
AS

History

International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1941

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

Mark scheme

7041

June 2017

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 2017

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 Anglo-Russian relations in the years 1904 to 1907? **[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 a letter from the British Ambassador to France to the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs and as such, provides only a British interpretation of French views on the Anglo-Russian relationship, though there would be value given that both men were significant in foreign affairs and should therefore be knowledgeable on current events
- the source is written before any significant formal negotiations had been made between Russia and Britain and seems to only reflect a French desire for better Anglo-Russian relations. The optimism offered by the French regarding the chances of improving relations is not so easily matched in the later review offered by Source B
- the tone of the source is informative yet informal, which would suggest that there would be little reason to doubt the content. Bertie appears to be simply conveying information about a meeting with the French minister for Foreign Affairs.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that Delcassé desires a settlement between Britain and Russia to help bring peace. He refers to the fact that France and Russia already have an agreement, therefore this would bring about a mutual friendship between the three countries; indeed an Anglo-Russian Agreement would be final step towards the Triple Entente
- although the source suggests that from the French point of view improved relations between Britain and Russia would bring a long reigning peace between the three nations, it would actually also see the forming of two distinctly opposing alliance systems in Europe
- the source also refers to the Entente Cordiale between France and Britain and how Bompard (the French ambassador to Russia) believed that the mutual concessions of the Entente could be replicated between Britain and Russia to end ill-feeling between the two. This antagonism had been driven by colonial disagreements which would be ended by improving relations and ultimately the 1907 Anglo-Russian agreement.

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

Provenance and tone

- the source comes from the British Ambassador to Russia who is reporting on Russia's foreign relations for the British foreign office, therefore it may offer details not released elsewhere. However, Nicolson had only recently taken up the post which may explain the 'difficulty in forming a clear and decided opinion'
- as the source is written by a British diplomat for the purposes of British documentation it does not provide a directly Russian point of view, instead only providing Nicolson's interpretation of Russian views on Anglo-Russian relations
- the tone of the source is cautious, but optimistic; the ambassador appears to feel that relations are improving and that a more formal agreement between the two would be possible, but only if Britain were to offer concessions to Russia.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that the relationship between Russia and Britain is complicated and that Russia is in a state of flux following the Russo-Japanese War. This may refer to Russian frustrations about the Anglo-Japanese Alliance which had been directed against Russia at the time
- the source refers to the traditional rivalries between Russia and Britain, particularly colonial issues in the Middle East and Asia. The two nations were able to start to reconsider these rivalries by 1905, particularly after a surprise defeat for Russia against Japan and amidst growing tensions in Europe
- the source suggests that an agreement between the two countries would only be possible if Britain were to safeguard Russian interests and not interfere in their military plans. This would be realised through the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, where spheres of influence were confirmed in return for better relations.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students could argue that although Source A explores the wider context and the influence of France in improving relations between Britain and Russia, Source B is the more valuable source in that it attempts to offer quite a frank view on the complicated relationship between the two countries and what would be needed to achieve a formal Anglo-Russian agreement.

Section B

- 02** ‘The personal influence of Kaiser Wilhelm II was the main reason for Germany’s worsening relations with foreign powers by 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 the personal influence of Kaiser Wilhelm II was the main reason for Germany's worsening relations with foreign powers by 1900 might include:

- the 1871 constitution enshrined the power of the Kaiser, a hereditary monarch, who was personally responsible for foreign policy. He was determined to take Germany in the direction of his own choosing and often unwilling to take the advice of those in government
- Wilhelm changed the direction of German foreign policy from *Realpolitik* to *Weltpolitik*. This extended imperialism would challenge the empires of France and Britain, with the Navy Laws of 1898 and 1900 offering a direct threat to the supremacy of the Royal Navy
- in 1896 Wilhelm sent a telegram congratulating President Kruger in South Africa for upholding the independence of the Transvaal after the Jameson raid by the British. This was seen as a significant insult to the British and led to further deterioration in relations
- in 1890 the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia was allowed to lapse. Wilhelm was seen to be anti-Russian and the ending of the treaty pushed Russia towards France, resulting in the anti-German Franco-Russian alliance of 1894.

Arguments challenging the view that the personal influence of Kaiser Wilhelm II was the main reason for Germany's worsening relations with foreign powers by 1900 might include:

- Wilhelm was not the only advocate of *Weltpolitik* in Germany. The Pan-German League and Navy League, along with key industrialists, put pressure on the government to pursue expansion, with Admiral Tirpitz and Bülow pushing for the Naval laws
- economic rivalry caused tension between Germany and Britain. Progress in chemical, electrical and engineering industries saw German exports displace British goods. Britain wished to defend her role as economic powerhouse of the world, worsening relations
- Bismarck had sparked colonial tensions having collaborated with the French against British interests in Africa in the 1880s, leading to the creation of two competing colonies, German East Africa and a British protectorate in Zanzibar
- the popular feeling of *revanche* in France after the Franco-Prussian War and reaction against the Dual Alliance of 1879 brought about the Franco-Russian alliance in 1894 which saw the encirclement of Germany and greater tensions between the nations

Students may argue that although the Kaiser had distinct power and was sure to make the most of these powers to direct policy in a way that pleased him, there were wider issues that saw tensions rise across Europe by the turn of the century.

03 'Italy entered the First World War due to its long-standing disputes with Austria-Hungary.'

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 Italy entered the First World War due to its long-standing disputes with Austria-Hungary might include:

- Italy willingly joined the conflict against Austria-Hungary due to their long-standing rivalry; there had been many disagreements between the two nations over territory, expansion and borders since before Italian unification and tensions remained over the Austrian rule of Italian inhabited territories such as Trentino and Istria
- Austria-Hungary doubted Italy's commitment to the Triple Alliance and from 1903 plans for a possible war against Rome were maintained by the Austrian general staff. Mutual suspicions led to reinforcement of frontiers and there was speculation in the press about a war between the two countries
- Italy had viewed Austria's invasion of Serbia in 1914 as 'aggressive' and argued that as the Triple Alliance was a 'defensive' agreement, there was no obligation for Italy to side with the Central powers
- Austria had refused to offer Trentino and Trieste in the negotiations of 1915, so Italy turned to the Allies who were prepared to give Italy what she wanted in the Treaty of London in order to sway Italy over to the side of the Allies.

Arguments challenging the view that Italy entered the First World War due to its long-standing disputes with Austria-Hungary might include:

- Italy was increasingly aware that remaining neutral in the conflict would mean they would be unlikely to gain land in the case of a victory for the Triple Entente and that if the Central powers won there would likely be harsh repercussions, given that Italy had refused to enter the conflict on the side of the Triple Alliance
- the land on offer from Britain and France through the Treaty of London would give Italy considerable influence over the Adriatic, something Italians desired to see as part of the Risorgimento (resurgence of Italy) which had been on-going since unification
- in 1902 Italy had signed a secret agreement with the French that had essentially nullified the terms of the Triple Alliance and made it increasingly likely that Italy would join the conflict on the side of the Entente.

Students may conclude that although the potential spoils of war on offer in the Treaty of London undoubtedly swayed the Italian government over to the side of the Triple Entente, there was an awareness that Italy could not afford to remain neutral for much longer and given their history with Austria-Hungary, their alliance had always been a tentative coalition unlikely to last.