



A-level HISTORY 7042/2K

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

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



2 2 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 © 2022 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 Italy's entry into the First World War in 1915.

[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 an American publication, this is an impartial source that will be valuable in understanding Italy's entry into the war from the point of view of a nation not yet (or only just) involved
- written in the midst of the war, the source will not be in the position of placing blame, as often happens in the aftermath of conflict
- as a six volume and therefore in-depth study of the conflict, it is likely to be highly informed on the causes of Italian entry
- the tone is very factual and not emotive, with an emphasis on suggesting that there was an inevitability that Italy would fight against Austria-Hungary in the war.

Content and argument

- the source exemplifies the past issues between Italy and Austria-Hungary, who shared a border and a long-standing territorial rivalry which had been exacerbated by Italian unification in 1871
- there is reference to the terms of the 'defensive' Triple Alliance in which Italy believed she was not obliged to join the conflict in 1914 after Austria-Hungary's overly aggressive actions in the July Crisis
- the source recognises the desire of Italy to achieve the reconquest of the unredeemed provinces. This was seen as the desire for Risorgimento and a wish to gain Trentino, Trieste, Tyrol, Dalmatia and Istria for Italy
- although there is mention of not offending the 'French-English-Russian combination', it is highly unlikely that the authors would have been aware of the 1902 secret agreement with the French, which essentially nullified the terms of the Triple Alliance (or aware of any detail of the Treaty of London.)

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Emperor Franz Joseph offers an Austro-Hungarian view of the Italian entry to war, but as the target of this declaration, it is likely to come from an anti-Italian viewpoint
- coming immediately after the declaration of war, the source is valuable in offering an immediate and emotive response to the declaration
- written to the armed forces, the purpose of the source is likely to stir emotion and encourage a joint approach to the upcoming conflict with Italy
- the tone is very defensive, suggesting that Austria-Hungary is the victim in this situation, with the emphasis placed on the concept of 'we', supporting a concept of being in this together.

Content and argument

- the source reflects the fact that in declaring war on Austria-Hungary, Italy had gone back on a long-standing alliance by joining the conflict on the side of the Entente, with the Triple Alliance having been agreed in 1882
- there is a suggestion that as a result of the Triple Alliance Italy had grown in strength, but the alliance was signed to avoid conflict with Austria-Hungary and provide a defensive measure following a Franco-Russia Alliance. In fact, Italy faced many issues at this time
- the source is naïve in its suggestion that Austria-Hungary posed no threat to Italy. Emperor Franz Joseph would be well aware that Austria-Hungary's intentions in the Balkans clashed with Italy's aims for that region
- this is partly reflected in the comment regarding 'jealous glances across our borders'. There had been negotiations after war had broken out, with Italy demanding Austrian lands in return for their support in the conflict. Italy had desired Tyrol and Istria for some time.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the Prime Minister of Italy would be a useful source on understanding the Italian entry to the First World War, though would likely aim to justify the actions of his nation
- as a public statement from the PM, it would likely aim to ensure the support of the public and clearly justify why the course of action had been taken to confirm his position of power
- the source is valuable in offering an immediate response to the declaration of war and the reaction from Austria-Hungary
- the tone is dismissive of the Emperor's response to the Italian declaration, emphasising that Italy had taken the moral high ground in the July Crisis and following circumstances.

Content and argument

- the source highlights the longstanding issues between Italy and Austria-Hungary, with a personal attack on Emperor Franz Joseph. Italy had long desired lands from the Habsburg Empire and had been frustrated by limitations on Italian expansion by Austria-Hungary
- the comment on 'rash foolishness' confirms that Italy had viewed Austria's invasion of Serbia in 1914 as overly 'aggressive' and as the Triple Alliance was a 'defensive' agreement, this had led to neutrality and a subsequent side change in 1915
- Italian 'aspirations had long been known', with negotiations ongoing since the outbreak of war over the lands desired by Italy. Austria-Hungary refused to offer Trentino and Trieste, so Italy turned to the Allies
- the source focuses on Austria-Hungary and avoids the other reasons for Italian entry, i.e. the (secret) Treaty of London. The Allies offered Italy lands they desired in return for joining the war on their side, a very significant factor in the change of alliances.

