
A-level HISTORY 7042/2K

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

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, c1890–1941

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 reactions to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June 1914. **[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

- the source, coming from an Austrian newspaper, is obviously going to be very emotive in reaction to the assassination of the heir to the throne
- the fact that the source comes from a special edition of the newspaper, especially printed in response to the assassination, shows the seriousness of the event
- coming straight after assassination, the source offers a fresh and immediate reaction to the event, though this may provide a more emotive than factual response
- the tone shows upset and shock at the events ('monstrous'), though the emphasis is more on the Emperor and unity of the empire rather than the assassination itself.

Content and argument

- the newspaper makes a significant attempt to promote unity amongst Austrians and greatly pushes the role of the Emperor. There were worries about rising nationalism across the Hapsburg Empire and a greater need to maintain control of the many different races
- the source discusses the immediate support of other nations from around the world and the loss of an heir would elicit reaction from other European monarchies who would have been shocked at such a murder, though initially there was little reaction other than words of condolence
- the source refers to Austria's 'nearest neighbours'; this is referencing support from Germany, which although limited initially to verbal support, would eventually become a 'blank cheque' to take action against Serbia
- the source gives very little actually on the assassination itself and in reality Emperor Franz Joseph could not stand Franz Ferdinand, with the Emperor's comments after the assassination displaying little grief; even the funeral was very low-key.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source comes from the German ambassador to Russia, who will have had good access to the Russian reaction, but as a German would be likely in support of the Austrian point of view
- this source offers a more delayed response to the assassination, written two weeks after the event, with time to reflect on post-assassination actions
- the source also comes after a number of developments following the assassination, such as the German offer of a 'blank cheque' in response to events
- the tone of the source seems surprised that the Russian minister is not condemning the crime more strongly, with an emphasis on his attempts to not blame the Serbs.

Content and argument

- the Russian response explained in the source would be expected, given that Russia had significant ties to Serbia, particularly through pan-Slavism, and Russia was allied against Austria-Hungary (and Germany), with a history of tensions between the nations
- the Russian foreign minister is accurate in his assessment that, whilst the assassination had been blamed on Serbs, it was ultimately the act of a 'few immature youths' (Black Hand), though a thorough investigation had not yet happened at the time of this report
- the source is demonstrating a sense of concern from both the German and Russian point of view about what the assassination may lead to; an unjust treatment of the Serbs, Russian involvement, past issues with Austria, all clouding judgement on both sides
- such concerns were justified by the fact that by mid-July there had been an escalation of events through demands on Serbia and the issue of the 'blank cheque' – increasingly the Germans were looking for justification to act 'defensively' and they would eventually use Russian reactions (mobilisation) as an 'excuse' for war.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source provides a British perspective, which is therefore more of an outside view of events. Lloyd George would be in a position to know in detail about events at that time and into the war
- being written some years after the event, these memoirs may only offer clouded memories ('sometime in July'). There may also be a desire to present himself/Britain in a better light
- it is easy for Lloyd George to comment on the threat of the assassination in hindsight, but at the time of Franz Ferdinand's death there are few who would have predicted the Great War
- the tone seems to make light of the assassination, with an emphasis on that fact that other nations did not initially react, so why would Britain?

Content and argument

- the source demonstrates an awareness of how the assassination could trigger the war with 'serious consequences'. The circumstances and events after Franz Ferdinand's death would lead to mobilisation and declarations of war through alliance system
- Lloyd George is accurate in explaining how initial foreign reaction was quite limited, the Kaiser did indeed go on holiday. First reactions were mostly diplomatic messages of support for the Austrians, showing their disgust with events
- events escalated after the assassination, with Austria placing unrealistic demands on Serbia; Russian and German involvement which would lead to mobilisation and declarations of war. The 'immense consequences' were the start of a general war in Europe
- initially, the assassination and its aftermath was just a central European issue, as highlighted by the concerns of the Hungarian lady, and the war could have remained a localised conflict. Britain was by no means obliged to join and initially worked to resolve tensions through diplomacy.

Section B

- 02** How significant was the first Moroccan Crisis for international relations in the years 1904 to 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/factors suggesting that the first Moroccan Crisis was significant for international relations in the years 1904 to 1907 might include:

- the events of 1905–6 firmly defined the Anglo-French Entente of 1904, with the British advocating total support of the French. This had not been expected by the Germans when challenging France's position in Morocco
- in the aftermath of the crisis, Britain was far more suspicious of German policy. The British were outraged at Wilhelm II for landing in Tangiers and stated that the Germans would 'live to regret' the incident. This was a turning point in Anglo-German relations
- the outcome of the Algeiras Conference increased Wilhelm II's fears of encirclement and served to discourage Germany from using international conferences to resolve disputes, as had been the norm for some time
- the crisis opened the way for improved Anglo-Russian relations, as both nations fully supported the French claims against the will of Germany; this would help to bring about the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907
- Italy backed the French position against Germany at the Algeiras Conference, counter to the Triple Alliance. This was a major diplomatic defeat for Germany and signalled a weak link in the Triple Alliance.

