



General Certificate of Education

AS History

Unit 2: HIS2N

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

Specimen Mark Scheme

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

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

Copyright © 2007 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

Specimen Mark Scheme

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 A** differ from those in **Source B** in relation to the immediate reactions of ordinary Germans to Kristallnacht in November 1938. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

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

Indicative content

Bremser, in Source B, reacts with horror to what has happened, while Maschmann; in Source A, accepts and justifies events. Bremser, in Source A, refers to the destruction of Jewish property as barbaric and symbolic of a breakdown in cultural values while Maschmann (Source A) regards what she sees as acceptable since 'the Jews are the enemies of New Germany'. While Bremser (Source B) is concerned that 'Foreign opinion everywhere is disgusted', Maschmann (Source A) wants world Jewry to see the events as a warning. While Bremser (Source B) shows sympathy for the Jews and horror at his countrymen's behaviour, Maschmann (Source A) states the official anti-Semitic line and shows no remorse.

Candidates might acknowledge that both sources refer to the destruction wrought by Reichskristallnacht and both anticipate that the day will be remembered – but for very different reasons. They are likely to observe that Maschmann, as someone attending the Reich Youth Leadership office, was clearly a Nazi and therefore likely to accept Nazi dogma whereas Bremser obviously was not – and furthermore was not afraid to reveal his own thoughts in a private diary. They might go on to question whether either reaction was that of an 'ordinary German'.

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

How successful was the Nazi regime in strengthening anti-Semitic views among the German people down to 1939. (24 marks)

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

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

Indicative content

From the sources: Candidates are likely to refer to Maschmann's statement that 'the Jews are the enemies of the new Germany. Last night they had a taste of what this means' (Source A) as an example of the prevalent anti-Semitic 'brainwashing' that had already taken place by 1938. They should also consider Bremser's alternative view (Source B) and his comment that 'the order for the destruction and manslaughter came from official circles', suggesting that the attack on the Jews was not the product of general anti-Semitic feeling. From Source C, plentiful information can be found to support the view that the Reichskristallnacht was part of a campaign leading to a hardening of official anti-Semitic policy. Goering speaks of 'a letter written on the Führer's orders' and the need to 'co-ordinate and solve' the Jewish question. 'Measures to eliminate the Jew from the German economy' are spoken of. The evolution of the

Nazi state and the need to eliminate Jews from it is also echoed in Maschmann's reference to Jews holding back Germany's 'new steps towards greatness'.

From own knowledge:

Candidates will need to understand the context of German anti-Semitism and be able to explain if and how attitudes changed down to 1939, with reference to the measures taken by the Nazi regime.

Specific details which might be used to suggest success include:

- Nazi use of propaganda, films (*The Eternal Jew*), newspapers and the infiltration of anti-Semitic ideas into education and youth movements
- The spread of anti-Semitic values in a country fed on Nazi ideology and accepted in return for the economic benefits brought by the regime. The emphasis on the Jews as the 'parasites' which had weakened Germany in the past became more credible as Germany began to revive while anti-Jewish measures were enacted
- Measures against Jews (Civil Service Laws 1933, Nuremberg Laws 1935) and the encouragement of violence (boycott of Jewish shops 1933), induced anti-Semitic ideas
- There was no reaction in support of the Jews in Germany after Reichskristallnacht suggesting a hardening of attitudes/acceptance of views (or fear of reprisals)
- After Reichskristallnacht, Germans were ready to accept the radicalisation of Nazi policy which brought new anti-Semitic measures whereby Jews were excluded from economic life. The cost of the Reichskristallnacht damage was partly borne by the Jews. They were forbidden to practise trades, own shops, market stalls or manage businesses; Jewish shops, firms and businesses were compulsorily purchased; in the winter of 1937–1938 as Goering reduced availability of raw materials to Jewish businesses, removed public contracts, forced registration of property over 5,000 marks and prohibited sales without permission. Such actions met virtually no resistance – and the economic advantage to Aryans must have helped in the acceptance of measures. Expanding businesses were keen to seize the assets of their Jewish competitors
- Further Aryanisation/segregation took place under state control: Jews were excluded from schools, universities, cinemas, theatres and sports facilities. Local areas established laws about Jewish appearance and many cities set up Aryan areas from which Jews were excluded. Regulations also clarified the position of those in 'mixed marriages' contracted before the laws of 1935. Jewish doctors, dentists and lawyers were forbidden to serve non-Aryans, and Jewish children had to be named Israel or Sarah. Such 'rules' were largely obeyed and enforced by Aryan Germans who provided information to the Gestapo
- Stronger anti-Semitic views led to tougher measures to eliminate Jews – the SS favoured enforced emigration and in January/February 1939 an emigration office was set up in Germany under Heydrich. Although Hitler appeared to support emigration ideas, in January 1939 he told the Reichstag that any war would lead to 'the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe'

