

**GCSE (9–1)**

**History B (Schools History Project)**

**J411/83: Living under Nazi rule, 1933-1945**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2021

## 1. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
✓ 1	Level 1
✓ 2	Level 2
✓ 3	Level 3
✓ 4	Level 4
✓ 5	Level 5
✓ 6	Level 6
SEEN	Noted but no credit given
NAQ	Not answered question
~~~~	Extendable horizontal wavy line

## 1. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

### INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

## Living under Nazi Rule, 1933–1945

<b>Question 1 – 7 marks</b> <b>What can Source A tell us about wartime opposition in Nazi Germany? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer..</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 2 marks</b> <b>AO3</b> Analyse sources (contemporary to the period). <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO3 are equal in levels 1, AO3 carries greater weight in level 2 and greater weight again in level 3.</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 3 (6–7 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows strong awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify a wide range of features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	<i>Valid features that answers could identify include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features (L1) – tells us there was a group called the White Rose who made leaflets; tells us that some people are indifferent.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the source's content (L2) – tells us that there was organised opposition to the Nazis during the war; tells us that students were organising resistance against the Nazis; tells us reason(s) that people opposed the Nazis, e.g. losing the war; tells us reasons why it was difficult to oppose the Nazis, e.g. terror ('same fate as the Jews); tells us about the nature of opposition, e.g. moral opposition / methods of opposition; tells us reasons that more people didn't oppose, e.g. propaganda and fear of communism.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the source's purpose/tone (L3) – the leaflet's purpose is to convince more people to join the resistance. This, plus the tone, suggests they think people are bystanders, which implies that resistance/opposition of this kind was not widespread.</i></li> </ul> <i>Examples of relevant additional characteristic features shown at levels 2 or 3 could include: growing opposition to the Nazis during the war; risks involved in opposing the regime; passive resistance and/or support for the regime from the German population during the war.</i>
<b>Level 2 (3–5 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows some awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify some features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). Analyses the source to identify at least one feature that relates to the focus of the question; this may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	<i>There is no requirement to mention any possible limitations of the source. Candidates will be credited for recognising features of the source such as its production or tone and explaining how these are helpful to historians. These could include the purpose of the source as outlined above.</i> <p><i>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations of the source unless this is explicitly used to help to say what the source "can tell us" in relation to the focus of the question.</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>

Question 1 – 7 marks What can Source A tell us about wartime opposition in Nazi Germany? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer. Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 3 (6-7 marks)</b>	<p>Explains what source tells us about wartime opposition in Nazi Germany by using a valid inference from <b>PURPOSE</b> of source, e.g.</p> <p><i>The leaflet is trying to convince more people to join the resistance movement. They call people to 'cast off the cloak of indifference' and try to shame people into action ('Prove by your actions that you think otherwise'). This suggests they think most people are bystanders, which implies that resistance/opposition of this kind was not widespread in Nazi Germany.</i></p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Valid inference with valid <b>source support</b> = 7 marks, no valid <b>source support</b> = 6 marks  <b>NOTE 2:</b> Stating the purpose, etc. is not the same as making an inference from the purpose.</p>
<b>Level 2 (3-5 marks)</b>	<p>Explains what source tells us about wartime opposition in Nazi Germany by using a valid inference from content of source, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The source shows that there was organised opposition to the Nazis from students in this period. The White Rose group have distributed leaflets to try to persuade others to 'reject the Nazi gangsters' and 'support the resistance'.</i></li> <li><i>The source tells us about why there wasn't more opposition to the Nazis. For example, it mentions Nazi propaganda about Communists, and the terror used by the Nazis – 'Do you and your children want to suffer the same fate as the Jews?'</i></li> <li><i>The source tells us the reasons that some groups opposed the Nazis in this period. We can see they hated the Nazis and opposed them for moral reasons.</i> (3 marks – no source support)</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Valid inference(s) with no <b>relevant support</b> from the <b>source</b> = 3 marks.</p>
<b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>	<p>Lifts surface detail from source or general comments on provenance to address question, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The source tells us that some people were indifferent towards the Nazis.</i></li> <li><i>The source tells us about a group called the White Rose who were making leaflets.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, makes valid but general assertion(s), e.g.  <i>The source tells us that there was opposition.</i></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.

