

PAPER 3 – Exam questions and answers

Question 1: Inference - Identifies the inference (what you can work out about the topic)
Detail from the source e.g. quote/evidence

1) Give two things you can infer from Source C about education in Nazi Germany (4 marks)

Source C: From the memoirs of a German who was a student in the 1930s. No one in our class ever read Mein Kampf. I myself only used the book for quotations. In general we didn't do much about Nazi ideas. Anti-Semitism wasn't mentioned much by our teachers except through Richard Wagner's essay 'The Jews in Music'. We did, however, do a lot of physical education and cookery.

What I can infer:

That improving the health and fitness of young Germans was a key part of Nazi education and they included lots of exercise

Details in the source that tell me this: The source says that 'we do a lot of physical education and cookery'

What I can infer: That teaching of Nazi ideology and race policy was not a key part of school education

Details in the source that tell me this: The source says 'Anti-Semitism wasn't mentioned much by our teachers'

1) Give two things you can infer from Source A about Hitler's leadership of the Nazi Party in the 1920s.

SOURCE A: From Hitler and I, by Otto Strasser, published in 1940. Strasser was a leading member of the Nazi Party in its early years. Here he remembers a conversation with Hitler in 1925: "I remember one of my first conversations with him. It was nearly a quarrel. 'Power!' screamed Adolf. 'We must have power!' 'Before we gain it', I replied firmly, 'let us decide what we propose to do with it. Our programme is too vague; we must construct something which will last.' Hitler, who even then could hardly bear contradiction, thumped the table, saying sharply, 'Power first! Afterwards we can act as events occur.'"

What I can infer:

We can infer from this source that Hitler's leadership style was aggressive

Details in the source that tell me this:

Hitler 'screamed' and 'thumped the table'

What I can infer: We can infer from the source that Hitler's leadership style was impulsive

Details in the source that tell me this: his is clear from his reaction to the idea that they might need to construct a long-standing plan, to which he says 'power first! Afterwards we can act as events occur'

Question 2: Explain why..... (12 marks)

Tips and Tricks • 18 minutes in total • No conclusion or judgement needed • You don't need to use the bullet points, you can use ANY other piece of relevant information to answer the question. The bullet points are simply there to guide you, they can be used as paragraphs or as examples within paragraphs.

2. Explain why Gustav Stresemann was able to achieve the recovery of Germany between 1924-29.

1 model paragraph.

You may use the following in your answer:

- The Dawes Plan
- The Locarno Treaty

During the period of 1924-9, Chancellor Gustav Stresemann was able to succeed in securing the recovery of the Germany economy. In 1923, the German economy was in serious trouble with the impact of the £6.6 billion reparations and the ongoing Ruhr Crisis and Hyperinflation. Stresemann was able to secure the Dawes Plan, a deal with US banker Charles Dawes in 1924 which vastly improved the German economy. Firstly, the plan tackled hyperinflation by destroying the old currency and replacing it with a new currency, the Rentenmark which reset the value of the mark. Furthermore, he secured valuable loans to help the German economy, the first of these was worth 800 million marks. These loans allowed Germany to begin paying off her reparations again and it also helped kickstart the German economy again. Therefore, Stresemann's securing of the Dawes Plan was crucial in helping the German economy recover by 1929.

2. Explain why the Spartacist uprising was important in challenging the Government of the Weimar Republic

Marks: 12 marks

Influence of the Soviet Union

Role of the Freikorps

There were many reasons why the Spartacist uprising was important in challenging the government. Firstly, the very fact that the uprising was in January 1919 shows how immediately unpopular the Weimar Republic was and how for many it was seen as a temporary 'filler' of the political vacuum following the Kaiser's abdication. Linked accordingly, it also showed how quickly the communists were to organise and mobilise. The Communist Party in Germany was only founded in December 1918 and within a month they were part of a widespread uprising spearheaded by the Spartacists. This clearly reveals that there was a popular Communist movement, and many Germans wanted to bring a revolution to Germany in the same vein that Communism was brought to Russia in 1917. This is especially true when you consider it had 33 newspapers and 400,000 members almost instantly, in large part due to funding from the Soviet Union.

The importance of the challenge also stemmed from the fact that the uprising was on a large scale and relatively successful within a short space of time. 100,000 workers took to the streets on January 6th 1919, seizing control of government newspaper and telegraph offices in Berlin. It was not until January 13th that the rioters were removed. This showed the inherent weakness and fragility of

the government, who had to become reliant on brute force to win control of the capital back. This links to how the uprising was also important because of the manner in which it was crushed.

The government reliance on the right-wing Freikorps to end the uprising was extremely important, revealing how the Spartacist challenge could only be dealt with effectively in a violent way. The Freikorps (which numbered around 250,000 by March 1919) were demobilised soldiers who still possessed their weapons and who were managed by the Army. The unarmed protesting workers were no match for the Freikorps. Such harsh violence was revealed in how the uprising eventually came to an end. Leaders Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were both arrested and killed by Freikorps officers. Liebknecht was shot and Luxemburg was shot in the head and her body dumped in a canal. The government's decision to use them in ending the uprising showed how little authority the government had and showed that the moderate Weimar government was to a large extent dependent on people that they would not ordinarily agree with. Indeed, the role of the Freikorps emboldened them to the extent that they were involved in their own rebellion in 1920, known as the Kapp Putsch.

Question 3a – Usefulness of sources

3a. How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the reasons for the growth in support for the Nazi Party in the years 1929-32?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your own knowledge of the historical context. (8 marks)

Source B – A photograph published in 1932 in a German newspaper. It shows people from Hanover queuing for their unemployment benefits. The writing on the wall of the building (top left) says 'Vote Hitler'.



Source C – From *Inside the Third Reich* by Albert Speer, published in 1970. Here Speer is remembering hearing a speech made by Hitler in 1931. Speer later became the official Nazi architect and a Nazi minister.

“I was carried away on a wave of enthusiasm by the speech. Here, it seemed to me, was new hope. Here were new ideals, a new understanding and new tasks for Germany. The dangers of Communism, which seemed to be growing, could be stopped. Hitler persuaded us that Germany could recover from all of its problems. It must have been during this time that my mother saw an SA parade. The sight of discipline in a time of chaos, the impression of energy in an atmosphere of hopelessness, seems to have won her over to the Nazis as well.”

Model Answer in regards to Source C

Source C could be considered useful for an enquiry into the reasons the Nazis gained power between 1929 – 1939 as the source states that Hitler won support because he convinced his audiences that he would be able to solve Germany's problems. This implies that his speeches and use of propaganda were a vital part of increasing support. From my own knowledge I am aware that Hitler had developed the art of public speaking in the early days of the Nazi Party and was a powerful speaker. His timing, expression and the content of his speeches impressed listeners. In his speeches Hitler could be all things to all people. He portrayed himself as a war hero, a saviour and an ordinary man in the street. He was able to tailor his message to the audience. The source also suggests that Hitler was seen as a potential saviour against the rise of the Communists. This source thus identifies fear of communism as a reason for the rise in Nazi support. Furthermore, the source provides evidence of the role of the SA in increasing support for Hitler and the Nazis, identifying the SA as a reason for Nazi party support. From my own knowledge, I am aware that the SA provided work for many unemployed men and also created a feeling of intimidation and fear in public.

This source is from an autobiography written many years later by a leading Nazi who, even with the benefit of hindsight, was still impressed by the impact of one of Hitler's speeches. This would suggest the author is likely to be biased and recall events with emotion. He is likely to focus on the charisma of Hitler because he worked closely with him. This view might not reflect the views of other people in Germany. The author is writing about his own experiences of hearing one of Hitler's speeches, not the collective opinion. Despite this, it could be argued that his insights into Hitler's life would allow him a clear understanding of events that led to the Nazi rise in power.

3a. How useful are sources D and E for an enquiry into the events of Kristallnacht in Nov 1938? Uses the sources and your own knowledge.

Source D: **Mob law ruled in Berlin ..as hordes of hooligans went on an orgy of destruction. I have never seen an anti Jewish outbreak as sickening as this. I saw fashionably dressed women clapping their hands and shrieking with glee, whilst others held up their children to see the 'fun'. No attempt was made by the police to stop the rioters.** An article in the Daily Telegraph Nov 1938 (A British newspaper) by one of their journalists living in Germany at the time.

Source E: **The outbreak of fury by the people on the night of the 9th November shows the patience of the German people has now been exhausted. It was neither organised or prepared but it broke out spontaneously.** From an article by Josef Goebbels in the Nazi Party's newspaper – November 1938.

Model Answer

Source B is useful in several ways. Firstly, it gives a clear idea of the violence that night, calling it 'an orgy of destruction.' I know this to be accurate because of the amount of damage done. 191 synagogues were destroyed that evening along with over 800 shops. It is also useful because it shows how ordinary Germans were prepared to go along with this violence, even enjoying it according to what the journalist witnessed. He talks of women 'clapping their hands and shrieking with glee.' The fact that it is a report of a British newspaper by a journalist present at the time probably means it is accurate in terms of what the journalist saw. He will not have been censored by the authorities. However, it may not be typical of all Germany on that night, not all Germans were joining in and pleased to see these events occur. This British journalist is clearly shocked by what he saw and this may have influenced what he wrote and therefore affected the source's use. Not everyone would have viewed this as 'fun'. Source C is also useful as it shows the way in which the Nazis wanted Kristallnacht to be perceived, as something that occurred and arose spontaneously

from the German people as a consequence of the shooting of a German diplomat by a Jewish teenager. Although this makes the source useful it also means it is unreliable in terms of the truth as it is an official Nazi report written by the propaganda minister himself, Josef Goebbels. Kristallnacht was mostly organised by members of the SA, SS and the Hitler Youth but that is not how the Nazis wanted it to be seen. It also tells us very little about the actual events of that night, merely mentioning the fury of the German people.

3b. Study interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views on the reasons for the growth in support for the Nazi Party in the years 1929-32. What is the main difference between these views? Explain your answer using details from both interpretations. [4 marks]

Interpretation 1 – From ‘Weimar & Nazi Germany’ by J Hite and C Hinton, published in 2000.

Hitler himself was central to the success of the Nazis in the years 1929–32. He provided charismatic leadership with his powerful message to build a new Germany. He was a powerful speaker with his timing, expression and the content of his speeches impressing listeners. He was able to identify with their emotions and gave people hope. Along with Goebbels, he realised the importance of propaganda. He used propaganda to target the specific grievances of many Germans.

Interpretation 2 - From ‘Hitler 1889–1936’ by Ian Kershaw, published in 1998.

There was nothing inevitable about Hitler becoming Chancellor of Germany in January 1933. Five years earlier the Nazis had been a small party in German politics with little support. Events such as the Wall Street Crash, which led to depression in Germany, brought increased support for the Nazis in the years 1929–32. Chance events, such as the depression and unemployment, played a much larger role than any actions of the Nazi leader himself in bringing Hitler to power.

Model answer:

Interpretation 1 suggests ‘Hitler himself was central to the success of the Nazis in the years 1929–32’. It emphasises his ‘charismatic leadership’ and suggests the main reason for his rise to power was his speeches and use of propaganda to attract support of normal German people. It also suggests Goebbels propaganda programme was essential for raising the status of the Nazi party. Conversely interpretation 2 suggests the main reason for the Nazis rise to power was down to chance events. ‘Events such as the Wall Street Crash, which led to depression in Germany, brought increased support for the Nazis in the years 1929–32’. This interpretation believes the Nazis only rose to power because of circumstances in Germany. In summary, the main difference is that Interpretation 1 emphasises the central role Hitler played in increasing support for the Nazis in the years 1929–32 such as his speeches and propaganda, whereas, Interpretation 2 emphasises the importance of chance events such as the depression and unemployment in increasing support for the Nazis.

3c. Suggest one reason why interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the growing support for the Nazi Party in the years 1929-32.

You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer. [4 marks]

MODEL ANSWER:

The interpretations may differ because the authors have a different **focus**.

For example, Interpretation 1 focuses on the role of Hitler. It states that he was ‘central to the success of the Nazis in the years 1929–32.’ It focuses on Hitler’s speeches and his personality being the main reason that the Nazis were successful.

However, Interpretation 2 focuses on events outside of Hitler's control that made the Nazi's successful. It focuses on the Wall Street Crash causing unemployment and the depression thus making the Nazis more popular and encouraging people to vote for the Nazis.

Therefore they differ because of the focus; with Interpretation 1 dealing with the importance of one individual in increasing support for the Nazis and Interpretation 2 focusing on the importance of wider, external events.

3d. How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons for increased support for the Nazis in the years 1929 – 1932? Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical content. (use interpretations above)

To become a master you must: YOU MUST LEAVE TIME FOR THIS QUESTION!!

It is worth 16 marks plus 4 SPAG

You must use key terminology and structure and spell with accuracy for bonus points

You need to analyse both interpretations to explain what they reveal

You then need to build a two sided argument with supporting contextual knowledge for both interpretations

Then you need to reach a judgement which links back to the question and draws your argument together

Model Answer: Interpretation 2 suggests that it was the impact of events in society that brought about increased support for the Nazis in the years 1929–32. Within the interpretation it suggests 'There was nothing inevitable about Hitler becoming Chancellor of Germany in January 1933'. This shows that circumstances are considered to be more important. Furthermore it highlights the significance of actual events such as the Wall street crash, which led to the depression in Germany.

From my own knowledge I am aware that In the years 1924–28 Germany had experienced a period of relative prosperity and it was not until 1929 that the economy experienced a general downturn. Many people blamed the Weimar Government for the depression and began to support parties such as the Nazis who were opposed to the Republic; the Nazi share of the vote increased from less than 10% to over 30% from 1929–32. The depression brought increased support for the communists and some Germans, especially businessmen and industrialist, supported the Nazis to prevent a possible communist government. This would support the claims made in interpretation 2.

In contrast to this, Interpretation 1 states that it was Hitler who played the key role in increasing support for the Nazi Party in the years 1929–32. It claims it was Hitler who brought increased support by providing examples of his abilities as a speaker that enabled him to identify with the audience and give them hope. It also suggests that it was due to the leadership of Hitler and his activities.