Arguments/factors challenging the notion that the first Moroccan Crisis was significant for international relations in the years 1904 to 1907 might include:

- the French approach during the crisis was not overtly aggressive and overall they believed in a conciliatory approach. The French sought to placate the Germans by forcing their outspoken foreign minister, Delcassé, to resign and agreed to the Algeiras Conference to resolve the issues brought about by the crisis
- the crisis did not cement an Anglo-French Alliance; the British made no military preparations to support the French, should the issue escalate, and subsequent military talks between the two nations were ineffectual
- the Anglo-French Entente of 1904 can be viewed as more significant than the Moroccan Crisis. Wilhelm had set out to test this relationship with his actions in 1905 and it was the friendly relations between Britain and France following the Entente that helped shape attitudes during the crisis
- the opening for the Anglo-Russian Agreement was the Russo-Japanese War, rather than the Moroccan Crisis. A humiliating defeat for Russia meant that the British were less worried about the Russian position in the Far East, thus encouraging a reconciliation that led to the 1907 agreement.

It can be argued that although events prior to the Moroccan Crisis of 1905–6 began to shape the relationships that would lead to a global conflict, the crisis itself was a key turning point in demonstrating the divide between Germany and Austria-Hungary against the other Great Powers. Students may offer a counter-argument stating that the Moroccan Crisis itself was not significant or that other factors were more significant (or indeed a combination of the two), all of which are valid approaches to this question.

03 How successful was the ‘Spirit of Locarno’ in securing international harmony by 1929?

[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 ‘Spirit of Locarno’ was successful in securing international harmony by 1929 might include:

- the Dawes Plan was the first negotiated agreement since the war, German international standing greatly improved and agreements ensured that the French left the Ruhr, paving the way for Locarno
- disarmament seemed more achievable, there was firm public support across Europe and America, with a more concerted effort made to limit weapon stores
- the Locarno Treaties guaranteed the western borders of Germany and demilitarisation of the Rhineland, allowing for Franco-German détente and further agreements
- Germany was welcomed into the League of Nations in 1926, after initially being excluded, and further international efforts were made to help Germany through the Young Plan of 1929
- the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 saw 62 nations pledge to never go to war again, this was viewed as an almost unanimous acceptance of peace.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the ‘Spirit of Locarno’ was successful in securing international harmony by 1929 might include:

- the Treaty of Mutual Assistance was never enacted. There were no clear guidelines and a lack of commitment to international harmony at each nation’s own expense
- the Geneva Protocol undermined the League of Nations, with international reaction lukewarm and Britain refusing to ratify the terms. This highlighted the unpopularity of collective security
- Locarno did not solve everything. Stresemann’s continued attempts to amend Versailles frustrated the Allies. Failure to secure Eastern borders pushed the USSR to their own measures
- Germany continued to secretly develop armaments with the aid of the USSR and was not really reconciled to the terms of the Locarno Treaties
- Kellogg-Briand was only successful thanks to careful wording and deliberately compromised terms, ensuring no existing treaty was undermined. Ideals were watered down, with no sanctions in place for any nation who broke the pact.

It can be argued that whilst the era of the ‘Spirit of Locarno’ was successful on the surface, there was limited commitment to the ideals promoted; promises overall lacked substance, with no clear actions available if anyone broke the terms of agreements made.

- 04** 'The only reason why the USA entered the Second World War was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.'

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 only reason why the USA entered the Second World War was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor might include:

- attitudes in the US prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor were very anti-war; the 1937 Neutrality Act shaped early beliefs about a 'far-away' conflict and a poll of the US public in May 1941 revealed that 79% were opposed to entering the war voluntarily
- early measures taken by the US prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor were only about self-defence; Lend Lease was only directed towards countries whose struggle against the Axis assisted US defence
- even as the war escalated for other nations, the US public were not convinced by the Atlantic Charter, this was very much about Roosevelt's opinions and desires rather than reflecting public or congressional sentiment
- the US was unprepared to become involved in such a widespread global conflict, for instance the Japanese navy was considerably stronger than that of the US, hence the retaliatory nature of the entry to the war
- war came the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor, this was seen as a retaliatory and defensive measure. It can even be seen that the US was only involved in a wider war thanks to the Three Power Pact.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the only reason why the USA entered the Second World War was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor might include:

- Roosevelt always felt that US intervention was morally justifiable and increasingly inevitable; this was proven by his policy as he had started to steer the US towards war through actions such as Lend Lease
- the US would not have been prepared to allow the abandonment of China to an aggressor with a track record of brutality; they had been watching closely since Manchuria and this led to embargos on rubber, oil and iron
- public opinion in the US had started to turn more pro-war as news of Nazi brutality in Europe spread. It was becoming easier to see a route into a war against the Axis amongst an increasing number of Americans
- US policy and actions were progressively moving towards intervention; this had started with Lend Lease and then the Atlantic Charter acknowledged US sympathy for the plight of Europe against Nazi aggression
- the US ended up joining the war against Japan and Germany. If this was only a reaction to events at Pearl Harbor then it could be argued that conflict against Germany could have been avoided in some way.

It can be argued that, despite Roosevelt's personal thoughts on a morally justifiable role, public and wider congressional opinion required an aggressive act directly against the US to fully justify entry into a global conflict.