

Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option D

**D2 Britain and the Challenge of  
Fascism: Saving Europe at a  
Cost? c.1925–60**

**SOURCES  
ACCOMPANYING  
SECTION B**

**SOURCE 1**

*From A.J.P. Taylor, The Origins of the Second World War, published 1961*

The settlement at Munich was a triumph for British policy, which had worked precisely to this end; not a triumph for Hitler, who had started with no such clear intention. Nor was it merely a triumph for selfish or cynical British statesmen, indifferent to the fate of far-off peoples or calculating that Hitler might be launched against Soviet Russia. It was a triumph for all that was best and most enlightened in British life; a triumph for those who had preached equal justice between peoples; a triumph for those who had courageously denounced the harshness and short-sightedness of Versailles.

**SOURCE 2**

*From W.S. Churchill, The Second World War, Volume I, published 1948*


The subjugation of Czechoslovakia robbed the allies of the Czech army of twenty-one regular divisions, fifteen or sixteen second-line divisions already mobilised, and also their mountain fortress line which, in the days of Munich, had required the deployment of thirty German divisions, or alternatively the main strength of the mobile and fully-trained German army. According to Generals Halder and Jodl, there were but thirteen German divisions, of which only five were composed of front line troops, left in the West at the time of the Munich arrangement. We certainly suffered a loss through the fall of Czechoslovakia equivalent to some thirty-five divisions. Besides this, the Skoda works, the second most important arsenal in central Europe, the production of which between August 1938 and September 1939 was in itself nearly equal to the actual output of British arms factories in that period, was now in Hitler's hands.

**SOURCE 3**

*From Alan Farmer, Britain: Foreign and Imperial Affairs 1919–39, published 1992*

It is far from certain that Britain and France would have been successful in 1938. Britain was virtually defenceless against air attack. She had fewer fighter aircraft and very little radar defence. Neither country was ready for war. Czech armed forces were weak and divided; most Sudeten Germans and Slovaks preferred to fight against the Czechs than for them. Czech border defences were situated in the Sudetenland and were by no means complete. It is far from certain that Russia would have come to Czechoslovakia's

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**



assistance, nor would Poland or Rumania tolerate the Russian troops passing through in order to do so. Britain may have lacked the support of several of her dominions and the British public was far from united in its determination to fight. Thus Munich bought valuable time for Britain, although this was not Chamberlain's intention.

### Examiner's Specific Advice

Section A requires you to answer a question in the form of what many people would see as a 'traditional essay'. This will always present you with an issue for discussion, usually proposing a view on the issue on which you are ultimately expected to reach judgement. Any good answer needs to show balance in this though, at least in examining the different sides of the argument.

If the question does offer a view which you are expected to consider (as in the exemplar question provided here), or if it gives a 'main reason' (in say a causal question), you should examine this thoroughly. It is probably sensible to deal with this first. Even if the question requires you to look at other issues or factors, a good answer will examine the strengths and weaknesses of the stated view/factor in depth.

Your introduction need not be overly long, although good ones will reflect your planning and demonstrate the issues you will examine and possibly highlight the arguments you will consider.

For the highest levels, your main points should follow a clear structure which keeps you consistently focused on the question. Any point you make should be supported by well-chosen information. However, this should not drift off into describing or listing relevant detail. Your knowledge and understanding should be applied to analyse and evaluate the arguments and points you raise. Strong answers will make sure they reach judgements on individual points.

### Exemplar Question

'A waste of British resources which had limited impact upon Germany.'

How far do you agree with this view in relation to the bomber offensive against Germany in the years 1942–45?

**(30 marks)**

### Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

The extent to which British bombers, considering

**(1)** The response begins by

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

the resources involved, fully exploited their capacity to inflict damage upon Germany and thus the wider war effort, is a matter of great debate. In order to examine this it is necessary to consider the nature of and impact on the intended targets, the impact this had on both German and British war production, whilst also exploring any less direct consequences over the period. Consideration must also be given to the claims of the advocates of the strategic air offensive, and the extent to which these obscured the true effectiveness (1).

Aside from the debate over the morality of targeting cities, the effectiveness of such bombing is also contentious. Improved guidance systems offering increased accuracy, and with planes such as the Lancaster seeing active service from 1942, provided greater range and payload. By May of that year, Harris was able to command a thousand-bomber raid on Cologne. However, whilst Harris made optimistic claims as to the damage this would and did cause, such as a knock-out blow to Germany or at least severely damage German morale, RAF estimates of thousands of deaths and a devastated city did not prove correct (2). Although Cologne suffered heavily, it had recovered within six months. Moreover, the strategic targeting of Cologne as a railway hub failed to have the desired impact. In part, the notion of such raids as failures was down to the over-optimism of the RAF; as Harris' predictions of the collapse of German morale failed to transpire, and in some cases the will of bombed civilians hardened (3). In terms of wasted resources, the loss of nearly 50 planes was beyond the 4% upper limit of what Bomber Command itself saw as sustainable. In this sense, the impact upon Germany can be seen to have been limited from the start, whilst the use of resources was costly, if not entirely wasteful (4).

Further raids, whilst more devastating on the cities such as Hamburg with fire-storms that left over 900,000 homeless in July 1943, can even be seen to have had a negative effect, turning sentiment in what had previously been a relatively anti-Nazi city. Whilst Hitler refused to visit the city and the port was disrupted, there was no collapse. Throughout the sustained bombing of Berlin from 1943 to 1944 and the raid on Dresden in February 1945, killing 50,000, the city bombing did not bring about a collapse in the Nazi regime, either

offering a clear appreciation of the demands of the question, setting out what issues it will consider to reach judgement.

(2) The answer is analytical, considering the aims and results of bombing cities, using specific own knowledge to develop this.

(3) Here the student develops the answer, showing a critical understanding of the context.

(4) A well-focused judgement following from developed analysis. The student has explored an issue in depth and has sustained a focus on the debate.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

through civilian morale or the wider impact on Germany's capacity to wage war. As such the raids must be seen not fulfilling expectations. Harris' admission that the Berlin raids cost more in terms of lost aircraft is evidence of wastage (5).

Nevertheless, they did shake the Nazi regime, as Goering's shock over Cologne through to Speer's post-war admission over the Hamburg raids show.

As shown, the RAF optimism raised expectations. The propaganda success of these was a double-edged sword in another sense though; as the faith of the public, and more importantly Churchill, was instilled in the capabilities of Bomber Command, further resources were directed their way. It is estimated over 25% of British war production went this way. The returns were not commensurate, either in producing a comparable damage to Germany's war production or in terms of taking much needed war resources from other forces. Whilst aircraft production could not always be easily turned to other uses, it consumed valuable resources and manpower. By its nature it is near impossible to calculate the alternative cost of these. However, it is fair to consider this an element of indulgence in a stretched war economy.

The bomber offensive was arguably most effective in its impact upon German war production. US estimates suggest losses of 9% and 17% in 1943 and 1944 due to bombing, although a large element of this was consumer rather than war production. Again, image obscures effective reality, with the Dam-buster raid of May 1943 arousing publicity ever since, yet the more industrially significant Sorpe Dam incurred only minor damage, although this was the most difficult to breach. The cost was significant losses of highly trained crew with little impact on Germany's industrial output (6). Speer's puzzlement at the failure to follow up these raids highlights the potential to have inflicted much greater damage. That said, from this point onwards Bomber Command did come to appreciate and focus on more strategic industrial and military targets. Despite increased British efforts to paralyse German industry though, munitions production more than doubled from 1942 to 1943 and was only slowed in late 1944 (7). Thus, any success of the bombing offensive was sporadic and limited to containing rather than crippling production, coming at a cost of

(5) Detailed own knowledge is well selected and applied carefully to an analysis of the impact later bombing had, exploring the issue across the short time period.

(6) Emphasis and prioritisation of issues. This is supported by specific detail and developed analysis of the impact, clearly focused on the question.

(7) The student gives an analysis that demonstrates an understanding that within any one issue, there is not simply 'one answer'.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

thousands of skilled air crew.

Nevertheless, evidence demonstrates that significant economic damage was inflicted on the German war economy. Speer, as Armaments Minister, admitted a 40% shortfall in production in the crucial years of 1943 to 1944. In particular, targeted raids such as to the Ruhr area in 1943 showed signs of considerable damage. Whilst in this sense Bomber Command's decision to focus on Berlin from this point can be seen as a flawed strategy, the daylight attacks on the Ruhr from late 1944, in conjunction with the USAAF when Luftwaffe opposition was minimal, were ruinous, disrupting or destroying the majority of rail transport, oil and steel production. Whilst conditions clearly advantaged Bomber Command here, and thus it could be argued it was the broader military offensive at work, it illustrates how effective the impact was at best (8).

Credit must also be given to the impact the bomber offensive had on the wider war effort, weakening the Wehrmacht in less direct ways. Defending against the offensive tied up over two million German personnel who were engaged in anti-aircraft defence, alongside one-fifth of all German ammunition. Such a drain on the German war machine had a crucial if less directly obvious impact upon their overall fighting effectiveness. Bomber Command effectively formed the second front, so demanded by Stalin, at a time when Britain and the USA were not yet able to launch one on land (9). Similarly, the diversion away from the eastern front of the Luftwaffe allowed Soviet air supremacy. The consequent deployment of long-range attacks, through the air superiority gained in this, ultimately allowed for the destruction of the Luftwaffe. In this sense the bomber offensive was far from wasteful, making a vital contribution to the wider strategic war (10).

Thus whilst the bomber offensive of 1942–45 did not always achieve its aims, in particular exaggerating its own capacity to win the war through a spectacular collapse of German civilian life, it did impact upon Germany and make a real contribution to the war effort, particularly in terms of the war economy. However, within this, and partly through the nature of strategic bombing, there was wastage of manpower and resources, both in production and in operational duty. The image of the more spectacular raids may have

(8) Developed and reasoned analysis, supported by well-selected own knowledge, evaluating arguments.

(9) The answer analyses the issue in the wider context of the war.

(10) The paragraph is concluded with a clear focus and judgement on the point.

(11) The conclusion answers the question confidently, with reasoning following from the

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

bolstered morale on the home front; however, the costs were not always justified (11).

### **Examiner's Assessment**

This answer would reach Level 5 as it offers a clear and effective analysis of the issue that is sustained throughout the answer. The student raises and evaluates key issues, making use of well-chosen own knowledge to substantiate points. Issues are developed in depth in the context of events, to give a thorough evaluation of the impact and cost of the bomber offensive.

### **Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2**

By May of 1942, Harris was in command of a fleet that was capable of a thousand-bomber raid on Cologne, using technology that by this time had improved guidance systems offering increased accuracy, and with planes such as the Lancaster in active service, greater range and payload. Harris made optimistic claims over the damage this would and did cause, claiming it was capable of inflicting a knock-out blow to Germany or at least severely damage German morale. RAF estimates that there would be thousands of deaths and a devastated city did not prove correct. Cologne suffered heavily, but had recovered within six months. The biggest damage, as was common with city bombing, was to civilian housing (12). Harris' predictions of the collapse of German morale did not happen and in some cases the will of bombed civilians hardened. The impact upon Germany can be seen to have been limited from the start, whilst the use of resources was costly, if not entirely wasteful (13).

Further raids continued. Some of these were very devastating on cities such as Hamburg in July 1943, where fire-storms reached 1000 degrees and left over 900,000 homeless. From the first half of 1943 Bomber Command focused heavily on cities in the industrial Ruhr area, with heavy raids on Essen and Düsseldorf. Here, massive damage was inflicted by using a tactic of repeated raids. Düsseldorf lost 140,000 homes in one single raid. In the Ruhr campaign Harris lost over 1,000 bombers, showing that the impact it had on Germany came at a cost to the RAF. Berlin was subjected to sustained bombing from 1943 to

analysis that has been made throughout the answer.

(12) This is a relevant introduction, although it tends to describe the context rather than set out what the issues are or how this will be adjudged.

(13) Here the answer shows some focus and gives a judgement, although this isn't fully explored.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

1944 and that did not bring about a total collapse of the city's morale. Despite reports that Dresden wasn't a suitable target a raid was ordered for February 1945, killing an estimated 50,000 out of a population of just over 600,000. It has been argued Churchill ordered the raid to gain revenge for Coventry and to sap German morale, although it was a military target. Later on Churchill distanced himself from attack. City bombing did not bring about a collapse in the Nazi regime, either through civilian morale or by destroying industrial capacity in the cities (14).

As shown, the RAF optimism over raids raised expectations. The propaganda success of these increased the faith of the public and, more importantly, Churchill, which meant further resources were directed their way. It is estimated over 25% of British war production went into these raids. The bomber offensive did use up resources; the loss of nearly 50 planes on the first thousand-bomber raid was at the top of the limit of what Bomber Command itself saw as sustainable. Bomber Command caught the attention of the British public, so was worthwhile in that sense. However, it is hard to argue that, as giving such a high proportion of British output over to this left other areas of war production under-resourced (15).

The bomber offensive did inflict major economic damage on the German war economy. Albert Speer, the German Armaments Minister, admitted that from 1943 to 1944 British bombing meant German industry produced 40% less than it would have done without the bombing. This was a significant blow to German weapons production at a vital time during the Second World War (16). The most effective raids were those targeted on the Ruhr area in 1943 which showed signs of real damage. Therefore it can be seen that bombing was inconsistent, focusing on both civilian morale and industrial production. It never committed a critical blow to either, but it certainly had an impact on war production that limited Germany's ability to fight the war (17). The later attacks on the Ruhr from 1944 destroyed 80% of steel production in the area as well as the majority of rail transport and oil (18).

Therefore the bomber offensive was arguably most effective in the impact it had on German war production. American reports estimated that in

(14) A very well-detailed and potentially strong paragraph. However, although this is relevant material, it is a little descriptive and does drift from a focus on analysing the question.

(15) The answer gives a judgement that is focused and follows from an analysis supported by relevant detail.

(16) A focused argument which is developed and supported.

(17) This shows developed analysis, with clear reasoning and focus on the question.

(18) Relevant detail, but this seems to be just tacked on and is not used effectively to answer the question.



**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

the period 1943–44, losses of up to a fifth of production were inflicted on German industry as a whole, although much of this was probably consumer rather than war production. The main effect of bombing was to destroy houses. Harris and Bomber Command should have seen from the Blitz on London that the effect of this was not always as great as would first appear. The Dambuster raid of May 1943 is perhaps the most memorable of the whole bomber offensive. Some dams were damaged but over half of the planes did not return. More importantly, highly trained air staff were lost. The most crucial dam, the Sorpe, suffered only superficial damage, whilst those that were breached caused spectacular flooding but did not really have an effect on Germany's war economy. Again, the propaganda value was greater than the real value as the 'Dambusters' became part of the Second World War legend (19). Albert Speer was puzzled at Bomber Command's failure to follow up the most damaging raids. He saw the damage done at Hamburg and believed further on such a scale on cities or dams that were crucial raids such as the Sorpe would have devastated industrial production. The raids could be very effective, but overall came at the cost of thousands of skilled air crew.

As Harris tried to bomb deeper into Germany, the losses grew. Beginning in August 1943 the offensive started to focus on Berlin. The damage inflicted was massive, but so were losses to the aircraft of bomber command. During 1944 a halt was called on the Berlin raids, partly as the losses were too great to sustain, and also as the force was required to assist in the build-up to the D Day landings (20).

The bombing offensive on Germany did cause massive damage, to both their war economy and civilian life, although this never succeeded in destroying their fighting spirit. It also came at a cost of air force lives and through exhausting over a quarter of British resources during the period. Therefore it can be seen as fairly wasteful in terms of resources, even if the impact contributed to winning the war (21).

### **Examiner's Assessment**

The answer is mainly analytical and focused,

(19) Here the answer does develop some in-depth analysis which shows a good understanding of the focus of the question, confidently explored using own knowledge.

(20) Here the answer gives a relevant comment with a good focus. However, this is followed up by detail that is not focused towards the question.

(21) The concluding paragraph offers a clear judgement, although this is not fully developed or reasoned.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

although at times it does drift from focus or points are not fully developed. Knowledge and understanding is generally very strong, although at times this isn't fully developed towards the explicit demands of the question. Therefore the answer would be likely to achieve a borderline mark between High Level 3 and Low Level 4.

**Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option D**

**D2 Britain and the Challenge of  
Fascism: Saving Europe at a  
Cost? c.1925–60**

**Mark Scheme  
for Section A**

'A waste of British resources which had limited impact upon Germany.'

How far do you agree with this view in relation to the bomber offensive against Germany in the years 1942–45?

**(30 marks)**

**Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%) (30 marks)**

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

<p><b>Level 1</b></p>	<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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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>(1–6)</b></p>
-----------------------	---	---------------------

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	<p><b>High Level 1: 5–6 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>	
<b>Level 2</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(7–12)</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<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. 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: 13–14 marks</b></p> <p>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></p>	<b>(13–18)</b>

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	<p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(19–24)</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>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>	

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	<p><b>Mid Level 5: 27–28 marks</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>	
--	---	--

### **Examiner's Specific Advice**

Many of the skills you would apply in Section A are of benefit in answering a question in Section B of Unit 3. Although the main focus is targeting an ability to handle interpretations, this is demonstrated in an extended essay format. It also requires analysis and application of own knowledge in a similar manner to the Section A essay.

It is most important that you read the question and the sources carefully. It is very likely that the view in the question will be directly from one of the sources, or at least follow its line of argument very closely. The other sources will present views that differ to a greater or lesser degree, so that as a whole they present a 'package' of views on the question. Effective planning using these should identify what the main arguments are, and what issues the authors draw upon to support their arguments. Although the question is not primarily about cross-referencing evidence, this skill is relevant in exploring the views. Therefore it is worth noting in your planning how and where the three sources relate to each other.

Your main points should be structured around the issues identified from reading the question, sources and own knowledge of any issues the sources do not address. The strongest answers usually cover points on an issue-by-issue basis, rather than going through one source at a time. This helps stay focused on argument and evaluation rather than drifting into explaining and describing what the sources say. Many such answers will deal with the view in the question first, exploring in depth its strengths and weaknesses. Obviously, as the sources present views themselves, most points will be closely linked to them.

You should aim to integrate your own knowledge and the sources as much as possible. This will mean linking evidence from more than one source and your own knowledge within the same paragraph. What is crucial in this is making sure you keep focused on answering the question, using the evidence, whether it is from the sources or your own knowledge, to analyse and evaluate the arguments.

Detailed advice on structuring your writing can be found in Edexcel's website, in a document on Unit 3 guidance.

### **Exemplar Question**

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

Use Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge.

‘The settlement at Munich was a triumph for Britain.’

To what extent do you agree with this opinion? Explain your answer, using the evidence of Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

**(40 marks)**

**Examiner’s Exemplar Answer 1**

Whilst the view that Munich was a disaster held considerable sway for some time, defence of Chamberlain’s actions has since been made. Taylor, one of the first to challenge the view of Munich as a failure, and thus identify with the opinion in the question, sees the settlement as a diplomatic triumph, in terms of it achieving the intended aims of Chamberlain and others who believed Versailles to have been unfair to Germany. Churchill clearly takes a different perspective, that it was a disaster for Britain, albeit with a focus more on the military cost. Farmer argues that, if not triumphant, Munich was necessary in the circumstances as the alternative of fighting in 1938 was deeply flawed in several respects. Therefore in any debate of this is it essential to examine the extent to which Chamberlain was viewed at the time as having been successful in avoiding war, or outmanoeuvred by Hitler into sacrificing a friend and potential ally, whilst also considering the extent to which it was morally defensible in terms of Germany’s legitimate grievances and the debate over relative military strength in 1938 and 1939 (1).

Taylor takes the view that Munich was a triumph as it ‘had worked precisely’ to the end of British policy. To evaluate this two issues must be considered; the extent to which the actual outcome was achieved and the extent to which redeeming the injustice of Versailles was in the first place the best policy, with its implications that a desire for peace and equity overwhelmed all other concerns in 1930s Britain. On the latter, it is fair to say that Chamberlain was not a ‘cynical British statesman’; he secured a joint declaration with Hitler that the two countries would not go to war. Chamberlain genuinely believed, if only for a short-time, that Munich paved the way for

(1) The student effectively sets out the arguments of the given interpretations, as well as the issues they raise that are to be debated.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

a broader European settlement. As Farmer highlights, the notion of war in 1938 was something much of the British public were against (2). Although the cheering crowds who greeted Chamberlain at Heston and through London were not entirely motivated by altruism, and the extent to which the entire press celebrated 'Peace for our time' has been exaggerated, the mood of the 1935 Peace ballot still prevailed, as demonstrated by the Oxford by-election of October 1938. As such Taylor is correct in viewing Munich as a triumph, at least in 'most enlightened' contemporary eyes (3).

What is perhaps more important is how Munich set the limits of appeasement. Peace at all costs was not Chamberlain's intention; as Bell argues, Munich set out that neither domination of Europe by Germany or a threat to the interests of Britain would be tolerated. The failure at Munich was not therefore over negotiating a peaceful settlement, it was the delusion, however temporary, that this was a peace that could hold. As regards seeing Munich as being a triumph, as Taylor does, in belatedly resolving the inequity of Versailles, this issue is more complex. Whilst focusing more on military aspects, Farmer can be used to support Taylor's argument, in that the division within the Czech defences demonstrates the artificial borders established since 1919 (4). Internal divisions had already been exploited since Henlein's speech of April 1938 set out demands for Sudeten autonomy; British and French discussions in London at this time urged the Czechs to do all that was possible to meet these demands whilst also opening talks with Berlin over Germany's position. Thus Munich was the culmination of efforts to resolve an imperfect situation. The triumph of fulfilling self-determination for the Sudeten Germans was outweighed by subsequent events demonstrating the flaws of applying such democratic principles to Nazi expansionism; in the same terms though, the disaster could have been said to have begun with the Anschluss.

Both Farmer and Churchill focus more on the military significance of Munich. Churchill's arguments hinge on the impact Munich had on the military strength of the eventual allies (5). This goes beyond Munich to see the resultant loss of the rump of Czechoslovakia and the subsequent impact this had. On one level it is hard to see past this as a disaster; without the Sudetenland, Bohemia and Moravia offered no resistance to the Wehrmacht in

(2) The answer identifies Taylor's (Source 1) argument and assesses this, assimilating own knowledge and the views of Farmer (Source 3).

(3) The interpretation is evaluated using own knowledge.

(4) The response gives a confident analysis of issues and the sources, in the context of own knowledge and using the views of other historians.

(5) The answer shows an understanding of the different themes that the debate focuses on.

(6) Here the answer gives a



**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

March 1939. Thus once appeasement had failed, with Hitler clearly going beyond Taylor's notion of equitable justice with aggression into areas to which he had neither valid claim nor the agreement of Chamberlain, consideration of British interests must be seen with regards to the forthcoming war (6).

The loss of a significant proportion of Czechoslovakia's active military strength and the Skoda munitions works was clearly a negative for Britain in terms of cumulative allied strength. Moreover, these greatly strengthened Hitler, with over 150 Czech tanks seized initially and subsequent production forming part of Panzer divisions that invaded Poland.

However, Farmer's arguments are equally valid; accepting Churchill's points assume that had Hitler been denied at Munich, the Sudetenland and thus the rest of Czechoslovakia would have been defensible. As far as the capability goes, this is debatable. The Czech army consisted of over 1 million men, and, even if somewhat divided, it mobilised in the midst of the crisis, thus ensuring the German army would not achieve a lightning success (7). The subsequent mobilisation of the Royal Navy and around 100 French army divisions highlight the dilemma; whilst strong enough to deter Hitler, with his about-turn to accept the agreement and the advice of his generals on 28 September after earlier upping his demands, these forces could not defend Czechoslovakia, only pressure Hitler to sign the agreement on 30 September. For the same reason, as well as those highlighted by Farmer, it was extremely unlikely Russia would or could assist. As for the Czech border defences, whilst incomplete, they were well developed and capable of slowing any German attack, whilst also a loss, as the Wehrmacht used these to train for later assaults on Belgian forts and the Maginot line. Therefore, the Munich Agreement was militarily a failure, as Churchill highlights, meaning the loss of a significantly placed ally of reasonable strength. However, these would have been lost anyway, as Farmer shows, and the cost would have been war in 1938. With this, Taylor's diplomatic triumph can be seen in averting war despite Hitler's determined intent for war only two days before the agreement (8).

Thus the military arguments hinge more on whether the time bought at Munich offsets the relative loss of strength in terms of the wider war. Here is where Churchill's arguments appear to carry more weight;

developed evaluation, making critical distinctions between issues raised.

(7) Well-developed analysis, exploring a given view with integrated own knowledge.

(8) The student gives a clear judgement, evaluating issues and the interpretations following from a developed analysis using own knowledge.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

the allies did lose over 30 divisions and it was admitted by German generals at Nuremburg that they would have found it difficult to overcome the combination of the forts and the natural barrier provided by the Czech mountains. However, the assessment of Churchill as historian is somewhat blurred with that as politician; for Chamberlain in 1938, with knowledge of the essentially defensive French war-plan and the over-estimates of German military strength, there was reason to be cautious. Whilst not the moral triumph Taylor portrays, it is the pragmatic response he alludes to, ultimately more effective for British and European interests than a resignation akin to Duff-Cooper's (9). Farmer's concerns over fighting in 1938 are valid; the meagre air defences of 1938 were much greater by 1939, with 8,000 aircraft produced in the period and radar extended far beyond the original Thames estuary site, stretching to Orkney. Chamberlain may have been hoodwinked at Munich, but he was not blind to defence memoranda of 1937-38 which advised postponing any war. Equally, although arguments are made that Hitler used this time to prepare, increasing long-range bomber production five-fold, his Z plan for naval competitiveness would not be ready until 1943. On balance the evidence suggests that in terms of military strength, the time gained at Munich was of some benefit, in line more with Farmer's broader view than Churchill's narrow focus on Czech defences. As regards allies, the dominions offered much clearer support, such as Smuts' pledge, by 1939 than they did as Farmer shows in 1938, as did Roosevelt after Kristallnacht. Whilst British and French calculations over Russia, implied by Taylor, went badly wrong, Munich was not to blame for this (10).

