

AS
HISTORY
7041/2K

International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941

Component 2K Great Power rivalries and entry into war, c1890–1917

Mark scheme

June 2019

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 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

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.

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941

Component 2K Great Power rivalries and entry into war, c1890–1917

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining Germany's response to British policy in July 1914? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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 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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- the statement comes from the German Chancellor, a key player, however, as a German record of a verbal statement the facts could have been distorted to show Germany in a better light
- the source comes from the cusp of a general war, specifically at the time of Russian partial mobilisation on 29 July, so this statement offers an insight into events at the time
- the tone of the source is very persuasive and seems persistent in its attempt to gain British neutrality, therefore the wording may have been very carefully chosen to achieve this aim.

Content and argument

- the persuasive nature of the statement reflects the fact that Germany hoped Britain would remain neutral in the impending conflict, this was due to the fact that the might of the British navy and Empire would be difficult to counter
- Britain was not obliged to join a conflict in central Europe, her concerns were more about the balance of power. The Triple Entente was not binding, particularly in support of Russia, and only secret naval agreements with France promised military support if attacked
- promises to assure Belgium neutrality lacked substance, given that Belgium was a key part of the Schlieffen Plan. It would be the Treaty of London that 'triggered' British entry, though it was not the sole reason. The Germans believed that Britain would not uphold a 'scrap of paper'
- this statement was part of continued German efforts to demonstrate to other nations that they were acting on the defensive and not being aggressive, suggesting that Russian mobilisation would trigger conflict, all in an attempt to keep Britain out of the war.

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

Provenance and tone

- notes from Kaiser Wilhelm II would be very informative given his very active role in German foreign policy, however, given Wilhelm's anti-British stance it may only reflect his personal view
- this source is likely an accurate reflection of the response, given that these notes were unlikely to be published
- the tone of the source is one of extreme anger in an immediate reaction to British declarations, which is reflective of the Kaiser's personality.

Content and argument

- as suggested in the source, King George V had initially stated that Britain would do all it could to prevent war and stay out of a wider European conflict, but at no point had Britain promised full neutrality
- there had been much communication between Tsar Nicholas II, King George V and Kaiser Wilhelm II in an attempt to prevent conflict, but ultimately this process was out of their hands. Military forces in Russia and Germany, and the government in Britain controlled decisions
- Germany felt that Britain had the power to stop French and Russian actions through their membership of the Triple Entente, though Germany continually tried to show that German actions were defensive, for instance mobilisation came after Russia's partial mobilisation
- earlier British action in threatening involvement may have been able to prevent German actions, as believing Britain would stay out of the war encouraged escalation. Grey's statement came too late as mobilisation had begun and the bombardment of Belgrade would start on 30 July.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might decide that although the purpose was to persuade Britain to remain neutral, Source A shows Britain's importance, with an element of desperation on Germany's part and an explanation of what Germany believed could bring Britain into the war, whereas Source B is more of a rash reaction to a broken 'promise'.

Section B

02 'There was little Great Power rivalry in the years 1890 to 1900.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that there was little Great Power rivalry in the years 1890 to 1900 might include:

- new alliances were formed, for example the 1894 Franco-Russian Alliance. The growth of two opposing alliances acted as a deterrent to war as the Great Powers showed concern for who might become involved in extended conflict
- colonial rivalries were settled through diplomacy, for example the 1898 Fashoda Incident, which could have been a significant crisis in Franco-British relations, ended peacefully when the French conceded to British demands
- the Concert of Europe continued to function in keeping the balance of power, for instance Britain, Italy, Austria-Hungary and Spain created the Mediterranean Treaties which helped to contain Russian expansionism in the region during this period
- as the Ottoman Empire declined, the Great Powers made significant efforts to maintain the status quo. This led to a cautious response to on-going issues in the Balkans, with Austria-Hungary having a policy of maintaining friendly relations in the Balkan region.

Arguments challenging the view that there was little Great Power rivalry in the years 1890 to 1900 might include:

- growing and shifting alliances created great tensions. The Reinsurance Treaty was not renewed in 1890 and the Franco-Russian alliance formed as a response to the Triple Alliance. Germany viewed this as encirclement, with the secretive nature of the terms of alliances increasing suspicion
- colonial rivalries still persisted, with the Germans sending military aid to support locals in the 1895 Jameson Raid, which was followed by the infamous Kruger Telegram. These actions were perceived as meddling, leading to great resentment of Germany in Britain
- the continuing decline of the Ottoman Empire presented significant opportunities for expansion at the expense of one another that served to promote Great Power rivalry, for example, Russia was deeply aggrieved by the Austro-Hungarian influence in the Balkan region
- nationalism in the Balkan region caused great worry amongst the Great Powers. Pan-Slavism was significantly popular in both the Balkans and Russia, with Russia seen as protector of Slavs against the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which stirred tensions between Russia and Austria-Hungary.

It can be argued that although significant rivalries had been contained, with conflict successfully avoided by 1900 and the balance of power across Europe essentially maintained, new alliances highlighted a shift away from diplomacy towards secret negotiations and increased tensions.

03 'Germany alone was responsible for increased militarism in Europe by 1911.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Germany alone was responsible for increased militarism in Europe by 1911 might include:

- there was a unique position for the army in Germany, which held a significant influence with both the leadership and within decision-making. This triggered much expansion through the Naval Laws and other foreign policy
- Kaiser Wilhelm II played a key personal role in military affairs. He was often belligerent, giving a range of provocative speeches, which drove forward the concept of Weltpolitik and a militaristic attitude
- Germany increased expenditure on its military and armaments by 73% from 1870 to 1914, compared to around just 10% in Britain and France. Germany was also home to the powerful Krupp Empire, which encouraged competition
- contrary to German military strategy, other nations had sought a diplomatic approach to resolving tensions in this time period. Tsar Nicholas even pushed for disarmament conference at The Hague in 1899.

Arguments challenging the view that Germany alone was responsible for increased militarism in Europe by 1911 might include:

- all of the Great Powers had military plans at this time, for example Plan No 19 for Russia with French backing, alongside the infamous Schlieffen Plan. Competing alliances necessitated the need for all to be prepared
- all of the continental European powers relied on compulsory conscription to build their armed forces, with key army reforms in Britain from 1907 ensuring a strong British Expeditionary Force for service on the continent
- British failures in the Boer War around the turn of the twentieth century had encouraged greater development of the military forces in order to ensure Britain was able to maintain her place in the world
- it could be seen that it was in fact Britain who had brought about an escalation of the naval race against Germany, with the building of Dreadnoughts and an on-going desire to maintain the Two-Power Standard.

It can be argued that the other powers were often reacting to German developments, as seen in the Naval Race, driven by the vital role played by the military in German politics.