



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2J

Britain and Appeasement, 1919–1940

Mark Scheme

2010 examination – January series

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 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 2010

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2J: Britain and Appeasement, 1919–1940

Question 1

- (a) 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 Britain's reluctance, in the years 1919 to 1939, to become involved in war. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources, for example:

- **Source B** suggests that there was some admiration for Hitler, notably from Mosley and the B.U.F., and that mainstream politicians were reluctant to confront Hitler, seeing another European war as 'unthinkable', whereas **Source A**, on the other hand, emphasises the opposition of young people (and not just in Britain) to war because of the slaughter in the First World War

- while **Source B** suggests that there was no reluctance about confronting Hitler on the part of Churchill with opponents calling him a 'war-monger', **Source A** points out that most people 'stepped forward to serve' when war did come in 1939

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

- examples of public opinion being opposed to war
- lack of opposition by Britain to Germany's 'acts of aggression' (and/or possibly to those by Italy or Japan)
- the change in public opinion from March to September 1939.

To address 'how far', they should also indicate some similarity between the sources, for example:

- both sources suggest agreement in the main about the reluctance of Britain, politicians and (young) people, to become involved in another European or 'great' war
- they agree about the influence of the First World War and both sources cite 'the war to end all wars'.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that the views about reluctance to become involved in war cite different groups of people and/or that opposition to Hitler is expressed by Churchill in one source and by 'most people' in the other.

- (b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far was the appeasement of Germany a misguided policy during the 1930s?

(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 policy was misguided against others which do not. All three sources provide references

pertinent to the appropriateness or otherwise of the policy of appeasement of Germany and candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** demonstrates the strength of public anti-war feeling and, by implication, that war was to be avoided, but nevertheless, when policy had been unsuccessful and war did break out in 1939, 'most stepped forward to serve'
- **Source B** gives reasons for opposition to war with the implication that appeasement was appropriate through non-confrontation and it also points out that Germany hoped to gain from the anti-war sentiments. However, it also points out Churchill's condemnation of Hitler and by implication therefore that appeasement was misguided
- **Source C** reveals the change in British policy from appeasement after Munich and particularly in 1939 with war becoming viewed as 'inevitable' and 'necessary'. The clear implication is that appeasement had failed to prevent war.

From their own knowledge there should be evidence and debate about how far appeasement was a misguided policy.

Factors suggesting that it was misguided might include:

- it failed to prevent war and was therefore misguided.
- governments in Britain, at least until 1938–39, did not fully understand the foreign ambitions of Hitler and the aims of the Nazi regime, for example German rearmament, occupation of the Rhineland and Austria were largely unopposed and thereby encouraged Hitler towards further conquests.
- in particular Neville Chamberlain's pursuit of active appeasement, most notably over the Sudetenland crisis, failed to prevent Hitler's conquest of Czechoslovakia and subsequent aggression.
- that Churchill was proved to be right about Germany's aggression and that appeasement failed in the end to prevent conflict breaking out.
- from March 1939 with Germany's occupation of Czechoslovakia, appeasement had to be abandoned with the guarantees given to Poland and other states (even if Chamberlain himself tried to avoid conflict right up to 3 September).

Factors suggesting that appeasement was not misguided might include:

- that appeasement was a continuation of policy, e.g. seen at Locarno, in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, or the World Disarmament Conference, which had maintained peace
- that in a democracy government policy had to remain in line with public opinion (to avoid war if at all possible), e.g. Baldwin's refusal to publicly advocate rearmament during the 1935 Election
- appeasement policy during the 1930s and particularly from 1935 was successful, e.g. over German rearmament, the naval treaty, the Rhineland, Austria and notably the Sudetenland by keeping Britain out of European conflict
- Chamberlain's Agreement at Munich was a genuine attempt to maintain 'Peace in our Time' and, as things did turn out, provided a year for British preparation for war if it came.

