



---

# A-level HISTORY 7042/20

Component 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

---

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 0 / M S

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 Examiner.

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

#### **Copyright information**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

### Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

### Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

**Section A**

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Reichkristallnacht.

**[30 marks]***Target: AO2*

*Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## 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 must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.**

**Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**

### Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this source comes from the Nazi propaganda minister and architect of Reichkristallnacht; it shows the thinking of the man behind this event; the entries are for the 10/11 November, which gives his immediate reactions to the unfolding events
- this comes from Goebbels' diaries and was intended for later publication and public consumption. This affects its value as Goebbels would be seeking both to emphasise his key role in this episode as well as his access and absolute loyalty to Hitler
- the source is written by the Nazi propaganda minister and therefore has little objectivity. It is valuable for demonstrating the process of developing propaganda by misrepresenting events and attitudes.
- the tone varies from exultant and triumphant, eg his cries of 'Bravo! Bravo!' to concern at the possibility of the incidents getting out of control and the likely international reaction. Overall, however, it conveys Goebbels' delight in matters turning out as he had hoped and reinforces the profound anti-Semitism at the heart of Nazism.

### Content and argument

- the source refers to the close relationship between Goebbels and Hitler regarding the start and development of Reichkristallnacht. Students may point out that one of the motives behind the event was Goebbels' wish to strengthen his relationship with Hitler and that Hitler was initially uncertain. Goebbels hoped to increase his standing in Hitler's inner circle following a marital scandal
- the reference to withdrawing the police shows how far Goebbels was complicit in allowing for the disorder and turmoil. By deliberately withholding the means to restore order he actively encouraged the turmoil, and is proud of his work. The events are indicative of the degree to which the legal system had become a pawn in Nazi hands by 1938 and the way Hitler's individual henchmen were able to manipulate the system
- the source emphasises the anger felt by the people and the popularity of the anti-Jewish attacks. This anger is deemed to be of such an extent that action may be needed to prevent it getting out of hand. Students are likely to challenge this view by pointing out that Reichkristallnacht was carefully directed from the start, by both Goebbels and Heydrich; vom Rath's murder merely provided an excuse that was used by the Nazi press to justify actions that were already being planned
- the source focuses on Reichkristallnacht serving as a trigger for further action against the Jews in relation to financial penalties and expropriation of Jewish business – again lending weight to the view that the event was orchestrated in order to justify further anti-Semitic legislation. A fine of 1 billion RM was imposed on the Jews as well as a decree excluding Jews from economic life, on 12 November
- the source indicates some concern from Goebbels as to the international reaction to the pogrom. This was a time of increasing radicalisation of Nazi racial policy following the Anschluss which had brought unrestrained action against Jews in Austria; whether Goebbels was genuinely concerned about

foreign opinion is debatable; Germany's economic situation was improving and Goering (in charge of the 4-year plan) was determined to remove Jews from businesses regardless of foreign opinion.

**Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**

### **Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- this report was produced in Leipzig, a city like others, such as Berlin, that suffered considerable damage as a result of Reichkristallnacht. It is by a politically-aware Consul who was in a position to see for himself what was happening in the city; he was also able to draw on reports from local witnesses and people coming to the consulate, some of whom corroborated the stories of others
- the account comes from American diplomat (whose values would be strongly against Nazism and the acts described). Tellingly, he presents his own consulate as 'a centre of humanity for the past 10 days'. Although an 'outsider's' opinion on what took place, this presents a useful counterbalance to the Nazi reporting (alluded to at the beginning) and the report, addressed to the American government, helps speak for western liberal opinion
- this report was produced just 10 days after the main events of Reichkristallnacht; its factual substance helps in an appreciation of the events and immediate reactions; it also helps show how and what the 'international' community learnt of the events
- the tone is clearly condemnatory of Nazi actions referring to the perpetrators' 'unprecedented fury' and the 'bloody, badly-bruised faces' of their victims; it emphasises the non-comprehension and powerlessness of Germans in the city who are described as 'silent and bewildered' 'horrified' and 'sickened at telling the tale'.

