



**General Certificate of Education
January 2013**

AS History 1041

HIS2N

Unit 2N

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

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 events which all examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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.

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 students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

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

January 2013

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

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

Question 1

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

How far do the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the impact of the Nuremberg Laws? (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

In identifying differences between the sources, students might include:

- Source A suggests that 'measures would not last'; while Source B claims there was 'no chance of slipping back into the mainstream of German life'
- in Source A, Julius (typical of many wealthier Jews) believes that the Laws were not aimed at him; Source B accepts that the Laws applied to all German Jews
- there is a clear difference in respect of the severity of the Laws. Julius in Source A fails to grasp how severe they are; Source B is unequivocal.

Students will need to use their own knowledge and understanding to explain and comment on these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- the context of earlier Nazi discrimination since 1933 such as the civil service legislation, the press law or education
- the belief of many in the older generation of German Jews that their contribution to society (such as war service) would protect them; or the idea that they had survived earlier bouts of discrimination.

To address 'how far' students should also examine the extent to which the sources have similar views. This might include:

- both sources agree that the Nuremberg Laws were a direct attack on German Jews: 'an insult to German Jews' (Source A); 'allowed no further part in German life' (Source B)
- both sources agree about the apparent success of Jews in Germany in the past: 'Source A points out that many had been successful and become wealthy; Source B comments on the major role Jews had played in German life
- there is an element of agreement in that Source A mentions that the younger generation, unlike Julius, *did* recognise the seriousness of the threat.

Higher-achieving answers will attempt to make connections and judgements. Such comment might include differentiation between the various strands of Source A; or a developed comparison in the light of own knowledge of the context and *why* many German Jews were slow to understand what was really going to happen.

Question 1

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

How successful was Nazi legislation in removing Jews from public life in the years 1933 to 1939? (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Students should present a balanced argument supported by evidence both from the sources and own knowledge. In 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) focused exclusively on the focus of the question – here, Nazi legislation.

Students should apply evidence derived explicitly from the sources. This might include:

- **Source A:** 'Julius, typical of older Jews, was convinced he could hold out against temporary Nazi discrimination'; there is an implication that Jews did not feel completely segregated from German society at that time
- **Source B:** 'no equality under the law'; for generations they had been an 'integral part' of German life but now 'for two and a half years they had gradually been cut off'; each move could now be made with legal backing 'and such moves began at once'
- **Source C:** the separation of Jews from Germans 'in the sphere of housing, transport, places of public entertainment etc.'; 'strict regulation of Jews being out in public'; 'concentrating the Jews in specific houses'; the later decree tightening laws on marriage.

Evidence from own knowledge might include:

- other legislation in 1933, such as the Law for the Restoration of the Civil Service, the Reich Press Law, the Law against overcrowding of German schools and universities
- later legislation after 1935, such as the stamping of Jewish passports with a J (1938); expulsion of all Jewish pupils from schools (1938); and the compulsory sale of Jewish businesses (1938)
- the main focus of the question is on legislation but relevant use could also be made of other measures, such as the 1933 boycott, SA intimidation, anti-Jewish propaganda, signs in windows, exclusion from swimming pools etc.

Points which suggest legislation was successful might include:

- the sheer number of anti-Jewish laws had a huge cumulative impact. Many were intimidated into silence; others sought to emigrate
- it can be argued that the public reaction to the legislation showed that many Germans were in support of it; or at least tacitly accepted it – some candidates may stress how the events of *Kristallnacht* showed people's lack of support for Jews, indicating they had been softened up by the tide of anti-Jewish legislation.

Points which suggest the regime's legislation was not successful (or only to a limited extent) might include:

- passing a law did not mean that it was fully effective – many Jewish civil servants or teachers kept their jobs after the 1933 laws; many Jewish businesses kept going after 1933 and it can be argued that the 1933 SA boycott was a one-day failure
- the rush of new laws in 1938 was virtually an admission by the regime that earlier legislation had failed (Source C suggests segregation only really came about from 1938)
- the public reaction to *Kristallnacht* included many Germans who were appalled
- it can be argued propaganda, fear and terror were far more effective than the legislation.

Higher-quality answers will provide differentiated assessment perhaps arguing that it was only from 1938, when voluntary emigration had manifestly failed, that complete segregation began to be enforced; or making judgements about the relative importance of legislation against other factors.