<b>Question 2 – 15 marks</b> <b>How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying the lives of Jewish people in Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939? In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO3</b> Analyse, evaluate and use sources (contemporary to the period) to make substantiated judgements, in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO3 and AO4 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources and interpretations may be combined in responses.</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – eg B is useful as it shows Jews were banned from the seaside resort; C is useful as it shows the Nazis expected demonstrations against Jews following the assassination in Paris; C useful for telling us that synagogues were attacked and property destroyed; D useful for telling us that Nazis/youth like Heck were against Jews but didn't want them killed; D is useful for showing us that the Jews were a 'disliked minority'.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3 and L4) – eg B is useful for showing nature of persecution of Jews, i.e. social exclusion/banning them from certain areas; C is useful for revealing how the Gestapo/Nazis created, organised and carried out Kristallnacht; C is useful for revealing the development of Nazi policy against Jews; D is useful for showing us that Kristallnacht was a turning point in anti-Jewish policy; D is useful for showing the presence of at least some anti-Semitism in Germany.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the sources' nature or purpose (L5), e.g. B's purpose is to attract Germans to the resort, so the fact that the Nazis chose to do this through anti-Jewish propaganda reveals the possibility of anti-Semitism amongst Germans; B portrays the resort being 'Jew-free' as a positive thing, revealing the propaganda the Nazis were using to spread their anti-Semitic ideas; the secret nature of the instructions to attack Jews in C reveals the concerns and methods of the Nazis, i.e. although Nazis were really behind Kristallnacht, they wanted people to think that the German people were behind it.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – eg B is useful as it shows Jews were banned from the seaside resort; C is useful as it shows the Nazis expected demonstrations against Jews following the assassination in Paris; C useful for telling us that synagogues were attacked and property destroyed; D useful for telling us that Nazis/youth like Heck were against Jews but didn't want them killed; D is useful for showing us that the Jews were a 'disliked minority'.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3 and L4) – eg B is useful for showing nature of persecution of Jews, i.e. social exclusion/banning them from certain areas; C is useful for revealing how the Gestapo/Nazis created, organised and carried out Kristallnacht; C is useful for revealing the development of Nazi policy against Jews; D is useful for showing us that Kristallnacht was a turning point in anti-Jewish policy; D is useful for showing the presence of at least some anti-Semitism in Germany.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the sources' nature or purpose (L5), e.g. B's purpose is to attract Germans to the resort, so the fact that the Nazis chose to do this through anti-Jewish propaganda reveals the possibility of anti-Semitism amongst Germans; B portrays the resort being 'Jew-free' as a positive thing, revealing the propaganda the Nazis were using to spread their anti-Semitic ideas; the secret nature of the instructions to attack Jews in C reveals the concerns and methods of the Nazis, i.e. although Nazis were really behind Kristallnacht, they wanted people to think that the German people were behind it.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – eg B is useful as it shows Jews were banned from the seaside resort; C is useful as it shows the Nazis expected demonstrations against Jews following the assassination in Paris; C useful for telling us that synagogues were attacked and property destroyed; D useful for telling us that Nazis/youth like Heck were against Jews but didn't want them killed; D is useful for showing us that the Jews were a 'disliked minority'.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3 and L4) – eg B is useful for showing nature of persecution of Jews, i.e. social exclusion/banning them from certain areas; C is useful for revealing how the Gestapo/Nazis created, organised and carried out Kristallnacht; C is useful for revealing the development of Nazi policy against Jews; D is useful for showing us that Kristallnacht was a turning point in anti-Jewish policy; D is useful for showing the presence of at least some anti-Semitism in Germany.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the sources' nature or purpose (L5), e.g. B's purpose is to attract Germans to the resort, so the fact that the Nazis chose to do this through anti-Jewish propaganda reveals the possibility of anti-Semitism amongst Germans; B portrays the resort being 'Jew-free' as a positive thing, revealing the propaganda the Nazis were using to spread their anti-Semitic ideas; the secret nature of the instructions to attack Jews in C reveals the concerns and methods of the Nazis, i.e. although Nazis were really behind Kristallnacht, they wanted people to think that the German people were behind it.</i></li> </ul>

