Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the changing treatment of Jews in Germany between 1933 and 1943.

General context of the period

- NSDAP wins 44% of the popular vote in the Reichstag elections (March 1933), becoming the single biggest party. All other parties, except for the SPD and the recently-banned KPD, offer support, allowing Hitler to secure the two-thirds majority required to pass the Enabling Act. Hitler can now rule by decree and gradually establish an authoritarian state.

- The Nazi Party, which is deeply anti-Semitic, seeks to exclude Jews from society. Almost immediately, there are boycotts of Jewish businesses and a ban on the employment of Jews in the civil service. However, neither measure is fully complied with. President Hindenburg objects to the dismissal of Jews who had fought, or had lost a father in, the First World War from the civil service, resulting in their retention.

- Treatment of Jews in Germany gradually worsens. In 1935, the Nuremburg Laws are enacted to determine who will be classified as Jewish. Jews were now denied German citizenship and prevented from marrying Aryan Germans. Distribution of state-sponsored anti-Semitic propaganda had paved the way for these measures and the public is encouraged to vilify Jews.

- During the Berlin Olympics of 1936, public displays of anti-Semitism are toned down and signs forbidding Jews from places such as public parks, are removed for fear of offending foreign visitors, an indication of the Nazis’ concern for their reputation abroad.

- By 1938, further measures have been introduced. All Jews have to carry identity cards stamped with a “J”, Jewish children are forbidden from attending schools, and Jewish men and women must add “Israel” or “Sarah” to their names respectively. In November 1938, with Hitler’s approval, Goebbels delivers a speech that instigates a night of violence against Jews in Germany. Synagogues are burnt down, buildings damaged, and Jews attacked; many are sent to concentration camps and others killed. This Kristallnacht demonstrates that the Nazis were now sufficiently authoritarian to carry out harsh and violent policies against Jews, regardless of public sentiment. By 1939, Jews can no longer own businesses and a curfew is imposed. In 1941, a law is past requiring Jews in Germany to wear a yellow star on their outer clothing.

- Successes in foreign policy (the invasion of Austria, March 1938, and the Sudetenland, October 1938) mean the Nazis are both popular and feared, making public opposition to anti-Semitic policies difficult to express.

- The signing of the Nazi–Soviet Pact (23 August), officially a 10-year Non-Aggression Treaty gives Hitler the confidence to begin a war in Europe. By the end of September, Poland is divided between Nazi Germany and the USSR. The Treaty is broken in June 1941 with the German invasion of the Soviet Union known as Operation Barbarossa. As the German invasion forces move eastwards and into the Baltic States, they come to areas that, historically, were the Pale of Settlement where Jews had been allowed to live during the Russian Empire.

- The Final Solution, the plan to exterminate the Jews more "efficiently", is formulated at the Wannsee Conference (January 1942). Deportations commence (albeit clandestinely) and the systematic shooting of Jews in the Baltic states, East Poland and Ukraine by the Einsatzgruppen is now replaced by the gas chambers of the death camps, many of which are located in occupied Poland.

- By 1943, the German army is in retreat in the USSR. This is due to a number of factors, including the decisive defeat of German forces at the Battle of Stalingrad.
### Key:
- **Values**
- **Limitations**
- **Other points of note**

### Source A  
From an article in *Volkischer Beobachter*, a Nazi daily newspaper (March 1933)

In every local branch and organisational section of the NSDAP, *Action Committees are to be formed immediately* for the practical systematic implementation of a *boycott of Jewish shops*, Jewish goods, Jewish doctors and Jewish lawyers. The principle must be that *no German will any longer buy from a Jew*, or allow Jews or their agents to recommend goods. The boycott must be general. It must be carried out by the whole nation and must hit the Jews in their most sensitive spot. The *boycott is not to begin piecemeal, but all at once*.  

apologies to this end are to be made immediately. Orders will go out to the SA and SS to post guards outside Jewish stores from the moment that the boycott comes into force, in order to *warn the public against entering the premises*. The start of the boycott will be made known with the aid of posters, through the press and by means of leaflets. The boycott will start at exactly 10.00 a.m. on Saturday, April 1. It will continue until the Party leadership orders its cancellation.

