
A-level HISTORY 7042/2K

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

Mark scheme

June 2020

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 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 © 2020 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, 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.

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 Anglo-German rivalry in the early twentieth century.

[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 a diplomatic naval officer, Dumas would be very knowledgeable on the naval race and the ongoing rivalry between Britain and Germany, though this source would offer an Anglo-centric opinion
- as a confidential letter, the content should offer an open viewpoint, with the purpose of reporting the meeting with von Tirpitz, useful in understanding relations at this time
- written in early 1907, the source comes after the launch of the Dreadnought and German plans for expansion, which heightened tensions between the nations
- there is a respectful tone used here, with reference to von Tirpitz as his 'Excellency' along with his title, suggesting that relations weren't as fraught as might be expected, though the diplomatic interactions between Dumas and von Tirpitz may not reveal the true nature of policy.

Content and argument

- the source references the naval race and how the formation of a British North Sea Fleet and building of the Dreadnought had heightened tensions between Britain and Germany, but appears to be downplaying the seriousness of the naval race at this particular time
- the source correctly emphasizes how tensions were rising amongst all the Great Powers at this time, following events such as the Moroccan Crisis, supporting the idea that Britain was preparing for a war generally
- Tirpitz's comment regarding the size of the German Navy in comparison to Britain's reflects the German desire to match the might of the Royal Navy, something which had become Tirpitz's aim from his appointment as Naval Minister in 1897
- the suggestion that Tirpitz has no idea why anyone would feel Germany wanted a war is highly inaccurate, following significant Army and Naval Laws, particularly the Second Naval Law of 1900 which aimed to create a powerful high seas fleet as part of expansionist aims.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Tirpitz was German Naval Minister from 1897 and therefore offers a valuable insight into Anglo-German rivalry at this time, though from a personal German-centric view only
- written in 1919, at a time when Germany has been defeated and were facing blame for starting the conflict, the source may attempt to lay blame for the rivalry of the time with Britain
- written years after the event, Tirpitz may not remember events accurately and may also over-emphasize certain aspects in an attempt to make the book more interesting

- the tone is very accusatory and defensive, attempting to blame Britain for the tensions at that time. Germany often tried to suggest its actions in the build up to the First World War were purely acts of defence.

Content and argument

- this type of attitude towards Britain from Germany, around 1905, in part stemmed from 'England's behaviour' including the signing of the Entente Cordiale and Moroccan Crisis, which saw Britain form a closer relationship with France, much to Germany's dismay
- the source acknowledges that an expansion of the German Navy had encouraged a counter-response from the British, which would see the creation of the Dreadnought and increased naval investment in order to compete with German growth
- the source also recognises the issue of public opinion against Germany in Britain. The British press and public demonstrated much alarm at the rise of the German Navy and pushed forward the idea of a counter-threat
- Tripitz neglects the fact that Germany had a role to play in the ongoing rivalry at this time. The 'encirclement policy' was a reaction to German expansion and domination of central Europe through the Triple Alliance, as well as inflammatory actions in the Moroccan Crisis.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- coming from a British newspaper at the time of increased rivalry, the source will likely offer a very anti-German viewpoint
- written in late 1908, the source comes after Germany had extended the number of German ships under construction as part of the ongoing naval race
- as a paper renowned for coverage of foreign affairs, it is likely a well-informed source, but may use exaggeration to stir emotions at the height of tensions
- despite the audience and potential purpose, the tone is fairly factual in nature, emphasizing the actual growth of the German Navy and the need for Britain to react.

Content and argument

- the British public at this time were becoming increasingly anti-German. The press encouraged these attitudes through inflammatory articles and campaigns such as 'We want eight and we won't wait!', which had forced a U-turn in defence cuts planned by the Liberals
- Britain had believed that the Dreadnought would secure superiority, but as the source rightly shows, Germany had been able to counter British growth following the widening/deepening of the Kiel canal building her own Dreadnoughts to rival British superiority
- this continued German growth, along with growing concern in the press and public opinion, spurred on the continued expansion of the British Navy and in 1909 Britain increased the planned number of Dreadnoughts
- the suggestion of a deficiency between the British and German Navy was not borne out as the newspaper predicted, in fact by 1914 it was clear that Britain had 'won' the naval race, having built 29 Dreadnoughts to Germany's 17.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The outbreak of a general war in Europe in 1914 was due to Germany's use of mobilisation to threaten Russia.'

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 outbreak of a general war in Europe in 1914 was due to Germany's use of mobilisation to threaten Russia might include:

- German mobilisation led to the enacting of the Schlieffen Plan which depended on holding the initiative to avoid a war on two fronts. This pressured Kaiser Wilhelm II into action and would later bring Britain into war following the invasion of Belgium
- Russia responded by fully mobilising her own army. Kaiser Wilhelm II interpreted Russian mobilisation as a declaration of war and claimed he had no choice but to declare war. This became a good excuse for pro-war German ministers to push forward with their plans
- Tsar Nicholas had hoped that the mobilisation of the Russian army would merely act as a deterrent to Germany and this was perceived as a last diplomatic effort to maintain peace; it was the German interpretation of this that led to war
- the mobilisation of German and Russian armies, along with their subsequent declarations of war, triggered the alliance systems. Germany encouraged Austria to mobilise against Russia, and France would back Russia, leading to a general war in Europe
- the concept of 'war by timetable' supports this view; the complexities of military plans meant that war became inevitable after mobilisation. On 1 August, Grey had declared Britain would remain neutral if France was left alone, but it was too late to reverse the Schlieffen Plan.

Arguments challenging the view that the outbreak of a general war in Europe in 1914 was due to Germany's use of mobilisation to threaten Russia might include:

- in July 1914, it was Russia who partially mobilised first as part of her support of Serbia in the circumstances surrounding the July Crisis. Germany was then able to use this partial mobilisation as an excuse to enact the Schlieffen Plan
- there was a continued failure of diplomacy. Grey was indecisive and failed to commit either way, backing France/Russia decisively could have caused Germany to back down or warning France/Russia could have prevented further escalation
- without the alliances in place at the time, the mobilisation and declarations between Germany and Russia would not have led to a general war. It was the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente that extended the conflict into a wider war
- Germany did not believe that the Schlieffen Plan would bring Britain into the conflict; they felt that Britain would not uphold the Treaty of London with Belgium as they would not go to war over a 'scrap of paper'
- even after the invasion of Belgium as part of the Schlieffen Plan, British involvement was not guaranteed. With considerable anti-war attitudes in Britain, there was considerable convincing needed before the final declaration of war.

Overall, it was the mobilisation of both the Russian and German forces that triggered a chain of events which would make conflict in Europe inevitable. However, if it had not been for the alliances and miscalculation of Britain's response to the invasion of Belgium, a general war would not have begun.

- 0 3** How successful were the peace settlements of 1919–20 in stabilising international relations by 1925?

[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 peace settlements of 1919–20 were successful in stabilising international relations by 1925 might include:

- the League of Nations brought some stability in international relations by 1925 through successfully dealing with early border disputes, for instance those involving Vilna, Upper Silesia and Åland Islands
- disarmament was a key theme of the peace settlements. The Washington Naval Treaty limited the size of capital ships and agreed construction ratios between the major powers, reducing the risk of another naval race and so stabilising international relations
- following through on the concept of self-determination and the subsequent formation of new states, such as Yugoslavia, meant that the peace settlements satisfied many of the demands of nationalists across Europe and beyond, thus stabilising relations
- there was consolidation of the settlements at Locarno in 1925, which guaranteed Germany's western borders and agreed four separate treaties between Germany, France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia and Poland, paving the way for Germany to join the League of Nations.

