



A-level HISTORY 7042/20

Component 20 Democracy and Nazism: Germany, 1918–1945

Mark scheme

June 2025

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 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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

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.

Copyright © 2025 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Supporting Marking Guidance

A separate Supporting Marking Guidance document has been created for use in this series and any future series.

It has been written by the senior examining team. It applies to all A-level History options. The purpose of the guidance is to clarify key aspects of the mark scheme and further ensure consistency of approach across all options. The guidance does not reflect a change in the standard applied, but clarification and amplification of the standard. We hope that the guidance document will aid you in your understanding of how the standard should be applied and deepen your understanding of how the key aspects of the mark scheme work. The Supporting Marking Guidance should always be used in conjunction with the mark scheme, and any relevant examiner standardising and teacher training material.

Examiners can find the Supporting Marking Guidance on the associate extranet.

Teachers can find the Supporting Marking Guidance alongside the current mark scheme on Centre Services on results day. It will also be published with any future assessment materials on the public website.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the radicalisation of the German state in the years 1936 to 1941.

[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 written by the head of the Hitler Youth, who had overall responsibility for ensuring that German children and young people, of both sexes, were indoctrinated with Nazi radicalism. It therefore reflects Nazi strategy towards young people, from the highest level of leadership
- the source is the text of the Law on the Hitler Youth. Students may discuss the nature of the law within this period, commenting on outward conformity to traditional, legitimate, constitutional government, while in fact, the Nazi dictatorship was well in place by 1936
- the date of this source, December 1936, puts it into the final stages of the coordination of German youth movements under the Hitler Youth umbrella, although membership was not yet compulsory. Students may recognise that this Law was a crucial part of that coordination
- the assertively nationalist tone of this source reflects Nazi totalitarianism, through its focus on the 'rearing' role of families and its emphasis on Reich citizenship, rather than familial bonds. However, students may question the extent to which it reflected the genuine wishes of ordinary German citizens at this time.

Content and argument

- the source outlines the process of coordinating German youth, through the law, which is valuable for showing one of the most important ways in which the Nazi state radicalised its citizens. Students may discuss the policy of Gleichshaltung with evidence, such as the eradication of Catholic youth organisations and the incoming monopoly of sports facilities and competitions. They may comment on the limitations of this policy, with examples such as the Swing Youth
- the source is explicit in describing the educative role of the Hitler Youth. Students may be able to put this into context with related measures, such as the creation of the National Socialist Teachers' League, and recognise that this law shows the expansion of education into young people's leisure time as well, thus widening their exposure to radical ideas
- the source describes the role of the Reich Leader, emphasising its elevated status. Students may discuss the prime importance that Hitler placed on preparing the Reich for its 'thousand year' future by tailored activities that would radicalise young hearts and minds. They may critically evaluate Schirach's claim for such high status by noting that enthusiasm and effectiveness were already waning by 1939
- the source refers to the Hitler Youth as embracing the totality of a young person, 'physically, intellectually, morally', without describing its sub-organisation into gendered and age-related divisions. Students may comment on these distinctions within the youth movement and the particular emphases placed within each sphere, which Nazi policy intended to ensure the preparedness of all for the demands of the future.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author was himself imprisoned for homosexuality by the Nazis and, as such, provides a valuable insight into the impact of the radicalisation of the Nazi state on its victims
- students may comment on the date of publication, 1972, as a potential limitation because of the passage of time. However, they may also argue that Nazi censorship and the workings of the terror state meant that victims' voices were rarely heard contemporaneously, due to the persecution they suffered, so any insight into their experience is valuable
- Heger's bewildered tone might be understood in terms of the sudden, profound reversal of the liberal gains of the 1920s, particularly in Berlin.

