

## Year 9 Mid Topic Test Mark Scheme

*Question One: How does Interpretation B differ from Interpretation A about the cause of the Reichstag Fire?*

### **Level 1**

**1 -2 Marks**

**Simple analysis of interpretation(s) to identify differences based on their content**

Students are likely to identify relevant features in each interpretation(s). For example, the Reichstag fire according to Diels (Interpretation A), was purposefully caused by van der Lubbe. Halder (Interpretation B) claims that it was Goering who set the fire.

### **Level 2**

**3 – 4 Marks**

**Developed analysis of interpretations to explain differences based on their content**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of interpretations with extended reasoning to explain the differences.

For example, how Interpretation A emphasises that there is only one real suspect for the fire and that there is clear evidence that supports the idea it was van der Lubbe who committed the arson. Diels does this when he suggests he confessed and was caught whilst still lighting the flames. By comparison Interpretation B suggests that Goering was guilty and how the author came to this conclusion by overhearing Goering 'owning up' about it at a party. Therefore, demonstrating a clear divide between the two interpretations.

*Question Two: Why might the authors of Interpretations A and B have a different interpretation about the cause of the Reichstag Fire?*

**Level 1**

**1 -2 Marks**

**Simple answers analyse provenance to identify reasons for difference(s)**

For example, the answer may focus on the motives behind the Interpretations. Interpretation A was by Diels who was Nazi head of police in 1933, who wanted to prove he had made the right arrest. Interpretation B was by Halder, another high ranking Nazi, who was on trial and probably wanted to tell the court what they wanted to hear/make himself look better.

**Level 2**

**3 – 4 Marks**

**Developed answer analyses provenance of interpretation to explain reasons for differences.**

Students may progress from identification to explanation of the reasons for differences in the interpretations with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge or understanding related to, for example, differences in provenance, context of their time of writing, place, previous experience, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, and access to information, purpose and audience.

For example, students may argue, although both interpretations are from high ranking Nazi officials, they would differ on their purpose/motive. Diels, the head of police, was keen to show that they had done their job effectively and defending the choices he had made. If he was to claim, 17 years after the crime, that someone else had actually caused the fire he would look incompetent. Therefore, he is unlikely to say anything different. Whereas, Halder was on trial at the Nuremburg War Crimes Trial and his interpretation would have been given under oath. Consequently, he may be telling the truth or telling the court what they wanted to hear so he would receive less punishment if he was able to contribute to the evidence brought against a high ranking official such as Goering. Therefore, the two men have different aims when they are recalling their version of events.