Good answers may conclude by considering the debate amongst historians about the justification and/or appropriateness of appeasement policy (though without detailed historiography), and whether Churchill (and others) were right to see appeasement policy as misguided.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Britain disagreed with her allies about the treatment of Germany at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-3**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

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

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Britain disagreed with her main allies.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the leaders of all of the three main allies, Lloyd George for Britain, Woodrow Wilson for the USA and Clemenceau for France had fixed, but very different, ideas about the treatment of the defeated Germany
- Wilson put forward his idealistic view based on his 'Fourteen Points' and particularly that of a peace settlement based on 'self-determination' including that principle for Germans. Britain was concerned with the implications of the principle for Ireland and the British Empire, and that Germany could not expect to benefit from the principle fully, given her responsibility for causing the War
- Clemenceau essentially wanted revenge against Germany and above all future security for France which entailed not only German disarmament but transfer of swathes of territory including the Rhineland to France. Lloyd George (if not the British public)

believed that too strong punishment of Germany would lay the seeds of future conflict between (the old enemies of) France and Germany

- Lloyd George took a 'middle way', moderating between the idealism of Wilson and the 'revanche' approach of France, with no strong commitment to either self-determination or French policy on security. Overall his approach brought compromise between the other two of the 'big three', e.g. over territorial and colonial changes, German disarmament and reparations. Overall Lloyd George understood the need for a future politically and economically stable Germany for the good of Europe and Britain.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might prioritise Britain's desire to avoid sowing (too many) seeds of future conflict in Europe, or how far Britain's compromises with France were more difficult than those with the USA.

- (b) 'The views of J.M. Keynes were the most important factor in explaining Britain's treatment of Germany in the years following the Treaty of Versailles until 1929.'
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 Keynes's views were the most important factor against others which do not.

Points which agree about the importance of Keynes' views might include:

- his resignation of his post at the Treasury in protest at the scale of the reparations imposed on Germany, an action later understood by some leading politicians
- his support of the approach of Lloyd George that Europe, for both economic and political reasons, needed an economically successful Germany and that excessive reparations made that difficult to achieve
- his book, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (1919), was influential in changing opinion in Britain which understood Keynes' view that a permanently crippled Germany would hinder, if not prevent, the recovery of the whole post-war European economies
- during the 1920s there was acceptance by British governments that a 'new' democratic Germany (Weimar Republic) had emerged. Permanent European peace should be based on mutually accepted agreements rather than the imposition of 1919
- British governments under Lloyd George, Bonar Law, Baldwin and especially MacDonald took a more conciliatory and pragmatic line concerning enforcement of the terms of Versailles at least in part influenced by the Keynesian view).

Points which disagree that Keynes's views were the most important factor might include:

- at the beginning of the period his view about the Peace Treaty had little influence
- even Lloyd George, who politically had to take a rather tougher approach to Germany on reparations, was heavily criticised in Britain for his 'leniency', especially by about 200 Conservative M.P.s
- the views of Keynes, not only on reparations, but also on the economy and unemployment during the period, found only limited support
- fading memories of the experiences of the Great War over the period, rather than because of the influence of the views of Keynes, led to governments and public believing that Germany had been treated too harshly and policy therefore should change
- generally public opinion evolved in line with British governments' actions and policies rather than because of the influence of one economist. Examples of government actions, e.g. getting the French to withdraw from the Ruhr, the revised schemes of German reparations' payments under the Dawes and Young Plans, the Locarno Treaty in which the treatment of Germany was completely different from the approach taken in the Versailles Treaty, admission of Germany to the League (1926), early withdrawal of British occupation forces, and Austen Chamberlain's close working with Briand and particularly Stresemann, might be cited.

Question 3

- (a) 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 candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Britain joined the Stresa Front.

Candidates may refer to some of the following long term factors:

- the overall aim was to maintain good relations with Italy and (together with France) present a united front against Hitler's Germany
- Britain had given diplomatic support in 1934 to Italy's action in preventing Hitler's attempted takeover of Austria. (Anschluss was forbidden by the Treaties of Versailles and St Germain.)

