



# Cambridge Pre-U

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/59**

Paper 5i Special Subject: Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

**For examination from 2022**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Specimen**

---

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

This document has **8** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

## Introduction

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

## Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

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

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

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

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

## Assessment Objectives

### AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

### AO2

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

### AO3

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

## Levels-based mark schemes

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

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 1**

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

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks</b>	<b>Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	9–10 marks Full analysis of all the documents as a set, interpreting them in relation to the question.	17–20 marks Well-sustained critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is well explained and supported throughout. Has a precise focus on the question. Coherent and developed judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on clear and persuasive evidence from the documents in their historical context.
<b>4</b>	7–8 marks Analyses all the documents, interpreting them in relation to the question, but some unevenness in depth or coverage of the documents.	13–16 marks Generally sustains a critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is mostly well explained and supported throughout. Has a broad focus on the question. Coherent judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on evidence from the documents in their historical context which is mostly clear and persuasive, but unevenly developed.
<b>3</b>	5–6 marks Some analysis of all the documents, with some interpretation of them in relation to the question. Uneven in depth of coverage of the documents with some omissions, description or irrelevance.	9–12 marks Some critical evaluation of evidence from the documents, but unevenly supported and explained. Generally coherent and contains some argument applicable to the question. Undeveloped judgement based predominantly on evidence from the documents which is occasionally clear and persuasive.
<b>2</b>	3–4 marks Limited analysis of the documents, with little interpretation of them in relation to the question. The depth of coverage of the documents will be very uneven, with significant omissions or evidence of misinterpretation of some documents, and with much description or irrelevance.	5–8 marks Limited critical evaluation of the evidence from the documents. Generalised critical comments with limited support and uneven explanations. Generally coherent and introduces argument which is mostly relevant to the topic. Attempts a judgement but offers limited supporting evidence from the documents.
<b>1</b>	1–2 marks Describes or paraphrases the documents. Little or no analysis and there may be major omissions of documents and very limited reference to the question. Answers reveal serious misinterpretation of the documents.	1–4 marks Little critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Has some coherence. Few parts of the response are relevant. It responds to some of the issues raised by the topic. No judgement beyond simple and unsupported assertions or relies on description of the documents.
<b>0</b>	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B about the place of women in Nazi Germany. You should analyse the content and provenance of both documents.</b></p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources agree that women should not be involved in actual combat (Document A – ‘everything that entails combat is exclusively men’s business’; Document B – a women’s battalion ‘is out of the question’).</li> <li>• Document A denies misogyny or that women were seen as ‘machines for making children’; Document B agrees, challenging the ‘a child for the Führer’ myth as being the work of ‘a few fanatics’.</li> <li>• Both suggest a more caring role for women (Document A – ‘training of youth, and in good works’; Document B speaks of a role as medics).</li> </ul> <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document A specifically denies women any political role, whilst Document B makes no reference to this.</li> <li>• Document A focuses on women in a creative role and identifies specific examples; Document B suggests a supporting military role and later indicates training of BDM to use pistols in the face of possible Bolshevik assaults.</li> </ul> <p>Provenance:</p> <p>The view of Hitler in his dinner conversations in 1942 was very different from the views reported in Document A when the situation in Germany had become more desperate. In early 1942, the Führer’s petit bourgeois view of women could still be held, though, in practice by this time, women were working more in the war effort. The Table Talk is not a considered policy statement. By the end of the war, it had become unrealistic with the Russian invasion. The recollections of Rüdiger in 1987 are different from the table conversation and cover the later part of the war.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks						
2	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that there was not a Nazi revolution in Germany in 1933? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in this set (C–F).</b></p> <p>Main issue:</p> <p>The issue here is the degree of change and the degree of continuity. The Nazi regime did not establish itself as a totally new state. The party coexisted with the old state and there were strong elements of continuity. However, there were also elements of radical change which laid the basis for future ‘revolution’.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 685 1326 1771"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 685 815 775">Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="815 685 1326 775">Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 775 815 1200"> <p>Document C stresses continuity with the past (part of the point of the ‘Day of Potsdam’ for Hitler was to reassure the conservative middle classes). The evidence seems to suggest that there was no revolution as such rather cooperation with the symbol of Germany’s military elite, no racial ideology and no hatred, but respect for tradition.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="815 775 1326 1200"> <p>Document C: This document needs to be put in context. Hitler was eager to reassure conservative Germany and establish continuity with the Prussian past. This official’s son is impressed by the lack of ideology and hatred. The careful omission of Hitler’s usual rants against opposition or Jews, and the stress of tradition, hid a radicalism that emerged more and more as the regime became more confident.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1200 815 1771"> <p>Document D: Revolutionary change is clearer in Document D, which represents a more revolutionary outlook, one based on race and not class. Calls for ‘new political forms’ and ‘a new understanding of history’ may not be revolutionary, but for ‘new human beings’ most decidedly is revolutionary.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="815 1200 1326 1771"> <p>Document D: This very ideological viewpoint being broadcast shows perhaps the revolutionary side of Nazism. The development of radical racial policies shows how seriously this was taken even though it remained rather academic propaganda in 1933. The racial policies were introduced with some caution, though there was an increase in laws for dealing with hereditary medical conditions and a euthanasia programme was underway before 1939. The broadcast reflects aspiration rather than the actual policies of 1933.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	<p>Document C stresses continuity with the past (part of the point of the ‘Day of Potsdam’ for Hitler was to reassure the conservative middle classes). The evidence seems to suggest that there was no revolution as such rather cooperation with the symbol of Germany’s military elite, no racial ideology and no hatred, but respect for tradition.</p>	<p>Document C: This document needs to be put in context. Hitler was eager to reassure conservative Germany and establish continuity with the Prussian past. This official’s son is impressed by the lack of ideology and hatred. The careful omission of Hitler’s usual rants against opposition or Jews, and the stress of tradition, hid a radicalism that emerged more and more as the regime became more confident.</p>	<p>Document D: Revolutionary change is clearer in Document D, which represents a more revolutionary outlook, one based on race and not class. Calls for ‘new political forms’ and ‘a new understanding of history’ may not be revolutionary, but for ‘new human beings’ most decidedly is revolutionary.</p>	<p>Document D: This very ideological viewpoint being broadcast shows perhaps the revolutionary side of Nazism. The development of radical racial policies shows how seriously this was taken even though it remained rather academic propaganda in 1933. The racial policies were introduced with some caution, though there was an increase in laws for dealing with hereditary medical conditions and a euthanasia programme was underway before 1939. The broadcast reflects aspiration rather than the actual policies of 1933.</p>	30
Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)							
<p>Document C stresses continuity with the past (part of the point of the ‘Day of Potsdam’ for Hitler was to reassure the conservative middle classes). The evidence seems to suggest that there was no revolution as such rather cooperation with the symbol of Germany’s military elite, no racial ideology and no hatred, but respect for tradition.</p>	<p>Document C: This document needs to be put in context. Hitler was eager to reassure conservative Germany and establish continuity with the Prussian past. This official’s son is impressed by the lack of ideology and hatred. The careful omission of Hitler’s usual rants against opposition or Jews, and the stress of tradition, hid a radicalism that emerged more and more as the regime became more confident.</p>							
<p>Document D: Revolutionary change is clearer in Document D, which represents a more revolutionary outlook, one based on race and not class. Calls for ‘new political forms’ and ‘a new understanding of history’ may not be revolutionary, but for ‘new human beings’ most decidedly is revolutionary.</p>	<p>Document D: This very ideological viewpoint being broadcast shows perhaps the revolutionary side of Nazism. The development of radical racial policies shows how seriously this was taken even though it remained rather academic propaganda in 1933. The racial policies were introduced with some caution, though there was an increase in laws for dealing with hereditary medical conditions and a euthanasia programme was underway before 1939. The broadcast reflects aspiration rather than the actual policies of 1933.</p>							