### Source B  
The *American Consul in Leipzig*, writing in a report to the American government, following the events of Kristallnacht (November 1938)

Ferocious as was the violation and destruction of property, the most hideous phase of the so-called ‘spontaneous action’ has been the wholesale arrest and transportation to concentration camps of male *German Jews between the ages of sixteen and sixty*. This has been taking place daily since the night of horror. This office has no way of accurately checking the numbers of such arrests, but there is *little question* that they have run to *thousands in Leipzig alone*.  Having demolished dwellings and hurled most of the movable effects onto the streets, the *insatiably sadistic perpetrators* threw many of the trembling inhabitants into a small stream which flows through the zoological park, *commanding* terrified spectators to spit at them, *defile* them with mud and *jeer* at their plight. These tactics were carried out *without police intervention* and they were applied to men, women and *children*. There is *much evidence of physical violence* including *several deaths*.

This Consulate has been a bedlam of humanity for the last ten days, most of these visitors being desperate women, as their husbands and sons had been taken off to concentration camps.

### Summary of points, including:
- **notes on the sources and their attributions/provenances**
- **notes on the specific context of the sources**

- Derives from a Nazi propaganda newspaper. This is evidence then of the approach adopted, officially, by the NSDAP
- Note the date. Ramping up tensions in this very early phase of Hitler’s control.
- Indicative of Nazi efforts to control: “Action committees are to be formed immediately” – NB the context around the Reichstag elections and subsequent Enabling Act.
- Targeting of Jews is clear: “no German will... buy from a Jew”. Emphasises the Jews as “other” and ties in with the Nazis’ racial ideology and *Volksgemeinschaft*. Evidence of the Nazi state’s exclusion of Jews from everyday life in Germany.
- Official view: dogmatic, may not reflect the extent of wider German feeling. NB: the boycott lasted for only one day and was difficult to implement. Further, temperate language is misleading: the intention was to encourage the public to discriminate against Jews.
- Tone is supportive of the proposed boycott and date indicates the speed with which the NSDAP was acting to impose its racial ideology. Links to *Volksgemeinschaft*, ensuring widespread compliance among the Aryan population.
- Indication of how the public were instructed to adopt discriminatory racial policies and how these were enforced.
- No explicit reference to the use of violence. Measures are still quite limited.

- From a report by the American consul in Leipzig, who is informing the US government.
- An independent observer at a time when the US was neutral and keen to avoid direct involvement in European politics.
- Date indicates that this was written soon after (in the same month as) Kristallnacht.
- Reference to the “night of horror” indicates sympathy for the Jews and is thus not unbiased.
- The “wholesale arrest and transportation to concentration camps of male German Jews” suggests an escalation in the treatment of Jews by the late 1930s.
- Use of parentheses around “spontaneous action” suggesting the author’s scepticism.
- Indicative of Nazi efforts to control: “Action committees are to be formed immediately” – NB the context around the Reichstag elections and subsequent Enabling Act.
- “Several deaths” mentioned but no numbers provided, again, suggests the author is quite cautious in describing events when the evidence, beyond what the consul has seen, is limited.
- Vivid description of the kind of actions carried out. Notes police inaction and that women and children, as well as men, were attacked.
- Emotive language (“horrified spectators”) indicates that ordinary Germans were not all supportive of this violence and had to be “commanded” to participate.
- The reference to “desperate” visitors and the description of the Consulate as a “bedlam of humanity” suggests direct experience of the aftermath of Kristallnacht. But the author does not provide any further information about what happened to these people, or why they visited the Consulate.
- Treatment of Jews is now being undertaken very publicly and is not wholly supported by ordinary Germans.
- Personal insight and reflects the opinions of someone who would have been used to providing official reports.
- Note that the Consul can testify only to events he witnessed: those in Leipzig, not in Germany as a whole.
Source C  
Heinrich Himmler, Head of the SS, in a speech to SS leaders at Posen (October 1943)

The Jewish people will be exterminated. It’s clear, it’s in our programme. Elimination of the Jews, extermination and we’ll do it. Most of you will know what it means when a hundred corpses are lying side by side, or five hundred or a thousand are lying there. To have stuck it out and, apart from a few exceptions due to human weakness, to have remained decent, that is what has made us tough. This is a glorious entry in our history which has never been written and can never be written. For we know how difficult it would be for us if we still had Jews as secret saboteurs, agitators and troublemakers amongst us at this crucial time. We had the moral right, we had the duty to our people, to destroy the people who wanted to destroy us. But we have not the right to enrich ourselves with so much as a fur, a watch, a mark, a cigarette or anything else. We have exterminated a bacterium because we do not want in the end to be infected by the bacterium and die of it. All in all, we can say that we have fulfilled the most difficult duty for the love of our people. And our spirit and our soul. Our character has not suffered from it.

• From a speech given to SS leaders by Heinrich Himmler, Reichsführer of the SS. This was given in Posen, in German-occupied Poland.
• The date is significant: by 1943, the German army was in retreat in the USSR.
• The targeting of Jews is clear. Himmler uses forceful language, asserting that “the Jewish people will be exterminated […] “elimination of the Jews, extermination and we’ll do it”. Refers to the Jews as “a bacterium”.
• Indicates that everything must be kept secret and can never be written about.
• Argues that the Jews represent a threat: “secret saboteurs, agitators and troublemakers… the people who wanted to destroy us.” It is therefore the moral duty of the SS to “destroy” them.
• Persuasive and propagandistic language. He identifies with his audience by using the pronoun “we” and praises them as “decent” and “tough.”
• This is not an official, public speech but one given to selected audience that would already have been part of an elite force responsible for carrying out the Final Solution. We can assume that Himmler is giving them a “pep talk” intended to encourage them to keep going and praising their dedication.
Keeping the question in mind, use the information above and identify similarities and differences between the sources. These may vary in number; you do not need to have an equal amount of each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities between the sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources A, B and C shed light on Nazi attitudes and policies towards Jews and the application of these policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources A and B indicate that the public response to increasingly harsh policies was not always supportive. In Source A, guards had to be posted outside Jewish shops to ensure customers did not try to enter. In Source B, “horrified spectators” had to be commanded to abuse the Jews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources A and C focus on how anti-Semitic policies are carried out in the interests of the nation. In Source A, it is stressed that the whole nation must carry out the boycott. In Source C, Himmler emphasises that the extermination of the Jews must be completed in order to protect the German people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between the sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source A and Source C differ from Source B. Both Sources A and C are supportive of Nazi policies, but Source B is critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources A and B mention the application of racial policies against Jews inside Germany, but Source C refers to events in occupied Poland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source A refers to the boycotting of Jewish shops and limits placed on Jewish doctors and lawyers, suggesting that these policies were implemented in part on economic grounds. Source B indicates a much harsher policy and refers to the beginning of the deportation of Jews to concentration camps. Source C refers to the Final Solution, the culmination of numerous policies aimed at restricting and punishing Jews now aiming at their extermination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source C differs from Sources A and B because it focuses on the racial ideology of the Nazi Party. It outlines the reasons why the Jews must be exterminated. Meanwhile, Sources A and B focus more on what actions were to be carried out and how these were accomplished.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, considering the general context of the period, your analysis of the sources and their provenances, identification of the specific content and identification of similarities and differences, outline and explain the value and limitations of the sources – both individually and collectively – to an historian studying the issue in the question. Again, these may vary in number; you do not need to have an equal amount of each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the value of the source or sources to an historian studying...