<p>details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<p><i>Understanding of appropriate characteristic features could include: <b>the nature of the growing persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany</b>, e.g. <b>anti-Semitic legislation, social persecution and violence; Kristallnacht and the Nazis' claim that this was spontaneous action by the German people.</b></i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses which comment on features of extract(s) which make them particularly interesting or useful to historians rather than seeing them as limitations could include (L5) –</li> <li>Developed comments on how purpose or nature of sources make them more useful (see L5 comments above).</li> <li>Less well developed comments will probably include –</li> <li>(L3) Comments which support or challenge the evidence presented in sources with <b>candidates' own knowledge</b>, rendering sources more or less useful in terms of typicality or reliability. Candidates may show how the sources/interpretation agree and/or disagree with each other.</li> <li>(L2) Undeveloped comments on how provenance of sources make them unreliable and therefore not useful, eg B is Nazi propaganda and therefore not useful; in D, Heck is trying to distance himself from Nazi policy and therefore not useful.</li> </ul> <p><b>Candidates should not be rewarded above Level 1 for simply saying what is 'missing' from the sources. 'ie Not useful because it has no information about ...'</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO3) Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about usefulness of the interpretation(s) and the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question, or there is an assertion but this lacks any support or historical validity</p>	<p>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations unless this is explicitly used to help to say how it affects usefulness for the context given. Evaluation of usefulness may also involve making valid substantiated suggestions of other lines of enquiry for which the collection may be useful, but the focus given in the question must also be addressed.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</p>

Question 2 – 15 marks How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying the lives of Jewish people in Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939? In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Explanation of why the purpose/nature of B and/or nature of C makes it useful evidence about the lives of Jewish people in Germany, 1933–39, e.g.</p> <p><i>Source B is very useful because its purpose is actually to attract Germans to the resort. It's an advertisement and shows an attractive beach scene with a woman enjoying the seaside in her swimming costume. So the fact that the Nazis chose to do this through anti-Jewish propaganda reveals the possibility of anti-Semitism amongst Germans. This shows us the prejudice that Jewish people were facing.</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers with no relevant SOURCE support = 13 marks.</b></p> <p><b>NOTE 2: Answers with no valid comment on any other source (content or inference) = 13 marks.</b></p> <p>(Other valid <u>inferences from</u> purpose/nature at this level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B portrays the resort being 'Jew-free' as a positive thing, revealing how Nazis were using propaganda to normalise their anti-Semitic ideas. This shows us the prejudice that Jewish people were facing.</i></li> <li>• <i>The secret nature of the instructions to attack Jews in Source C is evidence that the Nazis were concerned that ordinary Germans would not support their actions. This is useful evidence about the lives of Jewish people because it reveals the possibility that anti-Semitism was not widespread.)</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, supported inferences (support from source) from <u>content of two</u> of B, C or D to explain why at they are useful as evidence about the lives of Jewish people in Germany, 1933–39, e.g.</p> <p><i>Source B is useful for showing nature of persecution of Jews. We can see from the sticker that they were socially excluded and banned from certain areas with the resort boasting that it is 'free of Jews'. Interpretation D is useful evidence about Jewish lives because it reveals the presence of anti-Semitism in Germany amongst ordinary people, not just Nazis. Heck says that although people didn't want mass murder, they 'certainly' wanted the 'Jews out of Germany' and describes the treatment of them up until Kristallnacht as 'a minor form of harassment'. [15]</i></p>
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Supported inference(s) (support from source) from <u>content of one</u> of B, C or D to explain why it is useful as evidence about the lives of Jewish people in Germany, 1933–39, e.g.</p> <p><i>Source C is useful as evidence about the lives of Jewish people because it shows how the Nazis instigated and carried out 'Kristallnacht' – the violence against Jews on that night was not spontaneous but carefully orchestrated by Heydrich. The instructions say 'demonstrations against the Jews are to be expected', ordering the police to condone things like the burning of synagogues but to ensure the protection of 'non-Jewish' property.</i></p>

Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p><b>Valid but unsupported inference(s) from content to explain why one of B, C, D are useful as evidence about the lives of Jewish people in Germany, 1933–39, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>Source B is useful for showing the propaganda against Jews and how they were excluded from particular places.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, cross reference with contextual knowledge to argue that one or more of B, C or D are useful because they are reliable, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I think Source C is useful because it discusses attacks on Jewish property on Kristallnacht. This is right because 267 synagogues were destroyed and almost 100 Jews were murdered.</i></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p><b>Uses surface features of extracts to argue source(s) are useful about the lives of Jewish people, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>Source C is useful for showing that Jewish synagogues were burned down. D is useful for showing us that the Jews were disliked.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, argues not useful on the basis of purpose, bias, reliability or provenance, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>Interpretation D is not useful because it was written a long time after Heck left the Hitler Youth and he might be trying to cover up his real feelings towards Jews. Even before Kristallnacht the treatment of Jews was not just 'minor harassment'. For example, the Nuremberg Laws took away their rights as citizens.</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: Not useful only – limited to 4 marks</b></p>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	<p><b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>The sources are really useful because they tell us about different things. Source C tells us about Kristallnacht and B shows a sticker from the KDF.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, argues not useful because of what information the source(s) do not contain, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>Source C is not very useful. It's about Kristallnacht but it doesn't actually tell us what happened to Jews on that night. I know that ...</i></p>
0 marks	

**Note: Points made about the Holocaust are not applicable to the question: 'lives of Jewish people in Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939' and therefore should not be credited.**

<b>Question 3* – 18 marks</b> <b>'The reason why most Germans did not resist the Nazis was that they were afraid.' How far do you agree with this view of Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939?</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<b>NOTE:</b> The focus of the question is on the reasons for the relative lack of opposition. Answers which address how much opposition there was (ie taking issue with the 'most Germans' element of the statement are not addressing the question and will not reach the higher 'valid argument' levels  <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering both evidence to support and to challenge the statement.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (reasons for lack of opposition), consequence (impact of these reasons) and diversity (similarity/across different groups of people), but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Grounds for agreeing may include: the role of the SA in creating fear, e.g. intimidating opponents in elections March 1933 – more than 50 opponents killed and meetings were broken up; SA believed to have murdered 600 political opponents in 1933; in June 1933 – Köpenick Week of Blood – a Social Democrat shot three SA members and the SA then arrested 500 men and tortured them – 91 died. Work of the Gestapo (and the SD) created fear – tapped telephones, opened mail, used a network of informers to spy on citizens, used torture and had powers to send people to concentration camps without trial; despite the limits of the Gestapo, (e.g. only 15,000 agents for the whole of Germany</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	

**Level 1 (1–3 marks)**

Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2).

*The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.*

**0 marks**

No response or no response worthy of credit.

*in 1939), many Gestapo investigations were prompted by public denunciations, suggesting people believed the propaganda that the Gestapo were everywhere; the work of the SS – used the Emergency Power Decree of February 1933 to take suspects into 'protective custody' – by 1939 162,000 were in 'protective custody' without trial; between 1933 and 1939 another 225,000 Germans were convicted and imprisoned for political crimes; use of SS on 'Night of the Long Knives' to kill political opponents; the role of the concentration camps in creating fear and thereby removing potential opposition, e.g. by end of 1934 there were only around 3,000 prisoners in camps, mostly Communists, and there was talk of shutting the camps down; this rose again with the imprisonment of 'asocials' – 21,400 total camp population by September 1939.*

*Grounds for disagreeing may include: the roles of the police and courts in removing potential opposition – Nazis appointed judges and opponents did not receive a fair trial; the physical limits of the Gestapo suggest things like propaganda were just as important; role of propaganda in controlling opposition –made it clear to people what was expected of them through rallies (like those at Nuremberg), radio (listening to foreign broadcasts banned, production of cheap 'People's Receivers', loudspeakers in the street-bars to broadcast Hitler's speeches), film (all film had to carry a pro-Nazi message), books (public book burnings), posters, newspapers (Goebbels controlled the news as papers were not allowed to print anti-Nazi ideas Jewish editors and journalists were replaced and anti-Nazi papers shut down), art and music; the fact that some people supported the regime because of the benefits it brought, e.g. employment, economic recovery, marriage loans, KDF, etc; propaganda reminded people of these benefits; the effectiveness of the propaganda/censorship machine meant that there was no way to openly express any criticism of the regime.*

Question 3* – 18 marks 'The reason why most Germans did not resist the Nazis was that they were afraid.' How far do you agree with this view of Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939? Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p><b>Balanced argument, two valid supporting examples each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support the statement. Firstly, the SA created fear and made people afraid to oppose the regime. For instance, they intimidated opponents in the March 1933 elections where meetings were broken up and over 50 people were killed. Overall the SA is believed to have murdered 600 political opponents in 1933 alone so this would definitely frighten people into not opposing the Nazis. Additionally, the Gestapo created an atmosphere of fear. They tapped telephones, used a network of informers and had powers to send people to concentration camps. Even though there weren't actually that many Gestapo agents, many people believed the propaganda that the Gestapo were everywhere and this made them afraid to oppose the Nazis.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, there were also other reasons for lack of resistance. Some people actively supported the regime. For example, the Nazis organised public works programmes as employment to give jobs to the unemployed. Workers benefitted from the KDF who offered cheap leisure activities to workers such as theatre tickets. So they didn't resist the Nazis because they benefitted from the regime. Additionally, the role of censorship and propaganda was vital in the lack of resistance. Things like the Nuremberg rallies, posters, films, newspapers, and loudspeakers broadcasting Hitler's speeches meant people were constantly bombarded with pro-Nazi messages. So many people were persuaded rather than frightened into not resisting.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think that being afraid was a key reason but that it was closely tied to the effectiveness of the censorship/ propaganda machine. Propaganda was a way of spreading fear about organisations like the SA and Gestapo. So one of the reasons that people were so afraid was because people knew there was no way to openly express their opposition.</i></p> <p><b>NB: The focus of the question is on the <u>reasons</u> for the relative lack of opposition. Answers which address how <u>much</u> opposition there was (ie taking issue with the 'most Germans' element of the statement are not addressing the question and will not reach L3+.</b></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p><b>Balanced argument supported by three valid supporting examples (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support the statement. Firstly, the SA created fear and made people afraid to oppose the regime. For instance, they intimidated opponents to the Nazis in the March 1933 elections where meetings were broken up. The SA is believed to have murdered 600 political opponents in 1933 alone so this would definitely frighten people into not opposing the Nazis. Additionally, the Gestapo created an atmosphere of fear. They tapped telephones, used a network of informers and had powers to send people to concentration camps. Even though there weren't actually that many Gestapo agents, many people believed the propaganda that the Gestapo were everywhere and this made them afraid to oppose the Nazis.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, there were other reasons for lack of resistance as well. Some people actively supported the regime. For example, the Nazis organised public works programmes as employment to give jobs to the unemployed. Workers benefitted from the KDF who offered cheap leisure activities to workers such as theatre tickets. So they didn't resist the Nazis because they benefitted from the regime.</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by two examples, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I agree. Firstly, the SA created fear and made people afraid to oppose the regime. For instance, they intimidated opponents to the Nazis in the March 1933 elections where meetings were broken up. The SA is believed to have murdered 600 political opponents in 1933 alone so this would definitely frighten people into not opposing the Nazis. Additionally, the Gestapo created an atmosphere of fear. They tapped telephones, used a network of informers and had powers to send people to concentration camps. Even though there weren't actually that many Gestapo agents, many people believed the propaganda that the Gestapo were everywhere and this made them afraid to oppose the Nazis.</i></p>

	<p><b>Alternatively, a balanced argument, supported by one example on each side, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support the statement. Firstly, the SA created fear and made people afraid to oppose the regime. For instance, they intimidated opponents to the Nazis in the March 1933 elections where meetings were broken up. The SA is believed to have murdered 600 political opponents in 1933 alone so this would definitely frighten people into not opposing the Nazis. On the other hand, there were other reasons for lack of resistance as well. Some people actively supported the regime. For example, the Nazis organised public works programmes as employment to give jobs to the unemployed. Workers benefitted from the KDF who offered cheap leisure activities to workers such as theatre tickets. So they didn't resist the Nazis because they were benefitted from the regime.</i></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by one example, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I agree. The SA created fear and made people afraid to oppose the regime. For instance, they intimidated opponents to the Nazis in the March 1933 elections where meetings were broken up and over 50 people were killed. Overall the SA is believed to have murdered 600 political opponents in 1933 alone so this would definitely frighten people into not opposing the Nazis.