and urges revolution. Hitler did not repudiate the revolutionary ideology but was more focused, especially since his experience of 1923 of maintaining the legal façade. His military experience made him all too aware of the vulnerability of the party's forces if confronted with the Reichswehr. Though Strasser had been a soldier, he was more impressed with the potential power of 'trench socialism' and mobilising worker support. Hitler realised that he needed elite support, something that he had been cultivating since the 1920s.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Hitler owed his appointment as Chancellor mainly to his own political skill? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to the documents in this set [A–E].** [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 different historical interpretations is to be expected.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

The debate is between evidence which supports the view that Hitler owed his appointment to his own very acute political skills and understanding and evidence which suggests that what really mattered essentially lay outside Hitler's control and involved the mistaken belief that he and his movement could be controlled by an elite that had come to dominate the Republic.

Nothing shows Hitler's level of political understanding more than Document B – a candid explanation to Nazi party leaders. The SA and SS were no match for the army. The German *mittelstand* would not have accepted a coup. Any attempt to do a deal with von Papen from a subordinate position would have been doomed. Von Papen had shown his political skills in manipulating Von Hindenburg and by removing the government of Prussia, and that he was capable of establishing a conservative dictatorship without Hitler.

A challenges Hitler's tactics and looks at the consequences. The legality policy had come to grief because the logical position was that Hitler should enter government. If neither legality nor revolution was adopted, then there seemed no solution. However, Strasser's belief in a possible revolution succeeding seems unrealistic given the ease with which the SA was dealt with in 1934.

C partly suggests that rather than Hitler's own skills, which had not won over Hindenburg, it was the mistaken intrigues of Von Papen and Oskar Hindenburg. However, in the actual negotiations, Hitler seems to have played his hand well. It could be argued that by building up the threat from the SA but not actually implementing it, Hitler had given himself a strong negotiating position which he used well. However, without the actions of Von Papen this would not necessarily have been successful, and it may be going too far to think that Hitler's skills extended to predicting the events that led Von Papen to think that he might control Hitler.

D refers to the ability of Hitler to engender enthusiasm and devotion and promote idealism (the national soul). The appeal to the *mittelstand* and to traditional nationalists (especially teachers) is confirmed by many other accounts of his appeal. However, the context of the desire for 'unity' referred to must be taken into consideration. The battles between left and right and the danger of civil war had worried the German middle classes and without this Hitler might not have got such support, despite his skills.

Source E stresses this contextual argument. Hitler was clever in exploiting the situation but at root were the 'fears, resentments and prejudices' of ordinary people. If Hitler was the embodiment of hope, then the context of defeat, inflation and then protracted depression created the need for a saviour.

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

Section B

2 Assess the view that, in the period 1933–1938, Hitler was a ‘weak dictator’. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an 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.

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 debate here is between views which stress that the whole way of governing of Nazi Germany reflected the weaknesses of the Führer in terms of running a modern state. The party did not become the state as in the USSR but existed alongside the existing state structure. This led to overlapping competencies which, some argue, were encouraged by Hitler as a means of ‘divide and rule’. Often contradictory policies were continued with those eager for power and advancement seeing the approval of Hitler. The capricious and often irrational dictator did not always make his views clear nor were they always consistent. He was often inaccessible, especially after the start of the war and his health problems did not always lead to clear direction. Thus the ‘polycracy’ that developed because of a bohemian and disorganised way of governing by the man at the top resulted in a weak dictatorship.

The alternative view is that Hitler adeptly maintained overall control by all aspects of party and government ‘working towards’ him; that rivalries between his paladins kept his authority strong; that the ‘Hitler Myth’ that he was above the corruptions and inefficiencies of power was a major source of strength; and, most importantly, that he maintained very clear control of all key decisions – diplomacy and military strategy; rearmament; the need to make sure that support was maintained among the German people and racial policy. There were retreats and concessions; there was administrative overlap, but the authority of the leader was never successfully questioned or challenged. A lot depends on what the understanding of the terms of the debate is. ‘Weak dictator’ as a concept will be carefully defined in better answers. Weaker responses may offer accounts of some key elements and label them ‘weak’ or ‘strong’.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

3 'The most successful economic policies of Nazi Germany were put in place before 1936.'
Discuss. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an 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.

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 debate here is whether the most successful policies were those which ended the bleak economic conditions which brought Hitler to power and which he promised to deal with; or whether the preparations for war and the development of the German economy to deal with war were the most important achievement. The reduction of unemployment; the development of trade agreements with the New Plan; the extension of the infrastructure and the control of inflationary dangers by Schacht might be seen as a considerable achievement, though there was some sleight of hand – the removal of women from the workplace; the massaging of unemployment figures by using the Reich labour service and the armed forces to absorb young men, and unsustainable barter agreements have to be taken into consideration.

The economic development of the Four Year Plan and the subsequent development of a defence economy offered achievements, though the ersatz programme was probably overcostly and there were problems of promoting state-run armaments. Foreign observers thought that labour shortages, hidden inflationary pressures and shortage of raw materials would make the German economy overheat and might even bring down the regime. However, the tensions and problems were alleviated by conquest and the full-scale conversion to a war economy was delayed. There could be discussions of the role of Speer; the ability of the German economy to sustain the war effort despite large-scale bombing; and the waste of economic resources through racial persecution. No set judgement is required.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	59

4 What best explains the adoption of ‘the Final Solution’ by the Nazi Regime? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an 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.

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.

There is a considerable historiography here, but the question does require judgement and not just exposition of different views or events. Mere accounts of ‘structuralists’ or ‘intentionalists’ views will not score highly without a consideration of the evidence they are based on or assessment of the validity of the evidence. The basic debate is whether the Final Solution was envisaged from the early days of the movement; whether the regime moved as close to it as it could during the 1930s and then used the circumstances of war to pursue it, however haltingly at first, to its terrible conclusion.

The alternative view is that the prejudice and hatred did not amount to a considered aim of annihilation until the war intensified the Manichean conflict in the minds of the leadership and opened up opportunities and brought about pressures which led to the Holocaust. Supporters of this view point to the sustained interest in enforced emigration and the halting and improvised policies right up to 1941. They point to local initiatives in Poland and Russia; to random and improvised massacres; to killings of all sorts of possible opponents, including prisoners of war and Bolshevik officials. They point to uncertain policies about ghettos; to the problems of feeding large numbers of racial and political enemies under wartime pressure; to the impossibility of other ‘solutions’; to this bizarre and self-made problem. Even after the annihilation had been adopted, there were backtracking and inconsistent policies. Wartime reverses and destruction intensified vengeance until, at the end, pointless death marches with little central direction or aim were undertaken.

Whether this view is credible given the clear utterances made by Hitler and many other figures supporting deliberate annihilation; whether it is feasible to see invasions of Eastern Europe which did not consider the large number of Jews who would fall into Nazi hands; whether the steady segregation and acts of violence against German Jews amounted to merely random and improvised policy can be discussed. No set response is expected.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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