



A-level HISTORY 7042/2K

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



2 4 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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2024 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 escalation of the Second World War in 1941.

[30 marks]*Target: AO2*

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source, coming from Molotov, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, is obviously going to be very damning of the attack by the Nazis on the USSR in the summer of 1941, breaking the Nazi-Soviet Pact which Molotov had signed in 1939
- the radio broadcast comes the morning after the attack is launched and demonstrates the seriousness and hastiness Molotov wants to speak to the Soviet People to prove it was the Nazis who broke the Pact and widened the war
- coming straight after the invasion, the source offers a fresh and immediate reaction to the event, though Molotov is making the speech instead of Stalin. The Nazis had broken the Nazi-Soviet Pact, a Pact that Molotov had signed. However, at the point of signing it could be suggested that due to Stalin's distrust of Hitler, he knew that at some stage Hitler would try to invade, especially as Hitler's main aim of creating Lebensraum involved taking land East of Germany
- the tone shows anger and disbelief. The use of the words: 'treacherous'/'never once been able to dispute our observance' demonstrates Molotov's anger at the Nazis breaking the Pact. This could be challenged slightly as the Soviets had an idea that the Nazis would one day attack. It is clear propaganda as the regime could not afford to lose public confidence.

Content and argument

- Molotov informs the Russian people over the radio that the Nazis have invaded the Soviet Union in many places, as well as Romania and Finland, demonstrating the war was widened in 1941. This is valuable as Hitler's Operation Barbarossa sent armed forces in three directions: to Leningrad, Moscow and the Ukraine. He was adamant to prevent supply lines from the USSR to Finland and Molotov alludes to this
- Molotov makes clear that the Nazis did not declare war on the Soviet Union despite launching an attack unequalled in history. This is valuable as Hitler did not want to pre-warn the Soviets of his impending invasion. Barbarossa was also the largest land invasion force the world had ever seen, giving the source value
- Molotov's main point is that the Nazis have broken the terms of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. This is valuable as the non-aggression pact in 1939 meant the sworn enemies would not attack each other. However, because Hitler's plans in Poland and Western Europe went smoother than expected, he was able to turn his attention to the Soviet Union
- the source refers to the responsibility for the attack lying solely in the hands of the Germans. However, the USSR had been preparing for war since 1939 and must bear some responsibility for the escalation.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- as the former Prime Minister of Japan, Tojo is valuable in relaying Japan's reasons for escalating the war and attacking the USA in December 1941 at Pearl Harbor even though he was no longer prime minister at the time of writing. He is also taking the blame for the Emperor who made most of the decisions
- however, as Tojo is writing whilst in captivity having lost the war, Tojo is clearly trying to remove Japan from any blame for escalating the war, instead placing it on the USA and Britain
- Tojo's emphasis limits the source as it suggests that the USA was to blame for the widening of the war and that Japan was acting merely in self-defence. Japan had been expansionist in the Far East and it would have been unreasonable to expect the USA not to protect its interests
- the tone is extremely anti-American and self-serving, essentially justifying Japan's actions that led to the escalation of the war.

Content and argument

- Tojo's source is valuable for studying the escalation of the war as it clearly pinpoints the motivations behind the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and when plans were put in place for the attack in December 1941
- Tojo's reference to China is valuable for understanding the widening of the war as it was Japanese ambition in China that was triggered when the USA declared war on the Japanese following the attack on Pearl Harbor
- the reference made to withdrawal from China is valuable as the USA were unprepared to abandon China and therefore interfere with Japanese expansion through economic sanctions which did anger the Japanese and led to the attack on the USA. Similarly, this explains Tojo's remark surrounding 'protect and defend' the interests of Japan
- furthermore, Tojo's argument that '... hope of reaching a resolution through diplomatic negotiation...' is limited as Japan consistently refused all US requests.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- as a disillusioned general, Kleist gives an honest opinion on the widening of the war and the reasons behind it. He alludes to the fact that the Führer and his advisors thought the Russians would be defeated quickly as a reason for widening the war and he would have been privy to that intelligence as a high-ranking officer
- Kleist is writing shortly after the war, with hindsight. His army lost the war so he is now trying to absolve himself of any blame for attacking the Soviet Union and blames the High Command for their mistaken beliefs. He is perhaps trying to show the British public that not all Germans were of the same opinion as the Nazi High Command
- the source, coming from a general involved in Operation Barbarossa, is valuable as this was the operation that escalated the war into the Soviet Union and gives insight into Hitler's supposed motives for doing so
- the tone is quite disgruntled. Kleist was clearly told one thing and was faced with another during the escalation of the war and so by the time of writing, he is not holding back his honest opinion about being told things that didn't materialise. He is trying to justify why he and his fellow commanders followed the orders.

Content and argument

- the argument that hopes of victory were built on political upheaval is valuable as it demonstrates the German belief that the Soviet regime would collapse. This is valuable as Hitler believed the USSR would not be able to repel Barbarossa and was a reason he chose to attack in 1941
- Kleist's reference to a potential Russian attack on Germany can be challenged as Stalin was not preparing to attack Germany and was using the time given to him by the Nazi-Soviet Pact to build up militarily and economically. However, it does demonstrate value in showing what the Germans were told by the High Command
- Kleist's account does not show the real Naz thinking as set out in Mein Kampf with the creation of Lebensraum. Therefore, the source loses value because ever since coming in to power Hitler had been planning to expand into the East and so widening the war was almost inevitable
- Kleist's argument that the Nazis were hoping for a quick victory is valuable as Hitler's Barbarossa plan was based on Blitzkrieg before Stalin had time to react. This is valuable because with the Nazi-Soviet Pact, Stalin was not expecting Hitler to invade so soon.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent was Great Britain responsible for the increase in international tension in the years c1890 to 1900?

[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 Great Britain was responsible for the increase in international tension in the years c1890 to 1900 might include:

- Britain's policy of 'splendid isolation' during this period contributed to the increase in tensions, as it encouraged other European powers, such as Germany, to pursue their own aggressive foreign policies, knowing that Britain was unlikely to intervene
- Great Britain's imperialistic policies in South Africa during the late 19th century contributed to the increase in international tensions, as other European powers, felt threatened by Britain's expansionist ambitions especially the actions of Rhodes
- British ambitions for North Africa contributed to the increase in tensions as evidenced by the Fashoda Incident in 1898 with France over Sudan after the British victory at Omdurman solidified their claim to the region despite French attempts to connect their territories. Britain refused to back down and eventually forced the French to retreat
- the foreign policy of the British increased tensions: there were failed talks with Germany in 1898 partly because of international resentment of British naval dominance.

Arguments challenging the view that Great Britain was responsible for the increase in international tension in the years c1890 to 1900 might include:

- Russia's aggressive foreign policy, particularly its expansionist ambitions in Asia and the Balkans, contributed significantly to the increase in international tensions during this period. For example, the development of the Trans-Siberian Railway and its support for Serbia in the Balkans led to diplomatic crises with other European powers
- France's foreign policy during this period was largely focused on containing German power and influence and this added to international tension. French policymakers viewed Germany as a growing threat to their national security: in 1894, France formed an alliance with Russia, which was aimed at countering the perceived threat from Germany. This alliance contributed significantly to the increase in international tensions during this period as Germany felt encircled
- under the leadership of Kaiser Wilhelm II, Germany pursued an aggressive foreign policy aimed at establishing itself as a dominant power in Europe. This policy, known as Weltpolitik, involved expanding German influence and acquiring territories overseas. Furthermore, in 1898, Germany began construction on a large navy aimed at challenging Britain's naval dominance. This naval build-up was seen as a direct threat to British interests, and contributed to tensions between the two countries. Furthermore, the Kruger telegram and Wilhelm's continued support for the Boers increased tensions with Britain
- Austria-Hungary's aggressive foreign policy in the Balkans contributed significantly to the increase in international tensions during this period. The Austro-Hungarian Empire sought to expand its influence in the Balkans
- Great Britain was not responsible because, bolstered by its navy and dominance in finance, trade and industry, Britain's main aim was to retain the status quo – hence stayed out of alliances – and attempted to keep the peace.

Overall, students should argue the 'extent' to which Britain was responsible while also evaluating the contribution of other factors. Students may decide that Britain played a major part but this was equalled by that of other powers and their own ambitions during the period. Reward any well balanced and substantiated conclusion.

0 3 'In the years 1908 to 1913, the Great Powers dealt effectively with the crises in the Balkans.'

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 1908 to 1913, the Great Powers dealt effectively with the crises in the Balkans might include:

- the Great Powers' response to the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary in 1908 was effective because it helped to prevent a larger conflict, with Russia ultimately backing down from its threats of war. Austria and Russia provoked a potential crisis but the sensible actions from the Great Powers resolved the issues
- Great Powers dealt effectively with the decline of Turkey and the imminent crisis of 1911 after the Italian invasion of Turkish territory in North Africa. The British-French efforts to prop up Turkey and limit risks to the area showed a determination to prevent crises evolving, demonstrating effectiveness
- the Great Powers' negotiations at the end of 1912 and the beginning of 1913 were successful in mediating the crisis: the 1912 Conference of London prevented a broader European conflict by mediating in the First Balkan War and establishing the borders of newly independent Balkan states.
- Austria-Hungary's effective actions after the end of the First Balkan War forced the Serbs to retreat from Albania, diffusing tensions in the region
- the 1912–1913 Balkan Wars did not escalate into a broader European conflict in 1913, demonstrating the Great Powers' ability to manage the threat posed by Balkan nationalism in this time period.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1908 to 1913, the Great Powers dealt effectively with the crises in the Balkans might include:

- Austria-Hungary's annexation of Bosnia in 1908, in the wake of the Young Turk movement, was a main reason for the impending crises to begin as Russia and Austria confirmed their rival status
- the Great Powers were ineffective in dealing with the crisis in the time period as ultimately, they were unable to prevent the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913 despite their best efforts after 1908. The actions of the Great Powers left the ambitions of many Balkan states unrealised especially Greece and Serbia who felt Bulgaria had gained too much. It was Bulgaria which renewed the conflict
- the Great Powers were ineffective in their involvement in the Balkans with unresolved tensions in Serbia even after the Treaty of London. The ineffective response to the First Balkan War led to the Second Balkan War which in turn allowed Serbia to grow in confidence and led to an increase in the activity of the Black Hand
- the Great Powers were ineffective in dealing with the crises in the Balkans because tensions between the Great Powers themselves were raised over the course of the time period, especially between Austria and Russia, eg Russia was increasingly willing to support Serbian demands, whilst Austria was struggling to contain different ethnic groups within its empire.

Overall, students may argue that whilst the Great Powers were successful in preventing the crises in the Balkans spilling out into a world war during the time frame, the underlying tensions of nationalism and aggression between the nations still existed in 1913. Students may argue that the Great Powers were not successful in dealing with the crises as they could not prevent further issues from occurring. Some may argue that the Great Powers were successful as they did all they could to avoid all-out war during the time frame but struggled to fully contain the nationalist threat especially from Serbia and Bulgaria.

- 0 4** To what extent was the League of Nations weakened by the absence of the USA in the years 1919 to 1923?

[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 League of Nations was weakened by the absence of the USA in the years 1919 to 1923 might include:

- the defeat of Wilson in 1920 led to isolationism in the USA and this fundamentally weakened the League of Nations by American withdrawal
- the US was a major diplomatic power, and its absence from the League limited the organisation's ability to influence global politics and promote international cooperation. The US had played a key role in negotiating the Treaty of Versailles and other post First World War treaties, and its absence from the League weakened the legitimacy of these treaties and the League's authority to enforce them
- the US had also been a major proponent of disarmament and had played a key role in negotiating the Washington Naval Treaty of 1922, which had limited naval armaments. Without US support, the League was unable to promote disarmament effectively and was therefore a weaker organisation
- the US was a major military power, and its absence from the League limited the organisation's ability to respond effectively to early crises in the 1920s. For example, the Vilnius dispute in 1920, and the Corfu incident in 1923. In both instances, The League intervened to try to resolve the conflicts, but without US military support, its ability to enforce its decisions was limited.
- the absence of the USA allowed France and Britain to become dominant within the League. For example, France's occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 was a significant challenge to the League's authority, as it demonstrated the League's inability to enforce its decisions. The League appeared to only support the victors of the First World War, more akin to Clemenceau's visions. Britain went on to focus on its Empire rather than the priorities of the League.

Arguments challenging the view that the League of Nations was weakened by the absence of the USA in the years 1919 to 1923 might include:

- the League of Nations was already hampered by structural weaknesses. It had no standing army and economic sanctions were the only real threat it could use
- the League relied on consensus-based decision-making, which limited its ability to respond effectively to international crises as members were too concerned with acting in their own interests than for the good of the League
- attempts to move forward with disarmament were unsuccessful but not necessarily due to the absence of the USA. The proposed Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1923, which expected all member nations to send troops to defend victims of aggression, was never enacted and offered limited guidance on how to deal with disarmament
- major powers, including Russia and Germany, were prevented from joining the League of Nations, limiting its effectiveness and influence on the global stage. For example, Russia and Germany sought their own independent treaty (Rapallo) effectively undermining the Treaty of Versailles. This further weakened the League's ability to promote international cooperation and collective security as Russia was isolated and Germany was a pariah state.

Students could argue that due to the absence of the USA, the League of Nations was weak from its inception as it was the brainchild of Woodrow Wilson. Moreover, the absence of the USA as a major world power limited the league's effectiveness. Nevertheless, some will argue that the League was weakened by other factors because there was a lack of cooperation. Similarly, the decisions they made weakened the League not the USA's absence. Furthermore, some students may point to minor successes the league achieved to demonstrate the USA's absence did not weaken the league so much that they couldn't function at all. Reward any well substantiated and balanced judgement.