

Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

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



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS2N Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: history@aqa.org.uk

AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers

General Introduction by the Chief Examiner

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

Unit 1

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

GCE History HIS2N: Anti-semitism, Hitler and the German People, 1919-1945

Responses to June 2009 Questions

Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the German people's knowledge of concentration camps. (12 marks)

While Source A in an extract from a book that places some of the blame on ordinary Germans and Source B is a recollection from a German person denying this, there are still some similarities. Source A advocates that the Germans were not completely ignorant of the existence of the camps, and the woman from Source B supports this claim, stating that she knew about concentration camps even prior to 1938, even as a young woman. This suggests that it is highly unlikely for others to not also know and even support that Nazi scheme.

However, the sources disagree in that Source A accuses all of Germany for knowing about the camps they lived by and even goes so far as to say they supported the regime because they were German. Source B contradicts this by saying that although she knew of the existence of the camps as a whole, neither she or the rest of her town realised that only half an hour away was the concentration camp Bergen-Belsen. She holds that the Germans didn't know what was happening in the camps, nor that it was so close to home, hence the denial on the German people's part. The fact that her mother wanted to go to Belsen to try and understand what had happened indicates that in reality, everyday Germans were out of the loop. However, Source A use statistics to back up their claims, stating that between 100,000 and 500,000 civilians were implicated in the actual direct process of destruction, which is a small number considering the size of Germany, but difficult as it means that a lot more people would have known but not acted.

In conclusion, the two sources differ to the extent that Source A was written in an attempt to dismiss the claims in Source B that the ordinary Germans had no real knowledge of what was happening with the concentration camps in Germany at the time. However, that fact that the person in Source B knew about the camps lends some credibility to the claims in Source A; because many may have known and not spoken about it just as she did. This means that the two views only differ so far as to each's belief that the ordinary Germans were ignorant or not.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer shows a full understanding of the question and carries out a developed comparison of the sources looking at similarities and differences.

Differences:

- *Source A places some blame on German people for the Holocaust, whilst Source B denies this*
- *the degree of knowledge about the camps is different between the sources (A almost complete and B minimal)*
- *this is then developed to suggest knowledge of the camps led to support of the camps. This is contrasted with the shock displayed in B*

Similarities:

- *Both sources show some knowledge of the existence of the camps*

The conclusion gives a developed comparison which lifts that answer to Level 4, the candidate fully engages with the question of the degree of difference of views rather than simply they agree or disagree. Level 4 – 11 marks.

Candidate 2

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the German people's knowledge of concentration camps. (12 marks)

One of the main features distinguishing Source A from Source B is that the former implies that the Final Solution and the concentration camps were a uniquely German feature that would not be contemplated by other peoples, such as ordinary Danes or Italians. The source also suggests that 'most Germans supported mass murder', in which case it can be assumed most would likely know about the concentration camps at least, let alone support them. Source A further suggests that a considerable number of Germans operated in the 'machinery of destruction' – between 100,000 and 500,000. It is true that many Germans were involved in the mechanics of the creation of the camps, however it is a moot point as to how many knew of their ultimate objective. Moreover, many of the Germans who did know about the camps would have informed their families at home and the information, to a greater or lesser extent would have been known by a considerable number of ordinary Germans. Also, a small but nonetheless important section of the Einsatzgruppen/SS were proven to be sadistic and uncomprehensively brutal war criminals. One Nazi official for instance trained his dog to attack the genitals of camp inmates.