### **Content and argument**

- the report serves to demolish the view that the German people provided a strong popular backing for the events of Reichkristallnacht; this may be corroborated with reference to other reports, e.g. from British officials in Berlin or from the writing of eye-witnesses such as Christabel Bielenberg who witnessed similar scenes to those described and wrote about them; there is also evidence of 'ordinary Germans' sheltering and helping Jews
- reference to the firing of synagogues may be developed with further detail of the destructive vandalism that occurred; such detail helps reinforce the ideological motives (as opposed to desire for gain) behind the pogrom the extract reinforces the lack of police action and the failure of fire brigades to save Jewish property may also be noted.
- the treatment of individuals is also an important element of the source content; the mocking of Jews who were thrown into a stream, the violence which resulted in 'bloody and bruised faces' and the desperate Jewish women whose husbands and sons had been 'taken off' are described; reference may be made to the placing of Jews in so-called 'preventive detention' and to the arrest and transportation of male German Jews between the ages of 16 and 60 to concentration camps in the wake of the pogrom.
- a desire to escape increasing Nazi radicalism is shown in the desperate attempts of Jews – particularly women – to find a means of emigration from Germany. The frenzied atmosphere at the American consulate helps show the significance of Reichkristallnacht as a turning point for the Jews. Previously some had accepted Nazi persecution as a passing phase. After 1938, increasing numbers sought to escape. However, the removal of Jewish assets in the aftermath of Reichkristallnacht made emigration increasingly difficult and within a year this option was no longer possible.

**Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:****Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- this source comes from an eyewitness who was in Germany at the time of Reichkristallnacht. The writer witnessed both the events themselves and suffered in the aftermath of Reichkristallnacht making her a valuable source of information.
- this letter was written to her son and was not intended for a wider readership or audience. The writer would have therefore no reason to be guarded in her language or to embellish the details. Having emigrated, she was safe from Nazi retribution so could be more candid.
- the writer had an emotional involvement in the events, being Jewish herself and sufficiently concerned to ensure her son knew about what had happened; she had been so affected she had even emigrated to Australia. The source has value in presenting a first-hand anti-Nazi view –and written a year after the events described at a time when the world was beginning to realize the full extent of Nazi ambition.
- the tone is primarily factual but elements of opinion creep in, as in ‘The Nazis were just waiting for an excuse and, even without Paris, would have created one’, the ‘so-called outbreak of some collective national frenzy’ and ‘all hell broke loose’. There is also an expression of shock at what unfolded – ‘it was simply horrific’.

**Content and argument**

- the source refers to the murder of vom Rath being merely an excuse for Reichkristallnacht. Vom Rath was a minor official in the German embassy in Paris, and was assassinated on 9 November by a Polish Jew trying to avenge the mistreatment of his parents by the Nazis. This coincided with a reunion commemorating the Munich putsch attended by Hitler giving Goebbels the opportunity to propose the radical initiative.
- the source refers to Reichkristallnacht being ‘organised much like a military mobilisation’. This can be corroborated with reference to Heydrich’s detailed instructions given to the SA and police units across the country even though Hitler had said at the commemoration meeting that demonstrations (although not to be discouraged) were not to be organized or prepared by the Party. The stealth surrounding Nazi actions and the need to second-guess the Führer’s wishes is clear.
- the events of Reichkristallnacht are referred to as ‘all hell broke loose’ and the lawlessness of developments is stressed; the destruction of homes, businesses and synagogues was taken without any concerns for the economic implication.
- the source refers to Reichkristallnacht acting as a trigger for more radical actions against the Jews, particularly in terms of exclusion from society and the economy. These laws were not entirely new, however. The aryansisation of Jewish property had, for example begun with a decree in April 1938 and from October 1938, Jewish identity papers had had to be stamped with a ‘J’.
- the source refers to the suffering, arrests and deaths as a result of Reichkristallnacht. There were mass arrests and the 91 known deaths as well as thousands of injuries; there was the looting of cash, silver, jewellery and works of art, as well as the loss of homes, shops and businesses. The source makes clear how Reichkristallnacht profoundly affected families and individuals who, in the aftermath, sought to escape a regime which made conditions for Jews intolerable.

**Section B**

- 0 2** To what extent did economic rather than political problems pose the greater challenge to the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1923?

