



A-level HISTORY

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

Mark scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2K International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941

Section A

- | | | |
|----------|----------|--|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the treatment of Germany in the Treaty of Versailles. |
|----------|----------|--|

[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.

Students are asked to analyse and evaluate these sources and assess their value as evidence about the Treaty of Versailles and Germany. Answers may choose to deal with each source in turn; or to make a comparative evaluation, linking the sources together. Either approach is valid.

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

Provenance

- it is a partisan ‘heat-of-the-moment’ source, from the German delegation
- it is a response to the draft terms of the treaty.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the peace treaty does not adhere to previous agreements
- it asserts that the treaty would destroy Germany and Germany would lose its sovereignty.

Students may make reference to contextual knowledge to assess these points.

Tone and emphasis

- the tone reflects a sense of injustice and shock at unreasonable terms.

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

Provenance

- it is an official document in response to the protest of the German delegation
- although written on behalf of the Allied Powers, it reflects the view of George Clemenceau.

Content and argument

- the source argues that Germany was responsible for the destruction caused by the First World War
- retribution is justifiable
- the source argues that Germany has the potential to be powerful.

Students may make reference to contextual knowledge to assess these points.

Tone and emphasis

- the tone is stern and unforgiving and uses dramatic language.

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

Provenance

- this is a source from an article written by a leading socialist in his party paper.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the treaty has to be accepted because the alternative of renewed war would be far worse
- the source argues improvement may come through reason.

Students may make reference to contextual knowledge to assess these points.

Tone and emphasis

- the source is measured and reasoned in a context of popular outrage.

Section B

0	2	'The descent into a general European war in 1914 had very little to do with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.'
----------	----------	---

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.

Students should address the core issue of why a localised conflict in the Balkans led to a major European war – and how far this was due to the assassination at Sarajevo. In doing so they may present arguments that Sarajevo was indeed a major factor:

- the Balkans in general and Bosnia in particular was a major cause of instability and tension, especially after the Austrian annexation of Bosnia in 1908
- the assassination gave Austrian leaders such as Conrad von Hotzendorf a perfect justification for doing what they wanted to do anyway, which was launch a pre-emptive war against Serbia
- Germany saw Sarajevo as a useful excuse to push forward their ambitions. German backing for Austria was a direct cause of a bigger war
- the Austrian attack on Serbia led predictably to the Russians supporting Serbia, this triggered an Austrian-Russian conflict and dragged their allies into a wider war
- Franz Ferdinand, killed at Sarajevo, was the most influential person in Austria-Hungary who might have held back from war.

Arguments in the opposite direction, agreeing with the key quotation, might include:

- the assassination did not automatically mean war, even a localised one. There are many political assassinations that do not lead to international conflict
- even if Sarajevo did 'cause' war, it was only a small, limited war, less serious than the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913. There had to be other, external reasons why the small Austrian-Serbian war spilled over into a Europe-wide war
- these wider reasons included unlimited German backing for Austrian aggression; unlimited (and unnecessary) Russian support for Serbia; the unexpected failure of great power diplomacy to find a peaceful solution; the alliance system and the arms race; and the widespread failure of policymakers to realise how damaging and uncontrolled modern war would actually be.

Some good answers are likely to/may focus on the key words 'very little', concluding that there were indeed important consequences of Sarajevo, even if the assassination was not of itself decisive.

0 3 'The deterioration in the prospects for peace in the years 1924 to 1935 was mainly due to the Great Depression.'

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.

Students should address how and why there was ‘deterioration’ in the prospects for peace in 1924–1935 and how far this was due to the Great Depression.

In deploying arguments in support of the proposition, students may consider:

- prospects for peace did seem to improve from 1924 until 1930, with the Dawes Plan, the Locarno treaties, Germany joining the League, the Kellogg-Briand Pact and promising moves towards disarmament. After the Great Depression hit Europe and the West in 1930–1932, there was the failure of the Geneva Conference, Hitler’s rise to power, Mussolini’s invasion of Ethiopia and the weak response of the Western powers. Circumstantially, this fits the argument the Depression was to blame
- the Depression was a key factor in Hitler’s coming to power
- the Depression undermined democratic governments everywhere and distracted Britain and France from foreign affairs and military preparations.

There are, however, significant possibilities for alternative interpretations:

- the apparently favourable prospects for peace in the later 1920s were illusory. In reality the League was weak, the post-war peace was unfair and/or unenforceable, and Weimar democracy was too fragile to survive. The seeds of a future war had been germinating since 1919
- the real reason why peace was threatened by 1935 was above all Hitler’s policies; and they were continuous with previous German policies from before 1929
- peace started to fall apart in the early 1930s because neither Britain nor France was willing to defend the peace. They were held back by long-standing weaknesses that had little to do with the Depression and much more to do with the legacy of 1914–1918.

Stronger responses may show the ability to put forward differentiated assessments, for example appreciation of interrelated factors linking the Depression to other issues.

0 4 'The western democracies failed to avoid the outbreak of a general war in Europe in 1939 because of their fear of Communism.'

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.

What began in 1939 was not at all ‘the Second World War’. Hitler launched (and largely won) a war of conquest in Europe; this became a wider, world war much later, in 1941. Students should focus on the key dates, 1935–1939, to assess how and why the western democracies (primarily France and Britain) failed to defend the post-war peace they had established after the First World War; and reach a balanced assessment of the influence of ‘fear of Communism’ as compared with a range of other factors.

In doing so they may consider arguments that fear of Communism was central, such as:

- France made a pact with the Soviet Union in 1935 to defend Czechoslovakia but never showed the least interest in activating it, as at Munich in 1938
- Britain and France refused to get involved in the Spanish Civil War from 1936, largely because of Stalin’s intervention in Spain
- French and British policies of ‘appeasement’ were motivated, at least partly, by the feeling that Hitler and Mussolini were providing a strong barrier against Communism
- after Britain and France gave guarantees to Poland early in 1939, the only way to fulfil these guarantees was to form an anti-Hitler alliance with the USSR. Talks to achieve this were less than half-hearted and resulted in Stalin making the Nazi-Soviet Pact instead.

Against this, students may argue persuasively that the ‘lost peace’ was due to other factors, such as:

- appeasement had much deeper and wider causes than anti-Communism. Since the early 1920s there had been a belief that war should be avoided at all costs; and that the post-war peace was flawed anyway
- pacifism was a powerful force detracting from firm policies against the dictators
- many sections of political opinion admired Hitler and Mussolini as dynamic leaders
- the individual leaders of the western democracies such as Chamberlain, Blum and Daladier, were highly influential.

Strong answers may show differentiated assessments of change over time, showing how fear of Communism was especially important in some aspects of western policy (such as failure to make an anti-Hitler alliance to protect Poland in 1939) but not in others.

