



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS2J

Unit 2J

Britain and Appeasement, 1919–1940

Final

Mark Scheme

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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 candidates. 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 candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates 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. Candidates 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 candidates 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 candidate 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 candidates 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 candidates' 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*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate 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 candidate 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 2011

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 Chamberlain. (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 candidates 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.

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

- **Source B** suggests that Chamberlain lacked experience and imagination, whilst **Source A** argues that Chamberlain pursued absolutely the right policy and was ‘the greatest European statesman of this or any other time’
- while **Source B** suggests that Chamberlain mistakenly treated the Dictators as honourable and decent men like those he was used to dealing with, **Source A** believes that Chamberlain provided excellent leadership in preserving European peace

- in **Source B** Duff Cooper argues that Chamberlain's policy was misconceived and that this explains his mistakes, whereas Raikes in **Source A** believed that Munich was no humiliation, and that Chamberlain's policy had brought peace 'for our time' and should not be jeered at.

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

- support by most Conservative MPs for the appeasement policy, but opposition to it by other Conservatives led by Churchill and also by Attlee and Labour
- seeming public support and relief for what Chamberlain's policy had achieved in avoiding war.

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

- **Source B** acknowledges that Chamberlain had 'many good qualities' and **Source A** praises Chamberlain and his policy to the hilt.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that the two views of appeasement policy in the autumn of 1938 reflect the division of opinion at the time and in the debate ever since, even if Raikes view in **Source A** is somewhat extreme.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far was Chamberlain's agreement to the Munich Pact in September 1938 the only realistic policy Britain could pursue at the time? (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 candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** implication that the annexation of the Sudeten German area in 1918–1919 was not justified; the view that Chamberlain's policy at Munich was absolutely correct in avoiding war
- **Source B:** Chamberlain's policy was mistaken because of his misunderstanding of the kind of leaders Hitler and Mussolini were
- **Source C:** the Munich pact was not moral but it was realistic in terms of Britain's vital interests and the actual position of Britain (and France) at the time

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that Chamberlain's policy was the only realistic one at the time might include:

- above all else Chamberlain wanted to avoid war and keep peace in Europe. Seeking an accommodation with Hitler, he believed, was the only way to fulfil his objectives
- from the time Chamberlain became Prime Minister he had pursued an appeasement policy to avoid war, as evidenced in his dealings with the dictators over the Spanish Civil War and Hitler over Austria. He did not abandon this policy which he continued to believe was the only way of avoiding war over the Sudeten crisis
- Britain was a great power and had to be involved in any change of status of Czechoslovakia. Any avoidance of that would have seriously undermined Britain's standing, but Chamberlain believed by applying appeasement policy to the Sudetenland issue and by involving himself centrally, war could be avoided
- unlike France (at the time of Locarno) Britain had given no guarantee to Czechoslovakia which remained to Chamberlain 'a far-away country' while its people were one 'of whom we know nothing'
- Britain was not militarily ready to fight a war against Germany in autumn 1938, but avoidance of war then gave Britain time to prepare. Chamberlain stepped up the rate of British rearmament significantly after Munich
- British public opinion supported Chamberlain's policy because it had avoided war.

Factors suggesting that Chamberlain's agreement to the Munich Pact was not the only realistic policy Britain could have pursued at the time and that there were alternatives might include:

- going to war, which Chamberlain considered, if Hitler had not agreed to receiving the Sudetenland by negotiated agreement rather than invasion
- there is little evidence in September 1938 that Chamberlain believed he was gaining a year, or indeed any time, for Britain to re-arm and prepare fully for war
- support for France in honouring its 'little entente' with Czechoslovakia was a possible policy
- seeking an agreement with the Soviet Union was an alternative policy but not pursued until 1939 largely because many Conservatives and possibly Chamberlain himself saw communism as more of a threat to Britain than Nazism or Fascism
- Churchill's condemnation of the Munich Agreement as an unmitigated defeat in not standing up to defeat Hitler over the Sudetenland and what could follow as a result, a warning which appeared fully justified in 1939.

Good answers may conclude that in historical interpretation the Munich Pact is regarded as ‘the high-water mark’ point of appeasement policies. Most interpretations view Chamberlain as honest, genuinely seeking a lasting peace, even if regarded as mistaken and misled. Raikes in **Source A** expressed the majority view at the time, even if in an extreme form, in praise of Chamberlain. The view that policy was wrong was only argued by a few at the time, (though by many in the light of subsequent events).

Question 2**03** Explain why Britain joined the League of Nations 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 candidates 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 joined the League.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Lloyd George was not that enthusiastic, but wished to support what Wilson regarded as a crucial international organisation for ensuring there was not another war by settling disputes between states by peaceful negotiation
- with the US Senate's refusal to ratify the Versailles Treaty and join the League, British diplomats became responsible for how the League was organised
- The Covenant of the League was made part of the Treaty of Versailles and the new organisation could be useful in implementing, and enforcing if required, the terms of the Peace Treaties
- the League was useful in helping to determine the allocation of and responsibility for mandates, of which Britain was a major beneficiary

- the concept of collective security, the basis for the League maintaining peace, was supported by Lloyd George and also by the opposition parties (to the Coalition) especially Labour
- the League would encourage disarmament, initially of the defeated countries under terms of the Peace Treaties, but then of members of the League, policies which Britain supported, partly because of the need to cut government expenditure and pay debts after the War
- Britain wanted to be seen as a player on the international stage and they wanted to restrain the ambitions of some of their rivals.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link the aim of never again having another (Great) war with the League enforcing the Peace Treaties, especially that of Versailles on Germany, regarded still in 1919 as the main possible threat to Britain's security.

Question 2

- 04** 'Britain took a lead in promoting international peace agreements in the years 1925 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 candidates 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.

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

Evidence which agrees might include:

- Ramsay MacDonald's influence in securing French and Belgian withdrawal from the Ruhr and acceptance by France as well as Germany of the Dawes Plan
- Austen Chamberlain's major role for Britain together with France and Germany in securing the Locarno Treaties in 1925, in particular Germany's acceptance of the western frontiers and status of the Rhineland
- support for Germany joining the League in 1926
- signing the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1928
- support for arranging and holding the Geneva World Disarmament Conference especially from the second Labour government. Henderson was the first chairman of the Conference.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- Britain's role in securing the Dawes Plan was less important than that of the USA which proposed and financed the Plan
- the Geneva Protocol as an improved method of resolving disputes, proposed by Ramsay MacDonald and the Labour government in 1924, was not supported by Baldwin's Conservative government and not adopted by the League
- Britain's role in securing the Locarno Treaties was equalled by those of Stresemann for Germany and Briand for France
- the Kellogg-Briand Pact was an initiative of the USA and France
- the World Disarmament Conference was a failure largely because of Japan's aggression in the far East and Hitler's withdrawal of Germany.

Good answers may conclude that Britain played a leading role in securing some agreements, for example the Locarno Treaties, had a supportive role in others, for example the Dawes Plan and the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and failed in others notably with the Geneva Protocol and the Disarmament Conference. Answers may also note that securing agreements for peace was easier during the earlier part of the period when there were not major European or wider world disputes than after 1931 with more aggressive governments in power in Japan and Germany, and the world economic crisis.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why Britain did not intervene when Germany re-militarised the Rhineland in 1936. (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 candidates 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 the government did not intervene.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- relations with Germany had improved vastly since the imposition of the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno Treaty, with Germany not being considered a great threat to European peace despite the rhetoric of Hitler and the Nazi regime
- the British government was already following a policy of appeasement towards Nazi Germany, e.g. over German re-armament and the Naval Treaty
- the government shared the view with many in Britain that Germany was entitled to re-occupy its 'own back-yard'
- if France was not prepared to take action to defend the terms of the Versailles and Locarno Treaties when re-militarisation could be a direct threat to French security, then the British government was not going to take action

- Baldwin and the government were unaware of Hitler's intention to withdraw given French and/or British action against the re-occupation
- the effects of the Depression also meant a reluctance to increase greatly spending on British re-armament, let alone to intervene in the Rhineland (or indeed elsewhere).

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link appeasement policy in 1936 over the Rhineland with a changed government policy and public opinion from the mood when the territory was de-militarised (and occupied) in 1919.

Question 3

- 06** 'Britain's response to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia was weak.'
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 candidates 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.

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

Evidence which agrees might include:

- Britain, in line with the League's policy, imposed only weak economic sanctions, which excluded oil, on Italy
- the weak response reflected public opinion, which favoured disarmament and peace, e.g. the Peace Ballot of 1935, and, general hatred of war
- the Hoare-Laval Plan, by conceding extensive territorial and economic rights to Italy, was an act of appeasement which even public opinion in Britain could not accept (and neither did Mussolini)
- abandonment of the Plan made little difference to Mussolini, who continued to military victory in Abyssinia and incorporation of the country into the Italian Empire
- Britain (and other leading members of the League) were embarrassed by Haile Selassie's appearance and speech in Geneva
- as one of the leading powers in the League, Britain, by not taking effective action against Italy, was responsible for the collapse of the League's policy of collective security.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- diplomatic support was given to Haile Selassie and Ethiopia (at least initially)
- Britain did impose economic sanctions on Italy
- when viewed as inappropriate or wrong the Hoare-Laval Plan was withdrawn
- it was believed by the government that limited economic sanctions and avoidance of military intervention through what was essentially an appeasement policy were more likely to bring about a compromise solution
- Britain's national interests were best served by a limited response. Government concern over German re-armament led to a policy of trying to keep Mussolini 'on side' in relation to Germany
- given the state of the British economy the government's response was realistic rather than weak.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the government's response was weak given that the Hoare-Laval Plan was overwhelmingly one favouring Italy and that Italy was allowed to conquer Abyssinia, but the response was realistic given the wider context of political and economic considerations.

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