**[25 marks]***Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**



## 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.**

**Arguments supporting the view that economic rather than political problems posed the greater challenge to the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1923 might include:**

- the German economy already had to contend with massive war debt of 1.44 billion marks but this was worsened by the severe economic losses at Versailles, with 13% of her territory being taken as well as 75% of its iron ore and 15% of its arable land.
- these territorial losses, with the associated economic consequences, made it more difficult to pay off the spiralling debt, so putting more pressure on the German currency, leading to inflation.
- reparations of £6.6 billion exacerbated this economic situation, making it even more difficult to pay off the debt as well as meet the payments, fuelling the printing of money as tax rises or spending cuts politically unpalatable.
- hyperinflation, provoked by the Ruhr Crisis, caused a collapse of the currency leading to severe consequences for middle-class savings as well as the price of basic foods for the workers.
- political extremism, from both left and right, whilst serious, failed in all the attempts to destroy the democracy, e.g. through the Spartacist, Kapp and Munich revolts and by the end of 1923, a semblance of stability was returning.

**Arguments challenging the view that economic rather than political problems posed the greater challenge to the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1923 might include:**

- the Weimar Republic was challenged politically by the survival of undemocratic institutions such as the army, civil service and judiciary, which sought to defend their own influence and interests, which were, often, incompatible with democratic values so making it more difficult for the Republic's democratic institutions to function effectively, especially in times of economic and political crisis.
- the loathing of all aspects of the Versailles Treaty, the signing of which was one of the new Republic's first acts, ensured the deepening of political extremism around the 'stab in the back' myth, leading directly to the Kapp Putsch of 1920 and establishing deep-rooted hostility to the Weimar Republic from the start.
- the Weimar Republic's very existence was challenged by political extremism from left and right with attempted communist revolt in 1919 as well as further outbreaks in 1920–21 and right-wing revolts in 1920 (Kapp) and 1923 (Munich) as well as attacked by a campaign of assassinations by Organisation Consul which killed nearly 400 people.
- the Weimar Republic was also undermined by its own Constitution which made strong government difficult, including the management of the many economic problems facing the new Republic in this period, due to its voting system as well as giving the President significant emergency powers through Article 48.
- this period, whilst undoubtedly difficult economically, was not economically catastrophic throughout or for all; unemployment had virtually disappeared by 1921 and social reforms had improved the lives of many in this period, e.g. through the 8-hour day and the health insurance system.

Students can make a valid judgement either way on this question and may emphasise how inter-related and connected these two sets of problems were. They might conclude, for example, that, to a large extent, the growth of political extremism was worsened by deepening economic problems, notably in 1923. Also, students might argue that the range of both economic and political problems facing the new democratic republic, many of which emanated from Germany's defeat in the First World War and the subsequent treaty, was a primarily political challenge that it struggled to grapple with.

**0 3** 'Weimar society became more liberal and tolerant in the years 1924 to 1929.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## 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.**

**Arguments supporting the view that Weimar society became more liberal and tolerant in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:**

- greater opportunities for the liberalisation of women in Weimar Germany, backed by new rights in education, employment and voting rights, were enshrined in the Weimar Constitution. The concept of the 'new woman' was evident with sexual liberation and independence.
- there was significant creativity and experimentation in the arts, film and theatre, architecture, which many not only tolerated but found exhilarating and liberating, especially after the crisis-ridden years of the war and post-war years. Young people, in particular, were engaged by this increasingly liberal atmosphere and were attracted by aspects such as modernity, challenge to authority as well as greater freedom on issues such as sex and political satire.
- evidence of greater liberalisation of attitudes towards sex; gay men, transvestites and lesbians felt able to display their sexuality more openly rather than conceal it. This was emphasised further with the vibrant nightlife in cities such as Berlin where nightclubs became known for nudity and eroticism.
- further evidence of increasingly tolerant attitudes in Weimar society in this period was the deepening assimilation of Jews in urban society. Jews participated in many areas of German life such as law, journalism, culture and medicine.

**Arguments challenging the view that Weimar society became more liberal and tolerant in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:**

- there was some strong hostility and intolerance to the explosion of creativity in the arts, such as theatre and film, art and architecture. In rural areas, there was a clear tendency to cling onto conservative norms of culture. The Republic was seen as being far too permissive in its outlook.
- the extent of change to the social position of women has been somewhat exaggerated. There was some hostility, even from some women's groups such as the BDM, to the 'new woman' idea. Instead, traditional family values were promoted and there were limits to the apparent growing equality for women in terms of politics, employment and on abortion and contraception.
- the increasing assimilation of Jews in Weimar society was mostly an urban phenomenon; in the smaller towns and rural areas anti-Semitism was still powerful and was to be exploited by the Nazis in the 1930s. There was still some linking of Jewish businesses with corruption, for example the Barmat Scandal of 1925.
- the greater sexual freedom for gays, transvestites and lesbians, epitomised perhaps in the Berlin nightclubs, was viewed with horror by older, more traditionally-minded Germans, already concerned at the evidence of young people's desire to challenge authority and societal norms. They linked this looser moral framework to the perceived decadence and immorality of the Weimar Democracy.

Students might conclude that there is some evidence of a more liberal and tolerant Weimar society between the years 1924 to 1929 in areas such as toleration of the Jews, sexual liberation, the rights of women as well as cultural aspects such as in film, architecture and the theatre. However, students may argue that this change of attitude can be overstated and that these changes were viewed positively by a limited proportion of the population as Weimar Germany remained a broadly conservative and traditional society which was unsettled by, and hostile to, these changes. Students may also point out that much of this liberalisation was youth-centred and urban-based, where this would have been greeted more positively, with more evidence of intolerance towards these changes in rural areas and amongst older sectors of the population.

**0 4** 'In the years 1939 to 1945, it was lack of unity that caused opposition and resistance movements to the Nazis to fail.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## 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.**

**Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1939 to 1945, it was lack of unity that caused opposition and resistance movements to the Nazis to fail might include:**

- many opponents of Nazism and opposition groups had only their hatred of the regime as their only unifying point and had widely disparate objectives otherwise. For example, the Communists had little else in common with the military elites or the Churches. These opposition groups had little in the way of overall leadership or unity of purpose or methods in resisting the Nazis.
- opposition from young people was not unified with differences partly along class lines. For example, working-class groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates had very different perspectives from the more middle-class groups such as the Swing Youth or the White Rose movements.
- effective opposition from the left of German politics was still hampered by the fractious split between the Communists and the Socialists which emanated from the early years of the Weimar Republic.
- the German Christian Churches were split in terms of whether to oppose at all or how vocally and, over what issues, they should voice their opposition. For example, the Catholic Church was broadly supportive of Hitler's anti-Communism and focused on specific causes such as euthanasia.
- there was a lack of unity among the military elites who opposed Hitler and the wider Kreisau Circle and it took the increasingly bleak military in the east for focused assassination attempts to materialise.

**Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1939 to 1945, it was lack of unity that caused opposition and resistance movements to the Nazis to fail might include:**

- opposition and resistance to the Nazis was limited by the removal of many of those platforms which would have made effective opposition possible, e.g. the trade union movement and political parties.
- Nazi terror increased in ferocity to keep opposition minimised with hangings of Edelweiss Pirates in 1944 after arrests and labour camps had failed and mass executions after the failed July 1944 Stauffenberg Plot. As defeat loomed, the Nazi use of terror was intensified rather than diminished.
- the Nazis, backed by incessant propaganda, maintained the broad support of the population until the very end of the war, as shown by the positive response to Goebbels' Total War speech in 1943 and the little sympathy of ordinary Germans shown towards the failed 1944 plotters.
- the opposition was compromised by the support and co-operation given by some of Germany's key institutions such as the Churches. It was left to individuals such as Cardinal Galen and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, rather than the organisations themselves, to try to effect resistance.
- opposition and resistance were limited throughout these years partly due to the fact that Germany was at war and the majority of the population, despite increased grumblings and dwindling morale, were still focused on supporting the German war effort, especially as the threat of Soviet Russia grew.

Some students may argue that the opposition in Germany was still hampered in the war years by the same problems and obstacles it encountered before the war, i.e. a lack of platform for opposition, pervasive surveillance and use of terror from the state but also a lack of unity – of leadership, purpose and methods. Students may agree that the widely divergent aims and priorities of the different opposing movements ensured the failure of opposition and resistance even if they had the opportunity of voicing their opposition openly. Finally, some students might question the idea of failure with evidence of actions taken by individuals and groups which did have some impact.