



# Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (6HI03) Paper D

Unit 3  
Paper 3D: The Challenge of Fascism

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6HI03\_D\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## **GCE History Marking Guidance**

### **Marking of Questions: Levels of Response**

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

### **Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level**

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

### Section A

**Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)**

**(30 marks)**

The essay questions in Part (a) will have an analytical focus, requiring candidates to reach a substantiated judgement on a historical issue or problem.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There will be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in</p>

		<p>organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

**Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

## Section B

### Target: AO1a and AO1b (7% - 16 marks) AO2b (10% - 24 marks) (40 marks)

Candidates will be provided with two or three secondary sources totalling about 350-400 words. The question will require candidates to compare the provided source material in the process of exploring an issue of historical debate and reaching substantiated judgements in the light of their own knowledge and understanding of the issues of interpretation and controversy. Students must attempt the controversy question that is embedded within the period context.

### AO1a and AO1b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified, on the basis of factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. Links with the presented source material will be implicit at best. The factual material will be mostly generalised and there will be few, if any, links between the statements.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1 mark</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	4-6	<p>Candidates will produce statements deriving from their own knowledge and may attempt to link this with the presented source material. Knowledge will have some accuracy and relevance. There may be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 5 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>



3	7-10	<p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	11-13	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and – as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 13 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	14-16	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment</p>

	<p>of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 15 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
--	--

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

### Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

### AO2b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-9	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question. When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	10-14	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to analyse some key points of the arguments offered and to reason from the evidence of the sources. Develops points of challenge and support for the stated claim from the provided source material and deploys material gained from relevant reading and knowledge of the issues under discussion. Shows clear understanding that the issue is one of interpretation. Focuses directly on the question when structuring the response, although, in addressing the specific enquiry, there may be some lack of balance. Reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, supported by information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p>

		<p><b>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate. Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 17-19 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 22-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### Unit 3 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Section A Q	30	-	30
Section B Q	16	24	40
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>% weighting</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>30%</b>

## Section A

### D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>This question invites candidates to consider the extent to which the Weimar Republic was threatened in its unstable early years by political extremism. Expect coverage of the left-wing challenges of 1919, the Kapp Putsch of 1920, the Munich Putsch of 1923 and the Communist disturbances of that year in Saxony and elsewhere. Candidates might also address the spate of political assassinations and the political consequences of the crisis afflicting the currency, culminating in the collapse of 1923. There should be some degree of focus on the extent of the threat posed for the mid-levels or above, although it may be the case that responses are one sided, probably with an acceptance that there was a very real threat. Higher levels are likely to appreciate the assets at the disposal of the Weimar governments, including the support of a majority of the parties and of the largest party, the SPD, and its associated Trade Unions. Even the army, under Groener and Reinhardt, was willing to cooperate, although candidates are likely to be aware of its reluctance in 1920 to stand against Luttwitz; and Reinhardt's successor, Seeckt, was somewhat less co-operative. That said, candidates may offer valid argument that such groups were not necessarily reliable bulwarks against any extremist threat. Look for analysis also of the weaknesses of the extremists of both right and left; this could be illustrated by voting figures or illustration of the ease with which threats were countered e.g. the Nazi fiasco in Munich in 1923.</p> <p>At Level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the extent of the threat posed towards the Weimar Republic by extremist activity in these years. At Level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At Level 3 a range of arguments relating to the extremist threat may be examined, although the response may be one-sided or lack balance across the period. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>This question invites candidates to consider the seriousness of opposition to the Nazi Regime during the war years. There will doubtless be coverage of the opposition from the left, most successfully showing itself in the spy network known as the Red Orchestra, from the Churches, from youth groups like the Edelweiss pirates and the White Rose Group and – likely in many cases to be argued as the most dangerous of opponents as far as the Nazi regime was concerned - within the army and the Abwehr. As well as precise detail of such opposition groups, at the higher levels candidates are likely to give consideration to criteria for judging the seriousness of the threat, perhaps exploring issues such as the scale, the willingness to challenge the Nazi regime, the level of wider or external support, and even the unity of opposition groups in the face of Nazi security forces. It can be argued that the opposition in all its forms was never serious enough to threaten the regime, although the likes of Himmler took it seriously and the consequent repression was one of the reasons why it remained largely ineffective. Points raised on this side of the argument might be the handicap raised for the Communists by the Nazi-Soviet Pact from 1939 to 1941, the oath of loyalty taken seriously by many serving officers and the widespread consensual support that the regime appeared to enjoy from broad swathes of the public. Detailed consideration of events such as the July Plot are likely to feature, although for the higher levels, these should go beyond mere description and offer a genuine engagement with the question. Material on the tools the Nazi regime had at hand to deal with opponents, alongside detail on the context of the war may be offered, perhaps exploring the (inverse) relationship between apparent success on the war front with the ability of opposition groups to damage the regime.</p> <p>At Level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the extent to which the Nazis were ever seriously threatened, with coverage across both the given period and a range of opposition groups. At Level 4 there should be a real debate, although this may not be fully balanced. At Level 3 a range of arguments regarding opposition to the Nazi regime during the war years may be examined, although the response may be one-sided or lack balance across the period. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