Source B however suggests that most people did not know of the existence of the camps; many not knowing what a concentration camp was. There is ample evidence to deem this plausible. For instance Hitler, Himmler and the Nazi elite did their utmost to ensure the secrecy of the camps for fear of a widespread backlash and condemnation from ordinary Germans, similar to the way in which the T4 programme and child euthanasia program were held in utmost secrecy. Himmler himself said that the ultimate death of the Jews was a glorious chapter in history that was never to be written, further reiterating this point. Hitler would not have had the camps under such secrecy if he had the full support, or indeed the vast majority of support from the German people. It is obvious Hitler feared German public opinion which is why in 1941/42 when rest of Europe was under Nazi control and international opinion mattered little to Hitler he still refrained from telling the German people the direct and full truth, showing that many ordinary Germans would have drawn the line at genocide.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer is long but looks only at differences and does not address similarities. There is a great deal of own knowledge, which whilst addressing issues linked to the themes in the sources, is not used to answer the question. It is important to remember the focus of the question is the degree of difference between the views of the sources not the validity of the views expressed in the sources. The candidate is very knowledgeable but the conclusions drawn are largely on whether the German people did or did not know about the camps rather than the degree to

which the sources agree or disagree. Consequently the response gained Level 2 – 5 marks.

Candidate 3

- 1 (b) How successful was the Nazi regime in gaining the acceptance of the German people for its anti-semitic policies in the years 1938 to 1945? (24 marks)

To a large extent the Nazi regime was successful in gaining the acceptance of the Germans for its anti-semitic policies. Source C shows the effects of Nazi propaganda and Nazi policies in demonising the Jews, making it easier for them to be then persecuted. The fact that many of the inmates faced great starvation and ample disease in the ghettos, meant that many looked less like human beings, making it more easy for Hitler to make the Germans accept that Jews are fundamentally and biologically different for the Germans, subliminally implying that it is in their interests to persecute them. Propaganda such as the popular film 'The Eternal Jew', depicting images of starving and disease infected Polish Jews were instrumental in reducing German sympathies for Jews, making it easy for Germans to support anti-semitic policies.

In 1941, Jews were made to wear the Star of David in Germany, a ploy by Hitler to make them easier to identify to be subsequently liquidated. Previous to this however, many more anti-semitic measures took place, becoming increasingly draconian, culminating in Jews being stripped of their identity, their German citizenship and being forced to take the first names of Israel or Sarah. Jews were frequently persecuted and the persecution forced some, but in truth little resistance from ordinary Germans. Source A suggests that many Germans were involved in the 'machinery of destruction', which to a large extent is true, as many Germans directly or indirectly, often even unreservedly, corroborated in mass genocide. Operation Barbarossa is an important example. Many German ordinary soldiers in the Wehrmacht believed that the war in the USSR was a brutal war to the death in which one side was to be eliminated completely. Hitler believed that this and that the Aryans were locked in an eternal struggle with Socialism and Bolshevism, which he perceived as being synonymous. This dangerous ideology was fed throughout German society via propaganda. Hitler also instructed the immediate killing of any Jewish POWs, any partisan soldiers and even anyone who 'looked oddly'. This was particularly detrimental to the Russian Jews, as the Germans who accepted the Nazi's anti-semitic idea were largely brutalised during arguably one of the deadliest wars in human history. This entwined with Nazi propaganda meant they were mentally able to kill Jews on a massive scale without any remorse, proving Hitler to be greatly successful in his goal of exterminating European Jewry.

However, although the Nazi regime was mostly successful in obtaining German support for their policies, they often conducted many of their policies in secrecy, for fear of German public opinion, showing that a large proportion of ordinary Germans would not likely have supported their brutal policies. For example the Nazis never revealed to ordinary Germans the true nature of the extermination centres, had they done so it is unlikely ordinary Germans would have complied. Source B emphasises the fact that many ordinary Germans were shocked and unaware of the atrocities again suggesting that many of them would not have complied. Himmler himself in 1943 said that the extermination of the Jews must remain a secret, further explaining the fact that many ordinary Germans would not have complied with genocide.

