
AS-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS2J: Britain and Appeasement, 1919–1940
Mark scheme

1041
June 2015

Version 1: Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2015

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2J: Britain and Appeasement, 1919–1940

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to British public opinion in the late 1930s. **[12 marks]**

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**

L3: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**

L4: Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the levels scheme.

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source B suggests that most people in Britain were willing to give appeasement a chance, whereas source A suggests that Chamberlain knew that the policy of appeasement was not popular as he thought it should be

- Source B suggests that Munich was supported because war was now avoided, albeit at the expense of Czechoslovakia, whereas Source A suggests that Munich was supported because it allowed time for rearmament.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- knowledge of the different opinion polls that were used to gauge public opinion about the policy of appeasement
- knowledge of the occupation of Prague and how it influenced people in Britain against supporting appeasement at this point
- knowledge of alternative policies that were discussed but side-lined by Neville Chamberlain.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both sources see Munich as a peak of support for appeasement
- both sources see the actions of Hitler after Munich as partly responsible for the loss of public support for appeasement.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that while Source A focuses on Chamberlain's role in 'obscuring the divisions' over his policy, especially by manipulating the press, Source B reflects the 'guilt towards the Czechs' that would have been felt sooner had people known all the facts.

Question 1

02 Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far was the policy of appeasement the result of Chamberlain's personal commitment?
[24 marks]

Target: A01(b), A02(a), A02(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In ‘how important’ and ‘how successful questions’, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources might include:

- **Source A** suggests that Chamberlain knew that appeasement was not as popular with the public as he thought it should be and that most support was based on buying time to prepare for war and not to avoid it completely
- **Source B** shows support for appeasement in the country as a whole beyond Chamberlain’s personal commitment
- **Source C** emphasises Chamberlain’s personal commitment, which continued even after Munich.

From students’ own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that appeasement was due to Chamberlain might include:

- the policy of appeasement had already begun before Chamberlain’s premiership, but under Chamberlain this became a personal policy in which he felt that, through personal diplomacy, he could avoid war
- Chamberlain’s pacifism was no secret and his desire to avoid war was evident. He was a powerful (if vain and dictatorial) Prime Minister
- Chamberlain’s decision to hold a personal meeting with Hitler at Munich, rather than allowing his foreign secretary to deal with the issue, suggests that he took his role in appeasement seriously. It was Chamberlain who did a great deal of work to convince other leaders to accept Hitler’s demands.

Factors suggesting alternative views might include:

- appeasement was a long-term policy, followed by Baldwin and going back to the 1920s
- Chamberlain’s policy had the support of many in the government and the country for a great chunk of this period. Munich was largely hailed as a success and it was only after the occupation of Prague that the policy came in for mass criticism. Therefore, Chamberlain cannot be held personally responsible
- given the situation of Britain’s armaments and the lack of an ally, many would argue that he followed the only policy that was realistic at the time
- Hitler made a lot of his wish to negotiate a peace agreement. Chamberlain was responding in a way any other prime minister would have done. Those who opposed the policy, such as Churchill, were in a small minority.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Chamberlain’s policy of appeasement was based on many complex and inter-related factors, not just his personal commitment.

Question 2

03 Explain why the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were accepted by Britain in 1919.

[12 marks]

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Britain went along with Versailles.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Lloyd George and his government had played a significant role in creating the terms and therefore needed to accept the terms
- France was an important ally of Britain, sharing many 'joint interests'. Even though Lloyd George disagreed with Clemenceau on many issues, he had to maintain a common front with France and accept the terms of the Treaty
- Woodrow Wilson was a dominant voice in the 'Big Three' and Lloyd George could not openly disagree with Wilson, even when he wanted to
- public opinion in Britain was strongly in favour of 'making Germany pay' and the terms of the Treaty were likely to please the public.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might rank the reasons in terms of importance or may link factors in terms of economic, social or political reasons.

Question 2

- 04** 'In the 1920s it was clear that the British Governments believed that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh on Germany.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **[24 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- Lloyd George was already expressing private doubts about the treaty in 1919
- J M Keynes in the *Economic Consequences of the Peace* wrote about how the economic reparations placed on Germany would cripple their economy. This strengthened the belief in Britain that German economic recovery was essential for Britain and the world economy
- the Ruhr Crisis of 1923 showed that Britain felt less strongly about imposing the terms of the Treaty than the French. The British disliked the actions of the French and did little to help them uphold the terms that the Germans had flouted
- Britain was keen to ease some of the terms of the treaty, particularly its economic demands on Germany. (This was seen initially in the Dawes Plan and later in the Young Plan.) Britain was also keen to allow Germany back into the international community
- there was concern in Britain about the lack of self-determination for German speaking people and also Germany's exclusion from the League of Nations. Many people felt that a revision of the treaty was needed if peace was to be maintained in the long-term.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- Lloyd George, one of the Big Three at the peace conference, had played a key role in creating the terms of the treaty and was keen to make sure that Germany was being seen to pay for its role in starting the First World War in the early 1920's. Though he tried to mediate with the French he still wanted to create a treaty that was harsh enough to keep Germany weak
- the British public had demanded a treaty which made Germany pay and the Treaty of Versailles had satisfied the desire of public opinion. Throughout the early 1920's the public's opinion was still very anti- German and they was a desire for them to be seen to pay for the war
- many of the changes to Versailles suggested by the British were for its own gain and not just because of perceived harshness. Some were suggested so that the German economy could recover and trade with Britain. Therefore it could be argued that this was done for economic gain rather than because of sympathy with a 'harsh peace'.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that after the Treaty of Versailles there was an acceptance in Britain that some of the terms were too harsh and that to maintain a lasting peace some revisions had to take place.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why, in the years 1931 to 1935, Britain was unwilling to commit itself to any military alliance. **[12 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Britain was reluctant to make a military alliance.

Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- Britain had a traditional policy of avoiding foreign alliances; this was strengthened by belief in the League of Nations
- Britain was keen to avoid any military alliance which would make them more likely to have to enter a conflict
- Anglo-French relations were tested throughout this period due to their differing opinions on the enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles. France thought that all terms should be strictly imposed and enforced whereas Britain took a more lenient view
- Britain did not trust the government of the USSR sufficiently to make a military alliance with them

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- the impact of the Great Depression meant deep reluctance to make expensive military commitments
- Britain was angry at France's attempts to encircle Germany by making an alliance with the USSR. Britain wished to remain on good terms with Nazi Germany and felt that France's actions might anger the Germans
- Britain was keen to create some security against Germany as seen with the Stresa Front but this was an agreement and to create a full scale alliance would be to go much further than Britain was willing at this point. The British aimed to keep on good terms with the dictators but give themselves enough security without making a full blown alliance.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might group the factors into long-term and short-term reasons.

Question 3

- 06** 'British policy towards Mussolini was inconsistent.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **[24 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that British policy towards Mussolini was confused and inconsistent.

Points/factors/evidence which agree(s) might include:

- Britain agreed to the Stresa Front, which was supposed to be an agreement against the rearmament of Nazi Germany, but then shortly after made the Anglo-German Naval agreement' which undermined the Stresa front
- It was clear that Mussolini was looking to expand and it seemed that Britain was prepared to allow this. The British were aware of the build-up of Italian military but no formal mention of Abyssinia was made at the Stresa Front. However, Britain later made it clear that they would not approve of an Italian invasion of Abyssinia
- the Hoare-Laval Pact, made with the British and French Foreign Ministers, agreed to allow Mussolini to take part of Abyssinia. However, once the details of the plan were leaked to the press it collapsed
- Britain imposed some of the sanctions set up by the League of Nations against Italy, but they refused to close the Suez Canal as they did not want to anger Mussolini and were concerned that this could be interpreted as an act of war.

Points/factors/evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- British policy, though it appears inconsistent, was about maintaining good relations with Mussolini. Therefore, they had to tread carefully as they did not want to push Mussolini into an alliance with Hitler. The inconsistency was actually on Mussolini's side
- in the Abyssinian Crisis, Britain had made it clear that their intention was never to allow Mussolini to take all of the country: their policy was consistent in this aim until it was too late to stop the full scale Italian invasion
- Mussolini was a difficult dictator to negotiate with as his policies kept changing; therefore, it was difficult for Britain to follow a consistent policy that did not appear confused
- Britain's policy of appeasement was consistent in wanting to avoid war, with either Mussolini or Hitler, for as long as it seemed possible. Mussolini was only treated as an enemy when he invaded Abyssinia and when he allied himself with Hitler
- in 1938, and even in 1939, British policymakers differed over the approach to Mussolini. Mussolini was accepted as a mediator at Munich, and Britain gave serious consideration to the idea of treating Mussolini as a potential ally.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that British policy towards Mussolini was inconsistent and it made Britain appear weak. This resulted in the one thing that Britain had set out to avoid: Mussolini moved closer to Hitler.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion