

AS

History

Paper 2K International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1917
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

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

AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2K International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1917

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why the ‘July Crisis’ led to the outbreak of war in 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 of 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 an official document which was formally issued to Serbia by the Austro-Hungarian government after the death of Archduke Franz Ferdinand.
- The tone is assertive and insistent.
- The ultimatum was issued a month after the assassination.

Content and argument

- The source shows a wide range of demands including that Serbia acts against those involved in propaganda against the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.
- It demands that the Serbian government allow the involvement of the Austro-Hungarian forces in suppressing rebellion against the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the assassination of Franz Ferdinand provided Austria-Hungary with a potential excuse to declare war on Serbia in the midst of rising national tension and gave them the opportunity to assert their authority over the Balkans
- the ultimatum offered to Serbia was designed to provoke war, providing just 48 hours to achieve wide-ranging demands; Austria-Hungary expected this to result in conflict.

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 German Ambassador to the United Kingdom who did not have first-hand knowledge of events following the assassination at Sarajevo.
- The tone of the source is assertive and motive.

Content and argument

- The source suggests that the Germans should not support Austria-Hungary in its conflict with the Serbians over Franz Ferdinand's assassination.
- It suggests that there is nothing for the Germans to gain from a conflict in the Balkans, other than Austro-Hungarian self-confidence.
- It suggests that Austria-Hungary shares some of the responsibility for the assassination.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- Germany offered a 'blank cheque' to the Austro-Hungarians, promising unconditional support even if the ultimatum to Serbia resulted in a wider European conflict
- some believed that diplomacy could have prevented the war, Sir Edward Grey suggested the issue could be resolved and even King George V had sent a telegram on July 28th offering to hold a conference to avoid the war.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) both sources acknowledge the role of Austria-Hungary in turning the July Crisis into the First World War. Source A reflects the widely held believe that the assassination of Franz Ferdinand presented Austria-Hungary with the perfect opportunity to go to war with the Serbians and that the ultimatum was never meant to be a diplomatic act. Source B, though a lone voice in its objections, also suggests the assassination alone was not a reason to go to war, but acknowledges the longstanding relationship between Austria-Hungary and Germany which provided the confidence in Vienna to provoke a war. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

0 2 'In the years 1890 to 1904, colonial rivalries brought Britain into serious conflict with France and Russia.'

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 supporting the view that colonial rivalries brought Britain into serious conflict with France and Russia, might include:

- “The Great Game” between Russia and Britain intensified at the end of the 19th century as Britain aimed to keep Russia from the borders of India during their expansion towards warm water ports on the Indian Ocean
- opposition to Russia expansion led to the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902. When war broke out between Russia and Japan in 1904 it looked likely that Britain would be at war with Russia and France as France backed Russia in this conflict
- the Fashoda Incident of 1898 saw British and French forces square up in Africa when they crossed paths as they forged their respective colonies (Britain was moving North/South and France West/East). This was seen as a serious war scare by the British and French governments.

Arguments challenging the view that colonial rivalries brought Britain into serious conflict with France and Russia, might include:

- the Fashoda Incident of 1898 was the last serious colonial dispute between Britain and France. The outcome of the incident saw the acknowledgement of British control over Egypt and French control over Morocco
- the Fashoda Incident had ended diplomatically, with the French foreign minister Delcassé seeing no advantage in colonial war as he was keen to gain friendship against Germany. It was this thinking that would see the signing of the Entente Cordiale in 1904
- although alarmed by the quick expansion of the Russian rail network in Central Asia, rather than look to conflict, Britain moved towards the Entente Cordiale with France, partly in the hope of France restraining the ambitions of her Russian ally, as well as acting as a facilitator for better relations between Britain and Russia.

Some good answers may conclude that whilst colonial rivalry brought tension between the nations in this period, these issues were resolved diplomatically and actually brought the nations to the point of an alliance at the start of the 20th Century.

0 3 'Between 1908 and 1913, Great Power diplomacy was successful in dealing with the problems caused by the decline of the Ottoman Empire.'

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 supporting the view that Great Power diplomacy was successful in dealing with the problems caused by the decline of the Ottoman Empire, might include:

- in April 1909 the Great Powers amended the terms of the 1878 Treaty of Berlin in acceptance of the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, bringing the Bosnian Crisis to an end
- the Treaty of London, signed in May 1913, agreed territorial adjustments within the Balkans, bring the First Balkan War to an end. The Great Powers forced Turkey to make concessions and ordered the Balkan League to vacate Albania
- the Anglo-Ottoman Convention of 1913 defined the limits of Ottoman jurisdiction in the Persian Gulf, becoming the basis for the formal independence and modern frontiers for modern Kuwait.

Arguments challenging the view that Great Power diplomacy was successful in dealing with the problems caused by the decline of the Ottoman Empire, might include:

- the Great Powers quarrelled amongst themselves over the fate of the Ottoman Empire after the Young Turk Revolution and failed to ensure that the Ottomans brought about much needed reforms to prevent further decline
- Austria-Hungary had taken the opportunity to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina in the turmoil experienced in the Ottoman Empire during the Young Turk Revolution, much to the distaste of the other powers, causing the Bosnian Crisis
- although there was an official consensus over the Ottoman Empire's territorial integrity, the conflicting interests of the Great Powers in the Ottoman Empire meant that they failed to prevent the Balkan Wars
- Italy's successful attack on the Ottoman Empire in 1911, taking Tripoli and Cyrenaica, sparked nationalism in the Balkans and showed how weak the Empire had become, which led to the Balkan Wars
- the Treaty of London imposed on the Balkan League by the Great Powers to end the First Balkan War, greatly dissatisfied the Serbians and Bulgarians, leading to a Second Balkan War.

Good answers may conclude that whilst there were some small successes, ultimately the Great Powers failed to deal with collapse of the Ottoman Empire and it would be the rising tensions in the Balkans that would eventually cause the outbreak of world war.