
AS-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS2N: Anti-Semitism, Hitler and the German People, 1919–1945
Mark scheme

1041
June 2015

Version V1 Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students 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. Students 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 students 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 student 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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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 2015

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

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

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 Jewish attitudes to the Nazis in early 1933. **[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 students 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 levels scheme.

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

- Source B suggests that Jews in 1933 did not take Hitler and his anti-Semitism seriously (his father's suggestion that anti-Semitic articles belonged in the comic supplement) whilst Source A suggests divided opinion, some such as Wolff were significantly concerned whilst others were not, 'A Jewish banker slapped the face of another who offered the view that the Nazis might at the very most, beat up a few Eastern European Jews, "but nothing can happen to us."'

- Source B suggests that Nazi support was limited and would crumble whereas Source A suggests that it was limited because the Nazis were a minority in the Cabinet.

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

- levels of assimilation amongst Jews in Germany in the early 1930s
- the attacks on Jews by the SA and the existence of Nazi anti-Semitic propaganda
- reactions to the boycott of Jewish shops, 1933
- The Burning of Books in May 1933.

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

- there is a similarity between the view that some of the Jewish community did not see the Nazis as a threat. In Source A it states that "but nothing can happen to us." And in Source B this is supported by the statement 'the serious underestimation of the Nazis which was so widespread at the time.'
- there is also some similarity in the view with the start of Source B suggesting that author did not share the optimistic view expressed by his father but instead shared the pessimistic view expressed in Source A
- both are the views of assimilated Jews used to Weimar democracy.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that there was clearly an element in the Jewish population which failed to foresee the consequences of Nazi anti-Semitism. However, there was strong evidence of the impact of Nazi anti-Semitism during their rise to power. Source A presents the Jewish community as being highly divided over the threat of the Nazis in early 1933, with some being very worried and others not worried at all whilst Source B suggests that in 1933 the Jewish community was not too worried about Nazi anti-Semitism.

Question 1

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

How far was there widespread anti-Semitism in Germany before Hitler came to power?

[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 students 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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** The source states that Hitler's anti-Semitism was not considered important by many when he was appointed chancellor. The source suggests that there was little concern amongst the people about Hitler, despite warnings from the likes of Wolff. The source suggests that people were aware of Nazi anti-Semitism but divided on what it would mean in practice.
- **Source B:** The source states that the 'Nazi movement would crumble from dissatisfaction felt by the German people with Hitler in power' and supports this with detail about 'the sales of our family's newspapers had increased considerably. He believed if sales of these anti-Nazi papers continued to increase, then influence of the newspapers would grow'. That a Jewish-owned anti-Nazi paper appeared to be in circulation strongly suggests that there was not widespread support for Nazi anti-Semitism in Germany.
- **Source C:** 'German conservatism and German universities made anti-Semitism politically and intellectually acceptable' can be used to demonstrate support for anti-Semitism. Similarly 'with unspoken support of millions of Germans for whom the fate of the Jews was largely irrelevant in comparison with their other concerns' suggests indifference to the fate of the Jews and a willingness to accept anti-Semitism. The source does, however, point out that 'many people were drawn to anti-Semitism because they were drawn to Nazism, not the other way round.'

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting anti-Semitism might include:

- in May 1933 the burning of books by Jewish authors received some public support especially amongst university students. Large crowds watched the burnings and a good number joined in.
- the SA grew enormously through this period, reaching 400,000 by the end of 1932. This group was highly anti-Semitic and undertook wide-spread anti-Semitic violence especially during the 'Revolution from Below' or 'Brown Revolution' in 1933.
- there was little if any protest amongst the German people against the Nazis' anti-Semitic policies in 1933 such as the Civil Service Law and Law against Overcrowding of German Schools and Universities.
- the Nazi rise to power was based on the growing unpopularity of Weimar Germany and fear of Communism. In both these areas there were strong connections with key strands of Nazi anti-Semitism. The Nazis associated Weimar with the Jews (Jewish-Republic) largely due to the 'stab in the back' myth and role of Jewish politicians in the early years of the republic and Jewish influence on Weimar culture. Hitler was obsessed with the idea of

‘Jewish-bolshevism’ and linked Jews with communism. The Nazis positioned themselves as the ‘only defence’ against communism in Germany.

Factors suggesting that there was not widespread anti-Semitism might include:

- the Jewish people were on the whole highly assimilated and successful in Weimar Germany. There are numerous statistics, such as that 16% of lawyers were Jewish and there were high levels of Jewish inter-marriage into non-Jewish German families, which suggest that anti-Semitism was not prevalent in Weimar Germany
- people joined/supported Nazis despite anti-Semitism not because of it, e.g. belief that Nazis would solve economic problems, loss of faith in other parties which had been involved in numerous failed coalitions
- according to the Nazis’ own research, only 14% of their voters did so because of anti-Semitism. In a January 1932 speech to 650 businesses men at Industry Club in Düsseldorf, Hitler did not mention Jews at all in two and a half hours, which suggests that Nazi anti-Semitism did not help their rise to power 1930–1933
- failure of boycott of Jewish business on 1 April 1933.

