

GCE

History A

Unit : Y218/01 International Relations 1890 - 1941

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

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 2017

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

Use the following indicative content mark scheme in conjunction with the generic levels of response in the Appendix

MARK SCHEME Section A

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Which of the following made the outbreak of World War II more likely in the period 1929 to 1939?</p> <p>(i) The appeasement policies of Britain and France.</p> <p>(ii) Relations between Russia and the rest of Europe</p> <p>Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).</p> <p>In dealing with the impact of the appeasement policies of Britain and France, answers might consider the effect of the failure of Britain to respond forcefully to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria provided encouragement to the ambitions of other aggressive powers such as Italy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider that, in turn, the failure to prevent an Italian conquest of Abyssinia persuaded Hitler to remilitarise the Rhineland as well as the fact that Hitler gave orders to his troops to retreat immediately were they to encounter Anglo-French resistance. The failure to provide that resistance cemented the faith of the German people in Hitler, despite their opposition to war and made the removal of Hitler from power much less likely. • Answers might consider the effects of the Munich Conference on Hitler and his subsequent belief that Britain and France would not take up arms against him in any further move against the Czech state or Poland. • Answers might consider the effects of the Munich Conference on the USSR whose exclusion from the conference – despite her alliance with Czechoslovakia – convinced Stalin he could not work with Britain and France which, in turn, prevented them from threatening Germany with a two-front war. • Answers might consider the effect of the Munich 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • Judgement must be supported by relevant and accurate material. • Only credit material relevant to question. • Answers may deal with each factor in turn, then compare them to reach a judgement, or take a continually comparative approach. Either approach is acceptable. • 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.

	<p>Conference on Italy who, more decisively, threw in her lot with Germany and, after the invasion of the remaining Czech state in March 1939, concluded the 'Pact of Steel' with Hitler.</p> <p>In dealing with relations between Russia and the rest of Europe, answers might consider that it was the fear of Russia and the spread of Communism which played a decisive role in encouraging the British to adopt the policy of appeasement to avoid the effects of the cost of war upon her own people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the effect of the view that Hitler's accession to power provided a bulwark in Central Europe against Russian aggression. • Answers might consider that the reluctance of Britain to intervene decisively in the Spanish Civil War sprang from her fear of a pro-Russian Spanish government. Yet that reluctance allowed both Germany and Italy to use Spain as a 'testing ground' for World War II. • Answers might consider the difficulties involved in making good the 1939 guarantee to Poland given the poor relations between Russia and Poland. • Answers might consider that it was the poor relations between Russia on the one hand and Britain/France on the other which persuaded Stalin to pursue the Molotov/Ribbentrop Pact in the summer of 1939. In turn it was this agreement which enabled Hitler to go ahead with the invasion of Poland which provided the catalyst for World War II. 		
--	---	--	--

1	(b)*	<p>‘The Alliance System between the Great Powers was the most important cause of the First World War.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>In arguing Alliance System was the most important cause of World War I,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the effect of the Alliance System on relations between Germany and Russia. Germany’s commitment to Austria convinced Russia, especially in the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, that she was faced by a power bloc determined to humiliate her as well as to destroy the interests of Slavism. • Answers might consider Germany’s commitment to Austria, especially during the July Crisis of 1914, could be argued to have encouraged Austria to take a hard line with Serbia, the immediate catalyst for the outbreak of war. • Answers might consider the effect on Germany of the construction of the ententes between Britain and France/Russia which left Germany feeling encircled and hence dependent upon Austria for friendship. • Answers might consider that it was the Alliance System which encouraged Germany to come up with the Schlieffen Plan whose involvement of Belgium provided the British government with a legitimate excuse to fight in 1914. • Answers might consider the effect of the Alliance System on encouraging Britain to end her policy of isolation. <p>In arguing Alliance System was not the most important cause of World War I,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider that the origins of the Alliance System could be traced back to 1879 and 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At higher levels candidates will focus on ‘how far’ but at Level 4 may simply list reasons • At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to the relative importance of causes. • At higher levels candidates might establish criteria against which to judge this. • To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by accurate and relevant material, if not they are assertions. • 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 the descriptions in the levels mark scheme.
---	------	--	----	---

	<p>that, in fact, it had done much to preserve – rather than to endanger – peace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider that it was crises in the Balkans rather than the Alliance System which poisoned relations between Germany, Austria and Russia.• Answers might consider that Russia’s policy was, at heart, influenced by her failure in Asia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5 rather than by the Alliance System as it was defeat in 1905 which meant, inevitably, she had to turn towards Europe given the dependence of the Romanov autocracy on international prestige. Ironically war with Japan led Russia to ally with her friend, Britain.• Answers might consider that Britain’s involvement in the Alliance System only sprang from her fear of a potential German threat to her empire.• Answers might consider the effects on all the great powers of the arms race and the subsequent need to act before rivals became insuperably superior.• Answers might consider the effects of long-term issues such as those of Franco-German resentment and of other crises such as the Moroccan crises.		
--	---	--	--

