



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2010**

**AS History 1041**

**HIS2J**

**Unit 2J**

**Britain and Appeasement, 1919–1940**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 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

---

June 2010

**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 Britain's readiness to go to war. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

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 Chamberlain prepared Britain for 'a large war' by 1939. **Source A**, on the other hand, suggests that Baldwin put Britain in a position of relative military weakness
- While **Source B** indicates an increase in military spending from £185 million in 1936 to £719 million in 1939, **Source A** claims that Britain's level of armaments had made her militarily dominant over Germany in early 1936, but that the position had been reversed by late 1938 at the time of Munich
- **Source B** covers the armaments situation right up to 1939, whereas **Source A** covers the period only to the time of Munich in September 1938.

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

- the view that 'blame' for British appeasement of Germany at Munich lay with Chamberlain, whereas **Source A** puts the blame for lack of sufficient armaments at the time on Baldwin
- the 'passive' appeasement of Germany whilst Baldwin was the dominant British politician compared with the 'active' appeasement of Chamberlain. (**Source A** argues that decisions taken by Baldwin allowed Nazi Germany to gain military superiority)
- that Churchill was the most well known of the critics (referred to in **Source A**) who believed defence spending was never high enough under Baldwin or Chamberlain.

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

- both sources suggest Baldwin wanted rearmament only on a limited basis. (**Source B** states that Chamberlain also initially shared that view, but changed radically after he became Prime Minister.)

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that, in contrast with the weight of historical interpretation, **Source A** lays the blame for lack of British rearmament (and by implication appeasement) on Baldwin, whereas **Source B** goes some way to absolve Chamberlain.

---

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

How far was Stanley Baldwin responsible for Britain's appeasement policies during the 1930s? (24 marks)

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

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 Baldwin was responsible against others which do not. All three sources provide references to

Baldwin and/or to the context of his time in power as well as to other factors and candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** argues that Baldwin (with no one else mentioned) was responsible for the lack of British preparedness for war and allowing Germany to overtake Britain in terms of military superiority. This meant that Baldwin must be blamed for British policy at Munich (although the source does not actually mention the word 'appeasement')
- **Source B**, whilst acknowledging that Baldwin, and also Chamberlain, initially wanted limited rearmament, Chamberlain as Prime Minister adopted a policy of greatly increased rearmament in preparation for 'total mobilisation'. It can be inferred that Baldwin was responsible for lack of preparation for war and by extension that Britain, in a relatively weak position, pursued appeasement policies
- **Source C** lays the blame for low spending on arms and a lack of concern about international affairs on the impact of the Depression. Chamberlain is singled out for mention but in relation to arms spending in 1932. This was at a time before appeasement was developed in relation to the dictators in Europe, though Baldwin then was the leader of the dominant party in the National government.

From their own knowledge candidates should provide evidence that Baldwin was responsible for Britain's appeasement policies balanced against factors which place responsibility elsewhere.

Factors suggesting that Baldwin was responsible might include:

- the level of rearmament implemented by Baldwin up to May 1937
- his failure to act (with or without the League) against Japanese aggression in the Far East
- his appeasement policies towards Hitler's breaking of the Versailles Treaty through German rearmament and refusal to pay further reparations
- ambivalent relations with Italy in the Stresa Front and over Abyssinia
- failure to take action over Hitler's remilitarisation of the Rhineland
- failure to take effective action against the Fascist powers in the Spanish Civil War.

Factors suggesting that Baldwin was not (wholly) responsible and that there were other important factors might include:

- (as a main focus) the responsibility of Chamberlain with his pursuit of 'active' appeasement rather than the 'passive' appeasement of Baldwin. Reference can be made to the Spanish Civil War and/or the Anschluss, but should certainly refer to the handling of the Sudetenland crisis (Munich) and possibly subsequent events leading to the outbreak of war
- the impact of the Depression
- the influence of public opinion on democratic government and desire to avoid another war
- fear of the Soviet Union and Germany's usefulness as a barrier against the westwards expansion of communism
- some admiration for the dictators especially amongst Conservatives
- that appeasement policies had their origins in Britain's foreign policy during the 1920s.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Baldwin was only partly responsible for Britain's appeasement policies and that other politicians, notably Chamberlain, and other factors such as



the impact of the Depression or public opinion's influence on rearmament policy and desire to avoid war, were also significant.

## Question 2

**03** Explain why Britain supported the concept of Collective Security in the early 1920s. (12 marks)

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

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 supported the concept.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the concept of Collective Security was fundamental to the aims of the League of Nations. Britain, like other countries, had to find ways of preventing another Great War, or indeed any war
- the main aim of the League was to maintain peace through collective discussions and, when necessary, collective action. Britain was a supporter of this approach and together with France was a leading member of the League. (This did not prevent Britain, however, from taking diplomatic and other action outside the League and concept of Collective Security in the early 1920s, e.g. over the Chanak crisis, in relations with the Soviet Union, the U.S.A and France, especially over the occupation of the Ruhr in the case of the last)

- during the period Britain and the League (despite crises over Russia and the Ruhr) did not have to tackle disputes which threatened world peace and therefore the concept of Collective Security could be supported (with varying degrees of enthusiasm by different politicians and parties)
- the Labour Party gave stronger support to Collective Security as a means of maintaining peace than the Conservatives or what Lloyd George could give as leader of the Conservative dominated coalition to 1922
- the most enthusiastic Prime Minister and government in supporting the concept of Collective Security in this period were Ramsay MacDonald and Labour in 1924 MacDonald developed the concept of Collective Security for solving disputes through his proposed Geneva Protocol. Under it League members were to pledge to accept international arbitration in disputes which might lead to war and support victims of aggression. This built on those clauses of the Covenant of the League which allowed for the collective taking of diplomatic, economic and military sanctions against aggressors
- following the fall of the Labour government the Geneva Protocol was no longer sponsored by Britain and never accepted by the League. Baldwin's Conservative government, reluctant to become further involved with the League, refused to support it.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might prioritise that Britain wished to avoid another war and Collective Security was seen as one means of doing so, or they may question the degree of commitment to the concept especially by the Coalition and Conservative governments.

---

**Question 2**

- 04** 'The Locarno Treaties of 1925 were a triumph of British foreign policy.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

**Indicative content**

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

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that the Treaties were a triumph of British foreign policy against others which do not.

Points which agree with the view that they were a triumph might include:

- since 1923 Britain, through the efforts of the Labour government and then particularly through those of the Conservative Foreign Secretary, Austen Chamberlain, had been

---

attempting to bring about real and permanent reconciliation with the now democratic Germany. Locarno achieved that

- Chamberlain worked successfully with Stresemann and Briand to achieve the Treaties. They agreed that permanent European peace should be based on mutually accepted agreements, reconciliation and fulfilment rather than the imposition of 1919
- the most important of the Treaties, to which Britain achieved agreement was that dealing with the western frontiers of Germany
- Germany now voluntarily accepted her western frontiers, demilitarisation of the Rhineland and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, all changes which had been enforced upon her at Versailles
- at Locarno it was agreed that the now peaceful and genuinely European Weimar Germany could be admitted to the League, which she had previously believed to be a 'victors' club' to enforce Versailles, and there was also to be early ending of occupied parts of Germany (initially Cologne)
- at and after Locarno there did seem to be genuine reconciliation and establishment of real European peace, achievements in which Britain had played a major part.

Points which disagree that the Locarno Treaties were a triumph of British foreign policy might include:

- the Treaties and especially that dealing with Germany's western frontiers were as much an achievement of Briand (with France having the most direct interest in the matter), Stresemann and also the League of Nations, than just of Britain
- Stresemann and the German government may have accepted the arrangements made at Versailles for the western frontiers of Germany and permanent demilitarisation of the Rhineland, but they did not accept the settlement of the eastern frontiers (with Poland and Czechoslovakia) and no agreement was reached on them at Locarno. (There was no 'eastern Locarno')
- no arrangements were made for defence of France's and Belgium's frontiers should the need arise
- the 'sweetness and light' of Locarno rather disguised underlying grievances and distrust of many, including Britons, about the Great War and especially in Germany about the original Peace Treaty of 1919.

Good answers may conclude that the Locarno Treaties were an achievement rather than a triumph and that success came from other sources than just Britain.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why Britain made a naval treaty with Germany in 1935. (12 marks)

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

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 a naval treaty was made.

