



**General Certificate of Education  
January 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](http://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

---

January 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 the Treaty of Versailles. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>
<b>L1:</b>	Answers will <b>either</b> briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources <b>or</b> identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	<b>1-2</b>
<b>L2:</b>	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.	<b>3-6</b>
<b>L3:</b>	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences <b>and</b> similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	<b>7-9</b>
<b>L4:</b>	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.	<b>10-12</b>

**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:

- the view of Source A is that the Treaty was not unduly harsh whereas Source B suggests it was over-harsh
- Source A suggests the Treaty was fair, e.g. in holding plebiscites whereas Source B gives examples of it being unfair, e.g. the views of Keynes
- Source A thinks Germany came out quite well, e.g. in comparison with Austria-Hungary; Source B that it did badly, e.g. in the departure from Wilson's Fourteen Points.

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

- the clauses of the Treaty
- the different views of France, Britain, the USA and Germany
- politicians' views and economists' views.

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

- both sources indicate that the Germans perceived the treaty as too harsh
- both sources suggest that the Treaty raised controversy in the years that followed.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that the German attitude to the Treaty is consistent in both sources but that the views and evidence provided by the two historians are distinct in their differences.

---

**Question 1**

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

How far were British governments' policies towards Germany in the 1920s a reaction against the perceived harshness of the Treaty of Versailles? (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 balancing points which suggest that the British governments' policies towards Germany in 1920s were a reaction to the perceived harshness of the Treaty of Versailles against others which do not. All three sources provide references to the question of harshness and candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** provides support for 'perceived harshness' amongst the Germans though there is no specific reference to British policies
- **Source B** indicates Lloyd George perceived the treaty as unfair to the Germans, and provides details as influences on British opinion
- **Source C** refers to the rejection of the Geneva Protocol, support for the Locarno Pact and the movement towards security and conciliation. It also outlines Britain's 'reluctance to accept specific commitments in Europe'. These policies are implicit about reaction to the Treaty of Versailles rather than explicit.

From candidates' own knowledge:

There should be awareness of differing/similar government policies during the 1920s (Coalition, Conservative and Labour) and that perceived harshness was not the only factor. Britain's economic, diplomatic and military decline should be explored, along with the need for trade and suspicion of communist Russia by most governments.

Factors suggesting a reaction against the perceived harshness of the Treaty of Versailles might include:

- successive governments worried about the inherent unfairness of the treaty
- consequent government actions or inactions, e.g. the Geneva protocol, the Locarno Pact and the Kellogg-Briand Pact
- rift with France in 1923
- criticisms of Keynes.

Factors suggesting other reasons might include:

- growth of pacifism
- abhorrence of war – government, press and public- harsh treatment of Germany not likely
- Britain's economic and military weakness (not in a position for further conflict over Germany)
- reaction to Germany's growing stability- the Stresemann period of post-1923
- Germany seen as a bastion against communism therefore needed support.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the British governments' policies towards Germany during the 1920s were initially shaped by the perceived harshness of the Treaty of Versailles, but as time passed many other factors came into play (under successive Coalition, Conservative and Labour administrations).



---

**Question 2**

- 03** Explain why the British government opposed the invasion of Abyssinia 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 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 British government opposed the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Abyssinia bordered on British colonies in Africa (e.g. Uganda, Kenya)
- support for the League of Nations as the League had already suffered a humiliating defeat over Manchuria
- public outcry against Italy's behaviour and support for the 'underdog' – Haile Selassie and Abyssinia
- Great Britain supported the core value of collective security
- an approaching autumn election with the need for the government to get tough.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link longer-term factors such as the defence of British-African colonies, support of the League of Nations and hostility to aggression with Haile Selassie's appeal to the League for help and the pressure of British public opinion on the government to act.

---

**Question 2**

- 04** 'The Depression was the main reason why the British government followed a policy of appeasement in the years 1935 to 1937.'  
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 points which agree with the view that the Depression was the main reason against others which do not.

Evidence which agrees that the Depression was the main reason might include:

- the role of Depression in weakening the League of Nations, e.g. failure to use economic sanctions against Germans
- Britain's economic weakness
- limited finance for rearmament and therefore Britain not in a position to fight during the period of 1935–1937.

Evidence which disagrees that the Depression was the main reason for pursuit of appeasement might include:

- weakness of the League of Nations and France led the British government to an alternative policy
- fear of communism led British government not to upset Hitler
- attempts to maintain support of Italy- did not want Mussolini to align with Hitler
- strength of anti-war feeling – Oxford Union Debate and Fulham by-election
- role of Baldwin as Prime Minister- passive and therefore appeasement was the ideal policy to adopt.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the Depression formed the backdrop to the British government's appeasement policy, but there were other important factors accounting for the appeasement policy of Baldwin's government.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why Neville Chamberlain was personally committed to a policy of appeasement in 1937.

(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 Chamberlain was personally committed to a policy of appeasement in 1937.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- background of loathing of war – Liberal political roots of his family
- Chamberlain's cautious political nature- he preferred to adopt a 'wait and see' policy
- Chamberlain's views on international statesmanship – thought all issues could be resolved by talking and compromise
- followed mood of British public and that was certainly anti-war, therefore appeasement was the right policy
- the economic and financial situation of Britain – expenditure on re-armament needed to be restored.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might explore the relationship between Chamberlain's political background and personality and the existing international situation to explain why Chamberlain perceived that he was adopting the correct policy (appeasement) for the existing domestic climate and current international situation.

---

**Question 3**

- 06** 'There were no valid alternatives to the British government's policy of appeasement in the years 1937 to 1939.'  
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 that there were no valid alternatives against that which do not.

Points which agree that there were no valid alternatives might include:

- Britain was economically and militarily weak (appeasement may buy time)
- views on war on three fronts – therefore there had to be some appeasement
- Hitler could be negotiated with and was a bastion against communism
- weakness of the League of Nations and France, therefore a lack of international political allies
- strength of anti-war public opinion.

Points which disagree that there were no valid alternatives might include:

- Churchill's group and their views (advocating strong stance against the dictators)
- changed Labour policy – dictators must be stood up against
- support for Czechoslovakia should have been given (it had a strong economy and military)
- more pressure could have been made on Italy as weak link in the 'Rome-Berlin' Axis
- common cause against Germany could have been made with the USSR.

Good answers are likely to conclude that there were valid alternatives, but they were never going to see the light of day so long as Chamberlain was Prime Minister who persisted with the policy of appeasement even when it was seen to have failed in 1938 and 1939.