And some of the following short term factors:

- though it was Mussolini's Italy which initiated the Stresa Front in April 1935 to oppose Hitler's breaking of the Versailles Treaty, Britain and France were prepared to join
- the main concern of all three countries by, and in, 1935 was German rearmament. In 1933 Hitler had declared that Germany would no longer abide by the disarmament

clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. He had withdrawn Germany from the Disarmament Conference and League of Nations, and made no secret about his programme of rearmament

- the introduction of conscription in Germany in early 1935 was the catalyst for the establishment of the Stresa Front and Britain's decision to join
- Britain wanted to display its resolve to work in partnership to oppose aggression.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might prioritise concern over conscription or German rearmament in general, or explain that British policy was hesitant and contradictory, never being as committed to the Stresa Front as Italy. At the time that Britain was signing up to the Front she was also having direct negotiations with Germany over naval forces.

- (b) 'Britain's attempts to appease Mussolini in the 1930s were successful.'
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 appeasement of Mussolini was successful against others which do not.

Points which agree with the premise that attempts were successful might include:

- relations between Britain and Fascist Italy were generally positive and co-operative before the invasion of Abyssinia and seemed to have been cemented by the formation of the Stresa Front

-
- there was sympathy for Italy's imperial ambitions before 1935 (and a piece of British Somaliland had actually been transferred to Italy back in 1925)
 - in signing up to the Stresa Front Britain preserved close relations with Italy especially with regard to German rearmament
 - the Foreign Secretary (from June 1935), Sir Samuel Hoare, was successful diplomatically for a time in keeping Mussolini and Italy on the side of Britain (and France). The countries worked together both in the League and bilaterally during the time that it was clear Mussolini was looking to extend the Italian empire in east Africa by incorporating Abyssinia. Mussolini himself later proclaimed that he made his intentions clear at the time of the Stresa conference with Britain making no objections
 - though Britain (and the League) applied economic sanctions, Britain had some success in appeasing Mussolini through the exclusion of oil and keeping open the Suez Canal to Italian shipping, which meant that the Italian war effort in Abyssinia was not seriously hampered
 - for a time it looked as if the (initially secret) Hoare-Laval Plan to make concessions to Mussolini over Abyssinia in order to keep Italy on side against Germany might work.

Points which disagree with the view that attempts to appease Mussolini were successful might include:

- though committing itself to the Stresa Front, Britain had already undermined the relationship with Italy by direct negotiations with Germany over the Anglo-German Naval Treaty
- despite the efforts of Hoare, appeasement eventually collapsed over the Italian conquest of Abyssinia
- when details of the Hoare-Laval Plan were leaked in Britain, there was strong protest (out-of-line with the political and public's usual support of appeasement). Cinema newsreels had shown the devastation heaped upon defenceless African villages by Italian aircraft and flame-throwers. Largely as a result of public and press opinion the government had to abandon the plan to appease Mussolini and Hoare resigned
- following Hoare's resignation Britain supported the League's position in condemning the Italian invasion and refusing to recognise the conquest, a position which infuriated Mussolini and ended any possibility of Italy remaining as an ally against Germany. British policy had been ambiguous. The attempt at appeasement had failed either to prevent the full conquest of Abyssinia or preserve the Stresa Front
- indeed British appeasement attempts were totally unsuccessful as Mussolini not only 'went over' to Hitler's side and signed the Rome-Berlin Pact, but supported German reoccupation of the Rhineland (during the Abyssinian crisis), incorporation of Austria into the Reich which Mussolini had previously opposed, and later the Sudetenland, and intervened with Hitler in the Spanish Civil War
- ultimately Mussolini supported Germany's actions in 1939 and entered the war against Britain at the time of the fall of France.

Good answers are likely to conclude that attempts at appeasement were largely successful until the collapse of the Hoare-Laval Plan, but for the last half of the decade, following Britain's condemnation of the conquest of Abyssinia, appeasement was not only unsuccessful but also redundant as far as relations with Italy were concerned.