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The most significant value of Source A to an historian studying the changing treatment of Jews is that it shows how policies were communicated to the public with a clear instruction that all Aryan Germans were to carry out this policy. It also shows how the Nazi Party, which had only recently come to power, was intending to begin its campaign against German Jews in a relatively controlled way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why is this a value? (include contextual material – specific or general – where necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The initial attempt to put anti-Semitic policies into practice in 1933 was not met with immediate support, either from the public or from President Hindenburg. Although anti-Semitism had been part of the NSDAP programme since its inception in 1920, it is unlikely to have been the main reason why Germans voted NSDAP in March 1933. Also, the NSDAP did not hold the majority of the seats in the Reichstag when the Enabling Bill was passed, and so time was needed to convince the public to go along with increasingly harsh anti-Semitic policies. This is not mentioned in Source A, which tells us what was intended rather than how or whether it was carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most significant value of Source B is that it is an eyewitness report from the American Consul who would be have observed, first-hand, the impact of Kristallnacht in Leipzig. Also, unlike local or national newspaper reports of events inside Germany, the Consul would have been keen to give an account of events as accurately as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of significant value is that the three sources, taken together, demonstrate the steady radicalisation of Nazi policies towards the Jews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sources shed light on the ways in which the treatment of Jews changed between 1933 and 1943. They allow us to trace a path from the culture open but not necessarily all-encompassing anti-Semitism that existed at the start of the period through to the Final Solution of the 1940s. They also indicate that this was largely driven by Nazi ideology, but took along with it many, if not all, of the German population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the limitations of the source or sources to an historian studying...</th>
<th>Why is it a limitation? (include contextual material – specific or general – where necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The most significant limitation of Source A for historians is that the extract is taken from a Nazi newspaper, and we cannot be certain how widely it was circulated or if the instructions to boycott Jewish shops was carried out.</td>
<td>The intention was for there to be boycott of Jewish shops until the party &quot;orders its cancellation&quot; but the lack of public support led to it being a one-day boycott only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| For Source B, the most significant limitation is that the American Consul was sympathetic to the Jewish population of Leipzig and so may have exaggerated the abuse hurled against them.  
What did the wives and mothers of deported Jews who descended on the Consulate want? Exit visas? Assistance in retrieving their loved ones? | As this source refers to Leipzig only, an historian could not assume, without further evidence, that similar events happened elsewhere in Germany. However, the numbers of Jews who sought to leave Germany increased significantly after Kristallnacht – estimated 115,000 in the next 10 months. The US had placed limits on immigration, but 29,000 Jews from Germany and Austria filled the quota for the first time since the Nazis came to power. This supports the Consul's claim that that the US Consulate was "a bedlam" of anxious mothers and wives of Jews who had been deported. |
| For Source C, the most significant limitation is that the German army was now in retreat and it is possible that Himmler felt compelled to exaggerate the importance of exterminating the Jews due to the distinct possibility that Germany would be defeated. In addition, it does not shed light on how Jews who may have escaped deportation were treated in Germany or of how ordinary Germans felt about the treatment of Jews. | We don't know if the officers that Himmler was addressing needed to be reminded of why the Final Solution needed to be carried out. The SS were running the death camps and it was an elite force with selective recruitment so it is unlikely its officers would not have supported the racist ideology of the Nazi Party. |

In summary, what is the value of these sources to an historian studying...

Overall, all three sources are of some value to the historian studying the changing treatment of Jews in Germany during the period 1933–43. Each one discusses the persecution of Jews and how, at first, the Nazi Party discriminated against them and later had them deported and killed. Source B is valuable because it provides a non-propagandistic observation of Kristallnacht in Leipzig, but it is also the most subjective as the US Consul is not an impartial observer. His account is influenced by his sympathy for the Jews, making this source the least reliable. Source A, taken from a Nazi newspaper and Source C, taken from a speech by a leading Nazi, provide a clear indication of how the treatment of Jews changed and became more extreme over time.