Ultimately, despite many German's acceptance of harsh anti-semitic policies many would have perceived genocide as being a step too far, process by the refusal of the Nazi elite to share the true nature of the camps.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This is a balanced answer which addresses the question and uses the sources and own knowledge effectively. Right from the start the candidate is assessing the degree to which the Nazi regime was successful in gaining acceptance. The sources are used clearly and effectively to support the points made. The candidate addresses success and then goes on to address secrecy and failure. This means the essay is balanced. There is no need for a 50/50 split between the level of detail on the two sides of the argument to achieve a top Level 4 as demonstrated by this answer (nor is there for Level 5). The answer contains evaluation and judgement but the judgement is not sustained enough for Level 5. Also, QWC is not always controlled (the candidate writes "corroborated" instead of "collaborated" in the second paragraph, for instance. Overall, Level 4 – 21 marks.

Candidate 4

- 1 (b) How successful was the Nazi regime in gaining the acceptance of the German people for its anti-semitic policies in the years 1938 to 1945? (24 marks)

In 1933, when Hitler first came to power in Germany, a Jewish shop boycott was called off in disgust by the German people after just 24 hours. Yet by 1945, a huge policy of mass murder had begun, and was carried out without, seemingly, any interference.

The Nazi regime, apparently then, was highly successful in achieving its aims. The first example that shows this is Kristalnacht on November 9th, 1938. A violent overnight pogrom was met with support from many Germans, who joined in themselves and from others who did not, there was little resistance of support for the Jews. 96 Jews were killed in one night and yet there was no outcry like there had been in 1933. Rather, this time many Germans saw the opportunity to plunder Jewish homes or oust their neighbours, or at least stand back and let them take their 'punishment'.

The Nazis gained the support of many of the population in its policies of the removal of Jews from German society. Townspeople voluntarily erected 'no Jews here' signs outside their towns and villages, and many Jewish families were turned in to the Gestapo by their 'friends and neighbours'. Perhaps the regime had managed to convince them that they were up to nothing sinister, as Source B states: 'Germany didn't do this' was the opinion of most people. The local population was only 'officially made aware' of the camps at the end of the war, but if one believes Source A, 'the German people were not simply cogs', indeed the Nazis had convinced them that persecution was right and moreover 'large numbers of Germans' were involved in 'the machinery of destruction'.

There is also evidence that the Nazis won over significant numbers of Germans using their propaganda campaign. Even before 1938, anti-semitic documents and publications like 'Der Stürmer' and 'Der Angriff' were widely read in Germany and propaganda films like 'The Eternal Jew' were commonplace. By 1938, this policy was in full flow and Source C demonstrates in the liberation that some Germans were amazed that the Jews 'have no horns' or beards, as was depicted so vividly

by the Nazis, and indoctrinated into children in schools and through the Hitler Youth, a widespread movement with massive support. Many Germans didn't know that Jewish people looked normal.

Of course, it would be unfair to suggest that the Nazis had gained the acceptance of the entirety of German society. Though there is little evidence to the contrary, this can largely be put down to sheer fear of the German people. If, indeed, as Source A argues, they could not 'plead total ignorance', and were somehow involved, or knowledgeable, then they would surely know what would happen to them if they spoke out against the Nazi regime. Thus, it was not so much an acceptance, but more a bullying of the German population into allowing violent and awful actions to occur.

Also, Hitler had managed to so successfully unite Germany behind the war by 1939, that the Nazis could just get on with their policies with widespread support regardless and disguised by the war effort. Many Germans were desperate to avenge the defeat of the First World War, and Hitler's passion in his rearmament of Germany, and his ambition to make Germany great won him much support (as well as his blaming of the Jews for the original defeat). Finally, if Source B is true and Germans 'never knew' of what was going on during the Holocaust, then the Nazis could never truly claim the 'acceptance' of the German people, merely think they had managed it without being noticed.

In all, I do agree that many Germans were won over, back to the original German roots of anti-semitism by 1945, but I do not believe that such support was uniform, but that the position of the government and the nature of its actions forced people to keep quiet, and, whether desired or not, anti-semitic policy to go all the way up to the holocaust.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This is a balanced answer which fully addresses the question and uses sources and own knowledge effectively. It reaches a well developed conclusion. The candidate effectively compares the success/failure of Nazi attempts to gain support for anti-semitic legislation in the set period of 1938–1945 with attempts earlier on e.g. 1933. This was an unusual but effective way of starting the answer. The source use is clear, well done and effectively blended with own knowledge. A good range of reasons are given to counter success such as terror, the fog of war, ignorance and secrecy. The conclusion shows an advanced level of understanding, stating that it was not the case that 'support was uniform' and that many factors played a role. Level 5 – 23 marks.