**D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>3</b>	<p>This question invites candidates to evaluate the motivations explaining the British policy of appeasement of Germany in the years 1933-37. As far as the given proposition is concerned, there will likely be coverage of the issue of reparations, the disarmament clauses of Versailles and the growing sense in both cases that the French were inclined to be unreasonable in their treatment of Germany. Look for coverage of the Disarmament Conference of 1933, the response to German rearmament and the occupation of the Rhineland and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. When Germany remilitarised the Rhineland in 1936 Baldwin made it clear that the government were unwilling to act and risk war against Germany- maintaining that 'Germany was only walking into their own backyard'. In consideration of other factors that may be used to explain the policy of appeasement, it can be argued that the state of the British economy and the desire to boost trade with Germany was equally important as was the anti-war sentiment so prevalent from the late 20s onwards. Baldwin won the election of 1935 with a policy of collective security and disarmament. There may also be coverage of the perception of the horrors of war, which had developed markedly at the end of the 1920s and into the early 1930s, with reference to the Oxford Union debate in February 1933, the Fulham by-election of September 1933 and the realities of the Spanish Civil War, notably the bombing of Guernica in 1937; the Spanish Civil War convinced Baldwin that the 'bomber would always get through'. Candidates may argue that the motivations for appeasement changed from one of sympathy for genuine German grievances to one of fear.</p> <p>At Level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation, with concerns over genuine German grievances being explored alongside other issues. At Level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At Level 3 the extent to which there was a widespread feeling in Britain that Germany had been badly treated should be addressed, although the response is likely to be very one-sided. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer, with possibly detailed descriptions of the Treaty of Versailles.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>This question invites candidates to evaluate the significance of one key area of conflict during the Second World War. Candidates are likely to appreciate the importance of the North Atlantic as a highway for food, raw materials and then weapons from North America. Without this Britain could not have continued the war neither could the USA have brought its massive economic power to bear in western Europe. The security of the North Atlantic was vital for the passage of men and material to Britain for the assault on Nazi Europe. It is the appreciation of the strategic importance of the North Atlantic and the dependency of victory on the North American economy that is essential in a good response rather than details of the conflict, although doubtless the better candidates will be aware of the crucial turning point in May 1943. Candidates may be aware that as a result of victory, almost all shipping in the North Atlantic made the crossing unharmed. Candidates will assess significance by demonstrating an awareness of the strategic importance, as indicated above, but also be able to understand that it was a pre-requisite of the defeat of Nazi Germany but not the cause of the defeat. Both the bombing campaign and the landing in France were necessary but neither of these could have taken place without victory in the North Atlantic. Do reward candidates who demonstrate an awareness of the Eastern front's importance and the war in the Mediterranean, and particularly those who appreciate that even here, the North Atlantic was vital in making lend lease to the USSR possible and transferring resources to the Mediterranean. The nature of the question may lend itself to a consideration of issues other than the Battle of the Atlantic, and as such, expectation of what else should be included should not be exhaustive or rigid. Crucially for the higher levels, consideration of such other issues should be securely focused on the precise demands of the given question.</p> <p>At Level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the extent to which the Battle of the Atlantic was a crucial prerequisite to the ultimate victory. At Level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At Level 3 a range of arguments concerning the significance of the Battle of the Atlantic may be examined, although the response may be one-sided or lack consistent focus. At Level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30



## Section B

### D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>This question centres on whether or not planned German aggression was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. In considering the view in the question, candidates are likely to start with Source 1. Source 1 does refer to an offensive strategy, which many candidates will be able to develop with contextual knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan. The inflexibility of the plan made negotiation very difficult, if not impossible, after any power began to mobilise. Mobilisation was tantamount to a declaration of war, instead of a threatening gesture as a prelude to talks. Despite this, Source 1 asserts that Germany was essentially defensive in motivation and had no plan to dominate Europe, highlighting the willingness of other states to risk war. Source 2 might be said to support the notion of German aggression in broad terms, and offers the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the Fischer thesis, either agreeing with it or refuting it, as many historians have done. Candidates will also be able to use their own knowledge to contextualise the reference to the unconditional support (the 'blank cheque') and the Schlieffen Plan. Source 3 highlights a longer-term mentality within the German government and army which made war likely and accepted this as a possible outcome, whilst emphasising how events from 1913 worked to remove the constraints of elements of domestic opinion which had previously countered this. Candidates may thus use this when considering arguments for and against the given contention. A more nuanced reading may use Source 3 to examine the extent to which this aggression was actually planned, possibly setting this against the evidence Source 1 offers regarding defensive rather than offensive considerations. Beyond the issues referenced above, a range of points may be considered in using own knowledge, with candidates exploring aspects of German foreign policy such as flottenpolitik or the War Council of 1912, as well as broader issues such as developments in the Balkans or the significance of the alliance system.</p> <p>Responses at Level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on their relative strengths and/or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the extent to which German aggression was responsible. At Level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At Level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which German aggression was responsible, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At Level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At Levels 1 and 2, most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question focuses on the issue of whether Hitler's hold on German people relied more on terror than consent. This view is clearly supported by Source 4, which stresses the terroristic elements of Nazi Germany and the deliberate and widespread attempts to intimidate all opposition. The implications of this are clearly a regime relying not on consensus but fear and terror. Source 4 might be cross referenced with Source 6. Both sources can be enlarged upon by reference to own knowledge, exploring issues such as the role of the SD or the use of protective custody. Source 5 may be broadly taken as against the contention in the question, highlighting the positive inclination towards the regime and the 'social consensus' that was achieved. The positive attributes of the Nazi regime will be developed or refuted with contextual knowledge. Source 6 might be cross referenced with Source 5, which it can be argued it contradicts to some extent, although it is important to recognise the reference in Source 5 to the failure to abolish the camps given the asserted low level of opposition. Candidates are likely to notice the dates given for numbers of camp inmates in Sources 5 and 6. Some candidates may choose to refute Source 5 with own knowledge by reference to the point often made (for example, by Professor Richard Evans) that the camps are only part of the story of repression and intimidation and the ordinary prisons were fully used to the same effect. Source 6 is likely to be used to challenge the given proposition, giving detail of the terror apparatus used, and candidates may relate this back to the view of Source 4 that conformity was achieved through the terror system, and may develop an argument which considers the extent to which the success of the terror apparatus meant that in some senses it was scaled back. A more nuanced examination of the sources will consider the changing nature and extent of repressive measures used across the period. In applying own knowledge to extend the debate and assess the given views, candidates may draw on a range of detail concerning the use of propaganda, the position of Hitler and the police state, and many candidates are likely to comment on how the nature of the regime places limitations on the evidence available for assessing popular support or indeed repression.</p> <p>Responses at Level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on their relative strengths and /or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the nature and extent of opposition with regard to the policy areas it was centred upon. At Level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At Level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which the regime was reliant upon terror, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At Level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At Levels 1 and 2, most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements.</p>	40

## D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>This question targets the controversy surrounding Chamberlain's policy of appeasement. In examining the contention in the question, candidates are likely to consider Source 7 as that which is most supportive of the view, probably alongside evidence from Source 9. Source 7 proposes that a 'good case can be made' in support of Chamberlain, suggesting that regardless of his motives, he was right to avoid a war when Britain was in no real position to fight over Czechoslovakia. These issues are likely to be developed alongside the evidence from Source 9 regarding the state of British public opinion and the attitude of the Dominions. Source 8 is most likely to be used to challenge the proposition in the question, highlighting Chamberlain's actions from March to September 1938 as being both the zenith of the policy of appeasement and his misjudgement. Candidates may develop the arguments within Source 8 that Hitler's expansionist aims were evident before this, and that appeasement encouraged Hitler in thinking he would not be opposed. Source 9 offers a different view, highlighting what Chamberlain achieved in the context of public opinion, British and French capabilities and their attempts to reshape territorial claims and treaty revision. Evidence from Source 7 may also be used to challenge the proposition, considering the qualified nature of the judgement offered and the implication that Chamberlain's hatred of war clouded his judgement. In drawing on own knowledge to extend the debate and evaluate these views, candidates may examine the extent of Britain's military preparedness in 1938, events from the May Crisis through the three meetings between Chamberlain and Hitler culminating in the annexation of October 1938, weighing issues such as the time this bought or a genuine belief that peace had been won, against the loss of Czechoslovakia as a bulwark and arguably a potential ally in Stalin against German expansion. Candidates may also explore issues across a wider date range, and many are likely to offer evidence of public attitudes from earlier in the 1930s and how far this changed in 1939.</p> <p>Responses at Level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on their relative strengths and /or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints on Chamberlain's judgement. At Level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At Level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which Chamberlain's judgement was correct, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At Level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At Levels 1 and 2, most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>This question advances the view that government enactment of significant social reforms was expected in 1945, and candidates are likely to view Source 10 as clearly in support of this. Source 10 sees the war as engendering a positive spirit, one in which the 'British people' as a whole believed that the post-war world would entail improved housing and other services. Source 10 also suggests that there was an expectancy that government was likely to play a significant role in the provision of this future. Source 11 offers some evidence to support this, with approval for a national health service and nationalism, although the bulk of the evidence within Source 11 is likely to be used to counter the proposition, with the national mood being portrayed as one of tiredness and cynicism. Candidates will be able to make the connection using own knowledge between the socialist principles of the Labour Party and the issue of government 'interference' mentioned in Source 10. In Source 12, attention is drawn to the growing mood of political radicalism, both within Westminster circles and in the public at large. This could be developed in relation to both Sources 10 and 11; Source 12 may be seen to support the argument in Source 10, whilst reference to the Gallup polls is likely to be considered alongside Source 11, which sees the evidence of these in a somewhat different light. Candidates may of course challenge the assumptions made; one possible angle may be exploring the extent to which the evidence in Source 12 held up in the post-war period, applying knowledge regarding hostility to rationing and bureaucracy, with the emergence of groups such as the British Housewives' League. Candidates will probably seek to illustrate the debate with own knowledge of the growth of government intervention during the war, the deliberate encouragement of debate on post-war reconstruction and the question of growing sentiments of egalitarianism. Candidates may also reflect back on the impact of earlier developments such as the popular response to the Beveridge Report of 1942.</p> <p>Responses at Level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on their relative strengths and /or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions over different reform proposals or the extent to which generalisations about expectation can be made across society. At Level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At Level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which expectations of major social reform existed, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At Level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At Levels 1 and 2, most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements.</p>	40

