



**General Certificate of Education
January 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 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 students' 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 students' 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 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

January 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 the Munich Agreement of September 1938. (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:

- in Source A, Hodgson claims Munich as a 'triumph'; Source B says flatly it was an 'unmitigated defeat'
- Source A claims Chamberlain is a hero who has spoken 'for the common people of all countries'; Source B is speech made by Churchill specifically as an attack on Chamberlain's actions'

- in Source A, Hodgson says 'it is possible to criticise Munich' but then makes clear his view that these criticisms do not prevent Munich from being a 'landmark in the history of the world'; Source B says Munich is a betrayal of British interests as well as the Czechs.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context and their own judgements to explain these differences. They might, for example, comment on the 'fact' that Chamberlain was 'justified' by the mass support for his policy; or that Churchill was 'right'. Both sources were from the perspective of 1938, without the wisdom of hindsight, so students might use knowledge of what happened next to contextualise their comparison of differences.

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

- both sources agree that there were reasons to criticise the agreement at Munich; (and both agree Munich might not last long)
- Source B shows some agreement with Source A that Chamberlain was a well-intentioned 'struggler for peace'.

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; or may show depth of understanding about the context of the decisions taken in September 1938.

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

How important was the German occupation of Prague in March 1939 in turning British policy away from appeasement? (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 could include:

- Source A does admit that the Munich agreement can be criticised and that the settlement over Czechoslovakia might break down in a few years or months – otherwise it rejects altogether the idea of ‘turning away from a policy of appeasement’
- Source B predicts in October that Czechoslovakia will not survive as an independent state. This fits well with the idea of people coming to realise later (i.e. in March 1939) that appeasement would prove to be a disaster and would have to be abandoned
- Source C focuses directly on the impact of the German takeover in March 1939 and describes the key role of Halifax in leading the way along the ‘hesitant and stumbling path’ to a new British policy. On the other hand, Source C acknowledges that it may not be a turning point because ‘even now’ Chamberlain is clinging on to appeasement.

From students’ own knowledge:

Factors suggesting the Nazi occupation in March 1939 was a turning point might include:

- it showed that Hitler was going beyond rectifying German grievances from Versailles into naked aggression and thus tearing up Munich – so Hitler removed the very basis of appeasement
- the fact that Britain gave guarantees to Poland in March 1939 showed what a dramatic change in policy had taken place – Britain even began, rather half-heartedly, to pursue an anti-Hitler alliance with Stalin’s USSR
- the German aggression of March 1939 did a lot to change public and press opinion.

Factors suggesting other factors were more important might include:

- the turning point actually came much sooner than March 1939. After the first wave of euphoria post-Munich, opinion swerved sharply against appeasement, partly from guilt about the Czechs – this trend was accentuated by the revulsion following *Kristallnacht* in November 1938. Chamberlain’s government began a serious drive for rearmament in late 1938, especially in air power; this showed how it was already being recognised that appeasement was not enough
- March 1939 was not a turning point because Britain essentially carried on with the same appeasement policy. Chamberlain kept on hoping for a compromise solution right up to (and even after) the declaration of war in September. The guarantees to Poland were not a sign he was ready to go to war. Deep down (despite Source C) Halifax was still an appeaser
- the Phoney War and the hopes for a peaceful settlement with Hitler up to May 1940 showed that the principles of appeasement remained influential until Chamberlain was replaced by Churchill.

Good answers may show awareness of connections between different factors; or they may differentiate between factors of greater or lesser relative significance. For example, they may conclude that ‘turning away from appeasement’ was a long and complex process affecting different people in different ways at different times.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why J M Keynes criticised the treatment of Germany in the post-war peace settlement. (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 Keynes's reasons for attacking the decisions taken at Versailles in respect of Germany. There is little scope here for description of the detailed clauses of the treaty. Students might include some of the following factors:

- Keynes was an economic expert who had produced a massive in-depth report on the economic consequences of the peace. He was furious that Lloyd George and others did not listen to him. (He also disagreed strongly with Clemenceau and French military advisers)
- Keynes was not only concerned that the treatment of Germany was 'unfair' – he was more worried about the danger to the post-war economy of Europe (and thus to British interests) that would result from crippling the German economy
- Keynes was especially opposed to punitive reparations being demanded from Germany, thereby preventing economic recovery (and so making Germany unable to pay anyway)
- Keynes thought it was a mistake to punish (and thus weaken) the post-war democratic German government for the 'war crimes' of Imperial Germany.

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 pressures on Lloyd George, which meant that he had to take other factors than the economic impact on Germany into account; Keynes was arguing above all as an economist.

Question 2

- 04** 'The improvement in Britain's relations with Germany in the years 1923 to 1928 was due to British acceptance of the view that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh on Germany.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence that supports the view given against evidence which does not. Note that the improvement in relations occurred 1923 to 1928 but some of the *reasons for* that improvement can be traced back before 1923.

Evidence supporting the key quotation might include:

- it was all due to changed political attitudes in Britain. Immediately after Versailles Lloyd George had started to express severe doubts ('we will have to do it all over again in 25 years') and British policy had come to believe that Keynes was right all along
- reparations (finally agreed in 1921) proved to be immensely difficult to put into practice – Britain was keen to find a negotiated solution
- British policy was more and more concerned to get away from an imposed peace to an agreed peace that Germany would accept and that Britain would not need to enforce (Britain regarded the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 as something never to be repeated) – this was a main reason why Britain supported the Locarno treaties of 1925 and later international peace moves like the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1928.

