

---

# AS HISTORY

Paper 2K International Relations and Global Conflict, c1890–1917

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

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](http://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 United States entered the First World War in 1917? | <b>[25 marks]</b> |
|---|---|--|-------------------|

*Target: AO2*

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

#### Generic Mark Scheme

|            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be partial. There may be <b>either</b> some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question <b>or</b> 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.  | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The answer will <b>either</b> describe source content <b>or</b> 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.                                       | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

#### 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**

- this source is from the German Chancellor, making an official defence and justification of German policy. There is little attempt at a balanced or objective view
- the style is clear, direct and pleading Germany's innocence.

**Content and argument**

- it refers to significant reasons for US entry into the war, especially German use of unrestricted submarine warfare.
- it claims that the real reason why the US is being drawn into war is British policy in using blockade on the high seas.

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

- the extent to which Germany had aggressive intent towards the USA
- the nature of unrestricted submarine warfare
- the extent to which German actions were forced upon her by the British blockade

---

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

**Provenance and tone**

- it is the President's speech to Congress representing official American policy
- it is a direct reply
- the tone reflects President Wilson's high-flown idealism and his view of America's special place.

**Content and argument**

- the source argues that America does not want to go to war but is pushed into it.
- US interests were under attack and lives lost
- Germany is acting contrary to laws of humanity

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

- the accuracy of Wilson's stated position
- US losses, e.g. the Lusitania
- the indiscriminate nature of Germany's actions

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) the sources indicate opposing but also complementary views as they both recognise the importance of unrestricted submarine warfare. Source B is from Wilson himself and may be seen as more valuable in explaining America's decision, whilst Source A is a last ditch attempt by Germany to avoid war with the USA. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

**Section B**

- |          |          |  |
|----------|----------|--|
| <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> | The fact that Germany faced 'encirclement' from the Triple Entente by 1907 was entirely due to German foreign policymakers.' |
|----------|----------|--|

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**

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

### 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.**

In 1890, Germany was in a strong position. Her only direct enemy, France, was isolated and unable to threaten Germany militarily. By 1907, Germany was faced by a menacing Triple Entente, linking France, Russia (allies since 1894) and Britain. German policymakers had long feared ‘encirclement’ – this was now a reality, with the danger of a two-front war against France and Russia, backed by British worldwide sea power.

In explaining this, students may refer to some of the following in support of the view that German policymakers were to blame:

- after Bismarck’s dismissal in 1890, Wilhelm II let the Reinsurance Treaty lapse. This allowed Russia to drift towards an alliance with France
- provocative German policies, such as supporting the Boers in the South African war, alienated Britain and paved the way for the Entente Cordiale
- Germany had a chance to make an alliance with Britain in 1898; but rapid expansion of the German Navy (designed to make Britain see the need for a good relationship with Germany) had the opposite effect, pushing Britain to seek new allies
- the blundering personal initiatives of the Kaiser (such as his intervention in Morocco in 1905) caused alarm across Europe and pushed Britain and France closer together.

Students may also refer to some of the following to balance the argument:

- whilst Germany did cause some of its own problems, this does not mean emergence of the Triple Entente was ‘entirely’ due to German policymakers
- France was the key factor. France worked assiduously (and made massive loans) to win over Tsarist Russia to an alliance; France was also committed to an improved relationship with Britain, sacrificing colonial ambitions in the process
- Britain emerged from ‘splendid isolation’ for a complex mixture of reasons. Reacting to the perceived German threat was only a small part of this wider/long-term process of re-adjustment following the Boer War
- Russia was willing to make an agreement with Britain over Persia by 1907 because Russian foreign policy priorities had changed after the defeat by Japan in 1904–1905
- general structural reasons led towards the emergence of the rival alliances, including nationalism and the power of public opinion; and the rapid development of the arms race.

- 0 3** 'The main reason why a local conflict in the Balkans led to a general war in Europe in 1914 was Tsarist Russia's decision to back Serbia.'

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

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

### 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.**

In the summer of 1914, nobody had any idea that the First World War may occur. The

---

expectations were that conflict might be avoided entirely or, if war did break out, it would be short and localised. Answers should address the reasons why these expectations proved false and Europe was plunged into a major war.

Students may refer to some of the following in support of the proposition that Russia was mainly to blame:

- the looming conflict in July 1914 was between Austria and Serbia. Russia was the main backer of Serbia. If Russia advised Serbia to back down, there would have been no wider war
- Russia had been faced with a similar situation in the 1908–09 Bosnian Crisis. They wisely backed down then – many experts claim they should have done so in 1914
- Russia had had a revolution in 1905 and had recovered to a large extent in the years from 1906 to 1914. They were not ready for the strains of war in 1914 (as they knew)
- there was no pressing reason for Russia to clash with Germany in 1914. Russia was unwise to be committed to a war to help France.

Students may also refer to some of the following to refute or balance the argument:

- the pressures leading to war were much bigger and wider than any one country's decisions. War resulted from deep structural forces such as militarism and the arms race; or the 'accidental' failures of great power diplomacy; or the widespread failure to understand how bad the impact of modern warfare would actually be
- deliberate German aggression was the real cause of the slide to war. Without being pushed by Germany, Austria-Hungary would never have gone to war with Serbia
- the real cause of war was Austrian determination to launch a 'pre-emptive war' against Serbia – to deal with the worsening problems in the Balkans since 1903.