Content and argument

- Heger lists the victims of Nazi racial ideology. Students may discuss theories of natural selection and racial hierarchy that underpinned this targeting for persecution, and identify specific reasons why homosexual men were targeted, including the perceived social harm caused by their lack of reproductive contribution
- the source describes the nature of persecution as leading to extermination, by brutal treatment. Students may be able to contextualise the measures that the radicalised Nazi state took against its targets, recognising a distinction between concentration camps and death camps and between the treatment of political prisoners and those who were prisoners because of radical racial ideologies
- the source uses the term 'degenerates' and students may recognise that this was a key Nazi definition, used in other contexts such as the Exhibition of Degenerate Art. They may reflect on the use of depersonalising language in Nazi propaganda, enabling this harsh treatment of victims
- students may comment on the use of SS guards, as described by Heger. They may discuss how Nazi racial ideology positioned the members of the SS as the racial elite of the Reich and may describe policies designed to preserve and expand Aryan 'purity' within Germany through targeted policies such as the Lebensborn programme.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a Cardinal in the Catholic Church, Galen's sermon is valuable evidence for the presence of opposition from religious groups to some Nazi policies, demonstrating a limit to radicalisation
- the sermon was preached in 1941. Students may note that persecution of minorities had been underway within Germany since 1933 and, therefore, that this is a comparatively late intervention into the debate, which they may discuss in terms of the ambivalence of many German Christians to Nazism, simultaneously appreciating its promotion of 'family values' while decrying its excesses
- Galen's tone reveals his moral outrage at his discovery of widespread practice of euthanasia on the mentally ill Germans. Students may discuss the extent to which Nazi logistics and propaganda obscured the working of racial ideologies and they may consider the impact of living in a terror state on those who might want to speak against such activities.

Content and argument

- Galen is referring to the Aktion T-4 programme of euthanasia that began in 1939. Students may discuss this programme in terms of an expansion of persecution directed at Germans with disabilities, including mental illness, considering its evolution from earlier measures such as sterilisation
- students may discuss the link between racial ideology and the disabled community, explaining why these victims were targeted to prevent them from 'weakening' the German population, and describing how the public were influenced by propaganda to support this goal
- Galen appeals for this programme to be stopped on the basis that it breaches the law. Students may discuss how effective this tactic might be, given the measures that the Nazis had taken to thoroughly dismantle the rule of law within Germany by this point. They may reference the 'People's Court' system, or the 1933 Decree for the Protection of the German People
- students may consider this to be particularly valuable because Galen's sermon was effective in mobilising such significant opposition to the T-4 programme that it was substantially wound down as a consequence. They may discuss what this tells historians about the extent to which the wider German population actively supported, or passively tolerated, Nazi racial policies.

Section B

- 0 2** In the years 1919 to 1923, to what extent was the instability of the Weimar Republic caused by international, rather than domestic, factors?

[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 supporting the view that in the years 1919 to 1923, the instability of the Weimar Republic was caused by international, rather than domestic, factors might include:

- the Russian Revolution of 1917 provided the ideological and practical inspiration for the communist risings within this period, including that of the Spartacists in 1919. The impact of revolution on middle- and upper-class Russians, and the civil war that Russia plunged into, also catalysed a powerful fear of communism within swathes of the German population. This combination of inspiration and fear substantially explains the destabilising influence of left-wing extremism within this period
- the Allied blockade of German ports persisted into 1919, compounding the misery of wartime shortages on the German population, sustaining the high civilian mortality rate and contributing to rising inflation that dogged the whole period. This led to an environment of fear and anger which further increased the proclivity of the German population to support extremist groups which promised easy solutions, or at least, to withhold support for the Weimar governments
- the Treaty of Versailles was imposed on Germany by France, Britain and the USA. Its presentation, with a 2-week ultimatum for signature, provoked an immediate political crisis, necessitating a new governing coalition; German popular horror at the terms created an inexorable link between the Treaty and the Weimar Republic which was used as a rallying point for multiple challenges to the government, including the Kapp and Munich Putsches
- the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 was an escalated consequence of the imposed, and unsustainable, burden of reparations. It led to significant casualties within the region; the migration by virtue of expulsion of 150 000 Germans, and was a crucial contributory factor to the hyperinflation crisis which brought the Republic to the brink of full economic collapse.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1919 to 1923, the instability of the Weimar Republic was caused by international, rather than domestic, factors might include:

- the nature of the Weimar Constitution contributed significantly to the political instability of this period. In particular, the introduction of proportional representation created the conditions in which changes of government were frequent because of the inherent instability of each coalition. This impeded the development of long-term policies that were crucial for tackling the deep issues, such as inflation, which brought ongoing instability to the Republic
- persistent traditionalist values within the German population sustained the ongoing threat of the right wing to the Republic. Political appeals based on the 'stab in the back', hit fertile ground, such that right-wing opposition was widespread across the period and across social groups. The genuine stability of the legal system was compromised by right-wing bias within the judiciary
- inflation was a problem throughout the period. German wartime economic policies saddled the Weimar Republic with a debt of 1.4 billion marks, and there were real political challenges inherent in managing this debt through raising taxes or cutting spending. In this context, the lack of long-term financial planning meant that inflation caused turbulence; its short-term consequences were somewhat beneficial but by 1923, it ran out of control
- while imported communist ideas provided direction to workers' grievances, the development of workers' councils and the spread of strong socialist ideas were also strongly linked to domestic factors. Discontent with the direction of the war was the catalyst for the revolutionary movements of 1918/19 which led to working-class Germans realising their growing political influence throughout the period in question. Demobilisation, the need for welfare provisions, and disruption to industries in the wake of the First World War, all facilitated the spread of socialist ideas and movements.

Students may argue that international factors were more important than domestic factors in destabilising the Weimar Republic because of their catalytic role in provoking the major crises of the years 1919 to 1923. However, students may argue that domestic factors were more important because they provided the long-term, underlying conditions on which external influences could exert such an impact. Students may argue effectively in support or challenge of the statement; control over the material in order to focus directly on the question, and the ability to manage linkage between international and domestic factors is likely to distinguish stronger answers.

0 3 'Schleicher was the individual most responsible for Hitler's rise to the Chancellorship in January 1933.'

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 supporting the view that Schleicher was the individual most responsible for Hitler's rise to the Chancellorship in January 1933 might include:

- it was Schleicher's withdrawal of support for Brüning, in April 1932, that triggered his government to collapse. Specifically, Schleicher brokered the deal in which Hitler agreed not to oppose a new coalition, and subsequently influenced President Hindenburg to force Brüning's resignation by refusing to sign a presidential decree
- Schleicher's deal with Hitler caused a second political crisis in the form of the July 1932 Reichstag elections. The swing to the Nazi Party in this election ensured that Hitler could no longer be sidelined: the support of the NSDAP became even more critical for the viability of alternative governments
- in his role as political head of the Army, Schleicher next triggered the collapse of Papen's government when he withdrew his support from Papen in November 1932, having realised that he could not exert the control over Papen that he had anticipated. Schleicher's actions removed another potentially viable government, accelerating the rise of Nazi influence
- as Chancellor, from December 1932 to January 1933, Schleicher demonstrated that he lacked the political skill to create a stable government. In particular, his leaning towards progressive policies alienated the conservative, right-wing supporters that were his base and the collapse of his government followed rapidly. It was this final collapse that led directly to Hitler being promoted to Chancellor.

Arguments challenging the view that Schleicher was the individual most responsible for Hitler's rise to the Chancellorship in January 1933 might include:

- Brüning's failure to tackle the economic crisis of the Depression, with unemployment reaching 6 million by February 1932, caused his ability to govern unravel as he lost control of street violence and support for extremist parties rose. While Hitler refused to join the subsequent coalition, his agreement not to oppose it was crucial, catalysing the collapse of Brüning's government, and moving Hitler closer to a position of power
- Papen's political leanings were to the right, and he was crucial in lifting the ban on the SA, reducing socialist political influence in Prussia and controlling left-wing propaganda in the lead up to the July 1932 election, thus facilitating NSDAP reach into the electorate. It was Papen who, crucially, invited Hitler to join his coalition government in January 1933, as Chancellor
- Hindenburg, as President, had the power to appoint and dismiss Chancellors, and he had a powerful steadying influence on those in the electorate who were wary of extremist parties. While Hindenburg tended to respond to the political direction of those in his close circle of advisers, he was responsible for appointing each Chancellor and it was his elitist snobbery that led him to catastrophically misjudge the political skill and popular appeal of Hitler
- Hitler's political skill, drawing on Goebbels' undoubted effectiveness in propaganda, meant that the NSDAP rose in power within the Reichstag so that they could not be ignored in coalition agreements; Hitler was adept at exploiting the divisions and tensions within the turmoil of 1932/33, and his refusal to join coalitions until his appointment as Chancellor meant that he had emerged as one of the few viable candidates still standing by January 1933.

Students may argue that Schleicher played a crucial role in causing the collapse of a succession of governments that led to the promotion of Hitler. They may, however, argue that it was Goebbels' propaganda abilities, fully exploited by Hitler's particular political skill, that had brought the Nazis to the place where they could not be ignored.

- 0 4** 'The Nazis successfully managed the demands of the wartime economy in the years 1939 to 1945.'

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 supporting the view that the Nazis successfully managed the demands of the wartime economy in the years 1939 to 1945 might include:

- rationing was broadly successful in ensuring adequate supplies of food, clothing and fuel were distributed across the German population; it was only in the final months of the war that supplies were seriously inconsistent and inadequate
- policy decisions related to the workforce were broadly tolerated by the majority of workers, and political leaders made rapid policy reversals – such as wage reductions – in order to preserve broadly harmonious relations. Coercion also played a role in maintaining discipline in the workforce, with the threat of conscripting troublesome workers into the army on the Eastern Front serving as a powerful deterrent for industrial unrest
- measures taken to create the labour force required for the early wartime economy were somewhat successful until the catastrophic Russia campaign created a severe labour shortage. Once conscription had been introduced, including compulsory labour for women, and sources of foreign labour – mainly PoWs and slave labourers from concentration camps – had been organised and expanded, supply became broadly sufficient for demand
- Speer's promotion, in 1942, transformed the political leadership of Nazi economic policy and was a successful appointment. His immediate creation of a Central Planning Agency was crucially important as it facilitated the rationalisation of Germany's industrial activities, supported by increased standardisation of equipment and munitions, such that production rose rapidly.

Arguments challenging the view that the Nazis successfully managed the demands of the wartime economy in the years 1939 to 1945 might include:

- as Reich Plenipotentiary in charge of the Four Year Economic Plan since 1936, Goering proved incapable for the task he faced in 1939. He was ineffective in post, with neither the specific knowledge nor the management skills necessary, such that the economy was not competently put on a wartime footing until 1942
- production problems, including chaotic supply chain logistics, competition for resources from different branches of the armed forces and a lack of standardisation, were such that there was a shortage of weapons and military equipment between 1939 and 1942, with this having a significant impact on military successes by 1941
- conflicting policy imperatives caused ongoing problems. For example, Hitler's drive to maintain civilian morale meant that large-scale public building works continued, despite the impact that this had on the wartime economy; anti-Semitism removed key Jewish scientists from work on technological developments, such as rocketry, and rigid gender ideologies hampered the effective deployment of women into the labour market until late in the war
- the Nazis were unable to neutralise the severe economic impact of Allied bombing raids on Germany, estimated by Speer as amounting to 20-30% of industrial production.

Students are likely to argue that economic policy was substantially unsuccessful under Goering but successful under Speer's leadership. Stronger responses may link turning points in the military campaigns, pointing to Operation Barbarossa, or D-Day, as having a significant impact on the economic demands of war and incorporate chronological developments into their argument. They may note that, while Goering lacked competence, war was advanced by three years against the economic policy that had been established in 1936 and which may have been achieved in different circumstances.