



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS2M

Unit 2M

Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Final

Mark Scheme

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2011

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

HIS2M: Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the Nazis in Germany in March 1933. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4:	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the levels scheme.

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

- Source A offers a positive image of the Nazis, e.g. Hitler is described as 'a true statesman'. Source B is negative and shows a Nazi Party full of aggression – 'The Kroll Opera House was crawling with armed SA and SS men'
- Source A emphasises a moderate, nationalistic image whereas Source B emphasises the threat and menace of the Nazis

-
- Source A is emotive – ‘Father too is deeply impressed’ and highly subjective. Source B, on the other hand, is more objective and critical. Hoegner in Source B expresses some concern about what the future will bring: ‘Their expressions boded no good’, whereas Ebermeyer in Source A expresses hope for the future through the reactions of his father who is ‘deeply impressed’ and his mother who ‘has tears in her eyes’.

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

- the provenance of one account, by a Bavarian SPD deputy, is taken at a time when the Nazis were attempting to use the Enabling Law to curtail all forms of opposition
- Hoegner in Source B appears to offer a more factual view than Ebermeyer in Source A
- in the first two months after becoming Chancellor Hitler was careful to offer an image as a statesman and unifier. ‘The Day of Potsdam’ was designed to create this illusion and Source A reflects a certain element of propaganda. Source A focuses more on a perceived view of Hitler as a man who is reasonable and patriotic whereas Source B tries to debunk this image by trying to highlight the real nature of Nazism behind the veneer of respectability.

To address ‘how far’, candidates should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both relate to the same time-frame and both are looking at key events surrounding a momentous change in legislation – the formulation of the Enabling Act in March 1933
- both are referring to aspects of the Nazi Party – the leader and party thugs, behaviour and reputation
- both were live witnesses at these key events
- both are about the use and manipulation of power, even if Source A is emotional and Source B more physical.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that overall the sources differ considerably, particularly the fact that Source B, the view of a SPD official, has a different perspective and agenda on the Nazis compared to Source A, the view of an admirer.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.How important was the use of legislation in the Nazi consolidation of power by the end of 1933?
(24 marks)*Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)***Levels Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

L1: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views.

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer. All three sources are particularly useful and Source C could act as a template.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** offers the impression that Hitler, far from being a fanatic, will abide by the traditions of German life and will adopt a conciliatory, moderate stance when dealing with any opposition or future issues of state
- **Source B** indicates how 'anti-democratic' the Nazis were, especially that they would adopt as much violence and intimidation as was necessary to get legislation passed. Candidates may be able to highlight the irony of this position
- **Source C** is very objective and offers a balanced view of how the future situation in Germany might unfold. It suggests that the Nazis were prepared to try and keep within the parameters of Weimar but if a national revolution was to proceed then 'exceptional measures' would be used to enforce consolidation of power.

From candidates' own knowledge:

- the various laws passed, including the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State, the Enabling Law and the Law against Formation of New Parties gave Hitler the legal cover he required
- terror had been a key instrument in Hitler's rise to power. It was the party's *modus vivendi*. The SA were almost a law unto themselves and Germany had a climate of fear
- the paradox that the whole emphasis was on using the legal powers of the Weimar Constitution to destroy its political authority
- once the process of Gleichschaltung was commenced, it was inconceivable to allow the existence of any other political parties.

Factors suggesting that Nazi consolidation did depend on the use of legislation might include:

- Hitler was initially hamstrung by the fact that his options for change were limited. For example his cabinet only contained 3 Nazis and he was subject to the ultimate authority of President Hindenburg
- Hitler was conscious of the need to adopt a gradual approach, given the circumstances and the need for financial support from commerce and industry and acceptance from the army
- post the Munich Putsch of 1923, Hitler recognised that achieving power constitutionally within the Weimar constitution would pave the way for future consolidation
- despite the widespread use of terror in the 1933 election campaign, it still did not deliver the outright majority in the polls for the Nazi Party. Hence the need for further legislation such as the Enabling Law.

Factors suggesting an alternative view might include:

- the events surrounding the March 1933 Reichstag elections where left-wing parties were virtually driven underground and a precedent was set
- the rapid rise and influence of the SA. By July 1933 nearly 27000 political prisoners had been arrested
- the passage of the Enabling Law was met with much intimidation and violence
- election meetings were broken up by violence, newspapers were suppressed and the distribution of election leaflets became virtually impossible

-
- intimidation increased and trade union offices – with close links to the SPD – were subjected to violent attack. The result was the German Labour Front
 - the use of the Reichstag Fire to cynically exploit the opposition.

Good answers are likely to suggest that there is a great deal of evidence to support both the 'legal' and 'terror' line of argument in the sources and using own knowledge. In this sense the Nazi 'legal revolution' and the 'revolution from below' were opposite sides of the same coin. Any observation of the constitution was strictly limited and, if the letter of the law was kept, the spirit certainly wasn't. German democracy had been destroyed in less than six months. Goebbels's diary entry – 'all this had been achieved much more quickly than we had dared to hope' – suggests a mixture of violence and legality proved effective in the Nazi consolidation of power.

Question 2

03 Explain why the Nazis promoted the Strength through Joy (*KdF*) movement. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| | Nothing written worthy of credit. | 0 |
| L1: | Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. | 3-6 |
| L3: | Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. | 7-9 |
| L4: | Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. | 10-12 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Nazis promoted the Strength through Joy movement.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- to supervise workers' leisure time and make available luxury items to ordinary people
- to control and regulate workers' private lives and encourage a spirit of social equality
- to encourage workers to see themselves as part of a Volksgemeinschaft
- to use the KdF as a propaganda tool to indoctrinate workers and their families
- to bring together Germans from different areas and attempt to break down religious and regional barriers
- to encourage a degree of competitiveness.

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

- workers who were refreshed by holidays, sports and cultural activities would be more productive when returning to work
- to encourage participation in sport so that the nation improved physically as well as mentally.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might stress that the Nazis used the KdF to combine both an attempt to win over working-class support with the desire to put National Socialism into practice and to highlight that work and leisure were not separate but complementary spheres.

Question 2

- 04** 'Nazi policies towards German workers and peasants did little to improve the lives of these groups in the years 1933 to 1939.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view that German workers and peasants gained little from Nazi policies in the years 1933 to 1939 against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- workers lost bargaining rights, pay increases were controlled and there was a lack of freedom of movement. Choice and free-time were curtailed, as had been the trade unions. The KdF was a propaganda 'sham'
- the Reich Food Estate (1933) was headed by Richard Darré and controlled every aspect of agricultural production and consumption
- farms were not allowed to be divided
- despite public support for farmers, there was a drift to the towns in the late 1930s as peasants sought higher wages
- any improvements were due to other factors such as rearmament and an overall world pick up in trade, not specific Nazi policies
- workers' wages were earned by working longer hours
- the level of production of industrial goods far outstripped consumer goods.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- workers had regular work, stable rents and recreational and cultural provision was organised by the KdF
- there was security of tenure of medium sized farms
- the workers recognised the regime as the source of their economic recovery and perhaps as the creators of the 'economic miracle'
- a substantial number of farm debts were written off
- all farmers benefitted from increased prices between 1933 and 1939
- workers were not being driven to breaking point to reach targets as in the Soviet Union
- an increase in wages. Compared to 1928 levels, by 1938 wages had recovered by 85%.

Good answers are likely to conclude that it is perhaps important to look at the well-being of workers and peasants from a wider perspective than just an economic one. Varying degrees of tolerance of Nazi policies did not necessarily equate with material well-being. Political emasculation was a significant grievance. Also an awareness of differentiation over time might prove profitable. Candidates may choose to identify 1936 as a bridging date to highlight the impact of rearmament on the lives of workers and peasants. In general both workers and farmers had mixed feelings about Nazi policies. There is much debate over the material well-being of German workers and peasants. Superficially the statistics might suggest an improvement but not a large one. In relative terms the picture is somewhat different. At best the standard of living was static; at worst it fell. Stephen Lee's analysis – Chapter 5 in *Hitler and Nazi Germany* – is worthwhile. Sophisticated answers will note that material conditions did vary from one class to another and the picture is blurred by variables such as age and geographical location. Finally, it is clear that the best gains were made by those in industries associated with the rearmament boom, while those in consumer goods struggled to maintain their real incomes.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the Nazi rise to power in 1933 caused problems for the German Churches.
(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the rise of the Nazis created problems for the German Churches.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- how to respond to National Socialism which was basically an anti-Christian philosophy. Both philosophies were hence mutually antagonistic
- where Nazi values glorified strength, violence and war, Christianity taught love, forgiveness and respect
- German Protestants had a major dilemma with the arrival of the Nazis. How to react to a party which often represented many of their values – conservative nationalism, anti-communism, anti-Semitism, anti-Weimar and hence anti-liberalism and anti-decadence
- there were three main Protestant parties, there was much internal division and hence no co-ordinated policy towards the Nazis
- the Catholic Church was essentially anti-Nazi in terms of past voting behaviour and allegiance and therefore, although it was an international organisation and less

susceptible to Nazi ideology, many in it were aware that any accommodation with the Nazi regime would be difficult as co-ordinating all Churches into the Volksgemeinschaft was a key Nazi aim.

