



A-level
HISTORY
7042/20

Component 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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 from aqa.org.uk

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Component 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying resistance to the Nazis in the years 1941 to 1944. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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 must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source is from one of the leaders of the 'Red Orchestra', a name coined by the Gestapo. This group were loosely linked to the KPD and were fundamentally opposed to the Nazi regime
- this is a propaganda pamphlet whose intention was to rouse the German people into opposing the Nazis in whatever way they could following the increasingly bleak news of harsh wintry conditions and rising casualties on the Russian front by the beginning of 1942
- Schulze-Boysen uses some powerful and emotive language, such as 'senseless deaths' and 'despise murderers', to try to get its message across, almost as a plea, to the people to rise up and oppose
- there is a tone of anger as well as hope in this source, with the former directed at the Nazis and the latter giving the people the idea that tomorrow Germany will be theirs once again.

Content and argument

- Schulze-Boysen refers to the need for a 'Socialist government of the workers, soldiers and intelligentsia'. This clearly shows the KPD affiliations of the group, but students may reflect that Communist resistance during these years made little headway with Gestapo infiltration of factory cells in cities, such as Berlin and Hamburg, proving to be effective
- Schulze-Boysen comments on the increasingly bleak situation on the Russian front by early 1942 with 'senseless deaths of hundreds of thousands in ice and snow'. The German advance had been halted by December 1941 and her troops suffered in the freezing winter. Students may refer to this leading to the first signs of morale in Germany losing its positivity
- Schulze-Boysen refers to the limited scope of opposition at this time, such as telling 'stupid jokes'. He shows some frustration at this minimal resistance and urges further action. Students may argue that protesting about being in longer queues, as is suggested, may have had equally limited impact. Students may also support this view about limited opposition through reference to its scale elsewhere through the churches, youth and the conservative / military establishment for example
- Schulze-Boysen also comments on the 'general fear' and the regime's attempts to 'paint a distorted picture'. Students may refer to this mixture of terror, which increased in intensity in the war years, as well as the incessant propaganda of the Nazis, did much to contribute to people's hesitation when it came to opposition and to them 'putting up with everything'.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source is from the White Rose movement, a politically conscious student group led by Hans and Sophie Scholl based at Munich University, who were inspired to write a series of powerfully anti-Nazi pamphlets between 1942 and 1943 to try to provoke opposition, particularly among young people
- the tone of the source is partly – due to its timing – one of shame and anger, the former due to the disastrous loss of life and surrender at Stalingrad and the latter due to the 'swindling' of personal freedom by the 'abominable tyrant.' There is also a mocking and sarcastic tone with reference to the 'brilliant strategy of our First World War corporal'
- the emphasis of the source is to challenge young people, to 'arise, fight back and smash our tormentors' or face the shame of association with Nazi crimes
- the source uses a range of highly emotive words to add power to its message such as 'ferment', 'swindled', 'beseech' and 'tormentors'.

Content and argument

- the source refers to the catastrophic defeat at Stalingrad and lays the blame squarely, and mockingly, at Hitler's door. This view can be supported with the Führer's refusal to allow his Sixth Army to retreat, leading to the surrender of 90,000 troops just before this pamphlet was published. Students may refer to the damage to morale and the added effect of allied bombing and shortages which gave new hope to those who advocated opposition
- the source refers to the German people being in 'ferment'. Students may question whether this was a true reflection of the situation. Stalingrad certainly punctured the morale of the German people and shook their faith in the ability of the Nazi regime to deliver the promised victory, but evidence of an upsurge of anti-Nazi actions remained limited, partly down to continuing terror and propaganda such as Goebbels' 'Total War' speech the following month
- the pamphlet refers to the role of the Hitler Youth and SS in trying to 'drug us and regiment us... to become godless, arrogant and conscienceless exploiters and executioners'. Students may refer to the increasingly military character and culture of the Hitler Youth and its agenda in hardening young people to the necessities of war. Students may refer to youth opposition groups, such as the Edelweiss Pirates and Swing Youth, and the nature of their opposition to both the Hitler Youth specifically and to Nazism in general
- the pamphlet focuses on the White Rose's demand that young people need to stand up to the tyranny, shame and propaganda of the Nazi regime. Students may refer to the brave actions of the leaders, particularly Hans and Sophie Scholl, who intensified their campaign following the news from Stalingrad. This led, in February 1943, to their arrest and execution by beheading.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source comes from Robert Ley, the German Labour Front leader and a highly ambitious Nazi devoted to Hitler
- coming two days after the attack on Hitler, this speech is intended to reassure and buttress support by distancing the workers from the attack and aligning them with the relief felt at Hitler's survival
- Ley uses highly emotive language to reinforce the devastating consequences had the Bomb Plot succeeded, such as 'misery, slavery, destruction, poverty and starvation'
- Ley varies his tone from sheer terror at the thought of the plot succeeding, to relief at the Führer's survival ending with righteous condemnation of, and anger at, the plotters.

Content and argument

- Ley emphasises the disastrous consequences for the country had the plot succeeded, including ‘all prospects of victory shattered’ and ‘millions of Germans cast into indescribable misery, slavery, destruction, poverty and starvation’. Students may reflect upon the propaganda in this statement with the suggestion that faith in the Nazis was intact. Students may refer to the growing restlessness of the people, with Germany now being squeezed from the west as well as the east after D-Day and the impact of bombing and shortages was already making existence for millions very difficult. Students may also reflect on the view that this was the first genuine attempt to topple the Nazi state from within and is reflective of growing opposition due to looming military defeat as well as economic suffering and the horrors of the mass murders of Jews and other groups in the east
- Ley also insinuates that it was a miracle that Hitler survived, suggesting some divine intervention. Students may again point out the propaganda here and may focus instead on how close this assassination attempt came to succeeding, even if the wider plot failed to work as planned
- Ley makes every effort to associate the German population with disgust at the attack and relief at its failure, suggesting strong loyalty from the workers to the regime. Students may question this point, particularly as the war was being lost by this time and domestic conditions were worsening, leading to more widespread disillusion with the regime
- students may support Ley’s point that the failure of this plot did indeed lead to the destruction both of the plotters, with 5000 being arrested and executed, but also of the military and conservative opposition as a whole.

Section B

02 'German society was overwhelmingly conservative and traditional in the years 1924 to 1929.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments/factors suggesting that German society was overwhelmingly conservative and traditional in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- the extent of change to the social position of women has been somewhat exaggerated. There was some hostility, even from some women's groups such as the BDM, to the 'new woman' idea. Instead traditional family values were promoted and there were limits to the apparent growing equality for women in terms of politics, employment and on abortion and contraception
- attempts to break down class and religious divides in education were of limited success, with the Catholic and Protestant churches determinedly defending their traditional rights to promote religious teachings through the education system
- there was some strong hostility to the explosion of creativity in the arts, such as theatre and film, art and architecture. In rural areas, where the Church's influence was still strong, there was a clear tendency to cling onto conservative and traditional norms of culture and viewed the Republic as being far too permissive in its outlook
- the greater sexual freedom for gays, transvestites and lesbians, epitomised perhaps in the Berlin nightclubs, was viewed with horror by older, more traditionally minded Germans, already concerned at the evidence of young people's desire to challenge authority and societal norms, who linked this looser moral framework to the perceived decadence and immorality of the Weimar Democracy.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that German society was overwhelmingly conservative and traditional in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- there were a range of social reforms passed in the 1920s which sought to help the poorest in society, such as the 1924 Public Assistance system being modernised, the State Accident Insurance system in 1925 and a national unemployment insurance system in 1927, suggesting some challenge to the traditional order in terms of class and wealth
- evidence of greater opportunities for women in Weimar Germany, backed by new rights in education employment and voting rights, being enshrined in the Weimar Constitution. The concept of the 'new woman' was evident with sexual liberation and independence and increased visibility in public life
- evidence of youth breaking away from the constraints of family, school and church in the 1920s. Rising unemployment for young people in this period, especially in cities, led to many young, working class Germans joining gangs, for example the Red Apaches in Hamburg
- many in Germany found the new creativity and experimentation, in the arts, film, architecture and sex, exhilarating and liberating, especially after the crisis-ridden years of the War and post-war years. Young people, in particular, were engaged by the themes explored of modernity, challenge to authority as well as greater freedom on issues such as sex and political satire.

Students may conclude that there were some examples of a more progressive Weimar society between the years 1924 and 1929 in areas such as sexual liberation, the rights of women as well as cultural aspects such as in film, architecture and the theatre. However, there remained a strong conservative and traditional opinion which was unsettled by, and hostile to, these changes. Students may also point out that much of this social change was youth-centred and urban-based with more evidence of continuity and traditional values in rural areas and amongst older sectors of the population.