2	(a)	<p>Which of the following caused more problems in the Far East during the period 1930 to 1941?</p> <p>(i) Japanese nationalism. (ii) The policies of Britain and the USA towards Japan.</p> <p>Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).</p> <p>In arguing dealing with Japanese nationalism answers might consider the Japanese belief in racial superiority and determination to become the dominant power in Asia which inevitably brought her into conflict with Britain, France, the Netherlands and the USA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider Japan’s need to provide for her growing population and her belief that she deserved the same role in China which the Munroe Doctrine had reserved for the USA in Latin America. The effect of the growth of nationalist societies and of the strategic plans of the military might also be considered. • Answers might consider the effects of Japan’s invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and her emergence as an aggressor rather than the loyal junior partner she had provided for Britain in the early years of the Twentieth century. Such arguments might also consider the effect of Japanese actions on the League of Nations. • Answers might consider the effects of the extension of Japanese conflict with China in 1937. • Answers might consider the effects of Japanese occupation of French-Indo China in 1940 and the subsequent attack on Pearl Harbour in 1941. <p>In dealing with British and American policy, answers might consider the effect of Anglo-American policies on Japanese nationalists who belonged, for example, to the ‘Society of the Cherry’.</p>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • Judgement must be supported by relevant and accurate material. • Only credit material relevant to question. • Answers may deal with each factor in turn, then compare them to reach a judgement, or take a continually comparative approach. Either approach is acceptable. • 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.
---	-----	---	----	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider the confused response to the Manchurian Crisis where some opinion wanted a 'hard line' response but others felt Japanese aggression was temporary and should therefore be met with conciliation. The divisions between the American State Department and the British and American ambassadors to Tokyo (Sir Francis Lindley and Joseph Grew) might well be considered here.• Answers might consider the confused diplomatic and economic interests which both Britain and the USA pursued in relation to Japan. The impact of the Smoot Hawley Tariff might well be considered here as might that of the economic rivalry between Britain and the USA in the Far East.• Answers might consider the effects of the strategic difficulties of the British and the Americans with Britain pursuing budget cuts in defense and the Americans finding themselves at best 1,000 miles away from the area in their bases in the Philippines.• Answers might consider the effects of the reluctance of both Britain and Japan to support China and of the American embargo on the export of oil to Japan in 1940.		
--	--	---	--	--

2	(b)*	<p>Assess the reasons for the failure of the British and French policy of appeasement during the 1930s.</p> <p>Reasons might include the fatal misunderstanding of the nature of German foreign policy and the refusal of Hitler to consider seriously a negotiated settlement. Such answers might well consider the impossibility of dealing with Nazi Germany effectively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the impact of the Great Depression and the inability to combine negotiation with speedy rearmament as well as the effect of the Depression in encouraging aggression amongst a wide number of key states. • Answers might consider the effects of appeasement on the German people, considering that the most effective hope for the avoidance of war was an internal removal from power of Hitler. Yet the decision to accept the remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936 bolstered Hitler's popularity and made such a removal much less likely. • Answers might consider the effects of such a policy on the League of Nations. This body had been perceived as successful during the 1920s but the failure to stand up to Japan in 1931 or Italy in 1935 left the League powerless with no respect as an international peace-keeping body. However, it might well be argued the League was fundamentally incapable of maintaining peace amongst the great powers. • Answers might consider the effects of the appeasement of Japan and Italy were key motivators to Hitler and encouraged his aggression whilst, at the same time, the ineffective protests made to those two powers provided Germany with allies who made resistance of Germany even harder given their strategic threats to both the 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At higher levels candidates will focus on 'assess' but at Level 4 may simply list reasons. • At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to the relative importance of reasons. • At higher levels candidates might establish criteria against which to judge the reasons. • To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by accurate and relevant material, if not they are assertions. • 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 the descriptions in the levels mark scheme.
---	------	---	----	---

		<p>British and French empires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider the role of the Soviet Union. At Munich, appeasement certainly alienated Stalin making the prospect of containing Hitler with the threat of a two-front war highly unlikely. However, it might be considered that fear of the Soviet Union in itself made appeasement attractive as a means of securing a bulwark against the Soviet threat.• Answers might consider the isolation of the USA. The lack of certain American military and financial backing made appeasement less likely to succeed and hampered the efforts of Britain and France.		
--	--	---	--	--

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>
	1. Generic mark scheme for Question 1(a) and Question 2(a): Which of the following? [10]
2. Level 6 9–10 marks	3. Both factors are thoroughly analysed and evaluated using accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, in order to reach a developed and substantiated judgement in relation to the question.
4. Level 5 7–8 marks	5. Both factors are analysed and evaluated using generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, in order to reach a substantiated judgement in relation to the question.
6. Level 4 5–6 marks	7. Both factors are analysed and evaluated using relevant knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, however treatment of factors may be un-even with analysis and evaluation of one of the two being only partial. Analysis and evaluation is used to support a reasonable judgement in relation to the question.
8. Level 3 3–4 marks	9. Both factors are analysed and evaluated in a partial way, using some relevant knowledge of key features of the period, in order to make a basic judgement in relation to the question.
10. Level 2 2 marks	11. Limited and generalised knowledge of the period is used to attempt a limited analysis or evaluation of both factors, and this is linked to a very simplistic judgement.
12. Level 1 1 mark	13. Very limited and generalised knowledge of the period is used to attempt a very limited analysis or evaluation of one of the factors. The other factor is either not considered or there is very limited information or description of the factor with no attempt to use this knowledge. If there is a judgement, this takes the form of assertion.
14. 0 marks	15. Nothing of any relevance to the factors.

	<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>
	Generic mark scheme for Question 1(b) and Question 2(b): Essay [20]
Level 6 17–20 marks	There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated throughout the answer and is consistently evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated, developed and sustained judgements. There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.
Level 5 13–16 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.
Level 4 10–12 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.
Level 3 7–9 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.
Level 2 4–6 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.
Level 1 1–3 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.

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

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 2017

