



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

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 events which all examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges 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 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 2012

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 attitudes to Hitler's Germany in 1937. (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 is emphatic in saying that Hitler is a 'passionate lunatic' and presents a clear and present danger of war. In Source B Henderson believes that, if handled correctly, 'the reasons for Hitler's existence might disappear', and that it is essential to trust Hitler's words until the facts prove differently
- Source A says 'those in Britain advocating closer relations' are making a 'disastrous mistake'; Henderson in Source B believes there is still a real chance of such an approach working

- in Source A, there is an urgent warning about 'no further advances at the present time; Henderson (also writing about 1937) recommends exactly the opposite line
- there is a difference in the overall 'message' of the sources – one committed to firm action ready to meet an obvious danger; the other committed to conciliatory diplomacy.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, comment on British policy since 1935, perhaps especially the fact that Henderson was Chamberlain's choice as ambassador. Own knowledge could be used to develop the context of 1937 and recent issues such as Abyssinia, Rhineland and Spain where the response to Fascist aggression seemed weak; or to the range of potentially valid reasons why 'conciliation' still seemed a good policy at that stage.

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

- both sources show that Britain is keen to avoid war. Source A says 'no-one here wants war' and Source B says they must 'try to see the good side of the Nazi Regime'
- both sources show dislike of Hitler – even Henderson hopes he may 'disappear' and is also ready for the possibility he is a 'breaker of faith'.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may show differentiation in explaining the extent the two sources differ explicitly but agree implicitly about the Hitler threat; or may show depth of understanding about the context of developments in 1936 and 1937.

Question 1

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

How far was Britain's policy of appeasement in the years 1935 to 1939 based on fear of another war? (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 reflects fear of imminent war. Although it states 'nobody here wants war', this does not really include Hitler, who is portrayed as a 'lunatic, who 'listens to no advice', making the situation 'dangerous'. Implicitly, it suggests appeasing Hitler may bring war closer
- Source B is dominated by fear of war. Henderson presents the view that it was right to keep open hopes for being able to trust Hitler (and to put right German grievances from Versailles) because not conciliating Germany could cause unnecessary conflict – he was writing in 1940 when war had begun, and that the efforts to ward off war had failed
- Source C implies fear of war was only one of many factors, including public opinion, the belief that Versailles was unfair, his own personal desire to be a 'historic' peacemaker and the 'reality of the international situation'. But the last sentence agrees strongly that 'saving Britain and Europe from the devastation of a second world war' was a central motive.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that fear of another war was the main reason might include:

- fear of war was a common factor in many themes, such as memories of the awfulness of the Great War (re-awakened by images of modern war from Abyssinia and Spain; the belief that the 'bomber will always get through'; 'the view of military experts that Britain (and France) were too weak to resist the dictators
- other factors not directly about fear but closely related to it included pacifism (e.g. the 1935 Peace Ballot) and the desire to see collective security made to work
- the impact of public opinion. Throughout most of the period the public did not support war.

Factors suggesting that other factors were important might include:

- the influence of key personalities, especially Baldwin and Chamberlain – some answers may claim appeasement was all Chamberlain's fault
- the significance of long-term attitudes before 1936 (including the Peace Ballot) such as faith in the League and the belief that German grievances were justified
- the impact of the Great Depression, making politicians (especially Labour) hostile to expenditure on rearmament and war preparations
- appeasement under Chamberlain was not based only on fear of war but a postponement of war until Britain were ready to fight.

Good answers are may show differentiation and awareness of connections between different factors. For example they may conclude that in the period after 1935 appeasement was indeed seen as the logical policy to follow and that trust in Hitler was not unreasonable, even though it partly reflected wishful thinking; or argue that the alternatives to appeasement (such as an alliance with Stalin) were understandably unattractive.

Question 2**03** Explain why Britain signed the Locarno Treaty in 1925. (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.