Question 2**03** Explain why Hitler held anti-Semitic views. (12 marks)*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)***Levels Mark Scheme**Nothing written worthy of credit. **0****L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2****L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6****L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9****L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12****Indicative content****Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**The focus is on explaining *why* Hitler held anti-Semitic views, not on describing what those views were. Candidates may refer to some of the following:

Longer-term reasons, before 1918, might include:

- Hitler's early upbringing in Catholic Upper Austria and his resentment of his rejection as an artist and would-be architect by the 'Jewish' art establishment in Vienna (and the view that Jews were 'over-represented' in the professions)
- ideas acquired during his years in Vienna from 1907 that led towards anti-Semitism, such as: Social Darwinism, Pan-German nationalism and 'scientific' theories of race. (** NB many answers will do so in a literal and uncritical way – better-quality answers may show awareness that Hitler's anti-Semitism before 1914 is often over-stated)
- Hitler's avoidance of war service for the 'mongrel' Habsburg Empire and his decision to volunteer to fight for Germany in 1914.

Short-term factors showing how Hitler's views were radicalised from 1918 might include:

- blaming the 'November Criminals' and a 'Jewish conspiracy' for defeat in 1918
- being influenced by the sharp increase in anti-Semitism in Germany after the war, associated with the 'stab-in-the-back' legend, and hatred of 'Jewish-Bolshevism'
- resentment against the Weimar Republic and the influence of 'Jewish finance' – for example Walther Rathenau
- the influence of personalities Hitler encountered in extremist right-wing politics, such as Dietrich Eckart and Alfred Rosenberg
- the anti-Jewish aspects of the 25-point manifesto of the NSDAP (though these were only a minority part of the programme).

Answers at the higher levels will not merely provide a list of appropriate reasons but will offer links, differentiation or comment on higher and lower priorities – for example balancing long term factors against post-1918 ones; or distinguishing between myths and reality.

Question 2

- 04** 'The Nazi Party's anti-Semitic views were vitally important in its national election campaigns in the years 1920 to 1933.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Students should make a judgement of the degree to which anti-Semitism influenced the electoral successes and failures of the Nazis. Effective answers should show some understanding of chronology, covering the early 1920s as well as the Nazi electoral breakthrough from 1929/30. Effective answers will show awareness of the very limited impact of the Nazis in national elections up to and including 1928. It was only from 1930 and in particular the Reichstag elections and the presidential campaigns of 1932 that Hitler ceased to

be on the fringes of democratic politics. The key requirement of the question is a balanced assessment of the importance (or not) of anti-Semitism in winning votes for the Nazis.

Evidence suggesting anti-Semitism was important might include:

- inclusion of anti-Semitic views in the 23-point Manifesto of the NSDAP
- the centrality of anti-Semitism in Hitler's own personal views, as demonstrated by many of his speeches and by *Mein Kampf*
- the emphasis in Nazi propaganda on the supposed evils caused by Jewish influence on banking and finance in Germany; and on the supposed links between Jews and 'Bolshevism'
- the impact of the Great Depression from 1929/30 enabled propaganda messages the Nazis had been promoting since 1920 to take effect on voters – about Jewish financiers, 'decadent' Weimar culture
- the importance of anti-Semitism to the Nazis is proved by the speed with which they introduced anti-Jewish measures.

Evidence that it was not so important might include:

- the 25-point programme of the Party in 1920 included only a handful of directly anti-Semitic points
- at least as many voters were repelled by extreme anti-Semitism as were attracted by it. Many who voted Nazi for the first time in 1932 claimed that anti-Semitism had little or nothing to do with their decision
- elections when the Nazis were more successful tended to be fought on other issues, usually economic ones – such as appealing to farmers or promising 'work and bread'. Hitler tailored his message to specific audiences – anti-Semitism might feature prominently when addressing party fighters or the SA but would not be mentioned at all when addressing businessmen or traditional conservatives
- when Hitler was close to power in 1932 he went out of his way to appear respectable. Extreme racism and violence was toned down to make Hitler seem moderate this approach continued into the March election in 1933 – even the anti-Jewish boycott of April 1933 was only for one day).