Details that might be used to suggest limited, if any, strengthening of anti-Semitic views might include:

- The persecution was not systematic and there were plentiful incidences of measures being ignored
- Anti-Semitic measures were quite restrained before 1939: after the boycott of shops in 1933, the Nazis held back for fear of antagonising the people. Anti-Semitic measures were reduced at the time of the Berlin Olympics. Measures seemed quite half-hearted before Reichskristallnacht and it took time for them to become accepted.

- In 1938, the reaction of the general public to Reichskristallnacht was one of incredulity, shock and bewilderment
- Although official attitudes appeared to harden, Jews did not have to wear a distinctive badge and still had access to public transport. There was no public outcry against the Jews
- There was no support or talk, even among the Nazi leaders, of genocide – and despite Hitler’s pronouncements, emigration appeared a favoured policy
- Whilst businessmen benefited economically they were happy to support measures but this was not necessarily to do with racial views

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Hitler’s anti-Semitic views grew stronger between 1919 and 1925.

(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

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

Indicative content

The main elements were:

- A Social Darwinist belief that Jews were the *Untermenschen* (subhumans) which infected and weakened superior races, while the Aryans were the master race – *Herrenvolk*
- A belief that Jews had been responsible for Germany’s defeat in World War I. Hitler absorbed the ‘stab in the back’ myth and believed Jewish politicians had betrayed Germany
- A belief that the Jews were responsible for the corruption and decadence of the Weimar Republic, e.g. modernist culture and a move away from ‘German values’
- A belief that Jews were responsible for Germany’s economic chaos – they were perceived as rich parasites draining the nation

- A belief that Communists were also Jews – or Jew-led – with international plans to weaken the German nation
- A belief that all of Germany's troubles in this period could be laid at the feet of Jews – whether it be failure in war or of his own Munich Putsch in 1923

- (b) 'The spread of anti-Semitism in Germany 1918 to 1933 was primarily because it provided the people with an enemy to blame for their troubles'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

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

Indicative content

Candidates will need to show a judgement by balancing the ways in which the view is true and untrue.

Material that might be used to suggest it is true include:

- The circumstances of defeat in 1918 came as such a blow, after positive wartime propaganda, that the German people needed someone to blame

- Jews played a leading role in the Left Wing revolutions in the winter of 1918–1919 and helped encourage the view that the Jews were responsible for the German defeat and linked Jews with the ‘enemy’ of Communism
- Some Jews (e.g. Rathenau) became cabinet ministers. When the Weimar Republic appeared to be failing, as, for example, over the Ruhr invasion and subsequent hyperinflation, it was easy to blame the Jewish politicians
- Jews were associated with modernism in the arts and were blamed by those conservatives who opposed the spread of the new culture in this period
- The circumstances of the Weimar Republic were unstable with much political unrest and economic dislocation. It was easy to blame the Jews – particularly for economic problems such as hyperinflation
- The Great Depression from 1929 renewed the uncertainty and left people looking for a scapegoat. Jewish financiers were an obvious target
- The rise of Nazism in the late 1920s/early 1930s increased the swell of anti-Semitism and encouraged the blame idea
- It proved easier to blame the Jews than appreciate the complex problems facing Germany in this period

Material that might be used to suggest it is untrue include:

- The growth of anti-Semitism was the result of the barrage of anti-Semitic propaganda from Volkish groups which kept anti-Semitism alive
- The major institutions – army, civil service, judiciary, churches – were permeated by anti-Semitism dating back from before the war
- There had always been an inherent hostility to an ‘alien’ group, particularly one which enjoyed economic success
- Most German people were apathetic and never vehemently anti-Semitic

Candidates might conclude that the spread of anti-Semitism was the result of a multiplicity of causes. Some may also caution that its extent can easily be exaggerated.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Nazi policies against ‘racial undesirables’ moved from persecution to mass killing between September 1939 and January 1942. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may

not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised.

