



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2N

Anti-semitism, Hitler and the German People, 1919–1945

Mark Scheme

2010 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 © 2010 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 2010

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 attitudes to anti-Jewish violence Germany 1933 to 1939. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| | Nothing written worthy of credit. | 0 |
| 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. | 1-2 |
| 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Source A explains how some educated Germans found the Nazi's anti-semitic propaganda distasteful and even laughable. Maschmann the German woman discussed in the source does not take part in the violence against Jews but does feel it is justified. She goes on to become an active member of the Nazi party.

Source B gives the views of a member of the Hitler Youth about the violence against the Jews and those of an eye witness to the violence. It tells us that some of the Hitler youth boy took part in the violence but felt it was against their moral code and that Horst-Werner Kunze found the violence repugnant.

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources, for example:

- in Source B the eye-witness, Horst-Werner Kunze finds the violence repugnant whilst in Source A Maschmann feels that the violence is justified
- Source A suggesting the propaganda doesn't work but then suggests it does by showing support for Nazi action whilst B demonstrates loyalty to Hitler but questions the violence.

Candidates will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example refer to:

- the widespread horror at the actions of the SA and SS in acts of violence against the Jews, notably on Kristallnacht
- the fact that some 'well respected' Germans including Doctors joined in the violence on Kristallnacht
- failure of the Boycott of Jewish businesses in 1933.

To address 'how far' they should also indicate some similarity between the sources, for example:

- Horst-Werner Kunze in Source B does think the violence is 'not necessarily immoral' and Maschmann (Source A) sees the Jews as the enemies of Germany and therefore, the violence is justified
- both observe the violence from the outside
- both sources show the impact of Nazi ideas on young people. In both there are some misgivings but they are not acted on showing the power of propaganda and terror.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that both sources have misgivings about elements of Anti-semitic action but Source A shows support for the violence, Source B is repulsed by it.

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

How successful was Nazi propaganda in promoting anti-Semitism in Germany in the years 1933 to 1939? (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest success against others which do not. All these sources provide reference to propaganda and candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- Source A: 'Constantly exposed to anti-semitic propaganda, Maschmann later remembered that she and her upper-middle-class friends had considered it rather vulgar, and often laughed at attempts to convince them that the Jews performed ritual murders and similar crimes.' This shows that propaganda may have been ineffective towards the well educated. This will be questioned by some candidates based on the provenance and end of the source
- Source A: 'As educated people they looked down on the anti-semitic scandal sheet *Der Sturmer*' This suggests that some extreme Propaganda may have been ineffective
- Source A: 'Maschmann accepted that they were justified, and told herself: 'The Jews are the enemies of the new Germany... If the Jews sow hatred against us all over the world, they must learn that we have hostages for them in our hands' This seems to contradict the first part of the source showing acceptance of Nazi views
- Source B suggests that Nazi's had failed to convince even the Hitler Youth that the violence against Jews as acceptable, 'provoked revulsion and a number of Hitler Youth asked themselves whether the Fuhrer condoned such acts'
- Source B shows that even those who found the violence repugnant struggled to condemn it as immoral suggesting success in Propaganda
- Source C suggests 'some impact' but was 'limited to reinforcing the existing generally negative image of the Jews'
- Source C, it states they failed to win people over to 'the dynamic racism characteristic of Nazi ideology'
- Source C shows that although people may gain negative views of Jews in general they 'often distinguished between individual Jews who they knew and liked and Jews in general'.

From own knowledge:

Candidates will judge the level of support there was in Nazi Germany in the years 1933–1939 for the Nazis' anti-semitic policy. This will include looking at the public reaction to the boycott of Jewish Shops (1933), the Nuremberg Laws (1935) and Kristallnacht (1938). They may compare the level of support for anti-semitic policy to the comparatively low level of anti-semitism in Germany during the Weimar republic.

Specific details which might be used to suggest success might include:

- 'Revolution from below'
- support for the Nuremberg laws with Germans seemingly accepting the idea of Jews being segregated
- Nazis set up agencies to track German public opinion and react to it
- Nazi research showed that Hitler was popular with the German people and so policies with his personal backing were more likely to be well received
- many Germans approved of the actions on Kristallnacht and took part, including attacking and killing Jews
- Catholic and Protestant bishops did not condemn Kristallnacht
- large number of visitors to 'Eternal Jew' exhibition in 1937
- Goebbels understanding of the power of film and radio, in particular the need for films to entertain

- use of all mediums to bombard German people, some propaganda was subtle other propaganda was more extreme
- large increase in Cinema audiences (250 million movie goers in 1933, 1000 million in 1939)
- radio heard in 4.5 million households in 1933, this rose to 16 million in 1940
- the wide publication and prominent placement of *Der Sturmer*.

Specific details which might be used to suggest failure might include:

- ineffective boycott of Jewish shops in 1933
- some of the German population didn't like some extreme Nazi propaganda such as the portrayal of Jews as rats in the 'Eternal Jew'. Such extreme images damaged the credibility of Nazi propaganda
- many Germans disapproved of the events on Kristallnacht in 1938
- Hindenburg insisting those Jews who had fought in WWI should be excluded from anti-semitic laws of 1933
- candidates could argue that it was not propaganda that led to acceptance and compliance with anti-semitic laws but the Nazi use of terror
- opposition to the Euthanasia programme and also opposition groups such as the Confessional Church and Edelweiss Pirates.

Good answers are likely to (or may) concluded that propaganda reinforced the anti-semitism of already convinced anti-Semites and was effective on the young but did not universally convert the German people to radical anti-semitism.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Hitler blamed the Jews for Germany's humiliation in the Treaty of Versailles. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-2**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Hitler blamed Jews for Germany's humiliation in the Treaty of Versailles.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Germany's defeat led to a personal crisis for Hitler and pushed him towards looking for someone to blame
- Hitler saw the signing of the Treaty as the work of 'socialist' politicians, and he equated socialist with Jews
- Walter Rathenau the Jewish Minister of Reconstruction accepted the idea of complying with the treaty
- Hitler's belief in 'The Protocols of the Elders of Zion'
- Hitler's view that Jewish businessmen had profited from the war.

Candidates may refer to some of the following long term factors:

- Hitler's anti-semitism pre-World War One, such as his belief that Jews racially and practically corrupted Germany
- his belief in Social-Darwinism
- Hitler believed before World War One that killing German Jews would improve the war effort.

To reach the higher levels candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might suggest that Hitler's existing Anti-Semitism was key or link his belief about a Jewish conspiracy to the fact there were Jewish politicians such as Walter Rathenau who were responsible for carrying out the stipulations of the Treaty.

- (b) 'The Weimar Republic was a period of successful assimilation of Jews into German society.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will judge the level of Jewish assimilation into German society 1919–1933. They will look at evidence that suggests there was successful assimilation.

Specific details which might be used to suggest successful assimilation might include:

- Germany was seen as one of if not the safest place for Jews in Europe

- Jews were highly involved in the political, cultural and economic life of Germany. One in every four German Jews was marrying into a Christian family. Socially they were gaining acceptance as well
- 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% 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 the lack of evidence of active discrimination
- limitations to the spread of anti-semitic ideas which rested with the minority and extremists.

Specific details which might be used to suggest failure of assimilation might include:

- political hostility – especially the Right-wing complaints about 'Jewish politicians' and financiers
- the murder of Rathenau and Jews associated with defeat in World War I 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 street violence by the SA showing the spread of discrimination.

Good answers are likely to conclude that whilst there was anti-semitism in Weimar Germany, it was considered the best the progressive country in Europe in terms of opportunities and acceptance of Jews.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why the Madagascar plan was proposed in July 1940. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

- 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. **1-2**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Madagascar plan was proposed in July 1940.

- The invasion of countries in Western and Eastern Europe in 1939 and 1940 had massively increased the number of Jews under Nazi rule
- the attempts to force the emigration of all Jews from the German controlled areas in Eastern Europe, in the years 1938–1940 had failed
- the outbreak of war had closed most sea lanes to German shipping ending the chances of normal emigration
- the 'French Solution' led to protests from the French Vichy Government.
- the surrender of Britain seemed likely in 1940 making the Madagascar plan seem feasible
- Hitler and other Nazis were enthusiastic about the plan.

Candidates may refer to long term factors such as:

- this plan had been popular amongst the anti-Semites across Europe for many years
- Hitler's speeches and writings in which he spoke of ridding Europe of Jews
- Nazi co-operation with Zionist Jews.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of these reasons given, for example they might talk about the coming together of long term ideological goals with the circumstances of 1940.

- (b) 'The decision to exterminate all Jews was taken in the year 1941.'
Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1941–1942. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement which agree that Operation Barbarossa was the key event in Nazis decision to kill the Jews, in the years 1941–1945 against others which do not.

Specific details which might be used to suggest the decision was taken in 1941 might include:

- as late as August 1941 it has been argued that there was no clear plan to kill all of the European Jews. Operation Barbarossa provided the required circumstances for the decision to be made
- Hitler saw Jews and Communists as one in the same, Operation Barbarossa, therefore required the extermination of the Jews
- the invasion of the USSR massively increased the number of Jews under German rule.
- Mommensen argues that the Holocaust was largely initiated by local Nazi authorities in occupied eastern Europe due to their problems with coping with the masses of Jews under their control
- Kershaw argues that Hitler's decision to carry out genocide out of a sense of desperation and due to his desire for revenge for the massive losses the Germans were taking on the Eastern front
- war with the USSR was a war of 'annihilation' and the 'Final Solution' was part of this
- the actions of the Einsatzgruppen in Poland and elsewhere in Eastern Europe showed that the 'Final Solution' was under way in 1941.

Specific details which might be used to suggest other dates were more important might include:

- there is no disguising Hitler's desire to rid Europe of Jews as is widely expressed in his rhetoric, the timing of the decision can therefore be seen as academic
- the Wannsee Conference of January 1942 spelled out the plans eliminating the Jewish population of occupied Europe.

Specific material that might suggest 1941 may be the year of the decision:

- March 1941 Hitler tells generals that the war against USSR was to be a war of extermination
- June/July 1941 Einsatzgruppen move into USSR
- mass killing of Jews at Babi Yar, Kiev September 1941
- mass killings of Jews in Riga November 1941
- gassing of Jews at Chelmno
- war against Bolsheviks seen as a war against the Jews, meaning the Nazis saw the need to exterminate the Jews.

Specific material that might suggest 1941 was not the year the decision was made:

- It was not the offensive itself in 1941, but its failure to achieve a quick victory that was significant, e.g. early 1942 it was clear a quick victory would not come
- Wannsee Conference January 1942, can be seen as the point the arrangements for the Final Solution were made. This plays down the significance of Barbarossa it was 1942 when:
 - March gassings begin at Belzec
 - April, Sobibor opened as a death camp
 - May, mass gassings at Auschwitz
- reaction to assassination of Reinhardt Heydrich (May 1942).

Good answers are likely to conclude that the decision to kill Europe's Jews was not fully in place in 1941 but had certainly started. The formalisation of the policy took place in 1942 at Wannsee but it seems this was consolidating a policy that had already begun.