Thus, whilst it is clear that Munich provoked great hostility and was traditionally viewed as a disaster for Britain, it is hard to agree with Cato's hasty judgement of the 'Guilty Men'. Chamberlain had to balance a range of interests, both home and abroad. Though the triumph of moral courage that Taylor argues for is overstated, it at least appreciates the context of why war over Munich was desired by neither the British public nor those in command of British military interests. Therefore, as Farmer suggests, Munich was a qualified success in buying Britain valuable time to rearm, whilst subsequent events persuaded a public and international consensus of Churchill's call for action (11).

(9) Developed and integrated analysis of the interpretations using well-selected own knowledge.

(10) Evaluation of the interpretations with specific substantiation.

(11) The essay concludes with a developed judgement that follows from the analysis throughout the answer, relating back to the views of the interpretations.

### Examiner's Assessment

This answer merits a Level 5 for both AO1 and AO2, as it sustains an analysis of the issues raised in the question, exploring the arguments of the given authors with effectively integrated own knowledge. However, with regards to word count, it is at the upper end of what would usually be found in exams giving a similar time to respond, and perhaps because of this, it goes beyond what would be expected in using own knowledge to provide an analysis. Nonetheless, it directly addresses the focus of the question, evaluating the issues raised and assimilating own knowledge with the evidence provided from the sources.

### Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

The policy of appeasement has been strongly debated by historians, in particular the importance of events like the Munich Conference and the importance of the decisions made there. Munich could be argued to have been a triumph as it bought Britain extra time as they were not ready for a war in 1938, a view shared by Farmer in Source 3. Also, many people in Britain did not want a war, believing Versailles had been harsh on Germany, which Taylor shows in Source 1. However, the traditional view has often seen Munich as a failure, as Churchill in Source 2 argues, because it showed Britain and France to be weak, made Germany stronger and gave away much of Czechoslovakia. To assess these I need to examine these points, considering the arguments of the historians (12).

Taylor's main argument is that Munich was a triumph as it 'had worked precisely to this end' showing that it was successful as the results as exactly what British policy aimed for. This is the case, as Hitler had originally upped his demands at earlier meetings and was only persuaded to accept the Greenland operation the day before the agreement was signed. Like Taylor says, this was not a triumph for Hitler, who had set a deadline of 1 October for war. So Chamberlain's efforts, the culmination of a summer of negotiation, resulted in a peace that at the time he genuinely believed

(12) The opening paragraph shows an understanding that the debate involves differing interpretations, and identifies some of the given views, although it doesn't set out how these are going to be examined.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

could hold, and was supported by a majority of the British public. It is fair to say that Chamberlain was not a 'cynical British statesman': he secured a joint declaration with Hitler that the two countries would not go to war. Chamberlain genuinely believed that Munich paved the way for a broader European settlement, the cheering crowds who greeted him felt this was 'Peace for our time' (13). Many also felt the injustice of Versailles had created the tension of the 1930s and so the joining of a majority German-speaking people with Germany was a fair example of self-determination in action. As such, the view that Munich was a triumph can be justified as far as a British policy achieving the objectives of avoiding war over Czechoslovakia is concerned, even if this did not last.

The point of seeing Munich as putting right the inequity of Versailles, as Taylor does, is more complex. Farmer supports Taylor's argument, at least in military terms. The division within the Czech armed forces demonstrates the artificial borders established since 1919. Internal divisions had already been growing inside Czechoslovakia over the summer of 1938 (14). The British and French urged the Czechs to do all that was possible to meet these demands whilst also opening talks with Berlin over Germany's position. Though German influence clearly played a role in stirring up these tensions, it shows the crisis to be partly the result of an imperfect situation. Therefore giving the Sudeten Germans self-determination can be seen as something of a success. However, subsequent events show the limitation of this argument, as the remainder of the Czech state was consumed on without such legitimate claims (15).

Farmer's main arguments focus on the military aspects of Munich. Whilst not arguing it to be a triumph, in the context of the alternative of war over Czechoslovakia, it is seen as a limited success. If war was declared on Germany over Czechoslovakia, the allies would be limited in actually giving aid due to the distances involved, whilst the unfinished Czech border defences and divided forces would hold up the Germans but would ultimately fall (16). As British radar and air defences were unprepared at this time, this would have led to the threat of war with far less likelihood of success than was found when it did happen in defending against Operation Sealion.

Churchill's arguments hinge on the impact Munich

(13) Identifies Taylor's view and offers some analysis, explaining the strength of this with own knowledge. This is not fully developed or explicitly evaluated, however.

(14) Some integration of two of the views, alongside own knowledge.

(15) This does offer an assessment, although this could be more explicitly focused on evaluating the arguments raised.

(16) A valid point is raised, drawing on the arguments of Farmer. There is some level of analysis of these using own knowledge, but it is not fully developed or effectively focused back to the question.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

had on the military strength of the eventual allies. Churchill clearly blames the Munich agreement for the loss of the rump of Czechoslovakia and the subsequent impact this had. It is hard to see past this as a disaster; the Czech state offered no resistance to the Wehrmacht in March 1939. On a military level, British interests were clearly hindered. The loss of a significant proportion of Czechoslovakia's active military strength and the Skoda munitions works was clearly a negative for Britain in terms of cumulative allied strength, particularly as these fell into Nazi hands.

However, Churchill assumes that if Hitler had been denied at Munich, the rest of Czechoslovakia could have been defended. Farmer's argument contrasts with this. Czechoslovakia may have offered around 35 armed divisions and a mountain fortress line, but these were incomplete. Without the assistance of Britain and France, who could protest and offer support, but do little to directly intervene, Czech forces may have held up Hitler, but would not have been able to prevent a takeover. In a similar manner, as Farmer highlights, it was extremely unlikely Russia would or could assist, as Poland or Rumania wouldn't tolerate the passing through of Russian troops. Churchill therefore may be correct to point to Munich as a military failure as it conceded Czechoslovakia's strength to the Nazis, but on a wider scale, Farmer's views are stronger as they highlight that holding a firmer line at Munich would have risked a larger-scale war, with no guarantees that this would make a difference to Czechoslovakia itself (17).

Britain was aware of the impact of losing the Czech military forces, the armaments factories and fortresses. However, Chamberlain also knew of Britain's own military position. The Navy may have been in a strong position in 1938, and indeed was put on alert over Czechoslovakia. However, the lack of air defences would have left this exposed, not to mention the fact that a naval force could do little for Czechoslovakia. Chamberlain used the time from 1938 to significantly strengthen the British position. Radar, in its infancy in 1938, stretched the length of the south and east coast up to the Orkneys by 1939. Similarly, the high hopes Chamberlain had at the time of Munich for new aircraft such as the Spitfire, only just introduced by September 1938, were justified by the time war was declared a year later, as the RAF had 8,000 more planes, mainly fighters (18). Therefore, Munich was not such a

(17) The answer gives a developed and integrated analysis of the views of Churchill and Farmer, highlighting contrasts and integrating these with each other and own knowledge. Evaluation of these views is developed.

(18) Detailed, relevant, own knowledge used to develop arguments with a focus on the question. However, this could be more effectively integrated with the sources.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

disaster; at least for Britain's own defences, it could be seen as a partial triumph in allowing them time to prepare for war.

As far as allies go, a point raised by Farmer, Britain was in a better position by 1939. Australia, South Africa and other dominions had clearly pledged support by 1939, understanding the greater threat the Nazis faced. In 1938, few had the will to face the growing Nazi threat that he had. In that way, Munich bought time to build a greater consensus that was willing to stand up to Hitler, in the same way it bought time to prepare. It is hard to argue that appeasement and Munich were a triumph over this, Chamberlain was one of the last to be persuaded, clinging on to hopes of reasonable agreement with Hitler right up to March 1939 when the rest of Czechoslovakia collapsed. However, it was a more realistic approach and so was the kind of success Farmer points to, even if it was 'not Chamberlain's intention' (19).

Overall, Munich wasn't triumphant, at least not in the way Taylor argues. Chamberlain may have made the agreement with the best of intentions, but he was so mistaken in believing that such 'enlightened' views, as Taylor calls them, could be applied to Hitler. However, it wasn't the failure that Churchill argues either. It is hard to call anything as difficult a triumph, there was no victory to be had, but, for British policy, Farmer is right in seeing how it was the best that could be got out of such a tragedy by buying extra time to prepare (20).

### **Examiner's Assessment**

The answer interprets the sources with confidence and shows a sound understanding of the demands of the question. There is a good range of own knowledge and use of the sources. However, whereas at times these are integrated, at other times they are a little disjointed. Development is inconsistent, and whilst there is some evaluation, this is not consistently found throughout the essay. The answer merits a Low Level 4 on both A01 and A02b.

(19) Focused and developed, this offers a judgement that relates to an interpretation.

(20) The final paragraph gives an overall judgement that relates to all three of the interpretations. It focuses on the question, with some explanation, although reasoning could be taken further.

Edexcel – A2 GCE  
Unit 3: Depth Studies  
and Associated  
Historical  
Controversies  
Option D

**D2 Britain and the Challenge of  
Fascism: Saving Europe at a  
Cost? c.1925–60**

**Mark Scheme  
for Section B**

‘The settlement at Munich was a triumph for Britain.’

To what extent do you agree with this opinion? Explain your answer, using the evidence of Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

**(40 marks)**

**Target: AO1a and AO1b (16 marks); AO2b (24 marks) (40 marks)**

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)**

<b>Level 1</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p>	<b>(1–3)</b>
----------------	--	--------------

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.	
<b>Level 2</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(4–6)</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<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. 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></p> <p>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>	<b>(7–10)</b>



**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	<p><b>Mid Level 3: 8–9 marks</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<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. 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: 11 marks</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(11–13)</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<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. The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be</p>	<b>(14–16)</b>

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	<p>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: 14 marks</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>	
--	--	--

**AO2b (24 marks)**

<p><b>Level 1</b></p>	<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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>	<p><b>(1–4)</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p>	<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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less</p>	<p><b>(5–6)</b></p>

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	<p>convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7–9 marks</b></p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>	
<b>Level 3</b>	<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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(10–14)</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>	<b>(15–19)</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<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</p>	<b>(20–24)</b>

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	<p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>	
--	---	--

**Chronology: Key Events in *Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60***

Year	Month	Event
1925	October	Locarno Conference agrees Germany's western borders
1926	September	Germany admitted to the League of Nations
1927	May	Britain breaks off diplomatic relations with Russia after the Arcos affair
1928	August	The Kellogg-Briand Pact. The use of war as an instrument of foreign policy is renounced by the majority of the world's major powers
1929	May	The general election results in a minority Labour government taking power led by Prime Minister Ramsey MacDonald
	August	The Young Plan extends the period of reparations payment
	October	Anglo-Russian relations resumed
		The Wall Street (New York stock market) Crash
1930	April	Naval Agreement between USA, Britain and Japan
1931	January	National Government formed in Britain
	September	Japanese troops begin military operations in Manchuria
	October	General election, amid an atmosphere of economic panic. Overwhelming victory for the National Government
1932	February	World Disarmament Conference at Geneva
	June/July	The Lausanne Conference: end of Reparations
	October	Lord Lytton's Commission reports on the situation in Manchuria
1933	January	Hitler becomes Chancellor in Germany
	October	Germany leaves the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations
1934	July	Nazis attempt to seize power in Austria: Chancellor Dollfuss murdered
1935	March	Hitler announces German rearmament
	April	The Stresa Front: Britain, France and Italy combine against Germany
	June	Baldwin takes over as PM from MacDonald
		Anglo-German Naval Agreement
	October	Italy invades Abyssinia

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

	November	The League applies economic sanctions against Italy
		Baldwin's National Government wins the general election
	December	The Hoare-Laval Plan. Resignation of Hoare. Eden becomes Foreign Secretary
1936	March	German troops re-occupy the Rhineland
	May	Abyssinia becomes part of the Italian Empire
	July	Start of the Spanish Civil War
1937	May	Neville Chamberlain replaces Baldwin as PM
	November	Lord Halifax visits Hitler
1938	February	Eden resigns as Foreign Secretary: replaced by Halifax
	March	The Anschluss: Hitler annexes Austria
	August	Lord Runciman's mission to Czechoslovakia
	15 September	Chamberlain meets Hitler at Berchtesgaden
	22-23 September	Chamberlain meets Hitler at Godesberg
	29-30 September	The Munich Conference
1939	January	Chamberlain and Halifax visit Italy
	March	The end of Czechoslovakia
		Memel returned to Germany by Lithuania
		British guarantee to Poland
	April	Britain introduces conscription
	May	The Pact of Steel between Germany and Italy
	August	The Nazi-Soviet Pact
	1 September	Germany invades Poland
	3 September	Britain and France declare war on Germany
1940	May	Chamberlain resigns, Churchill becomes Prime Minister
	August/September	Battle of Britain
1941	March	US Lend-Lease to Britain
1942	November	Battle of El Alamein
1943	July	Allied invasion of Italy
1944	June	Allied invasion of France
1945	May	German surrender
1945	July	Labour victory in general election, Clement Attlee becomes Prime Minister

### Teaching Activities

Various approaches can be used to develop students' understanding of historical interpretations in order to develop the necessary skills for the historical controversies of Section B. The following suggestions are aimed at encouraging students to reflect on how the views of historians relate to each other and historical evidence.

1. Identify a historian with a relatively 'strong' view on a controversy, such as Churchill for this particular Section B debate. Go through a brief extract with students from this, identifying (a) the main argument and (b) any evidence or issues the author draws upon to support their viewpoint. Students should then do the same for an author with views that are contrasting, or at least distinctly different.

**Access to History Online Edexcel Unit 3 - D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism:  
Saving Europe at a Cost? c.1925–60**

2. After learning about a key event or issue, students could attempt to interpret this 'through the eyes' of a given historian. For example, students are briefly introduced to an event or issue such as the Cabinet discussion of February 1939 that agreed to declare war should Germany attack the Netherlands. Having previously studied the views of a given historian, either in terms of their broader views or their interpretation of earlier events, students develop a hypothesis on what view the historian would take on the Cabinet agreement. For example, could they use this to substantiate their broader interpretation? What priority would they give to it? How would they relate it to other events or issues? Students could then check this against the actual work of the historian. This approach could be used effectively over a period of time to the content of the section through interpretations.
3. An alternative to the above is to rewrite an interpretation from an alternative viewpoint. This could be aimed at views that are significantly contrasting, such as crafting a critique of Churchill's arguments from the pen of Charmley, or attempting to create a synthesis of two views on a particular event or issue.
4. Give students extended excerpts of at least two historians, ideally a short chapter. These should all be on the same particular issue. Students are then given 'commentary cards' – pre-written cards that give a brief synopsis of individual pages or sections of these excerpts. A good number would be six or so per excerpt. Students are then expected to match these to the particular excerpts. An alternative would be to give students a number of blank cards, on which they have to summarise in no more than two sentences the argument within a section of an excerpt. These can then be swapped with other students who try to match them together.