



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **AS History 1041**

## **Unit 2: HIS2N**

### **Anti-Semitism, Hitler and the German People, 1919–1945**

# **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](http://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**

**HIS2N: Anti-Semitism, Hitler and the German People, 1919–1945**

**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 position of the Jews in Germany in 1930. (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**

**Source B** suggests that there was a growing hostility towards Jews by 1930; that the Jewish owners of big department stores and consumer cooperatives were being blamed by troubled small shopkeepers and that struggling farmers saw Jews as scapegoats for their difficulties. The Jews are referred to as ‘inner enemies’, even in the universities. There is a climate of hostility against their ‘unGerman spirit’. **Source A**, on the other hand; suggests that the Jews were secure, politically equal, thriving economically and flourishing in intellectual, economic and political life, (the reference to ‘intellectual life’ directly contradicts the view of **Source B**). Furthermore it suggests they were socially accepted and only faced mild hostility at the most. Perhaps the strongest contrast comes in the last line of each extract. Whereas **Source B** suggests there was already a sign of a ‘potential bloodbath’, **Source A** considers the future attempted annihilation of the race something that could never have been foreseen at this time.

Candidates will be expected to apply the own knowledge to explain the position of the Jews in c1930, probably referring to the assimilation of the Jews during the Weimar Republic, but also to the growth of Nazism and the temptation to brand Jews as scapegoats in difficult times. They should also point to the similarities between the sources. Both accept some hostility towards the Jews although they differ on the degree. Both also suggest the Jews were wealthy and had

advanced themselves. Candidates might suggest that **Source A** is more concerned with the legal, economic and social position of the Jews and that this does not necessarily conflict with the opinion shown in **Source B**. Nevertheless the overall impression is that the writer of **Source A** is far more positive in his assessment of the Jewish situation, whereas the author of **Source B** adopts a negative stance, already perhaps, seeing the position of the Jews in the light of what was to come.

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

How far did anti-Semitism restrict the opportunities for Jews in Germany in the years 1919 to 1930?

(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

All three sources provide information on the position of the Jews in Weimar Germany. **Source A** refers to the assimilation and prosperity of Jews, **Source B** to undercurrents of anti-Semitism, restricting Jewish opportunities although this source is confined to the position in 1930, and **Source C** to the Freedom and opportunities that were open to Jews in politics, the press and the arts. This directly contradicts the idea that anti-Semitism was restricting opportunities for Jews 1919–1933.

Some of the ways in which anti-Semitism restricted the opportunities for Jews may include:

- political Hostility – especially the Right wing complaints about ‘Jewish politicians’ and financiers
- murder of Rathenau and Jews associated with defeat in First World War and the treaty of Versailles
- the association of Jews with communism which led them to be shunned/regarded with suspicion
- the challenge posed by the rise of Right Wing Nationalist parties, e.g. the Nazis, which encouraged active discrimination
- the importance of anti-Semitism in the election campaigns to 1930 and the street violence by the SA showing the spread of discrimination.

Some of the ways in which anti-Semitism made little or no difference to the position of the Jews may include:

- the granting of equal political/social rights as enshrined in the Weimar constitution
- the freedom and equality of the Weimar years which ensure there were opportunities available to Jews which allowed them to rise in the professions and creative world: 11% of Germany’s doctors and 16% of Lawyers were Jewish
- contemporary evidence that most Jews considered themselves Germans first, Jews second and that they integrated well in the liberal atmosphere of the Weimar Republic and lack of evidence of active discrimination
- limitations to the spread of anti-Semitic ideas which rested with the minority and extremists.

## Question 2

(a) Explain why Hitler passed the Nuremberg Laws in 1935. (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 passing of the Nuremberg Laws stemmed from:

- Hitler's own anti-Semitism and his anti-Semitic programme from the 1920s
- pressures from radicals within his party—especially the Gauleiter to remove Jews from citizenship
- pressure from moderates within the party who wanted SA attacks on Jews regularised, e.g. Schacht was concerned about the effect on exports
- Hitler's speech at the Nuremberg rally—a last minute decision with laws written overnight by civil servants.

(b) 'Before 1939, there was no plan behind the anti-Semitic actions of the Nazi regime.'  
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 may suggest there was no plan behind the anti-Semitic actions of the Nazi regime before 1939 because:

- measures followed a haphazard pattern, e.g. in 1933 some Jews were deprived of jobs in 1935 all lost citizenship, in 1938 further anti-Jewish decrees affecting employment
- anti-Semitic attacks were not always authorised and sometimes counter productive e.g. in 1935 and Reichkristallnacht, 1938
- the Boycott of Jewish shops 1933 was allowed to take place even though it did more harm than good, (Schacht resigned in 1937 over economic impact of the ill thought out measures)
- Jews were not excluded from economic life until 1938
- anti-Semitic attacks were reduced in 1936 because of the Olympic games
- Himmler was put in charge of Jewish emigration in 1936 but little was done until the Anschluss (1938) forced action
- Range of indiscriminate Jewish decrees was produced in 1938 which would not have been necessary had emigration been seen as the planned way forward.