Question	Answer		Marks
2	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	
	Document E sees revolution brought about by language and the 'mechanisation of the individual'. Values have been changed by the use of language which amounts to a revolution.	Document E is likely to date from later in the 1930s. The widespread use of propaganda terms in everyday life are well documented and even the ' <i>Heil Hitler</i> ' greeting in place of more traditional words was significant. Brutal acts of violence being given titles, for example, ' <i>Kristallnacht</i> ' or 'resettlement', might be used as evidence. However, this diary is from an academic, and the link between language and changing values is only a theory.	
	Document F stresses surface continuity between the new Nazi regime and the past, and Goebbels certainly avoided too much ideology. Foreign influences, for example, from America remained strong and civil servants continued to work in their posts if they were not Jewish.	Document F may be confirmed by contextual knowledge of continuity. Many economic institutions remained in private hands as before, and the Nazi Party organisation did not replace the traditional state for much of the Nazi period, though an SS state was developing in the war. However, the source may stress continuities too much. Education and many social institutions were undermining traditions, the basis for further change was being established, and, notably, there was the start of racial discrimination.	
	<p>Possible judgements (AO2):</p> <p>Some of the evidence suggests continuity (Documents C and F). However, Documents D and E suggest new values, new vocabulary and the revolutionary potential of the Nazi takeover. Answers may argue that this was revolution disguised by an appeal to tradition (Document C), some continuity with Weimar (Document F) and legalism. The ideology of Document E was not immediately put into practice, but seeds had been sown.</p>		