One feature of answers at the higher levels may be depth and differentiation – for example, tracing changes over time; or arguing that latent, 'submerged' anti-Semitism was actually a powerful factor even when hidden from view (and that anti-Semitism was a deeply-rooted factor in German politics. It appealed to many sections of society and was not unique to the Nazis).

Question 3

05 Explain why the Nazis drew up the Madagascar Plan. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

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

The focus should be on explanation of *why* the Madagascar Plan came about, not on description of the policy and the events that accompanied it. One feature of higher-quality answers may be differentiation between the relative importance of various factors; or explanation of the ways in which long-term and short-term factors were interrelated.

Longer-term factors might include:

- Nazi ideology had always promoted the idea of a 'Jew-free' Germany. The Madagascar Plan was just one variation among many of schemes to deport Jews to some distant place where they could be forgotten and allowed to 'wither away'. In 1941, for example, a similar scheme proposed deporting Jews 'east of the Urals' after defeating the USSR
- the Madagascar Plan was not a specifically Nazi (or German) idea. It had first been proposed in the 1880s. It was again promoted by anti-Semitic European intellectuals in the 1920s
- until 1938 great emphasis had been placed on voluntary emigration – since 1936 Adolf Eichmann among others had promoted links between the Third Reich and Zionists, in the hope that there would be mass migration of Jews to Palestine

- by 1939 plans for mass emigration of Jews had largely failed and the outbreak of war prevented it anyway.

Short-term factors from 1939–1940 might include:

- victories from the defeat of Poland onwards greatly increased the numbers of Jews under Nazi rule and made finding space for them an urgent priority
- the Fall of France in 1940 meant that French-owned Madagascar became a plausible destination – and the Vichy government seemed ready to cooperate with Germany on racial issues
- at the time the Madagascar Plan was being formulated, Britain seemed close to accepting defeat and making peace – this would open the sea route to Madagascar
- Hitler and other leading Nazis were enthusiastic about the plan when it was proposed.

Question 3

- 06** 'Operation Barbarossa was the most important reason for the 'Final Solution'.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Students should be able to make a judgement about the importance of Operation Barbarossa in bringing about the so-called Final Solution. This may involve a balanced view of the importance of a range of other factors. (***) NB the importance of the invasion of the USSR can be defined in more than one way – many historians suggest that it was the early success of the invasion that engendered the 'euphoria of victory' and determination to seize the opportunity it offered; but others would argue that it was the *failure* of the invasion that created crisis conditions on the Eastern Front, leading to short-term improvisations in race policy).

Evidence that Barbarossa was a decisive factor might include:

- Hitler had always regarded the war in the east as a war of 'race and space'. It can be claimed that Barbarossa was the logical, planned prelude to the implementation of 'Hitler's war against the Jews'
- Goering's Commissar Order in the summer of 1941 fits in with the view that the invasion of Russia led directly to the elimination of Communist leaders and then to Jews – in accordance with the Nazi idea of Jewish-Bolshevism'
- the activities of the *Einsatzgruppen* followed closely behind the front line of the invasion. This shows how closely the Final Solution was connected to the invasion and conquest of Russia
- the importance of Barbarossa was equally decisive whether it was deliberate or by accident (see above). The invasion brought 2.5 million Soviet Jews under Nazi rule, in addition to millions of Polish Jews conquered earlier; and the death camps were built in places the Nazis only controlled because of Barbarossa.

Evidence that there were other, more important, factors might include:

- the most important cause of the destruction of European Jewry was Hitler himself, following an ideology that went back at least as far as 1919
- there was a steady escalation of Nazi persecution from 1933 through 1935 and 1938 to the Reichstag speech of 1939 – the Final Solution (first mass shootings then gas chambers, was the logical culmination. Barbarossa had an important supporting role but was not the decisive factor
- the Final Solution was 'final' because of the failure of all previous schemes, such as emigration, ghettoization, the Madagascar Plan etc. The policy emerged out of an unstable and chaotic regime. Barbarossa provided the context but not the main cause.

One feature of good answers may be the ability to differentiate and to see change over time, perhaps arguing that Barbarossa was not a separate but an interrelated factor; or by analysis of the different elements within the Nazi power-system, such as the role of Himmler and the SS.

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