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

- despite a veneer of conciliation in early 1933 some leading Nazis such as Himmler and Heydrich were openly contemptuous
- Hitler in private suggested 'One is either a Christian or a German. You can't be both'.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might try and demonstrate the dilemma faced by the German Churches when confronted by the Nazi ideology of making the Führer the focus of loyalty for all Germans. For example, Nazi propaganda could readily make German Catholics' obedience to the Pope appear subversive to Germany's unity as a nation. Furthermore, Protestant and Catholic leaders felt alienated by the permissiveness of the Weimar Republic and secular liberalism. The Nazi regime offered a strong bulwark against atheistic Bolshevism and in rural areas many Protestants saw Nazism as a means of improving living standards. Clearly there was a dilemma.

Question 3

- 06** 'Nazi attempts to control the German Churches had limited success in the years 1933 to 1945.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that Nazi attempts to influence and control the German Churches met with little success in the years 1933 to 1945. With the elimination of political opposition and the Nazification of social and professional organisations, the German Churches remained the only potential source of

ideological opposition to the regime. Therefore relations were subject to a mixture of compromise and conflict throughout this period.

Points which agree might include:

- the German Churches remained relatively independent in the years 1933 to 1939
- anti-church propaganda often proved to be counter-productive
- the ability of the Churches to mobilise public support meant that Hitler was wary and he did not wish to alienate a major source of conservative support
- Nazi campaigns were relentless but piecemeal and lacked coherence
- over time the neo-pagan, atheistic nature of the Nazi regime meant relations deteriorated with the Protestant Church, which had been its most sympathetic supporter as the state religion
- the Nazis did not have great support in Catholic areas
- the role of individuals such as Martin Niemöller who formed the Confessional Church
- over 700 Protestant priests were arrested in 1935 for condemning neo-pagan teaching in schools
- Bishop Galen escaped punishment in 1941 when he publicly protested against euthanasia
- In 1943 a synod of the Prussian Confessional Church criticised those involved in the extermination of people on health and racial grounds

Points which disagree might include:

- many clergymen welcomed Nazism and found much common ground on issues such as race, politics, women's rights and homosexuality, pro-family, anti-abortion, anti-contraception
- recent research has shown not only a fair amount of collusion between the Churches and the regime but also a convergence between the sincerely held, if sometimes unorthodox, Christian beliefs of many leading Nazis and their political engagement
- the Churches welcomed the Nazi stance on Communism and the Weimar Republic
- the Churches created few obstacles to Nazi policies and were seen as compliant
- Hitler felt any concessions given to the Churches did not affect issues he considered more important
- the 'German Christians' advocated that Protestantism should wholeheartedly embrace Nazi ideology
- In the early years of the Second World War the Churches welcomed the attack on the USSR and there were more aggressive moves made against the Churches, particularly the security police against 'agitator' priests

Good answers are likely to conclude that it is difficult to quantify the actual level of success for several reasons. Principally from 1935 onwards Nazi tactics developed into a kind of war of attrition with the Churches. This may indicate the difficulty faced by the Nazi regime in knowing how to deal with the German Churches. Catholics had become alarmed, soon after signing the Concordat, when Catholic minister, Erich Klausener was murdered in 1934, with the banning of crucifixes in schools in 1935 and the increasing pagan ideology of Nazi radicals. Likewise the banning of Catholic youth groups in 1936 and the publication of 'With Burning Concern' in 1937 showed elements of tension. Often, opposition to the regime was usually individual not institutional. By 1939 the Nazi Party had cut its links with organised religion but it had failed to produce a consistent approach, partly due to the difference of opinion amongst the leading Nazis. The Nazis had failed to establish a single unifying Protestant Church. With regard to the Catholic Church, although the Concordat was effectively dead, Hitler still saw the tactical value

in keeping a semblance of co-operation. The Nazis had simply failed to co-ordinate the Churches into the Volksgemeinschaft and organised religion remained a powerful force.

Converting marks into UMS marks

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

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