This question is firmly about Britain's reasons for supporting Locarno. Although the treaties did not involve Britain directly, Austen Chamberlain, as foreign secretary, acted as a mediator along with Italy. There is little scope here for description of the detailed clauses of the treaty; the main focus is on British motives. Students might include some of the following factors:

- Britain was eager to see a voluntary agreement to confirm the post-war frontiers and make Europe safer. By 1925, Britain was coming to accept the views of J.M. Keynes that it was wrong to punish the new Weimar Republic for the 'war crimes' of Imperial Germany
- Britain was impressed by Gustav Stresemann and his promises of 'fulfilment' and wanted to encourage the good relations he had with the French foreign minister, Aristide Briand. The ground had already been prepared by the Dawes Plan of 1924
- Locarno was part of a general move to recognise the international 'respectability' of Germany – in 1926 it was followed by Germany's admission to the League of Nations
- if Locarno was a success it would save Britain from military commitments to help France.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might comment on the links between the various British motives, mixing together idealism and self-interest; or discuss the extent to which British policy was gullible, deceived into excessive faith in the 'Locarno Honeymoon' when Stresemann was actually a supporter of one day ripping up Versailles in respect of Germany's eastern borders and bringing 'home' all the Lost Germans in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland.

Question 2

04 'In the years 1925 to 1932, Britain believed that lasting peace with Germany had been secured.'

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 that supports the view given against evidence which does not.

Evidence supporting the view that hopes for lasting peace were well founded might include:

- by the mid-1920s, British policy had moved a long way away from the vindictive approach of 1919. People in Britain believed that better relations with Germany would lessen the dangers of military involvement in enforcing the post-war peace in Europe.
- the context of German policy was favourable. Gustav Stresemann, foreign minister from 1923 to 1929, gave consistency and continuity to the German policy of 'fulfilment' – e.g. the Dawes Plan of 1924. Stresemann's skilful diplomacy (e.g. the foreign loans gained by the 1924 Dawes Plan) led to economic recovery in Germany and produced an atmosphere of stability. Britain placed great faith in Stresemann during the 'Locarno honeymoon'
- Stresemann established a particularly good relationship with the French foreign minister, Aristide Briand – this was vital in setting up the Locarno treaties of 1925 and Germany's acceptance into the League of Nations in 1926. Britain strongly approved (and was reassured by) these trends
- the recovery of the world economy seemed to reinforce the prospects for peace and encouraged faith in the League of Nations and the Geneva Disarmament conference – the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 was another apparent sign of genuine optimism for international peace. Britain supported this
- even after the Wall Street Crash and the early stages of the Great Depression, the governments of Weimar Germany remained committed to legal agreements and negotiation. This reassured Britain. It was only the rise of Hitler in 1932 and 1933 that raised real dangers of tension and war.

Evidence against the key quotation might include:

- developments such as Germany's admission to the League and the Kellogg-Briand Pact were mostly diplomatic hot air and did not lay concrete foundations for peace
- improved relations from 1925 were mostly due to a short-lived economic boom. As soon as this boom ended there was bound to be renewed tension over reparations payments and German territorial grievances. Between 1930 and 1932 there were lots of issues for Britain to worry about; so it can be argued that the good relations between Britain and Germany were temporary, not 'lasting', as Hitler promptly proved from January 1933 on
- ever since 1919, British policy had been divided over enforcing the supposedly harsh 'anti-German' clauses in the post-war peace settlement. There were lots of people and politicians in Britain who were far from convinced there was lasting peace with Germany – for example because they thought Versailles had been fundamentally flawed, or because they knew Germany was involved in secret military cooperation with the USSR from 1922 and that there were plans for German rearmament in breach of Versailles.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that to an extent peace depended on favourable circumstances, so it was not 'lasting'. Another feature of good answers may be the ability to differentiate between shifting relationships over time, as personalities, and circumstances, changed.

Question 3

05 Explain why Britain joined the Stresa Front 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.

Students might explain French and Italian motives as well as British ones, though the main focus should be on Britain. Answers might include some of the following factors:

- many people in Britain (including Winston Churchill and several trade union leaders) regarded Mussolini's Italy as an impressively modern and successful state. They also saw Mussolini as a potentially powerful ally against Germany (remembering how Mussolini had sent troops to the Alpine border to block Nazi aggression against Austria in 1934)
- Laval, the prime minister of France, was especially keen to keep Mussolini as an ally
- it was already known that Mussolini might be planning a war against Abyssinia – so Britain and France wanted the Stresa Front as a way of bringing Italy 'inside the tent' and persuading Mussolini away from rash acts and doing things through peaceful negotiation
- Mussolini was very good at acting the part of a great statesman; British diplomats at Stresa were taken in by this.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might differentiate between long-term factors such as:

- British concerns to protect her colonies in North Africa and the Mediterranean from Italian expansion
- the complex relationship between Britain and France over the Mediterranean

and short-term or immediate factors such as:

- the personalities of the three leaders and how they interacted when they met on their sunny island on Lake Maggiore.

Question 3

- 06** 'Britain followed a consistent policy towards Mussolini's invasion of Abyssinia.'
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 a range of arguments for and against the view that British policies towards Mussolini's invasion of Abyssinia were consistent.

There two main possible interpretations:

- a) Britain's policies were the opposite of consistent – they were continuously confused and contradictory, swiftly changing according to circumstances and the influence of key personalities (such as the mutual loathing between Mussolini and Anthony Eden)
- b) British policy was actually consistent – confusion arose only because Mussolini was so wild and unpredictable in his foreign policies and his love-hate attitude to Britain.

Possible evidence to challenge the key quotation and show inconsistency might include:

- there were many differences of policy between Britain and France, some of them stretching back to 1919, and this led to a confused approach when Mussolini's attack on Abyssinia was being planned. Britain did issue warnings but there were mixed messages
- almost as soon as the Stresa Front was established, as a predominantly anti-German front, Britain reversed policy and made the Anglo-German naval treaty
- the Hoare-Laval Pact seemed to give Mussolini what he wanted but then the public backlash against the pact caused Britain to turn about and openly oppose Mussolini's actions in Abyssinia. Britain supported sanctions half-heartedly but refused to either take firm action against Italy or recognise the Italian conquest
- even after Abyssinia, some British politicians (such as Churchill and Chamberlain) wanted to have good relations with Mussolini; others (notably Eden) were very hostile. Britain was inconsistent in not publicly recognising Italy's possession of Abyssinia after the war ended, even though they tacitly accepted it
- British policy oscillated wildly between treating Mussolini as a Fascist aggressor and hoping he might be a helpful ally against Germany. This continued well after the Abyssinian War was over.

Evidence which could be used to support the idea of a consistent British policy might include:

- Britain was consistent in wanting to block Mussolini's expansion in the Mediterranean and North Africa but not wanting to make Italy a direct enemy. The saga of sanctions, and the Hoare-Laval Pact, for example, showed Britain not wanting to go to war with Italy, while at the same time not wanting to let him gain too much in Abyssinia
- Britain was consistent in wanting collective action through the League of Nations
- British policy was consistent in hoping that Mussolini could be prevented from becoming a close ally of Hitler's Germany. Many people in Britain, including Churchill and a number of trade union leaders, regarded Italy as a modern progressive state and a model for Britain to follow, at least in social policy
- Britain's big problem was that Mussolini was wildly inconsistent, both in what he said and what he did; Dino Grandi, as ambassador to Britain, was very keen on good relations – sometimes Mussolini encouraged him, at other times he contradicted him
- Mussolini stayed neutral in 1939 and this showed that British policy to avoid open conflict had been moderately successful, at least up to that time. If France had not been defeated so quickly in 1940, Mussolini might never have gone to war against Britain at all.

Good answers may show differentiated judgement according to change over time, or according to a variety of factors – arguing for example that Britain used inconsistent tactics to pursue consistent aims; or showing how different factors were interrelated.

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