</i></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p><b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b>  <i>Yes, I agree because the SA and the SS attacked opponents and people were thrown in concentration camps so this made people afraid to resist the Nazis.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, description of terror organisations/ relevant events without linking this to the question or without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>I disagree. The KDF was the 'Strength Through Joy' organisation for workers. It set up trips, holidays and gym evenings.</i></li> <li>• <i>I agree. Many opponents were killed by the SS on the Night of The Long Knives.</i></li> <li>• <i>I disagree because actually there were lots of people who tried to resist the Nazis in this period such as Christians like Martin Niemöller. He was ...</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p><b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b>  <i>No, there were other reasons such as some people liked the Nazis and wanted to support them.</i></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

Question 4* – 18 marks “Hitler’s position of total power by August 1934 was achieved through legal means.” How far do you agree with this view of Germany between January 1933 and August 1934?		Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>		Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>		<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering both evidence to support and challenge the statement.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>		Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (reasons for Hitler being able to take total control) and consequence (impact of the Nazis’ actions and how they achieved Hitler to achieve total power) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>		<i>Grounds for agreeing may include: Hitler had been appointed Chancellor in January 1933 partly as a result of the Nazis’ power base – they were the largest party in the Reichstag, so Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor can be seen as legal; the Emergency Decree passed following the Reichstag Fire was passed constitutionally by President Hindenburg using Article 48 – this suspended civil rights, gave the secret police the power to hold people indefinitely and was used to ‘legally’ suppress the Communists, eg 4000+ arrested; the Enabling Act in March 1933 was also passed legally, by 441 votes to 94 – this gave emergency powers to the government for four years and meant the cabinet (in effect, Hitler), could pass decrees without the involvement of the Reichstag or the President; the Act for the Restoration of the professional Civil Service in April meant that Jews and political opponents of the Nazis were ‘legally’ removed from their jobs; an Emergency Decree was used in June to ban the Social Democrats and imprison over 3000 of their workers; other parties dissolved and the Law against the Formation of New Parties was passed in July; the Act for the Reconstruction of the State in Jan 1934 legally took away the power of the Lander and gave it to Nazi Gaue/Gauleiter; the establishment of The People’s Court in April 1934 created a pseudo-legal way of putting on trial people who had committed ‘political offences’.</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>		
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>		
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>		
<b>0 marks</b>		

No response or no response worthy of credit.

*Grounds for disagreeing may include: Use of SA to intimidate opponents in elections March 1933 – more than 50 opponents killed and meetings were broken up, which helped the Nazis to achieve 44% of the vote; use of the SS and SA to intimidate Reichstag into passing Enabling Act March 1933 – allowed Hitler to pass laws without the approval of Reichstag or President, eg Feb 1933 Civil Service Act passed, July 1933 all political parties banned; SA believed to have murdered 600 political opponents in 1933 and over 100,000 had been arrested by October with many imprisoned in concentration camps; in June 1933 – Köpenick Week of Blood – a Social Democrat shot three SA members and the SA then arrested 500 men and tortured them – 91 died; this meant that political opposition was removed by 1934; use of SS on 'Night of the Long Knives' to kill political opponents and members of SA – reassured the army, who were suspicious of the SA; they took an oath of loyalty to Hitler Aug 1934.*

Question 4* – 18 marks “Hitler’s position of total power by August 1934 was achieved through legal means.” How far do you agree with this view of Germany between January 1933 and August 1934? Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p><b>Balanced argument, two valid supporting examples each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is some support for this statement. Firstly, it could be argued that Hitler’s first step towards total power was taken via legal means. When the Reichstag burned down in February 1933, Hitler claimed it was part of a Communist plot and persuaded President Hindenburg to pass the Emergency Decree. This suspended civil rights and was used to suppress the Communists, helping Hitler to reach total power by wiping out his most vocal opponents. Additionally, the Enabling Act in March 1933 was also passed legally, by 441 votes to 94 – this gave emergency powers to the government for four years and meant Hitler could pass decrees without the Reichstag.