

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/73

Paper 73 (Special Subject – Germany, 1919–1945),
maximum raw mark 60

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely 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.

Examiners should 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.

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 should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should 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 1: 8–10

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

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust 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 3: 0–3

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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

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. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

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 well 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 and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

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 well 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. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

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 well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should 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 should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, 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 well 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 2 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 should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should 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 1: 25–30

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. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of 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 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

Band 2: 19–24

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. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

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

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 relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

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 well 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. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

Band 5: 0–6

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; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. 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 is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

- 1 (a) How far do the views expressed in Document C support Strasser's argument in Document D that Hitler wanted to 'Strangle the social revolution for the sake of legality'?** [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of 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. Note should be taken of the dates and the provenances, in context; also of the tone of language used, the ideas expressed. C is from 1928, the year when the Nazis made some, albeit limited, breakthrough in Northern Germany; D from the year (1930) when that breakthrough broadened and the Nazis became a national party. In D Otto Strasser, a growing critic of Hitler's political stance and tactics, points up the divergence in thinking, the preference for tactical opportunism and pragmatism. C is a demonstration of that, as Hitler played down the overt socialist ideas of much of the original Party Programme; Hitler explains away such a shift by referring to a target group in the Jews. Strasser elaborates that Hitler was wooing the Right by playing down socialist ideas. Hitler rejected the criticisms by identifying Strasser's thinking as little better than Marxism and by emphasising the inability of winning over the working classes; he puts an emphasis on a master race of leaders. What part of D does point up is the prevailing inner Party tensions, pitting a perceived Left-wing (with the Strassers as spokesmen) against a more Right-leaning Party leader. The documents raise the issues of the reorientation of the Party – a tactical move – away from its earlier socialist roots, but also the unease of some in the Party about that shift of attitude and thinking. Comments on the tone of C and D will be useful to evaluation here.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that a 'new line of action' (Document A, line 1) was mainly responsible for the emergence of the NSDAP as a major national movement by 1930? [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 differing historical interpretations is to be expected. Answers will need to assess the argument that the Nazi breakthrough of 1930 was founded on a change of direction in policy and so political strategy set against other factors. In that sense, E has value in raising a number of factors. Reference can be made to the difficulties of the early 1920s (a small, regional party; limited appeal and membership; the more socialist meaning; the failed Putsch) and then the changes in and after 1924–5 (the trial, the publicity, the emergence of a national figure). It is likely that more coverage will be given to the period 1925–30, the founding of the 'second' (new) Party and the application of the lessons of the failed Putsch. A will be valuable here and can be linked to the new tactical (constitutional) direction pursued after 1924–5 – though Hitler's disdain for democracy is echoed in E, where that new approach is put into context. B and C demonstrate aspects of that new tactical approach, part electoral, part appeal; again E points up the strategic shift towards the lower middle-classes; the make-up of that range is featured there and in C and, implicitly, indirectly, in D. In the latter (D), Hitler defends the new emphasis against criticisms from the Left of the NSDAP, of whose number Otto Strasser (and his brother Gregor) was a prominent spokesman. In D, Hitler delivers a defence grounded in part in semantics – again, there is a link to part of E – while the value of B lies in the idea of a re-vamped S.A. as a propaganda tool, with appeal to those who would value order and discipline. Via contextual knowledge, reference can be made to key events and features between c. 1924–5 and 1930, including the reorganisation, the Führerprinzip, the reorientated messages, the electoral gains of 1928, 1930, set against the very limited developments of the early 1920s, electorally, regionally, etc. In addition, some reference can be expected to economic and political context factors (of E, some of A): the Weimar economic system and its highs-and-lows (agricultural problem by 1927–8: as in E); the effects of the P.R. system, weak coalition governments, indecisive leadership; anti-democratic trends and forces (there are links here to aspects of A, C, D and E).

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

- 2 'A legal revolution.' Discuss this verdict on the establishment of Hitler's dictatorship in the period from January 1933 to August 1934. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative will not work unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required here. There will need to be a good focus on the concept and place of the 'legal revolution', one of Hitler's major claims over the accession to and consolidation of power in these years. The nature of the *Machtergrieffung* needs to be addressed. There will be a focus on the significance and content of the Reichstag Fire and the Decree of February 1933, on the 'revolution from below' (the role of the S.A.), on the Enabling Law, its passage and legality, on the role and challenge of the S.A. and how Hitler acquired the presidency. These areas will enable coverage of the legal, the illegal or semi-legal. Terror, force, intimidation, the representation of (imaginary) threats, the weaknesses of the Political Left, the activities of the S.A. and the S.S., the use of the camps (Dachau as the model), the banning or dissolution of parties, the creation of a one party state, the uses of propaganda, the beginnings of economic recovery, the inherent weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution (already very weakened), the role of the elites, the political skills of Hitler (and Goering), the reasons for and importance of the Night of the Long Knives, all are areas and issues.

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 importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The formulation of the question here sets up the scope for answers that display argument and counter-argument – the ideas of legality, the uses of legal powers, of actions (just) within a constitutional framework, can be set against the decidedly illegal and the extent of fortuitous circumstances (including timid, weak opponents) that aided Hitler. There is scope here for debate. Much can be made of the 'legal revolution' concept, used by Nazi propaganda; then again, there was much that was illegal or semi-legal and accepted by many. The speed of the takeover of power, the near-constant activism, the depths of Nazi penetration were all important. But the attitudes of the elites and their compliance, their backing for Hitler's anti-democratic agenda, mattered also. And it can be argued that the showdown with the S.A. was a decisive factor – again, mixing the illegal and (retrospective) legal.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 explicitly be 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

3 What benefits did the German people derive from Nazi economic and social policies between 1933 and 1939?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Some policies which could be discussed are the social benefits of the *Volksgemeinschaft* – the idea of class conflict being subsumed into a folk community which encouraged positive values, supported the family, gave youth ideals and support, valued traditional feminine virtues and offered a sense of mission. There were attempts to engage what the Nazis thought had become a disenchanted working class by offering job opportunities, opportunities in the Nazi apparatus, improved conditions in the Strength Through Joy movement and a paternalistic ideal in labour relations. There was a great effort to provide full employment by some public works schemes and by taking young people off benefit into the Reich Labour Service. When rearmament got going in earnest, then more and more opportunities were created and skilled workers were able to evade restrictions on wages. Incentives in the form of entertainment, subsidized holidays, and promises of cars, radios and marriage loans were provided for Aryan workers. Farmers achieved higher status and some protection from foreclosures. Small businesses were praised and some protection was offered against competition from department stores, mail order firms, foreign competition and trade unions. The country could see visible signs of economic progress in cities, in new roads and improved transport; the grim days of hunger and dole queues did not reappear in this period.

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 set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The list of benefits applied only to those who accepted the regime or were acceptable to it. Racial out groups and those who were not good 'Folk Comrades' benefited far less. Some of the benefits were more apparent than real. Economic pressures forced women back to work where they did not have equal treatment; the benefits of the Youth and Women's movements have been seen as superficial. As the move to rearmament started, there was pressure on hours and conditions that ran counter to the official Labour Front policies. Some benefits remained promises – like the Volkswagen. Entertainment was curdled with propaganda. Many young people were bored by politics and exploited in the Reich Labour Service. Some sectors of industry – consumer goods and exports, did not benefit. The small businesses were often disappointed and rearmament needs led to an alliance between the state and the bigger businesses and industries. Social benefits have to be seen in the light of oppressive conformity which vitiated better physical conditions for many. Clearly there is scope for discussion about the nature and extent of benefits.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 explicitly be 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	73

- 4 'A series of reactions to events, not the enactment of a clear plan.' How far does this view explain the conduct of Hitler's foreign policy in the period 1933–41? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative of foreign policy events will not go very far unless there is good explanation linked to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are required. Links to the value of *Mein Kampf* and the arguments over possible blueprint, programme and master-plan as against a highly opportunistic approach can be expected. There is evidence both for the continuity of aims and the unfolding of some kind of plan and for more marked opportunism. Good answers will highlight core aims and goals but also flexible responses to opportunities; Hitler's methods were diverse, unusual, unconventional (hence why it was so difficult to deal with him). Answers do need to reach 1941 and the all-important invasion of the USSR, arguably Hitler's greatest goal. Links of geopolitics, historical interpretations presented by Hitler, racial considerations can be anticipated. Reference can be made to such factors and issues as Hitler's attitudes towards Russia, France, Italy and Britain; Lebensraum; the overturning of the Versailles Treaty; rearmament; Poland (1934, 1939); the Rhineland (1936); how he used Appeasement; Anschluss (1938); Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia (1938, 1939); the attacks in the West (1940) and the Balkans (1941); the nature of the War; Operation Barbarossa. His statements on foreign policy – in *Mein Kampf*, the 'Second Book', speeches to Generals (1933, 1938, 1939), Military Operational Plans (e.g. 'Green', 'White'), for example – could be used to effect.

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 importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography, and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There is scope in the question formulation for argument and counter-argument. Much debate exists here – with links to (e.g.) 'intentionalist' vs. 'structuralist' ideas. There has been a vigorous debate as to whether Hitler pursued a well-planned, 'programmatic' policy or whether he was an unprincipled, flexible thinker and opportunist, a reckless gambler. There is evidence for both, though the best answers will favour one over the other, and explain why. Key, core ideas and objectives should be assessed within the context of his special style of conducting foreign policy. Appreciation of the differences between the periods of peace and war would be helpful.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 explicitly be 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.