



**GCE**

**History A**

Unit **Y248/01**: International Relations 1890–1941

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H105**

**Mark Scheme for June 2016**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.















All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking.

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
	Assertion
	Analysis
	Evaluation
	Explanation
	Factor
	Illustrates/Describes
	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Judgement
	Knowledge and understanding
	Simple comment
	Unclear
	View

1. Use the following indicative content mark scheme in conjunction with the generic levels of response in the Appendix.
2. Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1*	<p><b>How far was German foreign policy responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing Germany was responsible,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> Germany's support for Austria-Hungary and, especially, her 'blank cheque' of 1914. For example, her support of Austria following the Bosnian Crisis of 1908 which was replicated in the July Crisis of 1914 only served to convince the Russians that she had no alternative than to forcibly resist the Germans and Austrians if she was to fulfil her Pan-Slav ambitions upon which the prestige of her autocracy increasingly rested following its defeat in the Far East in 1905.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> that German imperialism and 'Weltpolitik' had led her to embark upon a path which could only be considered a direct threat by the 'Entente' powers. For example, Germany's aggressive naval rearmament could only be seen as a direct threat by the British which had to be challenged before it presented insuperable difficulties; the German attitude during the Boer War, her colonial expansion and her ambitions in the Ottoman Empire with the building of the Berlin-Baghdad railway were similarly seen as a direct threat by the Entente.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement as to how far German foreign policy was responsible.</li> <li>• At higher levels, answers might establish criteria against which to judge the relative responsibility of German policy.</li> <li>• To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the German War Council of 1912 and the general strains placed upon Germany by her domestic policies which encouraged her to seek distraction in foreign adventures.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> Germany's reaction to the Bosnian Crisis of 1908 and her role in the Moroccan Crises of 1906 and 1911. For example, her clear support for Austria-Hungary allowed Aehrenthal to completely outwit Izvolsky, leaving Russia humiliated and convinced she could not tolerate a similar defeat; in the Moroccan Crises, Germany hoped to drive apart the newly reconciled Britain and France, but, in fact, only succeeded in strengthening their friendship leaving Germany feeling at greater risk than ever.</li> </ul> <p><b>In arguing other factors were more important,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> Britain's growing understanding with France and Russia. The ententes of 1904 and 1907 – combined with the failure to reach a similar agreement with Germany – convinced Germany that she was threatened by encirclement and that, consequently, she could not afford to allow her only friend amongst the great powers – Austria-Hungary – to be threatened, explaining her reaction to the Sarajevo assassination.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the alleged responsibility of Russia for the outbreak of World War One, for example considering the fact that the order to mobilise during the July crisis was the cause of Germany's declaration of war on her which brought the alliance system into play.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the alleged responsibility of Austria-Hungary for the outbreak of World War One, for example, explaining the severity of the ultimatum to Serbia following the Sarajevo assassination left Serbia with little option but to object and that this was, in fact the Austrian intention, given that she believed the ambition of Serbia represented a direct threat to her continued existence as a great power.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the effect of the arms race on all powers, explaining that this produced a situation often described as 'war by timetable'. For example, Germany could be argued to have believed that the degree of military strength projected to have been acquired by Russia by 1917 left her with no alternative other than to seek an opportunity to strike against Russia before that year.</li> </ul> <p><b>To what extent did the Paris Peace Settlement fulfil the aims of the 'Big Four' with regard to Germany?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing the settlement did fulfil the aims of the Big Four,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the continued existence of the German state which was expected to act as a bulwark against the rise of Communism in the East as well as, from Britain's point of view, being able to continue to act as a counter weight to French hegemony in Europe.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement as to how far the settlement fulfilled the aims.</li> <li>• At higher levels, answers might establish criteria against which to judge this.</li> <li>• To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> Germany had been successfully contained, having lost approximately 1/8 of its population, land mass and industrial resources meaning it was seen as being unlikely to be capable of mounting another attack of the kind it had in 1914.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the territorial settlement which saw Britain gain a large proportion of Germany's colonies and France gain the return of Alsace-Lorraine which she had lost in 1871; the demilitarisation of the Rhineland and settlement of the Saar were seen as meeting French demands for a weaker Germany across her border without strengthening the French to an undue degree at the same time.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the eventual settlement of the reparations question. Lloyd George had just fought an election campaign on the basis of 'Make Germany Pay', whilst France expected compensation for the destruction of 1/3 of her territory and the strain put on her population by the loss of the biggest proportion of the male population aged between 18 and 28; the USA had come to agree with the demand for reparations, especially after witnessing the scale of German demands at Brest-Litovsk.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the 'war guilt clause' since all powers were in agreement the war sprang from German aggression, something even the Americans had come to accept after Brest-Litovsk. The clause then provided the legal justification for all other actions taken against Germany.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p><b>In arguing the settlement did not fulfil the aims of the Big Four,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the failure to contain Germany successfully. For example, in 1914 the German Empire had been surrounded by three major powers: France, Austria-Hungary and Russia. After the Paris Peace Settlement, on her southern and eastern borders, Germany was surrounded by new and largely unstable states such as Poland and Czechoslovakia; once she had recovered from World War One, Germany would find it easy to act aggressively against these states.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the failure to create a body capable of performing an international peace-keeping role successfully. The Treaty, together with the peace settlement as a whole, left the role of 'world policeman' to the League. However, agreement could not be reached on providing the League with the necessary means to fulfil this role and the withdrawal of the USA from international affairs after the conference left the League dangerously weak; the exclusion of Germany from the League as well as the other defeated powers also worked to undermine its effectiveness.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the problems associated with the reparations settlement. For example, the fact that the Germans were forced to sign the treaty without even knowing the final figure for reparations could only breed resentment; the final figure finally presented could also be argued to have acted to undermine the successful development of peace-oriented democracy in the new German Republic.</li> </ul>		



Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the controversial nature of the war guilt clause further undermined the new German government and gave ammunition to right wing demands for vengeance, especially as the Social Democrats had argued against war in 1914.</li><li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the alienation of states such as Italy and Japan. For example, Italy argued the settlement left her with a 'mutilated victory' and failed to honour the commitments made to her in the Treaty of London of 1915, especially in regard to Fiume. This alienation would ultimately open the door to German alliances with these states which made successful containment of Germany even more unlikely.</li></ul>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	<p><b>'War in 1939 did not result from Hitler's long-term determination to begin one, but from his short-term miscalculation of the allied reaction to the Polish Crisis.'</b></p> <p><b>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making reference to other interpretations that you have studied.</b></p> <p>The historical debate about the role of Hitler and that of the appeasing nations in causing the Second World War centres around both roles and more general factors which include the legacy of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, the impact of the Great Depression, and the roles of other nations such as the Soviet Union, Italy and Japan.</p> <p><b>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the interpretation,</b> answers might consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hitler had no wish to fight a major war in Western Europe.</li> <li>• Britain and France had led him to believe they were unwilling to fight over Eastern Europe.</li> </ul> <p><b>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation,</b> answers might use knowledge and understanding of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hitler's aims in foreign policy. For example, answers might consider the fact that Hitler's principal designs for aggression and expansion were concerned with Soviet Russia rather than with the Western powers, as well as the fact that he especially wished to avoid a repeat of a two front war after the experience of World War One and regarded the British as a 'natural ally'.</li> </ul>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• Candidates must use their knowledge and understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate surrounding the issue to analyse and evaluate the given interpretation.</li> <li>• Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation.</li> <li>• The quality of analysis and the evaluation of the interpretation should be considered when assigning answers to a Level, not the quantity of other interpretations included in the answer.</li> <li>• Other interpretations considered as part of evaluation and analysis of the given interpretation do not need to be attributed to specific named historians, but they must be recognisable historical interpretations, rather than the candidate's own viewpoint.</li> <li>• Answers may include more on strengths or more on limitations and there is no requirement for a 50/50 split in the evaluation, however, for Level 5 there should be well-supported evaluation of both, in line with Levels descriptors.</li> <li>• Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hitler's hesitation during the Czech Crisis of 1938, explaining that throughout the summer of 1938 Hitler hesitated about how to approach the Czech crisis and veered between a wish to avoid a war with the West and a wish to fight a short, victorious war against the Czechs to 'toughen up' the German race.</li> <li>• The reaction of Britain and France to German rearmament of the Rhineland, for example explaining that Hitler had instructed his troops to turn back from the Rhineland should they have encountered British resistance and that the entry of German troops only went ahead because no resistance was offered by either Britain or France.</li> <li>• The role of Britain and France at the Munich Conference in 1938, explaining that despite France's alliance with Czechoslovakia and the democratic nature of the Czech state, the Western powers made it clear they would not fight for the integrity of the Czech state as created after World War One.</li> </ul> <p><b>In analysing and evaluating the limitations of the given interpretation,</b> answers might use knowledge and understanding of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hitler's policy of rearmament, explaining, for example, that from 1933 Hitler showed a clear intention to rearm Germany and thus prepare for war, withdrawing from the Disarmament Conference and reintroducing conscription, as well as threatening Anschluss with Austria in 1934.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The debate concerning the Hossbach Memorandum, explaining that by 1937 it is possible to argue Hitler had decided to abandon his plans to seek an alliance with Britain and that at this point he was informing his generals and foreign office that he intended to pursue a more aggressive and planned policy.</li> <li>• The aims and intentions of Neville Chamberlain, explaining that the policy of appeasement should not be viewed as simple surrender to Hitler's demands, but was, in fact, accompanied by a policy of rearmament and preparation for war which meant Britain was determined to deal with Hitler from a position of strength.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretation are:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretations focusing on the impact of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, explaining that – unintentionally – the settlement left Germany potentially stronger than she had been in 1914 since she was surrounded by largely new and unstable states to the East rather than great powers, as well as providing her with potential allies in the dissatisfied states of Italy, Japan and Russia.</li> <li>• Interpretations focusing on the impact of the Great Depression, explaining the difficulties it created for the allies to stand up to Hitler since heavy spending on armaments left them at risk of unrest at home and therefore made appeasement a necessity.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="412 225 1128 584">• Interpretations which consider the role of the USSR, Italy and Japan, explaining that the alienation of the former because of the Munich Conference left the Western allies with no chance of threatening Germany with a two front war; the dissatisfaction of the latter two with the Paris Peace Settlement and the rise of an aggressive right wing in both states left Britain, especially, with threats to her empire from both which limited her ability to respond to German actions.</li></ul>		

APPENDIX 1 – this contains the generic mark scheme grids

	<i>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.</i>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 25–30 marks	There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
<b>Level 4</b> 19–24 marks	The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
<b>Level 3</b> 13–18 marks	The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.
<b>Level 2</b> 7–12 marks	The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made. The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–6 marks	The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis. Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.

	<i>AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.</i>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 17–20 marks	The answer has a very good analysis of the interpretation. It uses detailed and relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows thorough understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of detailed examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a well-supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
<b>Level 4</b> 13–16 marks	The answer has a good analysis of the interpretation. It uses relevant knowledge of the historical context and good understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
<b>Level 3</b> 9–12 marks	The answer has a partial analysis of the interpretation. It uses some relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows partial understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of reference to other interpretations, in order to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation. The evaluation may be un-even with only limited treatment of either limitations or strengths, but both will be addressed.
<b>Level 2</b> 5–8 marks	The answer has a limited analysis of the interpretation. It uses generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows limited understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of generalised reference to other interpretations, in order to produce a limited evaluation of the given interpretation. The evaluation may deal with either strengths or limitations in a very superficial way, or may only address limitations or strengths.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–4 marks	The answer has a very limited analysis of the interpretation which may be descriptive and relate more to the topic area than the detail of the interpretation. It uses very limited and generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows very limited or no understanding of the wider historical debate, with reference to other interpretations being implicit or lacking, in order to produce a very simplistic, asserted evaluation of the given interpretation.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding or reference to the interpretation.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

