



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

AS History 1041

HIS2M

Unit 2M

Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Final

Mark Scheme

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

June 2010

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

HIS2M: Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Question 1

01 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 experiences of young people in Nazi Germany in the 1930s. (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.

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source A is a negative response to being in the Hitler Youth – ‘I have oppressive memories’
- Source B, although not solely about being in the BDM, is positive and upbeat – ‘I thought it was a good time’
- the tone of the two sources. Source A refers to a time of physicality, which revolved around ‘boring, military drill’; Source B refers to a fondness for ‘amusements’ such as

parades and celebrations and said she 'liked' them and did not see any negative connotations.

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

- the fact that one recollection is from a male; the other from a female and the importance which gender played in Nazi Germany
- Klonne in Source A appears to be less gullible than Kranz in Source B. He is much more critical and aware that there were clearly ulterior motives behind all the regimentation he received. He expresses his concern and tries to perceive what the logic behind it all was. He accepts that 'ambition' was a driving force but he also notes that the end result 'meant that those on top put the boot in'
- Kranz in Source B appears to be taking a more personal line, i.e. how Nazi rule in general related to her own family and others and sees the role of 'order and discipline' as a plus, not a minus
- Kranz refers to her own lack of political correctness and this may be useful in any assessment of difference.

To address 'how far', candidates should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both are recollections by young people many years after the events
- both comment in varying degrees of detail on the importance and value of discipline.

In considering provenance, candidates may discuss the significance of the different experiences of males and females within youth organisations and how this may have shaped their views.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that overall the sources differ considerably, particularly in the way that Kranz is clearly convinced of the value of Nazi policies, even after a long passage of time, whereas Klonne is very sceptical.

Question 1

02 Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How successful was the Nazi regime in indoctrinating German youth 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.

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

Source A makes it clear that, for Klönne, the constant repetition of drill was monotonous and therefore the experience of the Hitler Youth was counter productive to Nazi aims. His final comment is clearly not a vote of confidence, more a sinister warning and a suggestion that if physical force was necessary to get the message over, then indoctrination was not succeeding.

Source B differs by offering a clear vote of confidence in Nazi policies, especially as regards Kranz's view of the improvement in conditions for all.

Source C, using a different context (education), also notes the use of compulsion, as in **Source A**. Whilst it doesn't reveal any assessment of Nazi policies, it points out that a compulsory, one-model-fits-all approach was used. It also notes how the Nazis intended to interfere in all subjects, whether ideologically based or not. **Source C** continues to make it clear what the intention of education was to be – 'in the spirit of National Socialism'.

From candidates' own knowledge:

- the morale of teachers slumped in schools
- there was constant interference by the HJ, whose members were encouraged to reject their teachers' authority
- by 1938 there were 3000 vacancies in elementary state schools and early retirement was increasing.
- any assessment about Nazi educational success is tentative as it was vague and contradictory.

In this evaluation, candidates may well wish to briefly examine the different types of schools and their success in indoctrinating students.

Factors suggesting that indoctrination was successful might include:

- many young people did enjoy some of the opportunities, such as hiking and camping
- community values were popular with children from poorer backgrounds; less so with the middle class
- the HJ did reinforce certain values and stereotypes, notably glorification of all things military or patriotic and contempt for peace and humanity
- National Socialism's dynamism and sense of purpose proved attractive to many, even before compulsory membership

Factors suggesting an alternative view might include:

- the quality of its leadership was generally poor. Often middle class pupils proved to be unsuitable leaders of working class youths, already in employment
- many staff and parents felt that children were brutalised particularly in terms of military emphasis (of course one could argue therefore that there was some success, however malevolent)
- some teachers were concerned at the contempt shown towards anything intellectual
- by the time war started in 1939 many young people had formed illegal gangs to escape the suffocating influence of the Nazis.

Good answers are likely to conclude that it is very difficult to assess the success of indoctrination, particularly when applied to education and when the system being assessed is part of a one-party state. As Layton states, recent research suggests that German youth had not been won over by 1939, despite a great deal of good and ambitious education in the Hitler Youth, and that alienation and opposition to the regime actually increased in the war years. Many of the SOPADE reports confirm this, especially in the mid to later 1930s, i.e. change over time. Peukert suggests by 1938 there was a growing crisis in the HJ. Sax and Kuntz found that by the late 1930s students on the one hand could no longer think for themselves (a sign of indoctrination?) but on the other hand were incapable of providing the leadership, intellectual or technical, for the future. Some candidates may note both the connection and distinction between indoctrination and propaganda. The long term indoctrination of the youth involved regular exposure to propaganda but on the whole propaganda was more directly related to the use of channels such as the radio, press and cinema, whereas indoctrination was a process carried out in education, youth movements etc.