Candidate 5

- 1 (b) How successful was the Nazi regime in gaining the acceptance of the German people for its anti-semitic policies in the years 1938 to 1945? (24 marks)

Germany was plagued by propaganda between 1938 and 1945. The person in charge of this was Goebels, one of the more important anti-semites of the time. The propaganda made Jews out to be poisonous insects and thieves of the country. In one poster, a Jewish man is holding some coins with an indifferent expression. This gave the Germans the idea that the Jews were very well off and did not give money back to the country.

Source C is a dialogue between Germans and Jew. The German people had obviously been heavily affected by the propaganda they had seen because they did not know that Jews looked like normal people. They had been made to believe they looked like the devil with beards and horns. When the German people realised they weren't as parasitic as they were made to believe, they took food to the Jewish people.

Source B shows people were less willing to accept that these camps existed. The German people were said to be horrified by what they heard.

The regime to gain acceptance from German people had mixed effect on people. Some chose to believe that Jews were awful people like the devil but back-fired when they found they were just the same as them. For others, they refused to believe that these people were bad enough to be tortured and killed. And for other people, anti-semitism is still a big part of them today.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer shows some understanding of different interpretations but relies largely on two sources (B and C). The start of the answer shows some grasp of the question but focuses solely on the propaganda. There is some own knowledge shown about propaganda in the second paragraph. After this there are paragraphs based on first Source C, then Source B. The answer lacks development and the conclusion is general and lacks specifics to support statements. Understanding of the differing historical interpretations with the ideas not developed. The lack of depth is clear with only one example from own knowledge and use of two sources point to this being a Level 2 answer – 9 marks.

Candidate 6

- 2 (a) With reference to the years 1919 to 1929, explain why Hitler held anti-semitic views (12 marks)

Since Hitler was in his 20s, he had always followed the idea of anti-semitism. Anti-semitism was, however, not created by Hitler, ones it was going in Germany after World War 1, however it would now taken Hitler's evil and dynamic forces to take it to the extremity of mass murder.

After Germany's colossal defeat in World War 1, Germany were looking for people to blame. The emphasis of hatred was put on Jews. Jewish people had always been seen as wealthy, successful and 'money-makers', this was probably where the jealousy had started and eventually spread. The assassination of Mathias Berger who was a Jewish man who signed the Armistice union meant Germany 'given up' in the war, in 1922 and also the assassination of Walter Rathenau, a wealthy banker, in 1922 also, when the first attacks began.

Anti-semitism was not created by Hitler it had been around since time began and was now stronger towards the middle ages due to no high reparation payments, Germany had to pay due to damage during war. There was higher inflation during 1923 which had led to the Wall Street Crash in 1929. This is really where hatred of Jews grew. As many Jews were successful bankers they were blamed, Hitler even commented in 1920 that "any Jew who come to Germany after World War 1, must be forced to leave". Hitler held his anti-semitic views as he believed Jewry and Bohemianism were linked and after 1917 revolution in Russia this merely highlighted his thought processes.

I believe that Hitler's anti-semitic views were held from 1919–1929 because he was anti-semitic even before the war, he needed a scapegoat to use for Germany's economic troubles, and as the Jews were bankers, jealousy struck and this was Hitler's cue to take his anti-semitic ideas further, eventually leading to the Holocaust.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The answer looks at a good range (3) of different factors and offers material to support these points.

The candidate looks at:

- *Hitler's desire to find someone to blame after World War One combined with jealousy of Jewish success*
- *the connection Hitler made between the Jews and Germany's economic problems*
- *the connection Hitler made between Jews and Communism.*

There is a conclusion but it simply restates the reasons given earlier in the answer without solidly developing links or prioritisation needed for Level 4. It was awarded 8 marks – Level 3.

Candidate 7

- 3 (b) 'Violence against Jews was the main feature of Nazi anti-semitic policies in the years 1933 to 1939.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

The claim that 'violence' against the Jews was the main feature of Nazi anti-Semitic policies in the years 1933 and 1939 could be argued both ways. In some respects violence was the main feature of anti-semitism in the Nazi policies; it was the most radical and expressed the persecution physically; there were many outbreaks of such violence towards the Jews between 1933 and 1939. For example, a boycott of Jewish shops, Kristalnacht and then the invasion of Poland (the home of a high Jewish population).

On the other hand, the claim that violence was the 'main' feature could be disagreed in that although violence against the Jews was a radical step in outward anti-semitism; the cumulative process of exclusion of the Jews also had to do with the process of total annihilation of the Jewish population, in the "answer to the Jewish question". Both political and radical exclusion and separation of the Jews from normal day to day life were also among the main features of Nazi anti-semitic policies.

The violence against the Jews first broke out on 1st April 1933 with a boycott of Jewish synagogues and shops, this was only a small scheme against the Jews in regard to further more radical actions against the Jews later taken. Other violence (physical violence) includes the outbreak of Kristalnacht in 1938 in which over 100 Jewish men were killed, and 30,000 were sent to concentration camps. The acts of violence against the Jews showed the outward and strong anti-semitic beliefs held by the Nazis, and that they would stop at nothing until the total extermination of the Jewish population.

These violent outbreaks are also shown in the opening of concentration camps (to imprison their political and racial opponents), and later ghettos and extermination camps (purposely built for the mass killings of enemies). In 1939, 1st September the German Army invaded Poland' Poland was the homeland of many Jews. This invasion led to many murders of Jews, plus the start of the euthanasia programmes; in which Hitler ordered for those to be killed, i.e. the handicapped those who were a "drain" on the country during wartime.

On the other hand, during this time physical violence against the Jews was not the main feature of Nazi anti-semitic policies. Together with the combination of the Nuremburg Race Laws (1935), in which Jews were excluded from day to day life and work – plus marriage between Jews and non-Jews was banned, as it was thought to be causing "pollution to the German blood pool" – a further 2112 laws were passed, excluding Jews from society and further separating the Jews and non-Jews (i.e. not allowed to sit on a park bench with a German person, Jews had their own benches and not being allowed to own pets). Further separation included Jews being forced to wear the Star of David, late 1930s, this meant that Jews were further alienated from society and could be easily identified for persecution. Propaganda played a strong role in anti-semitic policies, describing Jews as 'filth' and 'a drain on the economy, not worth living', therefore German people found it acceptable to persecute and blame the Jews for the fall in World War One – and feel it unfair of the Jews economic status.

Overall it seems that a structured combination of physical violence and political

assertion of the Jews as being the “untermensch” (subhumans) and “evil” led to the main features of the Nazi anti-semitic success policies. The cumulative radicalism of policies meant it was acceptable for persecution to occur not only outwardly, by destroying their land, synagogues; pillaging from them and later using the Jews as forced labour and exploiting them, and then when they were of no more use to end their lives by mass genocide.

The main features of Nazi persecution seem to be as functionalist historian Hilberg states: 1) identification 2) isolation 3) concentration and 4) annihilation. There is no main one feature of Nazi policies which may have led to the Holocaust, the violence was just part of the package along with legal exclusion etc.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate shows a good understanding of different interpretations. A good balanced response with good supporting material. The candidate shows clear awareness of different interpretations looking at both violence and non-violence. Statements such as 'in some respects violence was the main feature of anti-semitism...' illustrate an analytical response. There is some lack of focus on the set period with mention of the extermination camps and Jews being forced to wear the Star of David. The answer is evaluative and well supported but falls short of Level 5 due to the lack of focus on the stated period at times. The conclusion again goes outside the cut off point on 1939. Level 4 – 19 marks.