Section B

- 0 2** How important were national movements in weakening the Ottoman Empire in the years c1900 to 1911?

[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 national movements were important in weakening the Ottoman Empire in the years c1900 to 1911 might include:

- the Macedonian Question caused significant issues. Macedonia was home to Turks, Jews, Greeks, Albanians, Bulgarians and Serbs, with the states around Macedonia keen to encourage the dismantling of the region and each nationality seeking representation
- nations who had gained independence from the Empire were growing in power and their desires for expansion were turned towards the Ottomans. For example, the Empire faced threats from the increasing military strength and aggressive foreign policy of Bulgaria
- the desire for an autonomous Macedonia led to the Ilinden Uprising in 1903. The cruelty shown by the Sultan in the uprising bred more determined and ambitious nationalist groups who continued to rebel against the oppression of the Empire
- opponents of the Sultan championed a Western-style parliament in an attempt to tackle the rising threat of nationalism in the Empire, believing it would pose less of a threat if the wide range of nationalities were better represented. This led to the Young Turk Revolution.

Arguments challenging the view that national movements were important in weakening the Ottoman Empire in the years c1900 to 1911 might include:

- the Sultan had a large role to play in the weakening of the Empire. Known as the 'Red Sultan' due to his repressive policies and severe treatment of the rebels, such as in the Armenian Massacres, his actions stirred further dissatisfaction and revolt across the Empire
- the stifling of intellectualism in the Empire (there was no university in the Ottoman Empire till 1900) encouraged citizens to study in Western Europe, exposing students to Western culture and democracy. These students returned with a desire for change
- there was increasing disaffection amongst liberals and intellectuals, who were frustrated by the Ottoman's loss of territory and influence, including increasing foreign involvement in the Empire's finances and their seizure of lands such as Bosnia-Herzegovina.
- the Young Turk Revolution actually began due to a spontaneous army mutiny in Salonika in 1908. Soldiers were increasingly frustrated at going long periods without pay and the rebels took advantage of a chaotic situation to stage the revolt.

Nationalism caused a wide range of problems for the Ottoman Empire, with a desire for independence amongst oppressed regions being supported by those who had already gained their freedom. However, it must be noted that the way in which this nationalism was handled by the 'Red Sultan' and the continued intervention of the Great Powers in the region, also weakened the Ottomans significantly.

0 3 'The sole aim of the Peace Settlements of 1919–20 was to punish Germany.'

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 sole aim of the Peace Settlements of 1919–20 was to punish Germany might include:

- the French, in particular, desired revenge following invasions in 1870 and 1914, believing that the Germans would be inherently dangerous unless crippled. France had suffered the worst destruction in the conflict and Clemenceau sought compensation from Germany for this
- Lloyd George was determined to ensure that the settlements punished Germany in a way which would guarantee the maintenance of British naval supremacy and secure the Empire for the foreseeable future following German desires to challenge Britain
- Germany was deliberately excluded from the process to emphasize her status as loser, with Germany not allowed a negotiating position at any point. Germany was also prevented from joining the new ‘world government’ of the League of Nations at the point of creation
- drastic cuts to the Germany military restrictions and the demilitarised zone on the Rhineland sought to cut at German national pride and its longstanding history of military prowess in order to ensure that she could not begin another conflict
- Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles placed the blame for ‘causing all losses and damage’ squarely on Germany, allowing for the imposition of significant reparations in the following years as compensation.

Arguments challenging the view that the sole aim of the Peace Settlements of 1919–20 was to punish Germany might include:

- Woodrow Wilson’s aims for the peace settlement were idealistic; less based on punishing Germany and more in favour of a lasting European peace that overturned the old European rivalries and militarism as demonstrated by his Fourteen Points
- the Big Three also sought to prevent future conflict. The establishment of the League of Nations in order to keep the peace through arbitration and negotiation, was of distinct importance to Wilson and one of his main aims in this process
- there were elements of self-interest and preservation behind the treaties. Lloyd George believed that Britain would benefit from a negotiated peace, with Germany a potentially valuable trading partner, hence the Fontainebleau memorandum and consequent agreements
- a fear of communism also drove the settlements. Russia was mistrusted and side-lined, not being allowed to join the League of Nations. The Hungarian Soviet Republic faced terms much harsher than other defeated nations, losing two thirds of her territory in the Treaty of Trianon
- all of the defeated nations faced settlements, with the concept of self-determination not applied to the break-up of any of the defeated nations. The Treaties of St Germain, Neuilly, Trianon and Sèvres saw all of those defeated lose significant territory.

Whilst the punishment of Germany was certainly a driving force in the creation of the Treaty of Versailles, there was also a distinct desire to ensure that conflict would not break out again, alongside ensuring that all of the defeated nations faced the consequences of their actions through respective treaties.

- 0 4** To what extent was the self-interest of Britain and France responsible for the failure to resolve the crises over Manchuria and Abyssinia in the years 1931 to 1936?

[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 self-interest of Britain and France was responsible for the failure to resolve the crises over Manchuria and Abyssinia in the years 1931 to 1936 might include:

- the self-interest of Britain and France took priority over solving disputes. The circumstances of the Great Depression significantly hindered the value of economic sanctions; for instance, the British would not enforce coal sanctions on Italy as falling demand would threaten British jobs, and neither France nor Britain were prepared to prohibit Italian ships from using the Suez Canal for fear of the impact on their own economies
- Britain and France also lacked the will to send troops to support nations under threat during both crises. Neither nation believed that they could spare vital troops for external conflicts, for example Britain could not afford to send a peacekeeping force to Manchuria during the Crisis
- in the aftermath of the Depression, the British and French public in particular did not see the point of action in faraway places like Manchuria and Abyssinia. Also, the Hoare-Laval Pact may have worked in Abyssinia had it not been for deep public hostility
- Britain and France felt the friendship of Italy was more important as Germany grew in strength. Italy was seen as a very valuable ally against Hitler and a Germany that was rearming, as exemplified by the Stresa Pact of April 1935.

Arguments challenging the view that the self-interest of Britain and France was responsible for the failure to resolve the crises over Manchuria and Abyssinia in the years 1931 to 1936 might include:

- the systems and functions of the League of Nations meant that a response to any crisis was painstakingly slow. In Abyssinia, by the time the League had agreed that prohibitive oil sanctions could stop Italy, their invasion was almost completed
- American isolationism also significantly weakened the League's actions. The Stimson Doctrine saw the US refuse to recognise agreements over Manchuria that threatened US interests and the US would have continued to supply oil to Italy even if sanctions were enforced
- the League of Nations also lacked a firm deterrent, with no armed force of its own. Combined with the unwillingness of member nations to send their own troops, this meant nations could simply ignore the recommendations of reports and leave the League, as Japan did in 1933
- Japan and Italy were important League members, but seized by nationalist regimes they were prepared to ignore its principles and then simply leave. The crises were caused by the aggressive nationalism and expansionist ideals that arose in Japan and Italy
- it could also be argued that it was the precedent set by the response to the Manchurian Crisis that caused the Abyssinia Crisis. Seeing little response to Japanese aggression encouraged Mussolini to push on with his own empire building with such force and brutality.

It is undeniable that the self-interests of Britain and France led to a limited reaction to the crises in Manchuria and Abyssinia and, as the leading nations of the League, this hampered any realistic challenge to Japan and Italy. However, this must be viewed in the context of a League with was flawed from its very inception and a particular set of circumstances in the 1930s which allowed for failure to resolve both crises.