Question 2

03 Explain why Hitler introduced the Enabling Law in March 1933. (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 the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons why the Enabling Law was passed in 1933.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- an Enabling Law would eventually do away with parliamentary procedure and legislation and transfer full powers to the Chancellor and his government for the next 4 years
- it would add legality to the emerging dictatorship and allow Hitler to dismantle the Weimar Constitution and pave the way for a one-party state
- a 'legal gloss' would help reassure his conservative allies and millions of middle class Germans who had voted for him
- it also allowed Hitler to discipline his own party
- it would allow Hitler to destroy legally the remaining opposition to the Nazis with further laws
- it allowed the Chancellor to pass decrees without the President's involvement.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might note that, whilst Hitler in essence wanted swift political change in order to establish a Nazi dictatorship, he also wanted to avoid offending his supporters.

Question 2

- 04** 'Hitler established a dictatorship by August 1934 by legal means.'
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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- Bracher believes that the Enabling Law of March 1933, whereby Hitler achieved a two-thirds majority in the Reichstag, was highly significant. It secured the 'legal revolution' and within weeks Hitler had dismantled the Weimar constitution
- Layton suggests that the Enabling Law was the constitutional foundation stone of the Third Reich. In purely legal terms, the Weimar constitution was never dissolved but in practice the Enabling Law provided the basis for the creation of an arbitrary dictatorship
- The Reichstag Fire Decree opened the floodgates to imprisoning people arbitrarily and much that followed had a superficial 'gloss of legality' attached to it
- to confirm the legality of the regime, on Hindenburg's death, Gleichschaltung was taking shape – all things Nazi seemed to signify that control over culture, education and social life was now the intention.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- the paradox of a legal dictatorship is perverse. Hitler aimed to use the legal powers of the Weimar Constitution to destroy its political authority, not amend it
- throughout 1933 and up to August 1934 there was at best a thinly disguised use of legality; at worst a blatant disregard
- officially sanctioned waves of violence and brutality against all forms of opposition e.g. the SA intimidation of Social Democrat deputies during the Reichstag vote on the Enabling Law
- the emergence of the SS/Gestapo/SD complex was what the Nazi apparatus was built on. In essence violence was an integral part of Nazism.

Good answers are likely to conclude that all the decrees were debatable in their legality and that violence, and the perverse interpretation and usage of legislation, was the key tactic which produced a dictatorship. Events between January 1933 and August 1934 offer excellent examples of how a nascent dictatorship was established using illegal actions, which were then justified by a distorted and false legality, and perhaps morality. The Nazi leadership was prepared to use violence and intimidation, whilst managing to maintain a veneer of legality.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the SS established control over Germany's police organisations. (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 the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the SS had grown in importance and established control over Germany's police organisations.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Himmler, leader of the SS, wished to execute Hitler's vision of a totalitarian state and the Third Reich depended on coercion and needed a ruthless organisation
- its ability to deal with Germany's internal enemies, including communists and Jews and 'asocials'. The SS developed into the main terror instrument of the regime
- as a reward for its involvement in the Night of the Long Knives. After the weakening of the SA, the SS emerged as the chief police arm of the Nazi party.
- Hitler needed an organisation which would not feel restrained by legal or bureaucratic qualms.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might show that a combination of the demands of the regime, the ambition of Himmler and/or the reward for ousting the SA confirmed the fact that the SS was the ideal vehicle to carry out the regime's all pervasive police and surveillance system.

Question 3

- 06** 'In the late 1930s, there was considerable opposition within Germany to the Nazi regime.'
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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- Nazi totalitarianism was incomplete and therefore opposition was not only a possibility but a reality. It varied in order of seriousness from everyday grumbling, through concerns over social deviance to active resistance
- Workforce opposition due to lack of wage increases and/or longer working hours and/or compulsory activities within the KdF. Along with peasant concerns over low food prices and shortages of labour, this opposition was known as 'loyal reluctance'.
- Church opposition to the regime's euthanasia programme. Catholic protest was more successful than Protestant due to its more centralised structure. In general Christianity proved most effective, not as a focal point of opposition but as a residue for the nation's conscience.
- some army potential for success e.g. military resistance following Blomberg and Fritsch's removal and Beck's attempt to persuade the General Staff to remove Hitler in 1938. There was also concern over Hitler's risky foreign policy and his speed of preparations for war

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- discontent remained low-key and showed little chance of converting into something greater
- most complaints centred on economic conditions as opposed to reservations about the nature of the Nazi regime
- political opposition, from the SPD and the Communists, was minimal as they made little inroads into the working classes
- people in general preferred the Nazis to the Weimar Republic.

Good answers may conclude that it is difficult to evaluate the depth of opposition, particularly as attitudes to the regime and its policies were not always clear – cut, even among its staunchest supporters or those who resisted. Candidates should try and define opposition – perhaps it is most appropriate to define it as active opposition to the regime. In any assessment, candidates might examine the twin aspects of conformity and opposition and resistance and collaboration. Passive resistance, **Resistenz**, involved women wearing make – up or youth listening to jazz but their motives may have been quite different to those who actively wanted to overthrow or damage the regime. Although active resistance involved only a tiny minority, opposition could be seen in industrial sabotage in factories and on farms and refusal to carry out the Hitler salute. However, popular opposition might often be temporary or a limited response to specific policies. For example, small businessmen and farmers were often openly vocal about details of economic policy, yet they were among the most vociferous supporters of the regime. Hence attitudes could be selective, temporary and shifting (Kirk).