



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY**9769/59**

Paper 5 Germany 1919–1945

May/June 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

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 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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

This document consists of **9** 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.

Introduction

This assessment is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material.

Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.

If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range.

If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

Assessment Objectives

AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

AO2

Showing understanding of appropriate concepts, investigate and respond to historical questions clearly and persuasively using an appropriate coherent structure to reach a substantiated and sustained judgement.

AO3

Analyse, interpret and evaluate source material and/or interpretations of the historical events studied.

Levels-based mark schemes

The levels-based mark schemes address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 2 and 3, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content for each question in the mark scheme.

Levels-based mark scheme for Question 1

Level	Level description	Mark
3	<p>Analyses both similarities and differences. Compares and contrasts the documents, integrating comments on both documents by content, theme or issue.</p> <p>Makes clear and well-supported comparisons of the content of the documents, and explores their themes and issues.</p> <p>Focuses consistently on the matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Analyses the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, and explains why with reference to their provenance.</p> <p>Demonstrates supported critical evaluation of both documents as historical evidence.</p>	8–10
2	<p>Describes the main similarities or the main differences and includes some reference to the alternative viewpoint.</p> <p>There may be some imbalance between comparison and contrast. At the lower end of the level, may treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes clear and supported comparisons of content, themes and issues.</p> <p>Deals largely with the matter under discussion, but use of the documents in relation to the question may be uneven.</p> <p>Some analysis of how far the documents agree or disagree. At the higher end of the level, there may be some explanation of why they might agree or differ, though the consideration of provenance will not be well developed.</p> <p>At the higher end of the level, demonstrates some critical evaluation of the documents as historical evidence.</p>	4–7
1	<p>Refers to some differences or similarities. May be uneven, for example, differences may be covered but not similarities or vice versa.</p> <p>Makes some comparison or contrast of content, themes or issues, but may be largely description or paraphrase. Likely to treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes reference to the wider topic but with limited focus on the specific matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Limited analysis of the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, though this may be implicit or asserted. Limited reference to provenance of the documents.</p> <p>At the lower end of the level, there may be simply description or paraphrase of the documents.</p>	1–3
0	No creditable response	0

Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2

Level	Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks	Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks
5	9–10 marks Full analysis of all the documents as a set, interpreting them in relation to the question.	17–20 marks Well-sustained critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is well explained and supported throughout. Has a precise focus on the question. Coherent and developed judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on clear and persuasive evidence from the documents in their historical context.
4	7–8 marks Analyses all the documents, interpreting them in relation to the question, but some unevenness in depth or coverage of the documents.	13–16 marks Generally sustains a critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is mostly well explained and supported throughout. Has a broad focus on the question. Coherent judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on evidence from the documents in their historical context which is mostly clear and persuasive, but unevenly developed.
3	5–6 marks Some analysis of all the documents, with some interpretation of them in relation to the question. Uneven in depth of coverage of the documents with some omissions, description or irrelevance.	9–12 marks Some critical evaluation of evidence from the documents, but unevenly supported and explained. Generally coherent and contains some argument applicable to the question. Undeveloped judgement based predominantly on evidence from the documents which is occasionally clear and persuasive.
2	3–4 marks Limited analysis of the documents, with little interpretation of them in relation to the question. The depth of coverage of the documents will be very uneven, with significant omissions or evidence of misinterpretation of some documents, and with much description or irrelevance.	5–8 marks Limited critical evaluation of the evidence from the documents. Generalised critical comments with limited support and uneven explanations. Generally coherent and introduces argument which is mostly relevant to the topic. Attempts a judgement but offers limited supporting evidence from the documents.
1	1–2 marks Describes or paraphrases the documents. Little or no analysis and there may be major omissions of documents and very limited reference to the question. Answers reveal serious misinterpretation of the documents.	1–4 marks Little critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Has some coherence. Few parts of the response are relevant. It responds to some of the issues raised by the topic. No judgement beyond simple and unsupported assertions or relies on description of the documents.

