5.4 Nazi Germany, 1933-1939: The Police State: 30-minute Pack

EDEXCEL 1HI0 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions. Question 2 refers to Source A. Questions 3, 4 and 5 refer to Interpretation 1 and Interpretation 2. You are advised to spend about 30 minutes on this pack.

Source A, and Interpretations 1 and 2

Source A was written for Revision Library. It is an original text representative of an official notice of the kind displayed in a German workplace after 1933, reminding employees of the risks of criticising the government. It is not a reproduction, translation or paraphrase of any surviving notice, and no genuine document or named authority is reproduced. Interpretation 1 and Interpretation 2 were also written for Revision Library, in the style of history textbook extracts discussing why open opposition to the Nazi regime remained so limited between 1933 and 1939; they are not the work of any real, named historian.

SOURCE A: a workplace notice written for Revision Library, representative of the kind of official notice displayed in German factories and offices after 1933.

ALL EMPLOYEES ARE REMINDED: careless talk about the government, its policies or its leaders will be reported. Every workplace has a duty to support the new Germany. Employees who hear disloyal remarks from a colleague, a neighbour or a family member should report them to their block warden or local party office without delay. Loyal citizens have nothing to fear. Those who spread rumours or complaints damage Germany's recovery and will answer for it. Display this notice where all staff can see it.

INTERPRETATION 1: from a history textbook written for Revision Library, discussing why open opposition to the Nazi regime remained so limited between 1933 and 1939.

The main reason opposition remained so limited was fear of the regime's machinery of terror. The Gestapo, founded in 1933, and the wider SS network built a climate in which ordinary Germans could not be sure who might report them, whether a neighbour, a colleague or even a family member, to the authorities. Early concentration camps such as Dachau, opened in March 1933, demonstrated from the very start of the regime that resistance carried a real and severe personal cost, and this knowledge was enough to deter most Germans from open dissent even if they privately disagreed with Nazi policies.

INTERPRETATION 2: from a history textbook written for Revision Library, discussing why open opposition to the Nazi regime remained so limited between 1933 and 1939.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Fear alone cannot fully explain the lack of opposition, because for much of this period genuine support for the regime was also strong. Falling unemployment, the restoration of national pride after the humiliations of Versailles, and constant propaganda praising Hitler's leadership meant that many Germans had little motivation to resist a government they credited with real improvements to their lives. Terror mattered most for identifying and silencing the minority who did object, such as communists and socialists, rather than for controlling a wider population that, for much of the decade, broadly approved of what the regime appeared to be achieving.

1 Give two reasons why open opposition to the Nazi regime was difficult to organise between 1933 and 1939.

(Total for Question 1 is 4 marks)

2 Give two things you can infer from Source A about how the Nazi regime tried to control ordinary people's behaviour. Support each inference with a detail from the source.

(Total for Question 2 is 4 marks)

3 What is the main difference between Interpretation 1 and Interpretation 2 about why open opposition to the Nazi regime remained so limited between 1933 and 1939? Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(Total for Question 3 is 4 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

4 Suggest two reasons why the authors of Interpretation 1 and Interpretation 2 might have different views about why opposition to the Nazi regime remained limited.

(Total for Question 4 is 4 marks)

5 Which interpretation do you find more convincing as an explanation of why open opposition to the Nazi regime remained so limited between 1933 and 1939? Explain your answer, using Interpretation 1, Interpretation 2 and your own knowledge.

(Total for Question 5 is 16 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 5.4 Nazi Germany, 1933-1939: The Police State: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

rival political parties and independent trade unions had been banned by mid-1933, removing the organisations through which opposition might normally have been coordinated — **B2**

widespread surveillance by the Gestapo and encouragement to report disloyal neighbours or colleagues created fear and distrust that discouraged people from speaking openly, even to those they knew — **B2**

Answer: Rival parties and trade unions had been banned, removing organising structures, and widespread surveillance/encouraged reporting created fear and distrust.

Question 2

inference 1, e.g. the regime encouraged ordinary people to inform on one another, including friends, colleagues and family — **B1**

supporting detail for inference 1 from the source, e.g. the notice tells staff to report 'a colleague, a neighbour or a family member' to 'their block warden or local party office' — **B1**

inference 2, e.g. the regime wanted to discourage private criticism of the government by making people fear the consequences — **B1**

supporting detail for inference 2 from the source, e.g. it warns that those who spread 'complaints' will 'answer for it', while 'loyal citizens have nothing to fear' — **B1**

Answer: The regime encouraged people to inform on those close to them; and it used fear of consequences to discourage private criticism of the government.

Question 3

Interpretation 1 argues the main reason was fear of the regime's terror apparatus, the Gestapo, SS and concentration camps such as Dachau, which deterred even Germans who privately disagreed — **B2**

Interpretation 2 argues the main reason was genuine popular support, driven by falling unemployment, restored national pride and propaganda, so terror mainly silenced a smaller minority of genuine opponents — **B2**

Answer: Interpretation 1 sees fear of terror (Gestapo, SS, camps) as decisive; Interpretation 2 sees genuine popular support as decisive, with terror mattering mainly for a small minority.

Question 4

the authors may focus on different types of evidence: Interpretation 1 draws on the machinery of repression (the Gestapo, camps), while Interpretation 2 draws on economic and social evidence, such as employment figures and popular attitudes — **B2**

the authors may hold different general views about how dictatorships maintain control, e.g. one emphasising fear and coercion and the other emphasising genuine consent, leading them to weigh the same period differently — **B2**

Answer: They may draw on different types of evidence (repression vs economic/social evidence) and hold different general views about whether dictatorships rely mainly on fear or on genuine consent.

Question 5

Level 1 States a simple preference for one interpretation, with little or no supporting reasoning or own knowledge. — **1-4**

Level 2 Describes the content of one or both interpretations and gives a limited reason for a preference, with some own knowledge. — **5-8**

Level 3 Explains reasons for a preference between the interpretations, using relevant own knowledge to support or challenge each one. — **9-12**

Level 4 Evaluates both interpretations critically, using precise own knowledge to reach a sustained and well-supported judgement about which is more convincing, or how far each is convincing. — **13-16**

Indicative content:

- Evidence supporting Interpretation 1: the Gestapo and SS built a nationwide surveillance network, and Dachau's opening in March 1933, within weeks of Hitler becoming Chancellor, showed from the very beginning that dissent carried severe personal risk.
- Evidence supporting Interpretation 2: unemployment fell substantially across the 1930s through schemes such as the National Labour Service and rearmament, and Nazi propaganda under Goebbels constantly reinforced a narrative of national recovery under Hitler, which many Germans appear to have genuinely welcomed.
- A convincing answer might note the two views are complementary rather than contradictory: genuine support explains why the regime rarely faced organised mass opposition, while fear of the Gestapo and the camp system explains why even the minority who disagreed, such as communists, socialists and some church figures, rarely acted on their views openly.
- Own knowledge that resistance did exist, but remained small-scale and largely underground, for example among banned trade unionists and socialists, could be used to argue that both fear and consent worked together to keep opposition contained rather than either factor working alone.
- A full answer reaches a supported judgement, weighing the balance of fear and genuine consent across the period to argue for one interpretation over the other, or for their combination.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk