



A-level History

7042/2K-Component 2K International Relations and Global Conflict,
c1890–1941
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

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 threats to international stability. **[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

- coming from a Soviet newspaper, the editorial is defensive of the Soviet position, so offers a partisan, thus seemingly less valuable, view of the threats posed to international security
- the emphasis of the source suggests that Nazi Germany poses the largest threat to international security, as would be expected from a communist newspaper
- the tone is one of anger and expresses an urgency for a united response against German rearmament as there is great threat to international security at this time.

Content and argument

- the editorial is reporting the Russian response to Nazi Germany's revelation that they had been rearming against the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, suggesting that Germany was rejecting any system of international security
- the implication is that not only was Germany responsible for this threat to security, but so were the other 'great powers' who had been complicit in the un-doing of the Treaty of Versailles, particularly the British government who felt that perhaps the Treaty had been overly harsh and sought to appease Germany
- Nazi Germany was only able to rearm without repercussion following the collapse of the Geneva Conference. Britain and the US had not supported France's desire to build greater defences against Germany and there was an overall failure to agree to disarmament which would have helped bring about the 'preservation of peace'
- the quote from the Soviet newspaper calls for a 'system of mutual assistance against German aggression'. By this point Germany had withdrawn from the League of Nations, encouraged an attempted coup in Austria and launched a wide scale rearmament programme, all of which posed a significant threat to international stability.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the article comes from a magazine with conservative views, which may show some sympathy towards a right wing regime, but would also be supportive of the current Conservative government in power at the time
- as a paper writing at a time when many in Britain were anti-war and desired international collaboration, the article may seek to suggest to the public that all was well rather than stir concern
- the tone of the article is cautious, attempting to offer a balanced attitude towards Hitler based on what his response may be to rearmament, perhaps withholding judgement until more is known about the potential threat at hand.

Content and argument

- the article is exploring the possible outcomes of a speech due from Hitler regarding rearmament and a previous conference in which proposals were made to Germany about what would be permissible as a form of defence. The source also states that it was Britain who was about to announce an extension of the air force, suggesting it was Britain rather than Germany who was initiating an ‘arms race’
- the article is reserving judgement on Hitler and the threat posed by Nazi Germany, suggesting that Britain must wait and respond favourably if Hitler does, or consider action if he is ‘aggressive or aggressively defensive’
- the article warns of a potential threat of aggression, but ‘not regards actual war’. The danger is that of an arms race, something that had been a prequel to the First World War. Hitler’s announcement of a German Luftwaffe and conscription, which defied the Treaty of Versailles, was not something to be ignored
- however, the article is almost conciliatory, arguing that Britain could not expect Germany to just allow an expansion of the air force, reflecting a desire to work with Hitler rather than against him, as evidenced by the London Conference and support of Germany’s gradual dismantling of the Treaty of Versailles.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- being written by Hitler, the assumption would be that he would play down any threat posed by Germany and in the source it is clear that he is emphasizing the need for self-defence, which may limit the value of the information on offer
- as an internal memorandum written for Goering, there may be more value in the source than first expected; it appears to be trying to justify the reasons for the Four Year Plan to Goering
- the emphasis is one of warning that Germany needs to be prepared for a coming conflict, with the tone determined and somewhat persuasive in trying to convince Goering of the importance of the Four Year Plan.

Content and argument

- Hitler is arguing that the greatest threat to security is Bolshevism and that all nations, apart from Germany and Italy, have been corrupted by the left. Many nations were more concerned about the threats posed by the left than the right, with Mussolini and the Japanese being appeased in the early 1930s
- Hitler implies that there is a coming war and that it is Soviet Russia who poses the threat. The ideological differences between the two nations made such a conflict increasingly likely, but the

Nazis made no secret of their desire to crush Bolshevism so the suggestion that Germany was acting on the defensive is not wholly accurate

- Hitler comments on the need to secure Germany's 'existence by every means' could be referring to the ongoing rearmament of Germany and continuing actions which sought to overturn the Treaty of Versailles
- the Four Year Plan was designed to ready Germany for an inevitable war and the existence of such a plan would imply that Germany did pose a threat to international stability.

Section B

02 'By c1900, the autocracies of Europe were stronger than the liberal democracies.'

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, including those which compare a single area (e.g. the armed forces), will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that by c1900, the autocracies of Europe were stronger than the liberal democracies might include:

- Germany was industrially superior to all the other Great Powers, with a large workforce and dominance in 'new' technologies. Germany's coal industry was treble that of France and Britain could not compete with Germany's industrial might, with the British share of world trade falling significantly by 1900
- the Russian Tsars used widespread repression to control revolutionary activity and by 1900 had lessened the powers of more democratic bodies, like *zemstva*, to ensure the position of the monarchy. In Germany, Kaiser Wilhelm II actively controlled decision-making, with his powers enshrined in the constitution
- in comparison, the relatively new French 'Third Republic' was made up of a wide range of small political parties with radically different views which made decision-making incredibly difficult. There were 10 different Prime Ministers in the 1890s, which weakened the position of France overall
- Germany had the most powerful army, whilst Russia had the largest. Germany invested heavily in military spending and pride in the German military emphasized this strength. Meanwhile, the British public disapproved of large military budgets and a long difficult conflict in the Second Boer War showed the weaknesses of the British Army.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that by c1900, the autocracies of Europe were stronger than the liberal democracies might include:

- decision-making was a slow process in Austria-Hungary thanks to the *Ausgleich* of 1867 which gave the two nations equal status; the separate parliaments fought for the best interests of their state, which made it difficult to be decisive in a Dual Monarchy with shared foreign policy, army and budgets
- by 1900 Britain still had the largest empire, which granted access to a wide range of raw materials and an expansive market to trade with. Alongside this empire, Britain had the largest navy and the Naval Defence Act of 1889 ensured that this remained at least as large as the next two in size combined
- despite improvements under Witte, the Russian economy still lagged far behind that of the other Great Powers, with its expansive agriculture unreformed and attempted moves towards industrialisation causing extensive debt. Austria-Hungary also had stunted economic growth, even lagging behind that of Russia
- although having the largest army in terms of man-power, the Russian army was massively inferior to that of the democracies; the soldiers were poorly trained, of ill-health and significantly under-equipped due to the limited industrial nature and weak economy of the nation.

Although Germany certainly had both industrial and military might, the weaknesses of Russia and Austria-Hungary, alongside the imperial supremacy of Britain, suggest that it is difficult to generalise regarding the strengths of autocracy versus democracy at the turn of the twentieth century.

- 03** To what extent was the Bosnian Crisis of 1908–9 caused by the rise of panslavism after 1900? **[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 Bosnian Crisis of 1908–9 was caused by the rise of panslavism after 1900 might include:

- on-going tensions in the Balkan region led to rising nationalism and posed a significant threat to the Austrian Empire. Austria-Hungary sought to confirm their position in Bosnia-Herzegovina in an attempt to quell possible rebellion
- the Serbian Coup of 1903, which saw the rise of a pro-Russian monarch and government, had heightened fears of united rebellion from the Slavic regions of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and drove the desire to confirm the status of Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Serbia regarded Bosnia-Herzegovina as a Slav state (with 44% of the population being Serbian) who needed to be liberated from foreign rule, Austria-Hungary believed the only option was to act quickly to protect their interests in the region, leading to the annexation
- Russia's defeat in the 1905 Russo-Japanese War had sparked a revolution and growing panslavism, with many looking for solutions to reverse Russia's apparent decline. This posed a threat to the Austro-Hungarian empire if Russia sought land and allies within the Slavic regions.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the Bosnian Crisis of 1908–9 was caused by the rise of panslavism after 1900 might include:

- the 1878 Treaty of Berlin had limited Russian gains after their victory in the Russo-Turkish War, whilst allowing Austria-Hungary to occupy Bosnia-Herzegovina. This caused tension between the two nations and a desire amongst both to confirm their position in the Balkans
- the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 had sparked fears within Austria-Hungary of a resurgence of Turkish power, and a sense of urgency that there was a need to protect Bosnia-Herzegovina from the threat of the Ottoman Empire
- when the Young Turks invited representatives from Bosnia and Herzegovina to join their parliament, Austria-Hungary realised that they would quickly lose the justification that annexation was to protect Bosnia-Herzegovina from the Ottomans, so Austria-Hungary had to act quickly after the Young Turk Revolution
- the desire for Russian access to the Black Sea Straits, which had been blocked after the Treaty of Berlin, led to negotiations with Austria-Hungary and a provisional agreement between the two nations for Bosnia-Herzegovina's annexation in return for Russian access to the Straits.

Whilst the circumstances surrounding the Young Turk Revolution pushed Austria-Hungary into action, they had long been concerned about rise of panslavism and its threat to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Increased nationalistic activity in the Balkan region drove Austria-Hungary to act in order to secure their position in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

- 04** 'The most significant problem faced by the League of Nations in the 1920s was the absence of the USA.'

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 most significant problem faced by the League of Nations in the 1920s was the absence of the USA might include:

- as the USA did not join the League of Nations, leadership was left to Britain and France. This meant that the League had a European bias rather than an international outlook and thus problem solving was Eurocentric and driven by desires to protect European interests rather than collective international security
- British PM Lloyd George labelled the League as a 'lame duck' without US membership, doubting the League's authority. He felt that it would only serve to be counterproductive without America who had played such a key role in the formation of the League
- without US membership the League lacked authority and political influence, which meant that they relied heavily on economic sanctions. Unfortunately, any trade restrictions/boycotts lacked weight without the world's biggest exporter (the USA) being tied into these actions against those who threatened collective security
- the USA went on to act outside of the League of Nations to pursue their own foreign policy objectives. Events such as the Washington Naval Conference of 1921 and subsequent Nine-power Pact undermined the need for the League.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the most significant problem faced by the League of Nations in the 1920s was the absence of the USA might include:

- in the 1920s France was preoccupied with a fear of German resurgence and sought to pursue policies of self-interest rather than supporting the covenant of the League. For example, France was reluctant to act during the Polish invasion of Vilna as the Poles were potential allies against German aggression, thus the League did not respond to the invasion
- attempts to move forward with disarmament and securing long-term peace were unsuccessful in the 1920s. The proposed Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1923, which expected all member nations to send troops to defend victims of aggression, was never enacted and offered limited guidance on how to deal with disarmament
- an attempt to define 'acts of aggression' in the Geneva Protocol of 1924 simply served to undermine the League. International reaction was lukewarm and Britain chose not to ratify the Protocol, suggesting that the drive for collective security was unpopular
- alternatively, the League did have some successes in the 1920s; Upper Silesia was successfully split following a plebiscite and the Aaland Islands declared Finnish with Swedish agreement. It could also be argued that the League did not face any challenging problems in the 1920s, so it didn't really matter if the US was a member or not.

Overall, the decision of the USA not to join the League of Nations, despite Woodrow Wilson's pivotal role in its formation, set the League up for failure. Without the Americans the League lacked the power to act, leaving Britain and France to drive actions that simply suited their own self-interests rather than the concept of collective security throughout the 1920s.