

**Up to 4 marks of the total for part (d) will be awarded for spelling, punctuation, grammar and use of specialist terminology.**

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about reasons for the growth in support for the Nazi Party in the years 1929–32?

Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context. (16+4)

**Interpretation 1:** From *Weimar and 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 I 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.

Start with your judgement. HOW FAR do you agree with the interpretation. Give reasons for your judgment.

<p>This should be one sentence outlining what the paragraph will be about.</p> <p>Aim for 2 sentences. You should give the facts here. What do you know about the event? What happened? Who was involved? When did it happen?</p> <p>This is where you are linking back to the question. How does the interpretation link to the focus? How does your evidence link to the interpretation?</p> <p>Here you need to judge <b>HOW IMPORTANT</b> the factor in the interpretation is. Compare it to your own knowledge of the event. Has the author missed anything? Have they over or underplayed a factor?</p> <p>Finally you need to judge how the author has presented the information. Have they been positive/negative? Have they highlighted any particular issue? Do you agree with their emphasis.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1</p> <p><b>Point:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p><b>Explain:</b></p> <p><b>Analysis:</b></p> <p><b>Language:</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 2</p> <p><b>Point:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p><b>Explain:</b></p> <p><b>Analysis:</b></p> <p><b>Language:</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 3</p> <p><b>Point:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <p><b>Explain:</b></p> <p><b>Analysis:</b></p> <p><b>Language:</b></p>
--	--	--	--

**Now write your conclusion, pull all the threads from your paragraphs together then write a sentence which sums up your argument.**