
HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/051

Paper 51 Special Subject: Germany, 1919–1945

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

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

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.

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.

1 (a) To what extent does Document C corroborate the evidence presented in Document B about Hitler's foreign policy aims? [10]

Both documents report Hitler's views but Document B was written much closer to the time of the meeting in which his views were expressed. A common element to both documents is the ambition to absorb Czechoslovakia. In B there is reference to annexation, in Document C Czechoslovakia is to disappear from the map, but the meaning is the same. Document B mentions Austria as well, but both documents may be taken as evidence of expansionist desires. The context is different – in B the wider policy is the enlargement of the racial community and the acquisition of foodstuffs whereas these aims do not appear directly in C. In C the wider context is of a conflict with Britain and France.

The dates of the reports are different. In November 1937 Hitler was on the verge of a radicalisation of military leaders which had been completed by May 1938. By that time Austria had been incorporated into the Reich without opposition from France or Britain, and the ability to operate from former Austria increased Hitler's military opportunities. He was now more confident and showing a more forthright determination to take Czechoslovakia than in November 1937 when the policy was part of a broader economic and geopolitical policy. Document B was a report of comments made to military leaders and the audience in C included diplomats. In C there is no reaction, but in recalling the meeting at a much later date Hitler's adjutant puts his own reactions and a comment by Von Neurath into the account. In C the aims are part of a more general war but to be waged later than was actually the case; in 1937, possibly because there were still reservations among those present about the preparedness of German forces, there is no reference to this.

Some candidates may know the discussion of the Hossbach document by historians, **but this is not a requirement for comparison**. Taylor points out that Hossbach wrote his account not from notes taken at the meeting but later; the notes from the meeting were not agreed by the participants or by Hitler as a true record. Document B is a copy of a copy and the original may have contained comments by Blomberg and Fritsch. In terms of provenance, C is not an official record either but a recollection and candidates may question whether the author was as shocked at the time as he later claimed to have been. The sentiments are Hitler's general views on race and expansion, not detailed plans. Taylor argues that the meeting was to push the generals into faster rearmament and points out that after the meeting the leading generals, Blomberg and Fritsch, were forced to resign. Thus the audience of the May conference was different and so the purpose may have been different.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that Hitler followed a clear plan in his foreign policy between 1933 and 1939? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

The debate is whether there was a clear, ideologically-driven plan to overturn Versailles in order to pursue geopolitical aims in the East and establish the racial state of Hitler's more rabid outpourings, which was in the minds of the Führer and his followers from the start, or whether Hitler proceeded with broad objectives in mind but adapted his foreign policy aims to circumstances, even, as some think, acting like his predecessors and seeking concessions which would be to Germany's advantage, rather than having a blueprint or putative timetable. Of the documents in the set, Document A is the furthest away from a plan – seeming to show peaceful intentions for a negotiated revision of Versailles and a respect for the lives of Germany's neighbours, but the date and origin of A must cast considerable doubt on whether it reflected Hitler's intentions. It does, however, point to the problem in that, whatever plans were held, they had to be pursued with caution given Germany's ability to wage war.

Documents B, C and D are all evidence of Hitler's stated intentions. Document B has achieved some fame as a document and it has been challenged, arguing that its intention was more to do with internal dynamics in the regime than to express a genuine premeditated plan. The justifications are racial, strategic and economic and indicate long-term policy objectives and a coherent plan. Austria and Czechoslovakia are firmly on the agenda. However, in 1937 it was not clear whether these objectives were achievable – Italy was still backing Austria even though Mussolini had been alienated from the West; Czechoslovakia had a strong army on paper and alliances with France and Russia. So whether there could be any meaningful plan remains doubtful and the speech to the military leaders might well have had other purposes.

In May 1938 (Document C) Hitler is again urging the destruction of Czechoslovakia, easier now that Austria has been incorporated – both in military terms and in terms of the clear lack of opposition from France, Britain and Russia. However, the 'plan' for settling with the West may be mere rhetoric. Candidates may note that the adjutant seems surprised – yet he was close to Hitler; if the plan had been self-evident would this have been his reaction, or is this a post-war self-justification on the author's part? In D the generals are once more treated to a geopolitical outpouring, but the uncertainty shown by top Nazi circles when war did actually break out in 1939, as touched on in Document E, might cast some doubts on this. The audience of B, C and D must be considered here – top generals have to make plans for the political aims of regimes, but this does not necessarily indicate that those plans are blueprints to be fulfilled at particular times. There is a debate about whether the crisis in Poland was led by Hitler or driven by events that Hitler did not anticipate, such as the British guarantee and Colonel Beck's policies. Document E suggests that the truth lies in Hitler's personal determination to achieve his objectives before he died but also that when war came it was unexpected, suggesting something between hopes, objectives and priorities and a precise and calibrated plan. It might be possible to see Hitler's reaction in E as a sign that a plan for later war had been thwarted by unexpected resistance from Britain.