From my own knowledge, I am aware that in 1932 Hitler toured all over Germany and spoke to huge meetings of people in halls and sports stadia. His speeches captivated his audiences and he inspired them to feel nationalistic and patriotic about their pure German culture. People were witnessed cheering and crying at his speeches, which shows how passionate they felt about his promises and leadership. Furthering this I know that Hitler's decision to put Goebbels in charge of Nazi propaganda ensured that the Nazi message was heard everywhere, particularly on the radio.

Furthermore, it can be argued the organisation and discipline of the Nazi party attracted many Germans, and the Hitler Youth provided opportunities for young people.

3d. How far do you agree with Interpretation 1 about the reason for Hitler coming to power in 1933? Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context. Up to 4 marks of the total for part (d) will be awarded for spelling, punctuation, grammar and use of specialist terminology.

Interpretation 1 – From Weimar and Nazi Germany, by Stephen Lee (1996) ‘... between 1929 and 1933 crisis returned in full force. Germany experienced a serious depression. This caused the collapse of businesses and an increase in unemployment. The moderate parties of the Weimar Republic could not agree... more use was made of article 48. The Reichstag was bypassed and democracy was replaced by dictatorship. A larger part of the population showed interest in Hitler’s ideas. The result was that the Nazis became the biggest party in the Reichstag. [They] gave Hitler power, hoping that he would use it as they wanted.

Interpretation 2 – From Nazi Germany 1930-1939, by Steve Waugh and John Wright (2007) ‘Von Papen was determined to regain power. He met Hitler and agreed that Hitler would lead a government with Von Papen as Vice Chancellor. Intrigue took the place of open debate. The landowners and leaders of industry were convinced that Hitler and Von Papen were saving Germany from Schleicher’s military take-over. Von Papen convinced President Hindenburg that a coalition with Hitler would save Germany. Von Papen said that he would control Hitler. On 30th January 1933, Adolf Hitler became Chancellor of Germany.,

Model Answer:

Interpretation 1 states that between 1929 and 1933 there was crisis within Germany which led to widespread economic problems like failing businesses and an increase in unemployment. From my own knowledge, I know that this is correct as after the Wall Street Crash in October 1929, unemployment in Germany rose to 6 million. This meant that in Germany 4 out of every 10 workers were unemployed and looked to parties that could offer employment such as Hitler and the Nazis. Furthermore, interpretation 1 is also correct when it talks about the political chaos that developed in those years. Chancellor Brüning was unable to pass laws through the Reichstag and was forced regularly to use Article 48 to pass new decrees. He used Article 48 44 times in 1931 and 66 times in 1932, when it had only previously been used 5 times in 1930. This showed the government was weak and began to undermine the confidence in the Weimar Republic further. People started to look at Hitler and this played an important role in his rise to power in 1933. This can be further cemented from the fact that throughout the 1920s, under Stresemann, Hitler and the Nazis had fallen to the wayside and lost popularity in the German elections, in 1924 they received around 6.2% of the votes but this fell to 2.6% in 1928.

However, Interpretation 2 raises valid points in arguing why Hitler came to power. It suggests that Hindenburg and von Papen’s scheming in an attempt to prevent a military takeover from von Schleicher was key to Hitler becoming Chancellor. From my own knowledge I know that this is also a key reason why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933 as without the suggestion of Von Papen of Hitler becoming Chancellor, he would never have been elevated to that position. Hindenburg had denied Hitler’s request to be Chancellor. He detested Hitler as a ‘jumped up corporal’ who had no place in German politics. Whilst the situation in Germany economically was important, without the instruction of Hindenburg, Hitler would never have risen to power as Chancellor in 1933.

Interpretation 1 is also incorrect as from my own knowledge I know that despite the fact that the Nazis had grown in popularity in the period 1929-1933, they never secured enough popularity for Hitler to be automatically elected as Chancellor. Towards the end of 1932, it was even the case that the Nazis were losing support compared to their results in July 1932. In July, they received 37.4% of the votes and gained 230 seats in the Reichstag, whereas in November they only received 33.1% and 196 seats in the Reichstag. This suggests that despite the political and social unrest, the 37% of votes the Nazis got might not have increased going forwards. However, overall I feel that interpretation 1 creates a strong argument for the rise of Hitler in January 1933. Despite the fact that Hindenburg played an important role and that votes for the Nazis did fall in November 1933, it cannot be contested that the influence of the Nazis was growing in the period 1929-1933 and that the social and political unrest of Germany directly contributed to this.. Their vote share increased from 2.8% to 37% and people looked to Hitler as a strong leader who could lead Germany into a brighter future and solve the unemployment issue. Furthermore, the 'Golden Years' under Stresemann suggests that had the social situation in Germany been better, the thought of a Nazi dominated government was not a realistic possibility.