
A-LEVEL

History

Component 2K International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941
Mark scheme

7042
June 2017

Version: 1.0 Final

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

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 from aqa.org.uk

June 2017

A-level

Component 2K International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1917

Section A

- 01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the potential threats to international stability in Europe by 1900 posed by colonial rivalry. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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 must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Bernhard von Bülow, as foreign minister, was chiefly responsible for carrying out the policy of colonial expansion and would therefore be very knowledgeable on the territorial expansion of Germany and the other Powers
- as Bülow would become Chancellor in 1900 it could be argued that he was clearly liked by Kaiser Wilhelm II (who appointed both ministers and chancellors) and that Bülow was therefore a supporter of an aggressive German foreign policy, thus the source reflects an aggressive German point of view
- the tone of the source is passionate and rousing, Bülow is justifying the need for German action in the face of other expanding empires to the Reichstag (who would be needed to pass policy), with some emphasis on the idea that this move is in fact defensive, perhaps in order to garner support from those who may not support a more aggressive foreign policy which may affect value.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that the greatest threat to international stability is colonial rivalry, with the British, French and Russians continuing to expand 'further and further'. Bülow is referring to the *Scramble for Africa* and the tensions between Russia and Britain in Asia that on a number of occasions brought these nations to the brink of war, as seen in the Fashoda Incident
- the source argues that Germany needs to act in the face of this expansion in order to protect themselves, though without aggravating the other nations. Bülow is aware of the threat posed by the other Great Powers who are Germany's greatest competitors
- the source also seems to suggest that it is not Germany who is the biggest threat to international stability and that Germany needs to protect herself politically and economically. A more defensive strategy may have been needed to convince a growing pacifist/socialist influence in the Reichstag which may affect the value of this source
- the source suggests Germany needs to take a 'clear stance' and thus refers to the developing *Weltpolitik* in which Germany sought power through aggressive diplomacy, overseas colonies, and a large navy. This would indeed see the 'restructuring of power relationships for the foreseeable future' as other nations saw Germany as the greatest threat to the Balance of Power in Europe, contrary to Bülow's argument.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a military diplomat stationed in Berlin, the author would likely be party to detailed information on the relationship between Britain and Germany, which would be further developed by regular correspondence with the British Ambassador
- as a confidential letter between the two diplomats, the contents would seemingly be open and honest about the situation at the time, given that Grierson would have expected only Lascelles to read it
- the tone is quite self-satisfied, with the author regaling Lascelles with the story of his encounter with Wilhelm II. There is a sense of pride that the author appears to have a good relationship with the Kaiser, but also there are hints of irony and dislike; and thus there may be an element of embellishment.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that Wilhelm II has an interest in French actions in Africa and believes that the British may be able to offer him information on this, as would be the case given that there were tensions between the British and French at this time in Northern Central Africa
- the source suggests that Germany had been trying to ally with Britain for some time, but it had been Britain refusing this alliance, the inference being that it was not Germany who posed a threat to international stability by 1900, which somewhat affects the value of the source
- the source appears to represent the friendly, yet tenuous relationship between Britain and Germany with links through the royal family, but distrust between the two nations. Kaiser Wilhelm II was jealous of the strength of the British Empire and Navy and had longed to compete on such a scale
- the source also states that Britain was reluctant to form an alliance with other nations in Europe, continuing with her policy of Splendid Isolation and preferring not to take sides at this time. There is a suggestion that a potential threat to Europe is alliances and becoming 'embroiled' in each other's affairs.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source comes from a regional newspaper which had no political allegiance, so would likely provide a rounded view of the British role in events at the time, though as a local newspaper its detailed knowledge of international affairs may be questionable
- as a British newspaper it is likely to present an Anglo-centric viewpoint which, at the time, would potentially show an anti-French sentiment after the Fashoda Incident which saw the two nations clash over territorial claims, thus questioning the value of the source
- the tone of the source is celebratory, seeing the agreement between Britain and France as an achievement, the emphasis being on the suggestion that there will now be an end to the tensions over Northern Central Africa.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that any conflict between France and Britain over colonial issues, at least in Africa, have been resolved primarily in the favour of Britain and that perhaps the

French would have feared a naval conflict with the British, especially given that the Royal Navy was the most powerful in the world

- the source also suggests that although issues over Africa have been concluded, there may still be territorial issues involving Asia, as was the case with Russian and British interests in the region; issues with Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet would not be solved until the 1907 Anglo-Russia Agreement
- the source argues that Europe is pleased to see a peaceful conclusion to the Fashoda Incident, though suggests that there are on-going tensions between the Germans and the French, which was the case nearly thirty years after the Franco-Prussian War and therefore these relations could have a potential threat to international stability
- the source also hints that the Germans had expected to gain from the British and French agreement, perhaps hoping that they would receive some land in Africa, given that other nations had shown a willingness to compromise. This reflects the German *Weltpolitik* and designs to match other nations in the size of their empires, particularly in Africa at this time.

Section B

- 02** ‘Desire to support Britain was more important than German provocation in bringing about the USA’s intervention in the First World War.’

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments/factors suggesting that desire to support Britain was more important than German provocation in bringing about the USA's intervention in the First World War might include:

- Atlanticists strongly championed American intervention in the war in an attempt forge a strategic alliance with Great Britain, a nation which shared the democratic and liberal values the USA represented. This group actively supported the Preparedness Movement and were supported by former President Theodore Roosevelt
- the sinking of the British liner, the Lusitania, in May 1915 had greatly steered public opinion away from neutrality and after the sinking, the US government had begun the 'Preparedness' programme of ship building
- the USA had a considerable financial stake in an allied victory. Half of Britain's war budget was spent on American materials and Britain took out large loans from the US as currency reserves ran low in Europe. The USA needed to support Britain to secure their investment
- some British immigrants in the USA worked actively for intervention. Albanian-Americans campaigned for entry into the war and were overwhelmingly pro-British, with Polish, Slovak, and Czech immigrants enthusiastically pro-war and generally pro-British.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that desire to support Britain was more important than German provocation in bringing about the USA's intervention in the First World War might include:

- the Zimmerman Telegram was seen as the final catalyst that would bring the USA into the war. It was seen as a direct threat with the German promise of support to a Mexican attack on the USA. The telegram challenged long held isolationist attitudes in the US government
- the German declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare in February 1917 greatly threatened US merchant ships, therefore it can be argued that this was a significant factor in forcing US intervention
- the use of German submarines to sink ships carrying supplies was seen as immoral and underhand in both US government and among the American population, there was a sense of the need to stand up for US interests
- although the sinking of the Lusitania had shifted public opinion about staying out of the conflict, US intervention came two years later, arguably only after the Zimmerman Telegram and escalation of unrestricted submarine warfare.

Students may conclude that the Zimmerman Telegram, and thus German provocation, became the final justification for US intervention and was needed to sway the last isolationists in both government and public opinion, but the seeds of US intervention had been planted by the sinking of the Lusitania and a desire to support Britain.

03 ‘The collapse of autocratic empires at the end of the First World War was due to Nationalist ambitions.’

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments/factors suggesting that the collapse of autocratic empires at the end of the First World War was due to Nationalist ambitions might include:

- for nationalists, the Russian Revolution was a cause for celebration and inspired them to strive for independence, such as Polish nationalists who achieved an independent Poland in 1918 with the creation of the Second Polish Republic
- Wilson's Fourteen Points endorsed self-determination and the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities met in April 1918 encouraging independence in Eastern Europe. Pan-Slavism saw the creation of new borders for Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia
- following Czechoslovakia's declaration of independence in October 1918, the dismantling of the Austro-Hungarian empire began. Faced with increasing pressure from nationalists and republicans, Karl I abdicated and fled to Switzerland
- Arab nationalism had been growing in the declining Ottoman Empire since the start of the 20th century and as the war came to a close, Arab nationalists aided in the attack and capture of Damascus; the Young Turk government would collapse at the end of October 1918.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the collapse of autocratic empires at the end of the First World War was due to Nationalist ambitions might include:

- the Russian Revolutions were driven by the difficult circumstances of the war. The deaths of millions, food shortages and a weak government were blamed on Tsar Nicholas I and it was a Soviet of workers and soldiers who refused to acknowledge his authority
- the roots of the German revolution lay in their defeat in the war. German sailors led a revolt in Wilhelmshaven in October 1918, followed by the Kiel mutiny in November. This spread a spirit of unrest across Germany and workers' strikes led to the proclamation of a republic
- the break-up of the Habsburg Empire was inevitable in the context of the war, with different regions operating independently for economic stability, laying the foundations for independence. The victorious allies positively encouraged independence in Eastern Europe
- Emperor Karl I lacked authority to restore the Austro-Hungarian Empire and he had sought an armistice from the Allies in return for granting political freedom to provinces. This would ultimately lead to his abdication and the break-up of the Empire
- the decline of the Ottoman Empire was a long process, driven initially by the liberalism of the Young Turk Movement and the Revolution of 1908. This process was formalised by the Treaty of Sèvres in 1920.

Students may conclude that whilst there was a rise in nationalism and growth in independence movements, it was the collapse of the Habsburg Empire and the wider context of the First World War across Germany, Russia and the Ottoman Empire which had the greater impact on the decline of autocracy within Europe.

- 04** To what extent were Britain and France responsible for the failure to uphold the post-war peace settlements in the years 1933 to 1937? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments/factors suggesting that Britain and France were responsible for the failure to uphold the post-war peace settlements in the years 1933 to 1937 might include:

- the signing of the 1935 Anglo-German Naval Pact undermined the Treaty of Versailles by allowing Germany to rebuild and defied the Stresa Front which had seen Britain, France and Italy attempt to work together to counter German rearmament and expansion
- there was a lack of action against the Italian invasion of Abyssinia, a member of the League of Nations. Britain had ‘no vital interests’ in Abyssinia and Laval (the French foreign minister) reportedly offered Mussolini a free hand to invade without repercussions
- the League of Nations failure to tackle Japan in Manchuria and Italy in Abyssinia suggested that there was nothing in the way of defying the settlements and opened the way for the appeasement of Germany, allowing Hitler to disobey the Treaty of Versailles
- differing views on how to deal with challenges to the peace led to regular disagreements amongst western nations and allowed for dictators to flout terms; the British referred to the remilitarisation of the Rhineland as Germany simply marching into ‘their own back garden’.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Britain and France were responsible for the failure to uphold the post-war peace settlements in the years 1933 to 1937 might include:

- Hitler repeatedly disobeyed the peace treaties; Germany withdrew from the League of Nations in 1933, the Non-Aggression Pact with Poland in 1934 challenged collective security and conscription was officially announced in Germany in March 1935
- Italy had viewed the peace settlements as a ‘mutilated victory’ and Mussolini had taken action in an attempt to restore Italy to the glory days of the Roman Empire. This resulted in the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935, especially after the humiliating defeat there in 1896
- Mussolini’s actions in Abyssinia distracted the western powers and allowed Hitler to take the opportunity to remilitarise the Rhineland in 1936, even though Germany was not militarily ready and acting as though he was making small steps compared to Mussolini
- the circumstances surrounding the Great Depression had made it difficult to make a stand against the aggression of Germany, Italy and Japan. There were limited funds for defence and a lack of desire to detract from domestic affairs to defend the peace settlements
- the inherent weaknesses of the League of Nations must also be considered. The League lacked the power to tackle the problems that arose in the 1930s due to the absence of its own military forces and a lack of involvement from the USA.

Students may conclude that whilst the actions of dictators like Mussolini and Hitler certainly broke the terms of the post-war peace settlements, the actions of Britain and France did little to prevent this aggression, particularly between 1933 and 1937, therefore they could be held responsible for the failure to uphold the post-war peace settlements.