10-12

Indicative content

Candidates may begin by pointing out that policies changed and evolved over the period and that it was only in June 1941 when the war against the USSR began, massively increasing the problem of what to do with the increasing number of Jews within the German Empire that persecution moved towards mass killing:

- 1939 – The Jews persecuted members of minority groups such as gypsies, homosexuals, asocials and the mentally ill, as well as Jews. Methods included sending asocials to concentration camps, and enforced sterilisation and euthanasia for undesirables – begun in 1939 but stopped in 1941 after a mass outcry
- Initial treatment of the Jews involved removing them from professional positions and weakening them economically. They lost citizenship under the 1935 Nuremberg Laws and faced loss of jobs and segregation
- Persecution developed in intensity after the outbreak of World War I in 1939. After the invasion of Poland, Jews were herded into ghettos in major cities and able Jews used as slave labour. Emigration plans pursued in Germany. 1940 Madagascar Plan
- June 1941 Germany invaded the USSR – Einsatzgruppen (SS action squads) and regular troops carried out killings of Jews and Communists June/July 1941. Half a million Jews were shot but there were too many to deal with and traumatised of German soldiers/inefficiency of the shooting/pit methods meant a search for alternatives. This may have led to decision to exterminate in 1941 although this may have not come until 1942
- September: German Jews ordered to wear the Star of David
- October: Emigration banned and mass deportation of German Jews to East began. Eichmann looked into possibilities of poison gas for use on prisoners of war – Cyclon B selected
- November First massacre when Jews being transferred to the East were shot
- December Resettlement Plans blocked by Soviet resistance preventing the transfer of Jews East beyond the Urals. Chaos in East Poland as Jews awaiting resettlement built up
- Gas vans used to kill Jews during 1941. Mass gassing of Jews at Chelmo camp began in December. Camps at Belzec and Auschwitz began construction
- January 1942 Wannsee Conference planned the 'Final Solution'. Beginning of systematic round-up of Jews under German control and gas chambers rapidly constructed at the extermination camps Belzec and Sobnidor (February-April Treblinka (June) Maidnek (November) Auschwitz (July)

- (b) 'Hitler alone was responsible for the Holocaust.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

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

Indicative content

Candidates will need to show a judgement by balancing the ways in which the statement is true and untrue.

Material that might be used to suggest it is true include:

- Hitler was a known anti-Semite and had made his views clear as long ago as in *Mein Kampf* (1924–1925). Many speeches before and during his rule had referred to the need to annihilate the Jews
- The development of anti-Semitic policy since 1933 and more particularly since 1938 might all be seen to lead in this direction, pointing to an underlying plan which it only became possible to carry out in wartime
- The Nazi state was geared to the enactment of Hitler's will making it inconceivable that he did not approve the Holocaust and highly probable that he ordered it
- No direct action took place until after the Wannsee Conference in January 1942 and despite the absence of a written order, it seems likely that this was held at Hitler's request to cement details of his policy

Material that might be used to suggest it is untrue include:

- Hitler's speeches and writings may have been misinterpreted. His references to the removal of the Jews may have meant resettlement or emigration
- Since no document exists, we can never be sure that Hitler ordered the Holocaust. The secrecy surrounding it makes it hard to apportion blame
- Mussolini wanted war to help him establish his political dominance. He wanted to strike at the Church, monarchy and landed interests which limited his power

Material that might be used to suggest alternative explanations include:

- The nature of the Nazi state – cumulative radicalisation and the lack of formal restraint – incessant propaganda, unthinking obedience and the experience of the euthanasia programme
- The anti-Semitic attitudes of ordinary Germans – the result of decades of growing anti-Semitism and propelled by group pressure but not primarily by fear of punishment
- War – the disruption of plans for emigration, the consequence of dealing with vast numbers of Jews, the brutalisation of the people, extremism bred of paranoia, lack of concern for international opinion and a justification for removing enemies

Candidates are likely to conclude that the Holocaust was primarily the result of Hitler's own genocidal tendencies but that other factors played a part. Some may suggest that persecution generated its own momentum but that it would not have happened but for the war.