- 03** To what extent was Franz von Papen responsible for Hitler’s rise to the Chancellorship of Germany in the years 1932/33? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments/factors suggesting that Franz von Papen was responsible for Hitler's rise to the Chancellorship of Germany in the years 1932/33 might include:

- Papen's establishment of a 'government of national concentration', also known as the 'cabinet of barons', consisted primarily of unelected figures from the landowning and industrial elite. This was a further key step away from Weimar democracy and nearer to authoritarian government, which Hitler was offering
- Papen's lifting of the ban on the SA in June 1932 and placing further restrictions on the left-wing press gave the Nazis impetus to take on the communists in the streets in the run-up to the July 1932 election
- Papen was behind the destruction of the SPD-led Prussian state government and declaring a state of emergency in July 1932, followed by making himself Reich Commissioner in charge of Prussia. This further weakened democracy in Germany and pushed Germany further in an authoritarian direction
- Papen's growing political weakness following the July and November elections, led to his resignation and replacement by Schleicher. Papen's determination to engineer the removal of Schleicher led to his plotting with Hitler to make him Chancellor
- Papen was heavily involved in the final intrigue with his 4 January meeting with Hitler which led to a deal to make Hitler Chancellor and Papen Vice Chancellor. Papen then used his friendship with Hindenburg to gain the President's acquiescence.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Franz von Papen was responsible for Hitler's rise to the Chancellorship of Germany in the years 1932/33 might include:

- Hitler compromised to accept the January deal with Papen. Following the Nazis' disappointing showing in the November 1932 election, increasingly short of money and evidence of splits emerging in the Party with Strasser's resignation, Hitler was less hostile to a compromise over entering some form of coalition
- Hindenburg was persuaded, not only by von Papen but by his son, Oskar, as well as other members of his inner circle, such as Meißner
- Schleicher's role in bringing about Hitler's appointment cannot be overlooked. His role in bringing about the end of both Brüning and Papen's Chancellorship, and his own disastrous time in office between December 1932 and January 1933, limited Hindenburg's remaining options and made the Hitler option far more likely
- pressure was being exerted on Hindenburg from other areas, such as Schacht and other bankers and by army leaders, both of whom were concerned about the threat of communism
- Hitler's own popularity and that of his party made him an option for the elites. His pledge to restore the economy and nullify the threat of communism made him increasingly palatable in the year before his appointment.

Students may conclude that Papen was indeed a key figure in bringing about Hitler's appointment as Chancellor due to his influence over Hindenburg, his determination to oust Schleicher and his deal with Hitler. However, students may also point out that other figures were also extremely important, such as Schleicher himself, and that both fear of communism and Hitler's own strong position were also key factors.

- 04** 'Hitler's policies towards both Jews and other minority groups in the years 1933 to 1941 were consistent.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments/factors suggesting that Hitler's policies towards Jews and other minority groups in the years 1933 to 1941 were consistent might include:

- persecution towards the Jews was consistent in hostility and escalation from legal measures, such as the Nuremberg Laws, to outbreaks of violence, as at Kristallnacht, and increased radicalisation following the Anschluss and the invasion of Poland, such as ghettoisation and the work of the Einsatzgruppen
- Volksgemeinschaft ('national community') implied excluding (and persecuting) those who were not deemed to belong. This racial policy was entirely consistent and underpinned Nazi attitudes towards their perceived racial enemies. It was only the timing and methods which varied
- the Nazis consistently promoted the theory of eugenics which lay behind their persecution, including sterilisation and euthanasia, of the mentally and physically disabled as well as of so-called 'asocials', for example the work-shy, alcoholics and prostitutes
- groups such as Roma and Sinti, as well as homosexuals, were also systematically and consistently persecuted by the Nazi regime throughout these years, as a threat to the purity of the Aryan race.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that, Hitler's policies towards Jews and minority groups in the years 1933 to 1941 were consistent might include:

- policies towards the Jews, in the period up to 1939, were inconsistent with policies such as the 1933 boycott of Jewish shops as well as voluntary emigration up to 1939, suggesting a lack of planning and cohesion
- policies towards the Jews, in the period from 1939–1941, still showed evidence of inconsistency. Policies such as ghettoisation and the Madagascar Plan, both in 1940, suggested an attempt to find a pragmatic solution to the millions of Jews now under German control; no clear plan was in place about their eventual fate
- the mentally and physically disabled were persecuted throughout this period through sterilisation from 1933, and later, from 1939 with euthanasia through the T4 programme. However, euthanasia began not as a coherent policy. This policy was also halted in 1941 due to opposition from the churches, most notably from Cardinal Galen's 1941 sermon
- Nazi policies towards 'asocials' changed during this period. In 1936, an 'asocial colony', was established at Hashude, for those who were not 'normal'. The aim was to 're-educate' and re-integrate such groups into society but as war approached, treatment became more brutal and many were sent to camps and died there
- a lack of consistency in policy and attitude towards homosexuals (as opposed to lesbians who were not categorised) with the former being persecuted from the start and suffering increasingly brutal treatment in camps with up to 60% of homosexual prisoners dying in camps.

Students may conclude that Nazi attitudes and theories towards minority groups were clear and consistent, in terms of their hostility and the belief that these groups posed a serious threat to the racial harmony and unity of the Reich. Students may emphasise, however, that policies towards these groups evolved and changed, with an increasing radicalisation following the Anschluss with Austria and the invasion of Poland, as well as an increasing confidence as the Nazi grip on power tightened.