



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2M

Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Mark Scheme

2009 examination – January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2009

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2M: Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Question 1

- (a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the reactions to Nazi rule of those living in Germany in 1934. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

- L1:** Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**
- L3:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**
- L4** Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

Indicative content

Candidates should focus on the perception of events happening in Germany, particularly in 1934 and with some specific reference to the Night of the Long Knives.

There are some obvious differences, centred on the provenance of **Sources A** and **B**, as they are written from different perspectives. William L Shirer was an American correspondent and it is clear from his viewpoint as an outsider that much had changed for the worst in Berlin since Hitler came to power. He indicates that although the S.A.'s presence has diminished somewhat, the climate of fear was of great concern. **Source B** is taken from Hitler's personal newspaper and as such offers a very distorted view of the violence and the actual impact of Hitler's actions regarding the Röhm plot. It is clearly an attempt at justifying violence and Hitler's actions are viewed as being almost 'virtuous'. Good candidates will also be able to distinguish between the intent of the two sources, one a diary, the other a virtual mouthpiece for the Nazi Party.

There are some similarities. Both sources are examining the climate of change in Germany. **Source A** is reflecting upon change (negative); **Source B** suggests Hitler has forestalled change (positive). Both refer to Röhm's S.A. plot and in doing so both are passing comment and offering judgement on Hitler's short period in power. Both sources also comment on the use of fear.

As usual literal evidence, merely adopting an uncritical, line-by-line approach, will limit candidates to Level 1. The most effective responses will not only assemble the relevant information, including own knowledge but also apply it to support argued, comparative assessments.

(b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far did Nazi control in Germany depend on terror and intimidation by the end of 1934?

(24 marks)

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

The key requirement here is to assess how far had the Nazis consolidated their power by the end of 1934 using non-legal methods and how did the German people react to Nazi methods. There is a great deal of evidence to support both the 'terror' and 'legal' line of argument, particularly in all 3 sources. Those who support the non-legal viewpoint might comment on:

- the harassment and eventual banning of opposition
- the final Reichstag elections were dominated by terror and violence and a major precedent being set

- the activities of the S.A. and the S.S. and their swift reaction to events
- Hitler's pronouncements against the Jewish population
- the climate of fear within Germany.

Candidates may also choose to highlight that control also depended on the following:

- The Enabling Law – although this was only possible once other political parties were 'neutralised'
- the Nazi need for financial support from commerce and industry
- use of quasi legal methods, such as the Decree for the Protection of People and the State. One day after the Reichstag Fire this decree suspended most civil and political liberties and allowed the emergence of a stronger centralised government.

Candidates may well pursue the line of argument which suggests that this 'legal revolution' basically complemented Nazi intimidation and was part of the same mindset.

Good candidates will recognise the irony of Hitler's violent actions against those in his own party, the S.A., whom he considered out of control. Likewise the role of the army was central to Hitler's thinking if he wished to maintain power in 1934. He needed the army onside and **Source B** provides evidence of its gratitude to Hitler in the face of Röhm's desire to integrate the army and S.A. into a people's militia. Successful answers will either agree or disagree with the extent of terror as the key to Nazi control, supported by selective evidence from both sources and own knowledge. Less effective responses will tend to be literal and paraphrase the sources, or even neglect to use them.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Hitler replaced the trade unions with the German Labour Front. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

The key requirement here is to explain why Hitler chose to replace the trade unions with the German Labour Front. Clearly Hitler's motives were in line with the aims of a totalitarian regime. There are several reasons candidates may use to explain why the trade unions were banned by Hitler:

- the trade union movement had a mass membership and had powerful connections to the alternative ideologies of socialism and Catholicism
- German organised labour had previously shown industrial muscle towards Nazism and potentially was a major threat to future stability of the Nazi state
- it was timely to take on the unions in 1933 with the effects of the Depression still evident
- part of Hitler's desire was to extend his already considerable power
- part of the so-called 'legal revolution' which allowed Hitler to 'legitimise' his actions
- strict regulation of the workforce and their working practices.