On the other hand, evidence that there was planning might include:

- the stream of legislation and measures which developed 1933–1939, with each year adding to the discrimination against the Jews
- Hitler's pronouncements from the 1920s which suggested he had an intentional anti-Semitic policy to carry through
- the logic of waiting until the party was in full control and economically secure before launching Reichkristallnacht and so accelerating steps towards driving the Jews from German life
- the development of emigration as a policy from 1934–which would have continued but for the breakout of war.

**Question 3**

- (a) Explain why euthanasia was introduced in Germany in 1939. (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**

Euthanasia was introduced because:

- Hitler's radical policies stressed the need for a healthy Aryan race which meant the elimination of those whose genes posed a threat, e.g. Jewish and people with hereditary illnesses
- the mentally/physically ill were regarded as a burden to the community (financially and morally) impeding the path to radical supremacy and weakening the state. Gypsies were regarded as asocial/unwilling to work
- before 1939 the Nazi position had not been strong enough to attempt this potentially unpopular policy—so there had been a reliance on sterilisation—but this was not deemed adequate
- degeneration of standards in Nazi state; propaganda to prepare public and staff especially through films—argument that science had acted against the natural laws of selection
- immediate trigger was a letter to Hitler in 1939 from a father asking that his deformed son be 'put to sleep' – a random policy decision?
- Success in war emboldened the Nazis and allowed Hitler to pay less heed to potential opposition.

Candidates may mention that a public outcry following the opposition of Bishop Galen led to the end of the practice of Euthanasia for the mentally ill (but not for Gypsies) after 1941 – hence euthanasia (which began October 1939) was at its height in 1940.

- (b) 'It was the invasion of the USSR which changed Nazi policies towards the Jews under German rule in the years 1941 to 1945.'  
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 invasion of the USSR (June 1941) changed the position of the Jews in that:

- it immediately added 3 million Russian Jews to the German Empire
- German forces with orders to round up and shoot Russian Communists and their Jewish supporters took matters into their own hands in disposing Jews
- the *Einsatzgruppen* carried out mass shootings in an attempt to control numbers (possibly half a million Jews in Russia were shot in June) and established a new level of brutality
- German Jews were ordered to wear the Star of David Oct 1941—a sign that Jews were to be more effectively marked out everywhere—and emigration of Jews was banned—a change of policy
- deportations to the East became possible (began October 1941)—but Soviet resistance prevented Jews being moved East of the Urals causing need for changed policy—overcrowding
- December 1941: the mass gassing of Jews at Chelmo camp set a precedent

- 
- January 1942: Wannsee Conference planned the Final Solution (probably following a decision taken in July/October 1941) – only possible in circumstances of war and Russian struggle?
  - 1942–1943 Extermination programme put into effect and hidden whilst war in east raged (i.e. would not have been possible without the distraction/'cover-up' of the war against Russia)

Arguments suggesting it was not the invasion of the USSR which changed the Jews' position include:

- Hitler's long-term anti-Semitic views and actions against the Jews which suggest its intention was always to move to the holocaust. Persecution developed its own momentum
- the brutalisation/radicalisation of the regime was already well underway before 1941 – e.g. *Reichkristallnacht* and escalation of anti-Semitic violence had been seen from 1938
- anti-Semitic propaganda had blinded the Germans and state lawlessness and the chaotic nature of the Third Reich meant that the Holocaust was waiting to happen
- the invasion of Poland was more important than that of Russia because it increased the Jewish population and the first mass killings were there in 1939-1941
- the war in general helped towards brutalisation – not just the invasion of Russia
- the euthanasia programme from October 1939 had set a precedent – invasion may just have provided the opportunity
- the timing of the Holocaust may have been more connected to the development of the necessary technical expertise in order for it to be carried out than military campaigning
- killing Hungarian Jews and death marches in 1944 can be seen in the context of the knowledge of certain defeat. As it became clear the Nazis faced defeat, they saw the elimination of the Jews their most significant work
- 75% of all victims of the Holocaust died after March 1942, suggesting that the push to achieve extermination of the Jews came after the war in the East turned against Germany.

In conclusion, candidates are likely to suggest that the invasion of Russia was the catalyst rather than the sole cause of the escalation of Nazi policy leading to the attempt to eliminate the Jewish race. Some may cite the historiographical debate between internationalists and structuralists, but this is not essential and it is more important that candidates understand the evidence on which such views are based than the names of specific historians or schools of historiography.