Level	Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks	Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks
0	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B about Nazi economic policy. You should analyse the content and provenance of both documents.</p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both stress military necessity – A Germany’s position in the world depends on armed forces and German population must be capable of bearing arms; B German army must be operational in 4 years. Behind both is a view that the economy is there to serve other ends than purely economic development. <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A is less specific about the aims that the economy must support. B refers to gaining raw materials by extending living space and detailed measures for self-sufficiency which A does not. B sets a timetable for the economy to support military preparedness and war which A does not. <p>Provenance:</p> <p>A is in a political context and stresses the political aim of boosting the population’s military preparedness and Germany’s world role. B is in a military context and is more specifically about war and also wider ideological aims such as living space. A is when Hitler still had to consider economic orthodoxy, but B is when autarky is more firmly established further on into the regime with the demise of Schacht and the dominance of the 4 Year Plan.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks								
2	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided in this set of documents for the view that there was a highly effective propaganda machine in Nazi Germany? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in the set.</p> <p>Main Issue:</p> <p>There may be more agreement on the sophistication than the effectiveness as the regime had to rely on quite high degrees of repression and there is evidence of some groups and elements not being receptive, but on the other hand the clear messages and avoidance of the obvious has meant that Goebbels has been seen as highly effective.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 685 1313 1816"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="316 685 815 786">Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="815 685 1313 786">Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 786 815 1084">C – This offers an analysis of how propaganda should be sophisticated and effective, requiring knowledge of ‘human souls’ and not underestimating mass intelligence, taking care to engage the people and not to be boring.</td> <td data-bbox="815 786 1313 1084">C – Though evidence of intention not achievement, the nature of propaganda does bear this out. The press was not nationalised, there was retention of much popular culture to ensure that the public was not turned off and the messages were clear.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1084 815 1382">D – The evidence here does not reflect the sophistication of C with direct orders to listen to Hitler for nearly an hour, though participation is expected, and it might be thought to be effective to rig up loudspeakers in so many different locations.</td> <td data-bbox="815 1084 1313 1382">D – This is from relatively early on in the regime and is from one area and might reflect local enthusiasm rather than the sophistication of the national propaganda policy.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1382 815 1816">E – On one hand the official does not like the propaganda excesses and the crudity of some of the messages, but he seems to have been convinced that the regime is representing the whole community. But the overall evidence suggests that there is some lack of conviction generally with people having a public and private view. Therefore, propaganda was not totally sophisticated or effective.</td> <td data-bbox="815 1382 1313 1816">E – The nature of the source may make this wishful thinking and is from only one region. The main foreign policy successes are to come and there is concern about the strains of rearmament, so this is not typical of either the early years when the economy was recovering nor of the years of greatest triumph 1938–40.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)	Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)	C – This offers an analysis of how propaganda should be sophisticated and effective, requiring knowledge of ‘human souls’ and not underestimating mass intelligence, taking care to engage the people and not to be boring.	C – Though evidence of intention not achievement, the nature of propaganda does bear this out. The press was not nationalised, there was retention of much popular culture to ensure that the public was not turned off and the messages were clear.	D – The evidence here does not reflect the sophistication of C with direct orders to listen to Hitler for nearly an hour, though participation is expected, and it might be thought to be effective to rig up loudspeakers in so many different locations.	D – This is from relatively early on in the regime and is from one area and might reflect local enthusiasm rather than the sophistication of the national propaganda policy.	E – On one hand the official does not like the propaganda excesses and the crudity of some of the messages, but he seems to have been convinced that the regime is representing the whole community. But the overall evidence suggests that there is some lack of conviction generally with people having a public and private view. Therefore, propaganda was not totally sophisticated or effective.	E – The nature of the source may make this wishful thinking and is from only one region. The main foreign policy successes are to come and there is concern about the strains of rearmament, so this is not typical of either the early years when the economy was recovering nor of the years of greatest triumph 1938–40.	30
Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)	Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)									
C – This offers an analysis of how propaganda should be sophisticated and effective, requiring knowledge of ‘human souls’ and not underestimating mass intelligence, taking care to engage the people and not to be boring.	C – Though evidence of intention not achievement, the nature of propaganda does bear this out. The press was not nationalised, there was retention of much popular culture to ensure that the public was not turned off and the messages were clear.									
D – The evidence here does not reflect the sophistication of C with direct orders to listen to Hitler for nearly an hour, though participation is expected, and it might be thought to be effective to rig up loudspeakers in so many different locations.	D – This is from relatively early on in the regime and is from one area and might reflect local enthusiasm rather than the sophistication of the national propaganda policy.									
E – On one hand the official does not like the propaganda excesses and the crudity of some of the messages, but he seems to have been convinced that the regime is representing the whole community. But the overall evidence suggests that there is some lack of conviction generally with people having a public and private view. Therefore, propaganda was not totally sophisticated or effective.	E – The nature of the source may make this wishful thinking and is from only one region. The main foreign policy successes are to come and there is concern about the strains of rearmament, so this is not typical of either the early years when the economy was recovering nor of the years of greatest triumph 1938–40.									

Question	Answer		Marks
2	Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)	Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)	
	<p>F – The issue of whether propaganda could be effective when it was clear that Germany was suffering from bombing and from fear of defeat is raised here. The turning from official sources to foreign broadcasts suggests that propaganda was losing its effects.</p>	<p>F – There is evidence of rejection of official sources in the last years of the war. However, the effectiveness of Goebbels' Total War propaganda and the ongoing belief that somehow Hitler might win explains the fanaticism of resistance to the allies. Together with the brutal suppression of defeatism in Germany, this might challenge the view that propaganda had ceased to be effective.</p>	
	<p>Possible judgements. (AO2):</p> <p>There is no doubt that much of the propaganda machine was sophisticated and that Goebbels was aware of the danger of not engaging with the people. However, there is an argument that this was not consistently the case, as is shown by D's hectoring, E's dislike of crudity and F's scepticism. A balanced judgement might take into account the circumstances.</p>		