The KDF and SDA were not intended as substitutes for trade unionism. Free collective bargaining was replaced by the creation of a corporate identity. One of its intentions was to destroy individual values and allow the Nazi regime to exploit the situation.

The German Labour Front subsumed all German workers' organisations. The DAF suited Hitler as it acted more as a vehicle for control than as a representative body of workers' interests and rights. The key aim was to break the power of the trade union movement, both politically and economically by controlling the organisation of labour.

- (b) 'The lives of German workers and peasants improved as a result of Nazi policies in the years 1933 to 1939.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Candidates should be aware that there is a great debate over the material well being of the German people, specifically workers and peasants in these years, and the premise of the questions demands assessment and evaluation over time. Superficially statistics in this period might suggest a rise but not a large one. However, in relative terms, a rather different picture emerges where at the best, the standard of living was static; at worst, it fell. Stephen Lee's analysis of the impact of the Nazi economy (Chapter 5 in *Hitler and Nazi Germany*) is very worthwhile.

Those who favour a rise in standards, an economic 'miracle', might pursue the following line:

- Germany was experiencing a steady growth in national income from 44 billion in 1933 to 80 billion in 1938
- unemployment was declining rapidly
- an increase in wages. Compared to 1928 levels, by 1938 wages had recovered by 85%
- an increase in consumerism
- the range of activities arranged in Strength Through Joy
- for most Germans there was not a constant fear of the S.S. and, unlike in the USSR, workers were not being driven to breaking point to reach targets.

Responses challenging the premise of the question may include:

- by the time Hitler came to power in 1933, Brüning's harsh measures were starting to have some positive effects
- there is an underlying assumption that any improvements after 1933 were purely due to Nazi policies
- the focus of the economy from 1936 was switched to rearmament; therefore declining unemployment was really due to the rise in armed forces
- a disciplined workforce was held down by lower wage levels. The wage earner was actually worse off in terms of the cost of living
- workers wages were earned by working longer hours
- the level of production of industrial goods far outstripped consumer goods
- choice and free-time were curtailed, as had been the trade unions.

Effective answers may therefore suggest that the German workforce was putting in longer hours for a notional increase in wages. Wages were in decline in comparison to the increase in the standard of living. Good answers will also highlight the fact that material conditions varied considerably from one class to another. Likewise, although the picture is blurred due to variables such as age, occupation and geographical location, it is clear that the best gains were made by those in industries associated with the rearmament boom, while those in consumer goods struggled to maintain their real incomes.

Of course candidates may examine the very nature of 'improvement', by taking a wider perspective than just an economic one. Tolerance of the Nazi regime did not necessarily equate with material well-being.

For industrial workers there were benefits:

- regular work
- stable rents
- recreational and cultural provision organised by the KDF.

The disadvantages however were:

- the loss of bargaining rights
- controlled pay increases
- lack of freedom of movement.

For peasants, the attraction was the promise of economic aid and the apparent sympathies of National Socialism. Nazi ideology – Blood and Soil – portrayed the peasants as the most radically pure of the *Volk*.

There were benefits for the peasantry:

- a substantial number of farm debts were written off
- all farmers benefited from increased prices between 1933 and 1939.

The disadvantages were:

- the Reich Food estate (1933) was headed by Richard Darre and controlled every aspect of agricultural production and consumption
- the security of tenure of medium sized farms was welcomed but also led to resentment as it forbade divisions of farms etc.
- despite public support of farmers, there was a drift to the towns in the late 1930s where wages were higher.

In general most farmers would have mixed feelings about Nazi policies. An awareness of differentiation over time might also prove profitable. Candidates may well choose to use 1936 as a bridging date to highlight the impact of the increased impact of rearmament.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why the invasion of the USSR changed the lives of those living in Germany in the years 1941 and 1942. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Candidates will recognise all warfare in general causes dislocation to the civilian population but answers which are generalised and simply refer to deprivation, uncertainty, insecurity and family separation will only receive a low level. Hitler's decision to invade the USSR, a huge and reckless gamble, clearly affected the population both physically and psychologically in a major way. Many students may argue that fighting on two fronts now made matters much worse for the German people, especially as the population was already under strain from the events of 1939–1941 and there were many Germans still unconvinced of the need for war. As Germany's military and economic plans were not due to mature until 1943–1945, the invasion and occupation meant serious hardship, even when at one point it appeared the army was winning. Germany was not prepared for the extent to which conflict had developed and reserves and economic power were stretched too thinly. With the increase in the theatres of war by 1942, the pressure on economic resources began to badly affect the population.

