



## Cambridge Pre-U

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/59**

Paper 5i Germany 1919–1945

**October/November 2020**

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 October/November 2020 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><b>How far does Document A corroborate the evidence in Document B on the effect of the Second World War on the Nazi policy towards Jews?</b></p> <p>Similarities – Both show radical change was a result of war – B says the Jews must be done away with; A speaks of immense reform. B speaks of a ‘great Jewish migration’ A refers to Jews leaving the Greater German space. Both refer to Hitler’s inspiration - B refers to the Fuhrer’s blaming the Jews for war and A refers to the Fuhrer finding a solution during the war. B refers to liquidation; A to extermination</p> <p>Differences – A suggests that the solution during war will not be immediate but may take five, ten or twenty years; B suggests that the solution will be within the period of the war. A speaks in general ideological terms of overcoming the ideas of the French Revolution; B is more about finding practical measures by the (Wannsee) conference</p> <p>Origin – Rosenberg though having the grand title of Minister for the Occupied Eastern territories was an ideologue rather than a hands on ruler like Frank. This is a public broadcast which would not be specific about intentions to actually kill millions of people. B is not for public consumption and is by a brutal administrator intent on taking practical measures. Some may notice the date – A is written before the great attack on the USSR while B is written after Barbarossa at a time when the offensive had failed to take Moscow and so frustrations and desire to achieve one major object of war – genocide – was even higher.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Hitler bears the responsibility for the Holocaust? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</b></p> <p>The debate has been about whether the initiative for genocide came from below – from the party, or from a sort of cumulative radicalism, from the men on the spot in occupied areas or from a premediated plan by Hitler who was the prime mover as the German state ‘moved towards the Fuhrer’.</p> <p>A suggests that the war has led to ‘immense reform’ and has led to overcoming the ideas of liberty and equality. The armed forces will be able to protect Germany while the Jewish problem is solved. Hitler is credited with the solution but not with the holocaust directly as the speech only refers to the Jews leaving Germany over an extended time scale. However, this is a speech in public and in any case the war was a direct result of Hitler’s actions. The extreme vocabulary – infected germs, exterminate implies a radical solution and some may hold Hitler responsible for this being widespread.</p> <p>B Hitler is quoted as an inspiration and refers directly to a bloodbath, though this is conditional on whether ‘Jewry’ succeeded in provoking a war, suggesting that the war rather than a predetermined Hitler plan was the key. Hitler is not mentioned as attending the conference – that is to be led by Heydrich and indeed Hitler did not attend Wannsee. Frank refers to what he was told in Berlin but does not mention Hitler – does this suggest a general acceptance among the leadership for mass murder rather than specifically by Hitler? Or does the nature of the dictatorship indicate that those in Berlin would not have policies which did not emanate from the leader? Frank had initiated brutal policies in Poland and the occupiers had not needed specific Fuhrer orders for the massacres and atrocities carried out</p> <p>C Heydrich is careful to say that evacuation has had the personal authorisation of the Fuhrer. However, the document suggests that policy has changed with emigration being replaced by evacuation, a prelude to mass murder. Hitler has authorised this, but it does not say he initiated it. It is rather Himmler having ‘authorisation’ Again the suggestion is that wartime circumstances rather than a preconceived plan by Hitler lies behind this, but the ultimate authority is that of the Fuhrer. There is a direct reference to a ‘Final Solution’ linking to Rosenberg’s reference to Hitler finding a ‘solution’ in A. However, the document also refers to evacuation as ‘the only feasible solution’ as though this was a pragmatic policy dictated by circumstance. Answers may put all this in the general context of government in the Third Reich which often depended on competing agencies ‘working towards the Fuhrer rather than responding to direct and clear orders from the top. Knowledge of Wannsee might see acceptance from a variety of elements of government of an extreme policy rather than be driven on by Hitler – who did not attend.</p> <p>D offers evidence for much more direct influence by Hitler on the practical implementation of the Final Solution. He was in Poland with Himmler and Globocnik says that Hitler personally ordered all action speeded up. He gave his personal sanction to Globocnik’s view that the extermination was ‘necessary work’ The enthusiasm of Globocnik, the presence of Himmler, the</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>involvement of Wirth and the acceptance of the actual murders by the medical officer indicates that Hitler was not driving unwilling collaborators though his responsibility for and knowledge of the extreme measures are clear from the source. Answers may know what happened in the camps mentioned. Though this is eye-witness testimony it relies as does D on reporting what someone else said about Hitler.</p> <p>E Hoss says that he was told ‘something to the effect’ that Hitler had given the order for a final solution. However, Hoss was instructed by Himmler who stressed the role of the SS in carrying out the order and it is Himmler who explains its importance. Hoss is careful to stress ‘the strict order’. In the circumstances of a trial Hoss may wish to put responsibility on his superiors and especially Hitler. He is somewhat vague about what Himmler said but his testimony does suggest that Himmler thought that his organisation the SS did have a special mission.</p> <p>The documents as a set show the complexity of attributing responsibility because of the nature of authority in the Third Reich with few direct and clear cut directions emanating from Hitler and competing agencies trying to show their ability to interpret and act on the will of the leader. The secrecy mentioned in D permeated the discussions – C refers to forcing Jews out of the living space, but the actual policy is not referred to directly and the same is true of A. However, in the context of what had happened once the invasion of eastern Europe began in 1939 the violent intentions were clear and resulted directly from the actions of the Fuhrer. However, the evidence does show others as culpable and no set answer is expected.</p>	

## Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>How powerful was Hitler as ruler of Germany by the end of August 1934?</b></p> <p>AO1/2 The Gleichschaltung had meant that the authority of the Fuhrer dominated party extended into all walks of life by 1934. There was a one-party state; political opposition had been suppressed; there were special camps for opponents; Hitler had authority for rule by decree; the state governments of the Federal constitution had been replaced by a strong central authority. The Night of the Long Knives had ended any resistance within Hitler's own party and removed other possible opposition. The army had sworn an oath of loyalty and the special position of Hitler not just as Chancellor but as Fuhrer, embodying the will of the nation had been confirmed on Hindenburg's death. There was no freedom of opinion, an active secret police and Nazi control of a wide range of aspects of national life. However, unlike Soviet Russia, the party was not the government and traditional authority existed alongside party rule meaning that a certain amount of 'bureaucratic drag' still existed. Unlike Italy there was no superior authority and the army was not totally 'coordinated' until 1938 and the more radical Nazi idea of a politically dominated national militia had died with Rohm. Traditional forms of authority still existed in the form of Reichstag, courts, police, ministries with a proliferation of competing authorities which some have seen as weakening the authority of the Fuhrer. The party did not shut down all existing media but controlled them. The ongoing propaganda campaigns showed a concern for maintaining support and some policies were modified for fear of public opinion. It has been argued that Hitler's authority depended on a large measure of acceptance and consent, but answers should focus on the extent of his actual power not explanations for it.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>How successful were attempts to create a ‘National Community’ (<i>Volksgemeinschaft</i>) in Nazi Germany?</b></p> <p>The debate is whether beneath the propaganda, there was a large amount of continuity with an older German society rather than the creation of a new type of community dedicated to the race and the nation. Attempts to ensure that Germans put the racial/national community before individual priorities featured in propaganda and well publicised schemes to bind the nation and eradicate previous class differences. This was particularly evident in education which stressed duty and the mission of the nation. It can be seen in extended welfare policies which stressed communal responsibilities and support for the health of the race – through encouragement of motherhood for the good of all, for policies to encourage marriage and good living that would benefit the racial stock and the prevention of weakening the community by inter racial marriage or relations. The rallies were a symbol of national unity. The widespread Winterhelf projects and everyone from the top of the hierarchy to the poorest enjoying frugal meals and sharing the burden of national revival were presented persuasively. The distinction between the public and private sphere of life as lessened – loyalty to the community was placed above personal loyalty. However, social divisions were not eroded. The workers on the whole were not integrated into the community and even though they lost political rights they remained somewhat apart from the wider community. The young did not all buy into the wider community. Class distinctions remained – the SAs socialist ideals were subordinated to the national side of Nazism. Private employers and big business cooperated with the regime but retained their profits. Greater educational and employment opportunities continued to be available to the middle classes. The radical social policies of the USSR were not replicated by the Nazis and the national community continued to have social inequalities. Some may argue that rather than Nazi ideology it was the war that did most to create the National Community as the early victories brought about a greater commitment to the ideals of the regime and then the defeats and the fears of invasion and occupation bound the community together in Goebbels’ vision of total war.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>What best explains why Hitler ordered the invasion of the USSR in 1941?</b></p> <p>Explanations may refer to the deep seated ideological and global political aims to Nazism – to create the living space for the German people and to extend the racial community. There was a vision of a Germanic elite dominating Europe and using the pools of slave labour and resources to support the Thousand Year Reich. This may be countered by the limited colonial settlements in conquered territories and the sheer impracticality of establishing Germanic latifundia run by people living in a modern industrial state. There was the overt political goal of destroying Judeo Bolshevism – the world view that saw Communism as a constant menace and driven by Jews whose ultimate goal was to engulf Europe in a sort of Asiatic invasion. This was the stuff of extreme propaganda but seemed to be at odds with the pact that Hitler had made and the effective cooperation of Germany and the USSR in dividing Poland and the economic cooperation that resulted from the pact. More practical aims might have been to ensure self-sufficiency and resources by having access to the Ukraine wheat growing areas and the industrial resources developed by Stalin. There would also be markets and a vast resource of labour. Some have seen the aim to reduce population to a level that would support Germany without being a burden.</p> <p>Another possible aim was to ensure security and bring the war to an end. Without having to worry about a possible war in the East, Hitler would be able to bring the war with Britain and its empire to an end and reduce any chances of US involvement. The key was to avoid a possible two front conflict.</p> <p>This links in with the belief among Hitler and his military chiefs that the war against the USSR could be brought to a relatively swift conclusion in the way that the war against France and Poland had been fought. Hitler did not envisage a lengthy crusade but a short and decisive campaign against an enemy who was unprepared, militantly weak and fundamentally unsound.</p> <p>Fundamentally Hitler invaded because he had the necessary resources and believed that he could win – because of the success so far and his belief in his own abilities and his belief that ‘Judeo Bolshevism’ would collapse because of its racial and political weakness.</p>	30