
AS

History

International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941

7041/2K Great Power rivalries and entry into war, c1890–1917

Mark scheme

June 2016

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

June 2016

International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941

AS History 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 the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908? **[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 source is from a 1918 American book documenting international relations in the build-up to the First World War, providing an outsiders' perspective (in terms of the tensions within Europe) with the benefit of hindsight and is given credibility as it is written by academics
- the source is a diplomatic handbook which is likely to focus on the legalistic, diplomatic reasons given by Austria-Hungary for the annexation, therefore offering value
- the tone is non-partisan and informative, with the suggestion that Austria-Hungary could no longer 'leave their status unclear' relating to the close proximity of the Balkans and the decline of the Ottoman Empire; Austria-Hungary was looking for the ideal opportunity to expand into the region, as provided by the Young Turk Revolution.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that under Count Aehrenthal, the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 provided a chance for Austria-Hungary to extend their control over Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Young Turk Revolution did provide an opportunity for Austria-Hungary to annex Bosnia-Herzegovina as there was little chance of a reaction from Turkey who were preoccupied with internal affairs
- it suggests that Austria-Hungary were concerned about their position in Bosnia-Herzegovina after the Young Turks promised self-government to the provinces and representation in the Turkish Parliament. The Revolution had provided Austria-Hungary with an excuse for the annexation, disguising the wider context – an agreement with Russia who initially supported the seizure of Bosnia-Herzegovina in return for unique access to the Straits
- references might be made to the wider international context referring, especially, to Russia's interest in the Balkans and the deal done by Aehrenthal.

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

Provenance and tone

- the source was written by the leader of the Austro-Hungarian empire declaring the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. It provides a one-sided view of the event, therefore does not reflect on the more pressing reasons for annexation. Rather than furthering the political advancement of Bosnia as suggested, the annexation was about solidifying Habsburg rule and aiding further expansion into the Balkans as the Ottoman Empire continued to weaken
- the tone of the source is one that seems to be trying to persuade the Bosnians that they should be thankful for the annexation. The source could also be seen as an attempt to reassure other European powers that the annexation was not a case of aggressive expansion, but just confirming their position in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that Bosnia-Herzegovina had prospered under Austro-Hungarian administration and that the annexation was simply the next step in this process to ensure the best possible outcome for the people, including ‘protection’ from the Ottoman regime
- it suggests that the annexation will bring further benefits to Bosnia-Herzegovina and its people, in particular a constitutional government which will give Bosnians a voice in the running of the country
- the offer of representation and positive outlook within the source came as an attempt to sway Bosnians away from the Young Turk promise of greater autonomy, as referenced in Source A, as well as attempting to counter nationalist and Serbian influence in the region.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) whilst both sources provide some context for the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Source A reflects the more realistic view that an opportunity was grasped after the Young Turk Revolution to enact the agreement with the Russians. Source B provides a rather more subjective view that the take-over was for the benefit of the Bosnian nation, though it was produced with the intention of swaying Bosnian opinion and, as such, disguises the real motivation behind the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

- 02** ‘Between 1890 and 1907, tension between the Great Powers was a result of increased militarism.’

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.

Increased militarism amongst the European nations caused tension as the Great Powers continued to build up their forces and seemingly prepare for future conflict, though these nations may have only turned to militarism in response to other pressures.

Arguments suggesting that between 1890 and 1907, tension between the Great Powers was a result of increased militarism might include:

- German policy was driven by militarism; the German Kaiser relied on a military council and chief of general staff. Determination to find their 'place in the sun' saw military expansion, military plans and modernisation which worried the other Great Powers
- Britain and Germany entered a naval race after Germany launched a naval programme designed to challenge the Royal Navy in 1897. This defied the 1889 'Two Power Standard' of the Royal Navy and saw the building of numerous battleships, including the Dreadnought in 1906 and consequent escalation of the race
- military plans, both offensive and defensive, raised tensions. For instance, France's Plan XIV (1898) and Plan XV (1903) attempted to combat the numerical inferiority of the French army through an offensive Franco-German border strategy and allow for the building of French reserves.

Arguments challenging the view that between 1890 and 1907, tension between the Great Powers was a result of increased militarism might include:

- colonial rivalry also elevated tensions; examples include the Fashoda incident of 1898 between the British and French, the German threat to British South Africa and the Russian threat to Britain's Asian colonies through the Trans-Siberian Railway from 1891 and expansion into Central Asia
- economic rivalry caused tension between Germany and Britain. Progress in chemical, electrical and engineering industries saw German exports dominate the Middle East, South American and South African markets, which displaced British goods. Britain would defend her role as economic powerhouse of the world
- as the Balkan nations began to rebel against the rule of the Ottoman Empire, tensions arose between the Great Powers as to who would triumph in the region. Britain was concerned that the Balance of Power would be disrupted as Austria-Hungary and Russia began to vie for control in the area
- the completion of a Triple Entente in 1907 saw competing alliance systems divide the Great Powers into two opposing camps. The Triple Entente essentially encircled the Triple Alliance and confirmed that Germany faced the prospect of a war on two fronts, which was planned for in the Schlieffen Plan.

Some good answers are likely to/may conclude that whilst European powers were concerned about increased militarism, it was the growth of Germany and Great Power colonies that caused widespread tension at the start of the 20th century.

- 03** 'Britain became involved in the First World War in August 1914 because Germany invaded Belgium.'

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.

Germany believed that their invasion of Belgium would not see Britain stand by the treaty of 1839 which guaranteed Belgian neutrality, but to what extent did this act finally bring Britain into the First World War?

Arguments suggesting that Britain became involved in the First World War in August 1914 because Germany invaded Belgium might include:

- the British government made much of their duty to protect Belgium. Belgium's ports were close to the British coast and German control of Belgium would have been seen as a serious threat to Britain. In the end, Britain refused to ignore the events of 4th August 1914, when Germany attacked France through Belgium as part of the Schlieffen Plan
- after the German invasion of Belgium there were press reports of the atrocities supposedly inflicted on the 'innocent' Belgians, seen as the 'Rape of Belgium'. It was felt that this gave Britain a moral obligation to enter the conflict in order to protect the Belgians from the aggressive Germans
- despite pressure from France and Russia to keep their moral obligation, as per the Triple Entente, Britain did not join the conflict until after the German invasion of Belgium even though both the French and Russian armies had mobilised and war was declared with Germany
- Britain had made efforts to prevent a conflict before the German refusal to leave Belgium (offer of a conference in London) and the government was undecided about becoming involved in the war in July 1914. The German invasion of Belgium won over a number of those against joining the conflict.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain became involved in the First World War in August 1914 because Germany invaded Belgium might include:

- the preservation of the Treaty of London was about the defence of France as well as Belgium. Britain desired the neutrality of Belgium in order to protect the French from the German army. This was particularly relevant after the 1912 Anglo-French Naval Convention in which British promised the protection of France's coastline from German naval attack
- although the Triple Entente did not require each country to go to war on behalf of the others, through the alliance they had a 'moral obligation' to support each other. As Germany had declared war on Russia and France it seemed increasingly likely that Britain would become involved
- there had been on-going tension with Germany for a number of years after she continued to threaten the Balance of Power in Europe that Britain longed to protect, as shown, for example, in the Moroccan Crises. There was increasing anti-German sentiment in the nation and a sense that a conflict against Germany was inevitable.

Some good answers are likely to/may conclude that despite increasing pressure from both France and Russia, with the French insisting that the British had a moral responsibility to support her allies, many in Britain wanted to stay out of the conflict and she continued to remain neutral until the German invasion of Belgium.