There were other factors:

- some answers may suggest that the invasion of 1941 unsettled the German public as people had been expecting news of a closer rapprochement between the Reich and the USSR
- Hitler made mistakes. Troops were sent into the USSR without the proper equipment and clothing. Even propaganda could not disguise this indefinitely from the population

- by December 1941 it was clear that Blitzkrieg had failed. This had huge knock on effects. The enormous increase in munitions required meant greater investment, more efficient mass production and, as there were labour shortages, a detrimental impact on the people
- the success of the Russian resistance and the disaster at Stalingrad gravely affected public morale. Even before Stalingrad, the security intelligence noted that the public were asking serious questions about the conduct of war. Because of the savagery of the fighting the public were concerned about the treatment of the POWs
- daily lives were affected by the growing influence of the Nazi party and the S.S. in particular. Greater central and local control was becoming apparent. The truth was difficult to assess due to the impact of propaganda
- The role of women and the war effort.

It is not expected that candidates will produce comprehensive answers but they should endeavour to select material which links the invasion with the impact on daily lives.

- (b) 'In the later stages of the war Hitler still commanded widespread support.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

The key requirement here is a direct response to a very provocative assertion. Many answers may disagree with the premise but some may produce evidence to suggest that while the Nazi Party had lost support by 1945, Hitler had not.

Many candidates may choose to examine the situation in Germany in 1945 as a contextual part of their answer. The following views may be expressed:

- defeat in 1945 was total and the population had no illusions. A summary of popular opinion in March 1945 reported that, although no one wanted to lose the war, nobody could have believed anymore that Germany could win
- there was a general feeling that it was Germany's own fault – not so much that of ordinary people but the leadership. It was widely thought that defeat could have been avoided and a great deal of popular criticism lay at the feet of the military. There was no faith in leadership, Party or propaganda and even the Führer, their last hope, was increasingly subject to criticism
- support had become more passive than active by 1945
- the criticism that did emerge was directed not at Hitler but at lesser Party leaders or the Party itself. This supports Hugh Trevor Roper's views that 'Hitler still remained, in the universal chaos he had caused, the sole master whose orders were implicitly obeyed'.

Other lines of argument may be pursued:

- Hitler, through his capacity for self-delusion, had lost support and credibility by 1943, never mind 1945
- allied bombing was having a very detrimental effect on Hitler's position from 1944 onwards
- the July 1944 bomb plot would suggest some in the military wanted rid of Hitler
- Hitler's nihilistic behaviour in 1945 received little support in Germany, where the public had little choice but to see the war to its conclusion
- Hitler's abrupt death brought an instant end to National Socialism and there were no enclaves of fanatical followers who wished to consider continuing Hitler's Crusade.

Others may suggest that as there was no German revolution in 1945, as there had been on 1918, there must have been a large amount of support for Hitler. Speer claimed that the public had great faith in Hitler and that right to the end he held something special in reserve. Highly effective answers will probably be aware of Kershaw's views on this. He states that Hitler's regime wasn't a narrowly based tyranny imposing its will upon the hostile masses of the population. Until the very end the terror had been targeted, and the level of, at least, partial consensus in all its reaches of society was extensive. The overwhelming mass of the population had been prepared to place their trust in a self-professed political saviour and all the previous triumphs in the war had been brought about not only with mass acclaim but with a high level of support from almost all non-Nazi elite groups; business, industry, civil service and above all, the armed forces. The logic being that there was no alternative but to follow the road to defeat. Whatever approach is adopted, there should be a balanced argument supported by appropriate selected evidence centred on the situation in Germany in the later stages of the war.