There does seem to have been a degree of passive anti-Semitism in Germany that meant that Nazi anti-Semitism did not deter people from voting for them. The level of assimilation and Jewish success suggests that anti-Semitism had not restricted the Jews before the great depression, when the Nazi vote was very low; however there appears to have been a shift in attitude as the economy crashed.

Question 2**03** Explain why Kristallnacht took place in 1938.**[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 students 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 Kristallnacht took place in 1938.

Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- Nazi grass root opinion felt not enough had been achieved regarding the 'Jewish problem' and wanted violent action
- Hitler felt secure in power, with opposition both at home and from overseas seemingly fading. He therefore felt able to escalate the anti-Semitic policy
- the Nazi policy of encouraging voluntary Jewish emigration had failed
- the Nazis wanted to get hold of Jewish wealth and businesses to help fund preparation for war

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- the assassination of the German official von Rath in Paris by a Polish Jew
- the Nazis were gathered together celebrating the 15th anniversary of the Munich Putsch and easy to provoke into action
- Göbbels, who was out of favour with Hitler following his affair with an actress, was determined to make the anniversary spectacular to regain favour.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might connect the long term anti-Semitic beliefs of the Nazis to the short term triggers of the murder of von Rath and Göbbels' desire to please Hitler. Students may alternatively look at reasons surrounding grass root desire for anti-Semitic action and link them to the anti-Semitism of the Nazi leadership.

Question 2

- 04** 'Nazi policies against the Jews had a major impact on Jewish lives in the years 1933 to 1939.'

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 students 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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- the Nuremberg Laws stripped the Jews of their German Citizenship
- the Nuremberg Laws prevented the Jews from marrying non-Jews and these laws were taken even further, to the extent that Jews were prosecuted for any physical contact with non-Jews
- the Nazis slowly restricted all areas of economic life and employment significantly affecting the Jews' financial wellbeing
- Jewish educational opportunities were restricted
- friendships and relationships between Jews and non-Jews were made very difficult by anti-Semitic legislation.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- 75,000 Jews who had emigrated returned to Germany in the years 1935 to 1937
- the Civil Service law did not affect 60% of the Jews working for the German Civil Service
- some Jews believed the Nuremberg Laws were the height of Nazi anti-Semitism and they did not massively affect their lives
- there was a lull in anti-Semitic action in 1936 and 1937 in particular during the time of the Berlin Olympics when the world's eyes were on Germany.

Alternatively students may argue that violent and illegal actions such as imprisonment, beatings, and disappearances etc. were worse than the Nazi decrees.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that early anti-Semitic laws were limited in their impact since the Nazis did not have a free hand as President Hindenburg could veto them. The impact of the Laws did then become more significant, most notably the Nuremberg Laws in 1935, but even then the degree of impact depended on the circumstances of different members of the Jewish community. The impact of aryanisation made life in Germany for many Jews impossible.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why Jewish ghettos were established in occupied Poland in the years 1940/1941. **[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 students 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 ghettos were established in Poland in the years 1940/1941.

- Nazi desire to separate Jews from 'Aryan' Germans due to racial theory
- Nazis saw Jews as enemies and therefore a threat given that Germany was at war; ghettos were an attempt to control the Jews
- creating ghettos would enable the Nazis to exploit the Jews economically
- the number of Jews under German control massively increased with the invasion of Poland
- the Nazis had no long term plan for what to do with the Jews and the ghettos were a temporary measure.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might connect long-term Nazi beliefs about the Jews being 'dangerous' and wanting to isolate them from the rest of the people with the particular context of 1940. This involves both the events of the war and the development of Nazi anti-Semitic policy which was seemingly fluid

and undecided. They might also comment on the coincidence of racial theory with the opportunity to exploit Jews economically.

Question 3

- 06** 'Of all the Nazi leaders (including Hitler), Himmler should bear the greatest responsibility for the Holocaust.'
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 students 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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that Himmler should bear the greatest responsibility for the Holocaust against those which accredit greater blame to other leaders.

Points/factors/evidence which agree(s) might include:

- Himmler was Head of the SS which was responsible for organising the Einstazgruppen who carried out mass shootings in the USSR
- Himmler was Heydrich's superior and the SS was responsible for establishing the gas chambers, following the Wannsee Conference in 1942
- Himmler was close to Hitler and was trying to 'work toward the Führer'
- Himmler was the highest ranking official to visit the death camps such as Auschwitz.

Points/factors/evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- Hitler gave Himmler orders and therefore has greater responsibility.
- much of the detail of policy was left to Heydrich. Heydrich was present at the Wannsee Conference which Himmler didn't attend. Heydrich must also therefore be seen as taking a high level of responsibility
- Göring played a role in the logistical organisation of the holocaust
- Nazi commandants on the ground were involved in anti-Semitic policy and as perpetrators in the Holocaust and therefore have responsibility for the actions taken against the Jews from 1942.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Himmler had a key role in the actions taken against the Jews from 1942 as the Head of the SS and the bureaucracy responsible for implementing mass murder. He was a convinced and fanatical anti-Semite who played a key role in overseeing its development. Many of the key orders regarding the development of the Holocaust can be traced back to him. However students are likely to weigh this against the fact that Hitler was in overall charge and that Himmler was a devoted follower of Hitler and very unlikely to have acted unless instructed to do so.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion