

A-LEVEL HISTORY

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

1041
June 2014

Version 1.0: Final

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 2014

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 the terms imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. **[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 A suggests that Keynes argued that the Treaty would drive Germany to despair whereas Source B suggests that Keynes's view was sentimental nonsense
- Source A suggests that the terms of Versailles would drive Germany to despair with potentially 'dangerous consequences' whereas Source B suggests that the Treaty actually enhanced German power and could be considered as little more than a 'tap on the wrist'

- Source B concentrates on the impact of the terms on Germany whereas Source A looks at the impact of these terms on Europe as a whole.

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

- JM Keynes' work at Versailles and his subsequent book that was published and explain his views
- some of the specific terms at Versailles – in particular the decisions that took place when setting the amount of reparations and how this was not finally agreed upon at the Paris Peace Conference.

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

- both sources agree to an extent that the reparations sum demanded by the Allies was too high and would cause problems for Germany
- both show that Keynes was chiefly concerned with the economic consequences of Versailles in particular the reparations payments.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that Source A shows a view based on Keynes' that the Treaty was too harsh whereas Source B feels that the Treaty was lenient and could have been much more harsh.

Question 1

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

How far was British policy towards Germany in the 1920s influenced by J M Keynes' view that the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh? **[24 marks]**

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

- **Source A:** shows the view of Keynes that the Treaty was too harsh and would lead to the economic destruction of Germany.
- **Source B:** Suggests that Keynes view that the Treaty was too harsh was sentimental and in reality it was little more than a slap on the wrist.
- **Source C:** Suggests that relations with Germany were improved due to the lessening of economic restraints in policies such as the Dawes Plan which therefore followed the ideas of Keynes. It also suggests that Stresemann played a role in British policy towards Germany as he was seen as a stable influence.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting Keynes was responsible for policy towards Germany might include:

- Lloyd George's Fontainebleau Memorandum fitted the view of Keynes that if Germany was too harshly treated then they would find a way of gaining revenge
- after the Ruhr occupation and hyperinflation crisis, Britain supported the Americans. The initial view of punishing Germany harshly had relaxed and Keynes' influence can be seen in policies such as the Dawes and the Young Plans that lessened the burden of reparations
- Keynes' view that Britain's recovery was dependent on their ability to trade with Germany was popular and many politicians throughout the 1920s were keen to improve the trading relationship between the two countries
- Keynes' book, 'The Economic Consequences of the Peace' was popular with the British public who became less set on punishing Germany harshly.

Factors suggesting other factors were important might include:

- Stresemann's policy of fulfilment made Britain more confident in dealing with Germany and this in turn led to the rectification of some of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Stresemann played a vital part in the development of the Locarno Treaty and was awarded the Nobel Peace prize for his role
- the Locarno Treaties created a more harmonious atmosphere in Europe and this helped Britain to have a more positive outlook towards Germany. This can be seen especially with Germany being accepted into the League of Nations
- the French influenced British policy towards Germany as Britain tried to balance out the French desire to cripple Germany

- British policy towards Germany could be seen to have taken a lenient approach as they did not want to be the ones to enforce the Treaty of Versailles. By taking a more lenient approach it left the British to concentrate more on their own interests.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Keynes was partly responsible for British policy towards Germany. In particular his work was important in changing initially harsh views towards Germany to a more conciliatory approach.

Question 2

03 Explain why Britain signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement in 1935. **[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 signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- by this point, German rearmament had become clear and the Agreement gave Britain the opportunity to ensure that they maintained a naval superiority over Germany
- the British navy faced a threat from Japan in the Far East and it was hoped that this agreement would help them keep a naval superiority in home waters
- by signing the agreement it meant that Britain could keep on positive terms with Germany and there was the threat that Germany would leave the negotiations unless their demands were met
- Britain was angry at France's attempts to encircle Germany with their talks with the USSR and the agreement meant that Britain could keep on positive terms with Germany and hope to keep them onside in a future conflicts

- after the failure of the 1932 Disarmament Conference this gave Britain the opportunity to deal directly with Germany
- the agreement had the approval of the Admiralty, Foreign Office and the Cabinet, which thought it was a realistic contribution to peace
- by this point the League of Nations had shown major weaknesses and since Germany had withdrawn from the League made it possible for Britain to negotiate with them directly
- the British public had shown that they were in favour of pacifism and the Agreement fitted the mood of 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.

Question 2

- 04** 'Britain failed to act effectively to threats to international peace in the years 1931 to 1935.'
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:

- since the conception of the League of Nations, Britain had been reluctant to play a key role and to follow its policy of avoiding continental commitments. Britain was not prepared to take on a leadership role particularly when the League of Nations was challenged. Britain had supported the concept of the League of Nations with America at the helm
- in the Manchurian Crisis, Britain was more concerned with its economic problems at home and even had some sympathy for Japan
- in the Abyssinian Crisis, Britain undermined the League of Nations. Firstly it would not close the Suez Canal as it was worried that Mussolini would interpret this as an act of war. It also made the Hoare Laval Pact, which proposed the dividing up of Abyssinia; although this was never put into practice when it was leaked to the press it significantly undermined the League. Britain also withdrew the sanctions imposed upon Italy by the League
- even before the Abyssinian Crisis, Britain had started to make agreements outside of the League such as the Stresa Front and the Anglo German Naval Agreement
- Britain could do little to support the League of Nations, with the public opinion pacifist and the economic situation at home there was little else they could have done.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- Britain upheld the League of Nations throughout the Manchurian Crisis with Lord Lytton leading the commission
- arguably Britain only started to act against the League of Nations once it had been proved to be a failure
- Britain did hold up some of the sanctions but was also concerned with maintaining its policy of avoiding war and maintaining good relations with the dictators.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Britain did do little to support the League of Nations as they were more concerned with protecting their own interests. The League had been doomed from the start with the absence of the USA and Britain were never prepared to take on this leading role in the League.

Question 3

05 Explain why Neville Chamberlain resigned as Prime Minister in 1940. **[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 Neville Chamberlain resigned as Prime Minister.

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

- Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was very much a personal policy and with his pacifist outlook he was not suited to the role of a wartime leader
- many recognised Churchill as a better leader for wartime and with the failure of appeasement he was increasingly being looked towards for leadership

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

- the failure of the Norwegian Campaign called into question Chamberlain's leadership and he began to lose the support of the House of Commons

- though Chamberlain won the vote in the Commons over the Norwegian Campaign it was clear that he had lost the confidence of his colleagues in the Conservative Party
- many in government saw the need to form a wartime coalition but in particular, Labour MPs were reluctant to serve under Chamberlain. Therefore, he resigned as Prime Minister.

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

Question 3

- 06** 'The Munich agreement was a great success for Chamberlain.'
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 Munich was a great success for Chamberlain.

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

- Munich was seen as the culmination of Chamberlain's personal diplomacy. Chamberlain felt that he could solve international disputes by talking with other leaders. He felt he had proved he could successfully negotiate with dictators
- many saw Munich as a triumph of avoiding war and not delaying it until Britain was ready. Chamberlain returned with his piece of paper that promised, 'Peace for Our Time'
- there is some debate as to whether Chamberlain's aim was to avoid war or to postpone war. If his aim was to postpone war until Britain was ready the fact that rearmament was stepped up after Munich could be seen as a success.

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

- Munich is seen as the 'high water mark' of appeasement. Therefore its purpose was to avoid war at all costs and not just because Britain were unprepared and as war broke out in 1939 Chamberlain's aim was not achieved
- as Hitler invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia this showed that Chamberlain's aim at Munich and his personal diplomacy had failed
- if Chamberlain's aim at Munich was to avoid war then the fact that Britain stepped up its rearmament programme after Munich can be seen as a way in which Chamberlain had not succeeded.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that though Munich was initially seen as a success for Chamberlain, as full scale war broke out the following year it did not have any lasting impact.

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