Solutions

Marking: **M1** a correct method, **A1** the correct answer, **B1** an independent mark.

Each answer shows the steps, then the **result**.

2.1

a policy of giving in to some of the demands of an aggressive state in order to avoid war, e.g. Britain and France towards Germany in 1938

2.2

any two, explained: memory of the First World War: about 10 million soldiers had died, and the public was strongly against another war; Britain needed time to rearm: fighters and radar were not ready until about 1939–40; many thought Versailles had been too harsh, so some German demands, e.g. the Rhineland, seemed fair; economic weakness in the Depression and the Dominions' unwillingness to fight

3.1

any three, from the source: war preparations (trenches, gas masks) were horrible / he was horrified by the idea of war; it was a quarrel in a far-away country; between people the British knew nothing about, so Britain had little at stake; Britain could not involve the whole Empire in war simply for a small nation

3.2

the Nazi–Soviet Pact was cynical / an agreement between enemies; details: Hitler and Stalin bow politely while calling each other insults, over the body of Poland, which they have destroyed together

3.3

value: origin: a leading MP speaking in Parliament days after Munich, so it shows the views of the critics of appeasement at the time; content/purpose: to persuade Parliament that Munich was a defeat, so it shows how serious some thought the loss of Czechoslovakia was; limitations: purpose: Churchill was a long-standing opponent of Chamberlain's policy, so he presents only one side; origin: speaking in October 1938, he could not know what happened next, e.g. whether the extra year helped Britain rearm

3.4

Award [1] for each point of comparison or contrast, up to [6]; if the sources are discussed separately, with no linking, award up to [3]. Points that may be included: similarities: both see Munich as a loss for Britain and its allies in some way: C a "total and unmitigated defeat", D handing over the Czech defences; both suggest Munich strengthened Germany; both show that France and Britain were involved together (C mentions France; D British choices); differences: C condemns the agreement completely, whereas D says Chamberlain had few good choices; D says Munich gained time to build fighters and radar, whereas C sees no gain; C was written at the time by a critic, whereas D looks back with hindsight and weighs both sides

3.5

Mark with the markbands: [7-9] focused on the question, sources and own knowledge used together as evidence, synthesis, a clear judgement; [4-6] sources and own knowledge used, but not always linked; some analysis; [1-3] sources or own knowledge only, mostly description. Points that may be included: reasonable: the public and the Dominions opposed war, and memories of 1914–18 were strong (Sources A and D); Britain was not ready: few modern fighters; the extra year let it build fighters and radar (Source D); many believed some German demands, e.g. over the Sudeten Germans, were understandable after Versailles; not reasonable: Munich was a "defeat" (Source C): Czechoslovakia's defences and arms factories went to Germany (Source D); Hitler took the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, showing that his aims went beyond German-speaking areas; appeasement convinced Hitler that Britain would not fight, and the Soviet Union, left out at Munich, signed the Nazi–Soviet Pact (Source B); Germany also rearmed in the extra year; judgement: understandable given Britain's position in 1938, but it rested on a wrong judgement of Hitler's aims

exercises.lol exercises.com.cn