Instructions
- Use black ink or ball-point pen.
- Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- There are two sections in this question paper. Answer ONE question from Section A and ONE question from Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided – there may be more space than you need.

Information
- The total mark for this paper is 70.
- The marks for each question are shown in brackets – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.
- The quality of your written communication will be assessed in ALL your responses – you should take particular care with your spelling, punctuation and grammar, as well as the clarity of expression.
- This paper has two unit codes. Unit 3 6HI03/F Topic D1 – From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900–45 is a prohibited combination with Unit 1 6HI01/F.

Advice
- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Keep an eye on the time.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.
6HI03/D – The Challenge of Fascism

SECTION A

Answer ONE question in Section A on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section A on page 3. Section B begins on page 11.

D1 – From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900–45

Answer EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2.

EITHER

1. To what extent was the effective government of Germany in the years 1919–33 handicapped by the nature of the Weimar Constitution?

   (Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2. To what extent did the Nazi Regime face serious opposition within Germany during the years 1939–45?

   (Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

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

Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

EITHER

3. ‘In the years 1925–37, successive British governments felt that Germany had legitimate grievances and this largely explains the policy of appeasement.’ How far do you agree with these judgements?

   (Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4. To what extent was the British commitment of massive resources to the campaign in North Africa and the Mediterranean, in the years 1940–44, a strategic mistake?

   (Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS
### SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then put a cross in another box ☑.

Chosen Question Number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1 ☐</th>
<th>Question 2 ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 ☐</td>
<td>Question 4 ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section B on page 13.

D1 – From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900–45

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.
Answer EITHER Question 5 OR Question 6.

EITHER

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

To what extent was the nature of the Schlieffen Plan responsible for the outbreak of a general European war in August 1914?

Explain your answer, using Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 5 = 40 marks)

OR

6 Use Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree that Hitler’s Regime was a ‘consensus dictatorship’ (Source 4, line 36)?

Explain your answer, using Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 6 = 40 marks)
D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925–60

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.
Answer EITHER Question 7 OR Question 8.

EITHER

7 Use Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree that Chamberlain’s behaviour during the Czech Crisis of September 1938 reveals that ‘Chamberlain was not the dupe of Hitler but a shrewd politician’ (Source 7, lines 1–2)?

Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 7 = 40 marks)

OR

8 Use Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree that there was an expectation in 1945 of massive government action to improve society?

Explain your answer, using Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 8 = 40 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
SECTION B

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then put a cross in another box ☑.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5 ☐ Question 6 ☐
Question 7 ☐ Question 8 ☐
(Section B continued)
Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

D1 – From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900–45

Sources for use with Question 5

SOURCE 1
(From A. J. P. Taylor, How Wars Begin, published 1977)

One essential part of the Schlieffen plan was to go through Belgium. The other essential part, which was equally important, was that there could be no delay between mobilisation and war. If there were delay then Russia would catch up and the Germans would get the two-front war after all. So the moment that the Germans decided on mobilisation, they decided for war, or rather war followed of itself. The railway timetables, which in other countries brought men to their mobilising centres, in the Schlieffen Plan continued and brought the troops not only to their barracks, but also into Belgium and Northern France. The German mobilisation plan actually laid down the first 40 days of the German invasion of France and none of it could be altered because, if it did, all the timetables would go wrong. Thus the decision for mobilisation which the German general staff made, and which Bethmann endorsed on 29 July, was a decision for a general European war.

SOURCE 2
(From Gordon Martel, The Origins of the First World War, published 1987)

Germany had really decided to force a war before Russia mobilised. Although the war plans are important in understanding why the crisis unfolded in the way that it did, they provide only a partial answer to the question, ‘why did the war begin?’ Ultimately, the Germans’ decision to force a war with Russia was not determined so much by railway timetables as by their belief that they could not permit Austria-Hungary to be defeated and that, if a war for the future of the Balkans and the near east had to be fought some time, the best time was now.

SOURCE 3
(From J. Grenville, A World History of the Twentieth Century, published 1980)

The years from 1912 to 1914 marked a vital change. A new fatalism about the inevitability of war was spreading among those who controlled policy, and even larger armies were being trained for this eventuality throughout the continent. With Poincaré as President of France, Russia would not again be left in the lurch by her French ally, whenever Russia judged her vital interests to be at stake in the Balkans and the Ottoman Empire. Poincaré’s support for Russia did not waver during the critical final days before the outbreak of war and was a crucial factor in the decision the Tsar and his ministers took to mobilise, which made war inevitable in 1914.
D1 – From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900–45
Sources for use with Question 6

SOURCE 4
(From Robert Gellately, Lenin, Stalin and Hitler: the Age of Social Catastrophe, published 2007)

Hitler believed passionately that political authority had to be based on popularity and be backed by the people belonging to it. Hitler had nothing but contempt for the Soviet-style dictators and the terror they used on their own people, and in stark contrast he set out to win over the hearts and minds of all non-Jewish Germans in a communal bonding based on the ‘exclusion’ of the Jews and others deemed racially unfit. What he wanted was dictatorship by consent of the initiated. Hitler’s hybrid form of government can be called a consensus dictatorship.

SOURCE 5

The Nazi regime was bolstered by an elaborate apparatus of terror. The first concentration camp for political opponents of the regime was opened at Dachau, near Munich, with considerable fanfare and publicity in March 1933. In subsequent years, well before the radicalization of the wartime period, a network of concentration camps was set up across Germany. The SS of Heinrich Himmler was able to arrest, torture and murder, with little respect for any rule of law. Himmler, between 1934 and 1936, took over the police powers of the Reich and State Ministries of the Interior, effectively controlling the means of terror in the Third Reich. Fear of arrest, and fear of informers, led to public conformity and the leading of a double life for many Germans, who withheld their real views and feelings for expression only in complete privacy in the company of family and close friends.

SOURCE 6
(From Eric A. Johnson, Nazi Terror, published 1999)

Most Germans were not Nazis. Nor were they Jews, members of the Communist underground, or Jehovah’s Witnesses. Most slept soundly, worked productively, and enjoyed their lives during the peacetime years of National Socialist rule. Why should they not have? The economy was improving, most were finding employment, and their country was regaining its pride and was still at peace. They knew that Jews, Communists, Socialists, and some religious activists suffered persecution. They could read about it in the daily newspapers. They knew that there was a strong police presence, an excess of laws placing limitations on personal freedom, and potential danger for those who refused to comply with Hitler’s wishes. Many grumbled and complained privately, but most found little difficulty in conforming. Many, probably most, still believed that the police and the laws were there to protect them. Nazi terror posed no real threat to most ordinary Germans.
D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925–60

Sources for use with Question 7

SOURCE 7

(From Graham Stewart, Burying Caesar: Churchill, Chamberlain and the Battle for the Tory Party, published 1999)

To his defenders amongst historians today, Chamberlain was not the dupe of Hitler but a shrewd politician who knew that war would very likely be a disaster, not just for the Czechs and the British, but for western civilization itself. This interpretation of his motives subdivides into two camps: those who believe Chamberlain hoped that war could be postponed indefinitely and those who believe he was seeking to postpone it only until Britain was in a position to improve its military deficiencies and take on Hitler from a position of strength. Evidence in support of the latter includes the views of military figures at the time like General Ironside, who concluded in his diary that “Chamberlain is of course right. We have not the means of defending ourselves and he knows it. We cannot expose ourselves now to a German attack. We simply commit suicide if we do.”

SOURCE 8

(From R. A. C. Parker, Churchill and Appeasement, published 2000)

Munich pleased only one of its leading actors: Neville Chamberlain. Daladier felt shame at the desertion of France’s most faithful ally; Mussolini knew that his apparently important role as a mediator was a sham; Hitler resented his own failure, for the moment, to eliminate and take Czechoslovakia into his control. He had had to put up with too much fuss and interference from Chamberlain. However, he gave up very little of his proclaimed demands. His prestige swelled; the army plotters, if their plots were ever real, could now not justify Hitler’s overthrow.

SOURCE 9

(From Douglas Hurd, The Search for Peace, published 1997)

But the merits of the Czech and German arguments were not at the forefront of Chamberlain’s mind. Nor was he playing for time, recognising that war was inevitable, but aiming to postpone it to allow Britain to gather strength. It is true, and to Chamberlain’s credit, that the year of peace gained between 1938 and 1939 was well used to build up the Royal Air Force and introduce conscription. But Chamberlain was driven primarily by a determination to avoid war if at all possible, and only secondarily by the need to win it if it came. War, whether it ended in defeat or once again in victory, was the evil. He could not begin to share Churchill’s underlying excitement with questions of strategy and military leadership. The shadow of the slaughter of the Great War hung over him, as over so many.
D2 – Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925–60

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10
(From Andrew Marr, A History of Modern Britain, published 2007)

A vision of Britain as an almost ungoverned, self-regulating place, whose people got on with their lives without interference, had survived from the eighteenth century, but by 1945, in a Britain of identity cards, ration books, regulations and high taxation, it seemed to be dead. The mood was for big government, digging deep into people's lives to improve them.

SOURCE 11
(From Corelli Barnett, The Audit of War, published 1986)

The comforting assumption about plentiful resources waiting to be used no doubt enabled Attlee, as Leader, to give his blessing to the Labour Party election manifesto in 1945, with its basic message that the people 'deserved and must be assured a happier future'. This Labour Party manifesto therefore laid its emphasis on creating a welfare state and the building of no fewer than 4 million houses. It did so to the relative neglect of discussion of investment in industry and infrastructure. Yet, in stark contrast to this, Attlee told Laski in 1944: 'I am sure that you are under no illusion as to the multitude of problems which will face us at the end of the war or as to the difficult economic position of the country'. He was similarly realistic in addressing his own constituents during the 1945 general election: 'I do not seek to conceal from you that the post-war years will not be easy'.

SOURCE 12
(From David Kynaston, A World to Build, published 2007)

Was there perhaps widespread popular anticipation of a future national health service? Those who have scoured wartime diaries report remarkably few sightings, and indeed the 1944 Gallup poll revealed 55% approval and also showed a significant 32% in favour of the status quo. Polling evidence demonstrated that approval towards the end of the war for Labour’s nationalisation plans was reasonably broad (usually 40–60%) but invariably approval was shallow, with few people seeing it as a high priority issue. As for education, a poll in 1945 found less than half those questioned had heard of the recent Education Act and a mere 13% were aware of its provision to remove fees from grammar schools. Understandably, the novelist George Orwell’s earlier optimism about a newly radicalised people had by this time completely vanished. 'I overhear very little discussion of the wider issues of the war’, he told his American readers in autumn 1944. ‘Everyone expects not only that there will be a ghastly muddle over demobilization, but that mass unemployment will promptly return.’ And he added, ‘Everyone wants, above all things, a rest.'