Arguments challenging the view that the peace settlements of 1919–20 were successful in stabilising international relations by 1925 might include:

- arguably only actions which moved away from the peace settlements restored international stability, for example the Dawes Plan of 1924 restructured Reparations payments, which allowed for US loans to Germany and improved Germany's international standing
- Germany and Russia had been significantly isolated by the peace settlements; however, the Treaty of Rapallo brought them closer as allies. This greatly worried the other western powers as the Soviets received aid from Germany at a time when fear of Communism was growing
- although supposedly 'legal', according to Versailles, the invasion of the Ruhr and harshness of the occupation heightened tensions, as well as increasing sympathy for Germany. This changed attitudes towards the Treaty of Versailles as more questioned its fairness
- the Treaty of Sèvres created instability, leading to a Turkish uprising against foreign troops and the revision of Sèvres in 1923 with the Treaty of Lausanne, restoring land to Turkey that had been given to Greece
- the League of Nations failed to bring stability; US isolationism and the reluctant leadership of Britain and France meant the League lacked authority and success came from agreements made outside of the League, such as the Washington Naval Conference.

Although there was much stability in international relations by 1925, it can be argued that this only came as a result of moves to lessen the impact of the post-war settlements as demonstrated by the fact that some of the most successful elements of international relations in the early 1920s only came about as a result of making changes to the Treaty of Versailles.

- 0 4** 'Hitler's foreign policy, in the years 1933 to 1938, was solely concerned with overturning the Treaty of Versailles.'

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 Hitler's foreign policy, in the years 1933 to 1938, was solely concerned with overturning the Treaty of Versailles might include:

- limited military: rearmament and conscription were officially announced in March 1935, with the existence of a German air force, the Luftwaffe, confirmed. The Anglo-German Naval agreement allowed for the increasing of Germany's battle fleet
- Anschluss prohibited: Hitler and the Nazis had encouraged the assassination of Dollfuss in July 1934, with an attempted Coup by Nazi agents. The Anschluss was successfully achieved in March 1938 when a German invasion force was sent to 'restore order' in Austria
- collective security: the German-Polish Non-Aggression Pact in 1934 was a bilateral agreement which defied the concept of collective security. Hitler also withdrew Germany from the League of Nations in October 1933
- lost territory: acts of intimidation and persuasion ensured a Nazi victory in the Saar plebiscite of 1935. Hitler used the excuse of Germans being treated badly to stir riots in the Sudetenland, which was made part of Germany in September 1938
- demilitarised zone: remilitarisation of the industrially rich Rhineland was a key objective for the Nazis, with 32 000 German soldiers marched into the Rhineland in March 1936 in defiance of the terms of the Treaty.

Arguments challenging the view that Hitler's foreign policy, in the years 1933 to 1938, was solely concerned with overturning the Treaty of Versailles might include:

- the 1934 German-Polish Non-Aggression Pact had secured Eastern borders and proclaimed no conflict for ten years, suggesting initial intentions had been peaceful and not just about overturning the Treaty of Versailles
- Hitler stated that German rearmament was as an act of 'defence' following the failure of the campaign for international disarmament and the collapse of the Geneva Conference 1934, with the remilitarisation of the Franco-German border necessary to ensure this defence
- Hitler sought to improve relations with other nations, for instance, the Anglo-German Naval agreement of 1935 had set limits on the German Navy, but brought much international prestige for Nazis and better relations with the British
- Hitler's involvement in the Spanish Civil War from 1936 was driven by the ideology of resisting communism, as well as providing a useful testing ground for new weapons, equipment, personnel and strategy
- the appeasement of Germany encouraged Hitler to escalate his foreign policy aims. No action was taken following announcements of rearmament and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, with the Sudetenland handed to Germany in September 1938 aiding the success of Lebensraum.

Although the undoing of the Treaty of Versailles was without doubt a significant driving factor in Hitler's foreign policy in his first five years in power, his actions at this time were also driven by an overall ideological aim for expansion and allowed by the circumstances of the period.