Evidence against the key quotation might include:

- the main reasons for improved relations were not British but German. Stresemann was foreign minister from 1923. He gave consistency and continuity to the German policy of 'fulfilment' and this was vital in winning Britain over. (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 in 1926)
- Stresemann was a conservative (and a monarchist) – this reassured Britain that there was less to fear from the right-wingers and the military in Germany.
- Stresemann's skilful diplomacy enabled Germany to receive foreign loans through the 1924 Dawes Plan – an American plan that Britain strongly supported
- improved relations with Germany were above all due to changed French policies after the Ruhr occupation of 1923 – Aristide Briand was the key partner of Stresemann
- possibly the biggest reason of all was the economic recovery between 1923 and 1928, which allowed Germany to recover political and economic stability and produced a general atmosphere of harmony and international respectability that Britain was keen to encourage.

Some answers may focus on evaluation of the 'improvement', arguing that it was temporary and misleading, pointing out that Stresemann frequently concealed his true objectives in order to seem more peace-loving than he really was. At Locarno in 1925 he kept open Germany's ambitions in the East; his private letter to the Crown Prince of Germany in 1926 showed expansionist aims that would have angered Britain if those views had been made public. This can indeed be rewarded appropriately but it is *not* an essential element of good answers. The question takes improved relations as a given. One feature of good answers may be the ability to differentiate between the relative significance of a range of factors; or to comment on the way these factors were interrelated.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the British government did not take firm action against the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931. (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 the diplomatic situation of 1931, dealing with British motives for not intervening, including some of the following factors:

- Britain had had good relations with Japan since at least 1902 and did not want to move into conflict. Britain was also worried about trade issues in the Far East
- Britain had a strong commitment to collective security and was really anxious to work through the League of Nations
- dealing with Japan in the Far East could only be effective if the US was directly involved – the US had disengaged from collective security since 1919 and there was no prospect in 1931 of strong joint action between the Americans and the British
- by 1931 the Great Depression was already taking hold and British policy was determined to avoid military commitments and expensive rearmament
- Britain sent the Lytton Commission to investigate the situation. They did not feel they could do anything until they had the report back from the Commission and this took about a year.

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 and short-term or immediate factors relating to the timing of the Japanese invasion in 1931.

Question 3

- 06** 'Public opinion was the main reason why Britain failed to deal effectively with international crises 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 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 Britain's weak response to international crises was due to public opinion against rearmament and war. Examples of crises in these years include: Abyssinia 1935–1936; the German remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936; the issue of intervention or non-intervention in Spain's Civil War; and Japan's expansion of the war against China in 1937.

There is a range of possible interpretations, such as:

- that public opinion really was to blame for undermining British policy and preventing firm action from being taken
- that British policy was already totally committed to appeasement by 1935; this was the line consistently followed by Baldwin. This was due to many key factors including the personal leadership of Baldwin; memories of the Great War; the economic impact of the Great Depression; the weakness of Britain's armed forces, etc – so public opinion had no significant effect beyond reinforcing what the government wanted to do anyway
- that Britain was really committed to supporting the League of Nations in order to deal with international crises but other countries (especially France, but also the US) were to blame for preventing collective security from working.

Possible evidence in agreement with the key quotation might include:

- there was a strong pacifist movement in Britain after the Great War and this was influential in shaping public opinion throughout the post-war period – the Peace Pledge Union was formed in 1936
- public opinion was strongly in favour of the League of Nations and collective security. The 'King and Country' debate at the Oxford Union in 1933 got a lot of attention in the national press and seemed to indicate a public mood against war and rearmament
- the National Government was too concerned to protect a fragile economic recovery and did not want to commit to expensive military preparations – there was a lot of public support for this view, including trade unions and the Labour Party
- the 1935 'Peace Ballot' results strongly influenced politicians
- Baldwin was a popular and influential prime minister. Public opinion was in line with his cautious approach. The general election result of November 1935 emphasised this.

Evidence which could be used to disagree might include:

- public opinion was not overwhelmingly pro-appeasement: the 'Peace Ballot' actually supported stronger support for the League of Nations, rather than appeasement. Many historians claim that public opinion in Britain was misrepresented by the press, which was actually out of step with what people round the country felt. Public opinion reacted furiously against the Hoare-Laval Pact in 1936 because it was too weak in reacting to Mussolini. There was huge support on the Left for action to help the Republicans in Spain
- there were other factors influencing foreign policy that were much more important than public opinion: The extreme economic pressures of the depression and the wish to avoid expensive rearmament; the belief of the armed forces that Britain had too many foreign commitments; British mistrust of France as an unreliable ally; attitudes to the dictators, such as the belief that German grievances were justified, or the wish to make an ally of Mussolini, or anti-Communism, preventing intervention in Spain
- there were many difficulties in dealing with international crises: Britain wanted to work through the League of Nations (e.g. sanctions against Italy) but this could not be made to work in practice; it was almost impossible to block Hitler in the Rhineland because Britain was not willing to go to war to stop German forces moving into part of their own country; British military experts regarded France as too militarily weak for joint action to be effective; stopping Japan in China was impossible unless the USA acted strongly.

Good answers may conclude that many of the factors above were interrelated. They may also show differentiated judgement according to change over time – there were many shifts in policy (and many different personalities involved) between 1935 and 1937.

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