2 'Hitler became Chancellor more as a result of the political intrigues of others than his own political abilities.' Discuss. [30]

AO1 – Political intrigue should focus on the negotiations following the July 1932 elections. By then Hitler had seemed to be at the limit of what could be achieved electorally and the Nazi vote fell in November. Ironically, he was a victim of the undemocratic nature of Weimar by 1932, with presidential power and few Reichstag sittings. The only way forward seemed to be a coup but Von Papen could count on military support if this happened. The frustrations in the party were resulting in internal feuds and there is a strong case that Hitler might well have lost his opportunity had the Weimar elite stood firm and retained army support. However, the decision to oust Von Papen turned out to be crucial and the intrigues that surrounded that, the revenge that was taken by the meeting between Von Papen and Hitler, and the dismissal of Schleicher are well-known. Candidates could note the following: an ageing president manipulated by close advisers; the power-hungry political general Von Schleicher; and the shallow and self-centred Von Papen wrongly assuming that he could control Hitler and manipulate Hindenburg. However, candidates should also reflect on the considerable skills of Hitler: his policy of legality which showed understanding of the psyche of the *Mittelstand* and elites in Germany; his simplification and energetic conveying of key political ideas; his ability to ally with and use people like Hugenberg and the racial wing of his own party; his insights into popular concerns; and his ability to hold his nerve (at least in public) and not to sanction a coup.

AO2 – It was because Hitler had built up such a strong mass support that the elites negotiated with him. That was possible partly because of circumstances, but these circumstances had to be manipulated by an insightful politician – in themselves depression and hatred of Versailles could have been manipulated by others.

3 How far did Nazi policies towards women succeed in their aims?**[30]**

AO1 – The aims became blurred as the regime rearmed and went first into war, then total war. Initially, a series of lower middle class and conservative prejudices held the view of separate spheres for women and men – women were seen as domestic, child-rearing, artistic and inspirational. The progress made under Weimar towards greater emancipation was resented by the Nazis and to some extent reversed. Women political activists on the left were treated brutally; opportunities in work and higher education were reduced and a culture of motherhood and healthy marriage was supported in propaganda and legislation such as Marriage Loans. However, as the *Volksgemeinschaft* needed total participation, women and girls did take part in political life and there were party organisations dedicated to women, which amounted to a sort of empowerment. The Führer is said to have had great appeal for many women, and many women did welcome an official endorsement of homemaking and child-rearing so, with the greater prosperity of the 1930s, it is arguable that some aims were achieved.

The regime however, sent mixed messages – when rearmament began in earnest, women could not be spared and there was encouragement to return to the labour market and this increased during the war. Also, traditional *Hausfrau* values clashed with growing industrialisation and urban modernisation. On the one hand, women were urged to adopt a semi-rural life style, but on the other hand, they were needed for work in factories and shown glamorous actresses on screen. Nazi leaders' wives were seen as equivalent to film stars, not dirndl-wearing, healthy peasant mothers. Educationally, girls were restricted, but levels of instruction in household skills improved. The wartime experience, as with so many policies, could be said to have undermined progress, or could be said to have created more of the sense of social solidarity until Soviet invasion and Allied bombing raids led to horrific casualties.

AO2 – There is some debate about whether women were empowered or discriminated against and whether they were victims or perpetrators. Candidates could make a distinction between the earlier years of the regime and the impact of preparation for and prosecution of war.

4 Assess the view that the main reason for limited German resistance to the Nazi regime was the genuine popularity of Hitler and his policies. [30]

AO1 – German resistance took the form of: the underground activities of socialist and communist groups; individual acts; the resistance of the generals culminating in the Bomb Plot of 1944; the resistance of youth groups; opposition by religious groups to some aspects of policy, especially euthanasia; and isolated movements such as the opposition by ‘Aryan’ wives to the deportation of their Jewish husbands and the sheltering of ‘submarines’ (Jews). However, the question is more about why resistance did not achieve more. Candidates should discuss: the impact of supposed popularity, for example the recovery from the depression and the end of unemployment; the successful foreign policy; and the greater sense of national unity and pride. It could be argued that the repression and the police state were popular because they restored order and traditional values.

Candidates could discuss how popular the racial policies were, with some evidence that discrimination was generally approved of and driven from below. However, opposition was also limited because of its fragmented nature and the inability of opposition groups to work together or at the same time. The aims of the different groups and individuals were different; their planning was poor – suicidal opposition by the Krolls for instance, and the weaknesses of the 1944 plotters. On the other hand, candidates could note: the widespread acceptance of the regime (just how widespread could be discussed); the denunciation by members of the public of anything suspicious; the close supervision by block wardens and local party activists; the skills of the Gestapo and SD; the sense of isolation in the face of obvious successes by the regime in the 1930s and then the pressures of war; and the lack of any possibility of foreign help – even from communist Russia in the 1930s. These should be set against the consent of the governed and the inherent limitations of resisters.

AO2 – Candidates should debate different explanations for the limited German resistance. The track record of unity between opponents of the Nazis before 1933 had not been good. Conservatives and Catholics swallowed objections because of fear of the left. Communists and Social Democrats failed to act together. Trade unions seemed more worried about the effects of jobs than about the Nazis and they failed to launch strikes. Aristocratic militarists looked down on the Führer but were reassured by his blood-letting in 1934. From this basis it was not difficult to keep potential opposition fragmented, and Hitler was careful to keep up the propaganda and drew back from measures which might have been too unpopular. However, the war gave the regime the chance to intensify its enforcement of conformity, but also by 1944 created the only major opportunity for regime change. If the Bomb Plot had been more efficient, there must remain some doubt, given the adulation of Hitler and the public belief in him as the only way to protect themselves from the Soviets, as to whether the plotters would have succeeded.

