

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2K International Relations & Global Conflict, c1890–1941
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version: 1.0

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

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2K International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August 1939. | [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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance

- It is a speech from a prominent right-wing British politician who had long warned of the danger posed by Nazi Germany.
- Coming from Churchill, an anti-communist, its acceptance of the need to unite with the Soviet Union is telling.
- This desire for an alliance was not necessarily shared by others in government due to the fear of communism that was widespread in Western Europe at the time.

Content and argument

- The source states that the cooperation of the Soviet Union and the Baltic states is crucial in preventing Nazi aggression; given the economic situation in the 1930s all military powers would be needed to mount a successful defence.
- It states that these nations are willing and have the potential military power to unite against Hitler. Hitler's anti-communist stance meant that an alliance with between Britain and the Soviet Union against Germany was possible.
- It is useful in explaining why an alliance between Britain, France and the Soviet Union did not occur as Poland's refusal to allow Russian troops into the country became a sticking point in negotiations. The Soviet Union would eventually turn to the Nazis and sign the Nazi-Soviet pact to protect herself.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone and emphasis is insistent that the aid of the Soviet Union is essential and suggests defeat would be inevitable without it.
- It suggests frustration with the attitude of Poland.

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

Provenance

- It is from the German point of view and von Ribbentrop was an influential figure in the pact (it was named the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, as referred to in Source C).
- It is from Ribbentrop's personal memoir written with the intention of self-justification.

Content and argument

- The source states that Russian neutrality in the German-Polish conflict was necessary to counteract Western moves against Germany.
- It suggests that Stalin showed some reluctance given the issues faced between the two nations (Hitler's blatant anti-communism had been an affront to Soviet Russia), but saw the benefits of the pact, especially after the failed attempts to ally with Britain against Germany.
- It is useful in explaining why the Nazi-Soviet pact was essential to German plans in August 1939 as the Nazis had removed the possibility of a war on two fronts and this enabled the invasion of Poland just days later.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone and emphasis is triumphant.

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

Provenance

- It comes from the Russian point of view, but was not written by someone present.
- It was written some time after the event and has the benefit of hindsight.

Content and argument

- The source acknowledges that the pact was one of convenience given the many issues and ideological conflicts between the nations.
- It argues that the pact successfully delayed war for the Soviet Union, with the Nazi invasion of Russia coming two years later.
- It gave the Germans the opportunity to avoid a war on two fronts [as reflected in Source B].
- It is useful for showing that the pact was inevitable given the circumstances of a failed British/French alliance and increasing aggression of the Nazis by the late 1930s which saw them making moves eastwards (Czechoslovakia, etc).

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone and emphasis is reflective and defensive of the pact and its benefits.
- It stresses the difficulty facing the Soviet Union.

Section B

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 2 | To what extent was the desire for improved relations between France, Britain and Russia responsible for the creation of the Triple Entente in 1907? | [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 supporting the view that the desire for improved relations had led to the creation of the Triple Entente might include:

- Russia believed that an alliance with Britain was necessary if she were to maintain relations with France, especially after the signing of the Entente Cordiale
- Britain had long wished to improve relations with Russia in order to take pressure off Afghanistan and northern India
- Russia's defeat by Japan in 1905 made Russia less of a threat to British interests in China, enabling the Anglo-Russian alliance of 1907 which brought about the Triple Entente
- Russia hoped the improved relations would buy time to focus on domestic affairs, bringing an end to Anglo-Russian rivalry
- the basis of the Entente Cordiale was essentially an understanding over colonial issues which would end longstanding hostility between Britain and France over Africa; better relations would protect the interests of each nation in a number of colonies.

Arguments challenging the view that the desire for improved relations had led to the creation of the Triple Entente might include:

- France's concern about the growth of Germany after the Franco-Prussian war and the Dual Alliance led her to approach Russia to form an alliance which would surround her enemies. The Franco-Russian alliance of 1894 was explicitly directed against Germany
- Germany's aggressive reaction to French claims in Morocco and attempts to break the Anglo-French alliance only cemented the Entente Cordiale and paved the way for the Triple Entente
- growing Anglo-German rivalry economically and militarily (particularly in the Naval Race) forced Britain to find allies to protect her status as a Great Power and help restore the Balance of Power in Europe
- despite the agreements, relations between France, Britain and Russia were not always harmonious; there was still Anglo-Russia rivalry in Persia and a number of key officials in France advocated an alliance with Germany.

Good answers may focus on the fact that whilst relations had improved between the nations, it was the common distrust of a growing, hostile Germany which ultimately brought them together by 1907.

0 3 'War engulfed Europe in 1914 because of the collective failure of the Great Powers to deal with the consequences of the Second Balkan War, 1912–1913.'

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 supporting the view that the collective failure to deal with the consequences of the Balkan Wars caused the outbreak of war in 1914, might include:

- none of the Great Powers fully appreciated the dangers posed by the Balkan problem and the system of alliances that had developed. The Great Powers did not see the need to work together
- success in the Balkan Wars meant that Serbian confidence and daring was at a peak. The assassination of Franz Ferdinand by a Serbian national brought about the events of the July Crisis, where Austria-Hungary served Serbia with an ultimatum that in the end was not met, triggering the declarations of war
- victory for Balkan nationalism was a disaster for Austria-Hungary and weakened their position in Europe. Their desire to counter Serbian gains and show strength meant that Austria-Hungary were determined to bring an aggressive conclusion to the July Crisis, the intention being that Serbia would never agree to the ultimatum
- the tensions arising from the Balkan gains and decline of the Ottoman Empire meant that Franco-Russian and Austro-German commitments were tighter than ever, bringing the confidence to declare war with the support of stronger nations. Germany provided Austria-Hungary with a 'blank cheque' to show strength in the Balkans.

Arguments challenging the view that the collective failure to deal with the consequences of the Balkan Wars caused the outbreak of war in 1914, might include:

- it was the alliance system which ensured that war spread beyond the Balkans. German commitments to the Dual Alliance allowed for Austria-Hungary to request help in the July Crisis, and France wished to defend her ally. Britain wished to maintain the Balance of Power and uphold its guarantee of neutrality to Belgium
- there had been long standing tensions in Europe that were simply brought to a head by the Balkan crises
- Military, economic and colonial rivalries had seen the nations brought to the brink of war on numerous occasions in the late 19th and early 20th Century during the Scramble for Africa and beyond
- deliberate German aggression could be seen as the real cause of the slide to war. Without being pushed by Germany during the July Crisis, Austria-Hungary would never have gone to war with Serbia. Germany sought to push the Triple Entente into a conflict when she held the upper-hand and could potentially split the alliance.

Good answers may focus on the fact that whilst the consequences of the Balkan Wars were far-reaching and ultimately became the trigger for war, the circumstances surrounding the July Crisis became an excuse to further national aims and address long-standing tensions in Europe.

0 4 'The isolationism of the United States meant that appeasement was the only sensible policy open to Britain and France in the 1930s.'

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 supporting the view that US isolationism meant appeasement was the only sensible policy open to Britain and France, might include:

- failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles in the USA had left the burden of carrying out and enforcing the treaty to France and Britain
- there were many disagreements between the two nations as how to best handle the post-war situation and this disunity meant that appeasement was seen as the only possible route
- the absence of the USA from the League of Nations greatly weakened the power of the organisation to uphold its demands and left it ignored by the aggressive powers of the 1930s. Appeasement appeared to be the only solution to avoid war
- the large scale withdrawal of American capital from Europe after the Wall Street Crash meant that Britain and France sought safety in economic retrenchment. There was no room for arms expenditure and the expense of another war was unthinkable
- the USA's reluctance to do anything other than denounce Japanese aggression in Manchuria in the early 1930s left Britain unwilling to act against Japan alone.

Arguments challenging the view that US isolationism meant appeasement was the only sensible policy open to Britain and France, might include:

- many, including Chamberlain believed that Hitler had no intention to bring widescale war to Europe. He believed Hitler would be grateful for the gains and sated by the overturning of the Treaty of Versailles
- many in Britain also wished to use Nazi Germany as a bulwark against Bolshevism
- the British public were predominantly anti-war
- appeasement was consistent with British foreign policy dating back to the 19th Century. Maintaining a balance of power through compromise and the accommodation of conflicting interests ensured the protection of Britain and the Empire
- French timidity led to appeasement; her military chiefs believed that France would not face a certain victory in conflict with Germany and as French public opinion was already divided on social and economic issues there was no guarantee of national unity in the face of war
- there is an argument that appeasement was not the only sensible policy option in the 1930s. Some contemporaries viewed appeasement as a naive policy that made the democracies appear weak and simply encouraged the Fascist powers in their attempts to construct empires.

Some good answers are likely to/may focus on the fact that whilst the USA's withdrawal from European relations brought limitations to the options available to Britain and France, they willingly followed a policy of appeasement as it at least bought them time for what would become an inevitable war.