



A-level HISTORY 7042/2K

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

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 K / M S

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

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.

[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

- as Polish foreign minister, who has spent most of the 1930s trying to make deals/alliances with the rest of Europe, Beck's position within the Polish Government gives valuable insight into what the Poles thought about the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact
- Beck's memo is sent on the day of the Nazi-Soviet Pact which is valuable as it demonstrates his instant reaction to the Pact which threatened the existence of Poland
- being a memo to the Polish Government – Beck's purpose is to express to the Government his anger and his plans of how to react to the Pact
- the type of the source is valuable to an historian as it shows Polish naivety and a sense of inevitability of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Also, the fact that Beck's tone is defensive and angry that the Soviets have 'played' Poland is valuable as it shows Poland's vulnerable situation.

Content and argument

- Beck's argument that the Soviets have been playing a 'double game' is valuable because in early August the Soviets had tried to make an agreement with Britain and France. The London negotiations would have seen an Anglo-German alliance so Beck is valuable here in his suggestion that Stalin had proposed a Nazi-Soviet Pact in order to stop an Anglo-Polish pact. However, Beck's stance is slightly limited because throughout 1939, Beck had tried to negotiate with multiple powers and it was his decision against Soviet troops in Poland that led to Stalin pursuing the Nazi-Soviet Pact
- Beck's threat to publish the Moscow negotiations is valuable because Poland had at that point been trying to get a deal with the Soviets. By doing this, Beck was trying to 'intimidate' Stalin with a threat but it would fall on deaf ears as Stalin was happy with the outcome of the Pact
- Beck argues that the Nazi-Soviet Pact was completely against the ideology of Adolf Hitler as the Soviets were the antithesis of Nazism. The context could be that Hitler had signed the Anti-Comintern Pact with Japan in 1936
- Beck's suggestion that consolidation with allies is top priority is valuable because of the vulnerable situation Poland found itself in with two huge powers having agreed to share Poland between them. The British-Polish Act was confirmed on 25 August – confirms the Poles' change in attitude towards Britain after the Nazi-Soviet Pact was signed.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a Fascist, Joyce's tone is apologist – he is defending Hitler's actions siding with the Communist, Soviet Union to British people – Britain had a chance to join with the Nazis against Stalin and they didn't take it
- the broadcast is the day after Hitler launched Operation Barbarossa so Joyce knows the Pact has been broken and now Hitler is forgiven for the 'betrayal of western civilisation' giving the source value as a live commentary of events
- as a member of the BUF who fled Britain, Joyce would have an anti-British stance excusing German actions – many of his radio reports were 'digs' at Britain so could be classed as limited
- the emphasis of Joyce is valuable to an historian as it shows the Nazi stance on the USSR and their disbelief that the Western powers are against Germany and not the Soviets.

Content and argument

- Joyce argues that Britain forced Hitler into the Pact by their 'aggressive' stance in the late 1930s, eg the agreement with France to defend Poland if attacked and the Anti-Comintern Pact. This is limited as it is an over exaggeration as Hitler had been aggressive towards Poland previously and clearly wanted to take Poland
- Joyce completely ignores the extensive efforts made by Chamberlain to avoid war through the policy of appeasement. Hitler brought the conflict on himself by ignoring the promise he had made at Munich in September 1938 and going ahead with the invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939
- the argument that spheres of influence were defined to protect borders is limited because Joyce purposefully makes no reference to the secret agreement to split Poland as he doesn't want the Pact to be seen for the aggressive pact it was
- the argument that Hitler did so with a heavy heart could be limited. Hitler didn't feel he was ready to attack the USSR and needed assurances that he wouldn't face a war on two fronts. It was also an easy way into Poland as he would be sure Stalin wouldn't find Nazi invasion of Poland aggressive.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Khrushchev writing his autobiography in the distant future has been able to assess the wider impact of the Pact, eg the Nazi betrayal of the Pact in 1941 and is therefore justifying Soviet decision-making giving the source value
- Khrushchev's writings could be limited as he is attempting damage limitation due to the major losses during the Second World War. He is justifying the signing of the Pact
- the source has value because Khrushchev was a well-informed/high ranking Soviet with insider knowledge to Stalin and the Politburo and he would have known the Soviet Union were fearful of a Nazi invasion as they were not ready in 1939. The source gives a good insight into the thoughts of the CPSU at the time
- Khrushchev's comment that it was hard for the USSR to sign the Pact is to try and mitigate the fact that the USSR joined with Hitler rather than the Western Allies (although Chamberlain didn't want to ally with Stalin). This is valuable as it is almost trying to justify that the Soviets helped to defeat Hitler because they signed the Pact allowing them to prepare.

Content and argument

- Khrushchev argues that the Pact was inevitable due to the situation/relations in Europe at the time; the gamble reference shows that the USSR were strategic in signing the Pact which could be challenged because Hitler had attempted to ally with Britain first
- Khrushchev explains Hitler's motives to manoeuvre relations in order to make time, which makes the source valuable as Hitler didn't want to fight a war on two fronts (France and the Soviets)
- however, the source is slightly limited because Khrushchev underplays the Soviet's relief at the signing of the Pact as they, too, did not want to fight a war on two fronts (the Nazis and Japan)
- the reference to the coming war shows that Khrushchev acknowledges a war was inevitable; they knew they were being used by the Nazis and were expecting an invasion but wanted to prepare, giving value to the source.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent was the growth of rival alliance systems, in the years 1902 to 1911, provoked by German foreign policy?

[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 growth of rival alliance systems, in the years 1902 to 1911, was provoked by German foreign policy might include:

- the First Moroccan crisis was an embarrassment to Germany due to the outcome of the Algeiras conference; they had failed in their aims to defeat France in Morocco and destroy Franco-British relations. This had the adverse effect and solidified the Franco-British alliance rather than weakening it due to their distrust of Weltpolitik
- Germany's stance on the Bosnia crisis solidified and developed the Dual Alliance as a central force to rival any alliance of Russia
- Germany may be seen to be responsible for the development of the Triple Entente due to the outcome of the second Moroccan crisis as international feeling was that Germany was the aggressor
- the growth of rival alliances can be attributed to the Kaiser's Weltpolitik and naval ambitions as it could be argued they forced the British to actively seek an alliance with Russia.

Arguments challenging the view that the growth of rival alliance systems, in the years 1902 to 1911, was provoked by German foreign policy might include:

- Russia provoked rival alliance systems due to the failure of the Bjorko agreement due to Russian hesitations and two years later the Russians joined the Entente creating the Triple Entente surrounding Germany; something Germany had tried to avoid, meaning the Anglo-Russian entente was signed showing Germany was not responsible for the development of alliances as they had actively tried to avoid this
- events in the Balkans provoked rival alliance systems as the Bosnian crisis weakened relations between the great powers. The violation of the treaty of Berlin by Austria-Hungary angered Serbia, which in turn brought Britain and Russia to their aid. Germany came to the aid of Austria-Hungary
- Britain and France provoked the growth of rival alliances because, in 1904, Paris and London agreed that Britain would establish a protectorate over Egypt, and France would do the same over Morocco. The Algeiras conference was a direct result of antagonistic behaviour by Britain and France: Germany were right to feel threatened by two strong powers. Furthermore, British Naval Admiral Fisher believed Britain needed to reassert their naval authority by building the Dreadnought in 1905. This was a direct provocation by Britain as their relations with France had strengthened, threatening Germany
- the Triple Entente was not actually a concrete alliance and therefore there was no rivalry as such to the German Austria-Hungary dual alliance. France and Britain, for instance, had no formal agreement to defend each other should Germany attack them. Therefore, there were no rival alliance systems in Europe; just a series of agreements.

Students may conclude that Germany did cause the development of the alliance systems through an aggressive foreign policy. It could further be argued that this was not their intention as the development of rival alliances was the last thing Germany wanted. Students should evaluate the extent Germany was responsible and could rest some responsibility on Britain, for example, for actively seeking out Russia for an alliance and 'goaded' Germany into a Naval race. Credit any judgement that is well substantiated.

- 0 3** 'In the years 1911 to 1914, it was the actions of Austria-Hungary that were responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe.'

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 in the years 1911 to 1914, it was the actions of Austria-Hungary that were responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe might include:

- Austrian imperialism in the Balkans was aggressive – Franz Ferdinand's trip to Bosnia was ill-advised and antagonistic especially after the rise in panslavism post the second Balkans war
- the Austrian ultimatum after the assassination was supposed to be declined and provoke Serbia and Russia into a world war because Austria-Hungary had the backing of Germany and by Germany giving Austria a 'blank cheque' of support enabled Austria to throw around the ultimatum. The fact that Serbia accepted, threw Austria off guard and they cancelled it anyway
- the bombardment of Belgrade signalled Austria-Hungary's intentions and that they were unafraid of Russian involvement knowing that any move against Serbia would be supported by Germany
- Austria-Hungary was responsible because, as a major loser of the Balkan wars of 1912/13, Austria became even more aggressive towards Serbia.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1911 to 1914, it was the actions of Austria-Hungary that were responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe might include:

- Austria-Hungary alone was not responsible for the war because of the Great Powers involvement at the London Conference to poorly conclude the First Balkan War. This shows the interest of European powers in the area and therefore, any escalation in the future could feasibly have led to a world war
- Germany was responsible for the outbreak of war because their offer of a 'blank cheque' for Austria showed they were looking for an excuse to go to war
- Russia was responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe because of the Russian guarantee to support Serbia if attacked by Austria-Hungary. Similarly, Tsar Nicholas' decision to mobilise before hearing back from Kaiser Wilhelm shows Russia as the aggressive power
- Serbian aggression was the main reason for war because Austria's ambition was to solidify relations in the Balkans and with Bosnians. However, Gavrilo Princip ruined this by assassinating Franz Ferdinand and started a chain of events that led to war
- the Balkan wars of 1912/13 show that war was commonplace in this area of Europe: it had never escalated into a world war before – Austria were simply continuing unfinished business of the second Balkan war with no intention of starting a world war.

The July crisis can be viewed as just one aspect of the continuing wars in the Balkans and the responsibility for the outbreak of war may be placed on the Balkan nations themselves, on Austria-Hungary or on Russia. Students may argue that the outbreak of war in Europe was the result of Russia's promise to support Serbia, and Serbia's rejection of Austria-Hungary's ultimatum. Equally, they could make a case that it was Germany that was responsible and that the Germans were waiting for any excuse to take action. Any answer that offers a convincing explanation of the ultimate responsibility for war backed by evidence should be credited.

- 0 4** 'In the years 1923 to 1928, attempts at disarmament and conciliation in international relations were a failure.'

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 in the years 1923 to 1928, attempts at disarmament and conciliation in international relations were a failure might include:

- there was a distinct lack of commitment to disarm as most nations didn't want to risk their own safety including, Britain. This was demonstrated in the fact that the Treaty of Mutual Assistance was never agreed to
- the Protocol of Geneva was rejected and another example of the lack of collective commitment; it undermined the League of Nations. Britain were major players on the international stage and so their rejection of the protocols showed others they were not prepared to conciliate
- Stalin felt the 'Spirit of Locarno' was an anti-communist plot and sought secret agreements with Germany, demonstrating a lack of conciliation and distrust in international relations
- Stresemann's constant attempts to secure better deals for Germany and retract many of the Treaty of Versailles' terms frustrated the Allies, meaning conciliation was never fully achieved.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1923 to 1928, attempts at disarmament and conciliation in international relations were a failure might include:

- the Kellogg Briand Pact of 1928 ensured that there was a form of conciliation in international relations. 62 Nations agreed to never go to war again
- demilitarisation of the Rhineland at Locarno clearly shows there were attempts at disarmament and conciliation; the Détente between Germany and France supports this. Chamberlain, Briand and Stresemann's work was recognised with the Nobel Peace Prize demonstrating their collaborative approach to conciliation and disarmament
- the Dawes Plan was instrumental in conciliating Europe as it showed negotiations could take place and that Germany was given international recognition
- the fact that the League of Nations allowed Germany to join, demonstrates conciliation and disarmament plans because of the League's effort to limit the amount of weapon stores internationally.

Overall, students may argue that attempts at disarmament and conciliation in international relations failed completely in the years 1923 to 1928 because of the unwillingness of nations to commit to something that could have left them vulnerable. Some students may argue that the Locarno treaties created an illusion that disarmament and conciliation in international relations was successful because of the agreements, but the limitations of the agreements meant attempts at conciliation failed. Others may argue that attempts at disarmament and conciliation were successful as the 'Spirit of Locarno' demonstrates nations were willing to work together when they were not previously. Any well-balanced and substantiated judgment should be credited.