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

- initially after Hitler came to power he expressed a desire for a peaceful understanding with Britain and the MacDonald National government (preoccupied with the Depression) seemed to accept his sincerity
- many politicians, especially those on the right of the Conservative Party, and, to an extent, public opinion, believed that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh and Hitler had a genuine case for rectifying some of the 'excesses' it contained.

and some of the following immediate factors:

- with German conscription and the clear breaking of the disarmament clauses of Versailles British policy became hesitant and contradictory. Though it was Mussolini who mainly initiated the Stresa Front in April 1935 to oppose Hitler's breaking of the Versailles Treaty, Britain and France were prepared to join and agreed to mutual defence against 'any unilateral repudiation of treaties'. However, Britain immediately

broke that agreement by seeking to do its own deal with Hitler, signed in June 1935 when Baldwin was 'inheriting' the premiership

- from Britain's point of view, given that it was not going to intervene physically to prevent the building of a German fleet, the sensible and realistic policy was to limit it by agreement. Memories of the pre-First World War naval race were still strong
- the Anglo-German Naval Agreement allowed for a German navy to be 35% the size of the Royal Navy. Under certain circumstances there could be equality in submarine strength. The British government believed a German navy of this strength would not be a threat to Britain
- it was prepared to make this unilateral Agreement, to protect Britain's own interests, behind its Stresa partners' backs and contrary to the concept of collective security. There was the threat of the Japanese navy to be considered and another naval race was out of the question, on political and military grounds as well as economic.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons give, for example they might argue that, given Hitler's clear intention of building a fleet, limiting its size by agreement was the main motive driving British policy, or recognise that through the bilateral Treaty with Germany British policy was ambivalent and meant that Britain herself had broken clauses of the Versailles Treaty and no longer took seriously those clauses which required German disarmament, thus weakening her moral, as well as political and military positions, in relation to Hitler's further breaking of the Treaty of Versailles.

**Question 3**

- 06** 'The Stresa Front collapsed because of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

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 those points which agree with the view that the Front did collapse because of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty against others which do not.

---

Points which agree that the collapse was due to the Treaty might include:

- until the signing of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty diplomatic relations between Britain and Italy remained good, for example Britain had given diplomatic support in 1934 to Italy's action in preventing Hitler's attempted takeover of Austria
- the main concern of Britain, France and Italy in 1935 was German rearmament and this is why the Stresa Front was formed in April
- however, British policy became contradictory. Britain was never as committed to the Stresa Front as Italy and a bilateral Treaty with Germany was bound to undermine the relationship
- the Naval Treaty seriously strained the relationship and trust established at Stresa. As a result the Stresa Front became of limited significance, or even worthless, as a united position of Britain and Italy (and France) hardly existed.

Points which disagree with the view that the Front collapsed because of the Treaty might include:

- despite the signing of the Naval Treaty relations between Britain and Fascist Italy remained generally positive and co-operative until Mussolini's invasion of Abyssinia in October 1935
- it was the invasion of Abyssinia which caused the Stresa Front to fall apart
- British policy was hesitant as well as contradictory. Both government and public opinion were torn between sympathy for the Abyssinians and the desire to avoid being involved in war
- this was reflected in British support for the League's attempt at collective action, mainly through economic sanctions, (a policy which helped Baldwin to win the 1935 General Election), and an attempt at a peaceful solution which would satisfy Mussolini's ambitions in Abyssinia
- the latter resulted in the Hoare-Laval Plan. This was an attempt by Britain (and France) to prevent Italy aligning itself with Germany. This made it clear that it was Britain's (rather muddled) reaction to the Abyssinian crisis rather than the existence of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty which led to the complete breakdown of the Stresa Front
- British public opinion led to Hoare's resignation and Britain then supported the League's position in condemning the Italian invasion and refusing to recognise the conquest, and it was this position which so infuriated Mussolini and ended any remaining faint possibility of Italy remaining as an ally against Germany's rearmament (and foreign) policies.

Good answers are likely to conclude that British policy had been ambivalent resulting in the attempt to present a united front against Germany failing. They may recognise that the signing of the Naval Treaty and (changing) policy over the Abyssinian crisis had led to the opposite of what was intended in driving Mussolini towards Hitler. Hitler was able to reoccupy the Rhineland in March 1936 with no effective action taken by the now non-existent Stresa Front.