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, there much evidence to challenge the statement. During the March elections, the SA broke up socialist meetings and killed more than 50 people. Then, during the vote on the Enabling Act, the SS and SA surrounded the Opera House where the vote took place, intimidating the remaining deputies. This brings into question whether the Act was actually passed legally and suggests that it was only passed due to the threat of violence. Finally, in July 1934, the violence on the ‘Night of the Long Knives’ helped Hitler to achieve total power. He used the SS to murder Rohm and other SA leaders, whom the army saw as rivals. After this, the German army gave Hitler their full support and swore an oath of loyalty to Hitler. With an elite force like the German army now on his side, Hitler was a step nearer total control.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think that violence was the ‘main’ way Hitler achieved total power, not legal means. Though the Reichstag Fire happened by chance and the passing of the Emergency Decree did not itself use violence, Hitler used violence to capitalise on it in the following month during the elections. Additionally, the Enabling Act was only partially legal and would never have been passed without the use of violence and intimidation.</i></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p><b>Balanced argument supported by three valid supporting examples (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is some support for this statement. Firstly, it could be argued that Hitler’s first step towards total power was taken via legal means. When the Reichstag burned down in February 1933, Hitler claimed it was part of a Communist plot and persuaded President Hindenburg to pass the Emergency Decree. This suspended civil rights and was used to suppress the Communists, helping Hitler to reach total power by wiping out his most vocal opponents. Additionally, the Enabling Act in March 1933 was also passed legally, by 441 votes to 94 – this gave emergency powers to the government for four years and meant Hitler could pass decrees without the Reichstag.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, there much evidence to challenge the statement. During the March elections, the SA broke up socialist meetings and killed more than 50 people. Then, during the vote on the Enabling Act, the SS and SA surrounded the Opera House where the vote took place, intimidating the remaining deputies. This brings into question whether the Act was actually passed legally and suggests that it was only passed due to the threat of violence.</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by two examples, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I agree. There is some support for this statement. Firstly, it could be argued that Hitler’s first step towards total power was taken via legal means. When the Reichstag burned down in February 1933, Hitler claimed it was part of a Communist plot and persuaded President Hindenburg to pass the Emergency Decree. This suspended civil rights and was used to suppress the Communists, helping Hitler to reach total power by wiping out his most vocal opponents. Additionally, the Enabling Act in March 1933 was also passed legally, by 441 votes to 94 – this gave emergency powers to the government for four years and meant Hitler could pass decrees without the Reichstag.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, a balanced argument, supported by one example on each side, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is some support for this statement. Firstly, it could be argued that Hitler’s first step towards total power was taken via legal means. When the Reichstag burned down in February 1933, Hitler claimed it was part of a Communist plot and persuaded President Hindenburg to pass the Emergency Decree. This suspended civil rights and was</i></p>

	<i>used to suppress the Communists, helping Hitler to reach total power by wiping out his most vocal opponents. On the other hand, there is much evidence to challenge the statement. During the March elections, the SA broke up socialist meetings and killed more than 50 people. Then, during the vote on the Enabling Act, the SS and SA surrounded the Opera House where the vote took place, intimidating the remaining deputies. This brings into question whether the Act was actually passed legally and suggests that it was only passed due to the threat of violence.</i>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<b>One sided argument, supported by one example, e.g.</b> <i>I agree. There is some support for this statement. Firstly, it could be argued that Hitler's first step towards total power was taken via legal means. When the Reichstag burned down in February 1933, Hitler claimed it was part of a Communist plot and persuaded President Hindenburg to pass the Emergency Decree. This suspended civil rights and was used to suppress the Communists, helping Hitler to reach total power by wiping out his most vocal opponents.</i>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b> <i>No, I disagree because the Night of the Long Knives was violent and not legal.</i> <b>Alternatively, description of relevant events Jan 1933–August 1934 without fully explaining how this helped Hitler achieve total power, e.g.</b> <i>In June/ July 1934, Hitler carried out the Night of the Long Knives, also known as Operation Hummingbird. He invited Rohm and other SA leaders to a meeting. Here, he arrested and later murdered them.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b> <i>Yes, there were many areas where legal means were used like legislation being passed.</i>
0 marks	

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**  
Telephone: 01223 553998  
Facsimile: 01223 552627  
Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored