



**GCE**

**History A**

**Y248/01: International relations 1890-1941**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2019**

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 2019

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

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
<b>BP</b>	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
<b>A</b>	Assertion
<b>AN</b>	Analysis
<b>EVAL</b>	Evaluation
<b>EXP</b>	Explanation
<b>F</b>	Factor
<b>ILL</b>	Illustrates/Describes
<b>IRRL</b>	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
<b>J</b>	Judgement
<b>KU</b>	Knowledge and understanding
<b>P</b>	Provenance
<b>SC</b>	Simple comment
	Unclear
<b>V</b>	View

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

**MARK SCHEME Section A**

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	<p><b>'The outcome of World War One in 1918 was determined by the entry of the USA.' How far do you agree?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In arguing the outcome of the war was due to the entry of the USA,</b> answers might consider that the strength of the Western Allies was markedly increased by the Americans, explaining that by summer, 1918, two million American soldiers had arrived in France and more continued to do so at a rate of ten thousand per day.</li> <li>• Answers might also consider American victories at Cantigny, Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood as well as their role in the final allied offensive.</li> <li>• Answers might consider that at the time of American entry, the Nivelle Offensive had failed and that allied commanders seemed to have no better idea than to return to the failed tactics of 1914.</li> <li>• Answers might consider Pétain's declaration that he was 'waiting for Americans and tanks' in May, 1917 as well as the continuing deadlock witnessed at Passchendaele, July-November 1917.</li> <li>• Answers might consider the series of mutinies amongst French troops during 1917 and the Austrian victory at Caporetto in the same year. Without the American entry, the allies might have been fatally weakened.</li> <li>• Answers might consider the impact of Russian withdrawal from the war following the October Revolution as well as the near success of the Ludendorff Offensive in 1918.</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 the relative importance of the American entry.</li> <li>• At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge the relative degree of importance.</li> <li>• To be valid, judgements 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>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>In arguing the outcome of the war was not determined by the entry into of the USA</b>, answers might consider that America's entry into the war still left time before her men and her resources were mobilized.</li><li>• Answers might consider the lack of effectiveness of American tactics with Pershing, for example, committed to full-frontal attacks which produced a high casualty rate.</li><li>• Answers might consider allied successes before American entry such as the Battle of Cambrai, the restoration of order amongst French troops by Pétain and the Italian recovery.</li><li>• Answers might consider the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive and the role in this of the British at Amiens.</li><li>• Answers might consider the moves towards peace made by the Emperor Karl of Austria-Hungary a year before American entry.</li><li>• Answers might consider that another German ally – Turkey – owed her defeat to successful <i>British</i> campaigns in the Middle East.</li><li>• Answers might consider the domestic strain on Germany and how prolongation of the war could not last indefinitely.</li></ul>		
--	--	---	--	--

2		<p><b>To what extent were Anglo-French policies responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In arguing Anglo-French policies were responsible,</b> answers might consider Britain’s undermining of the Stresa Front by the conclusion of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty in 1935.</li> <li>• Answers might consider Anglo-French policy towards Mussolini during the Abyssinian Crisis undermined the League and was directly responsible for encouraging Hitler to remilitarise the Rhineland.</li> <li>• Answers might consider Hitler’s instructions to his troops to retreat from the Rhineland in 1936 should they encounter Anglo-French opposition.</li> <li>• Answers might consider the alienation of Russia by the allies created by the failure to invite Russia to the Munich Conference despite her alliance with Czechoslovakia.</li> <li>• Answers might consider the undermining of the Republicans in the Spanish Civil War by the British and the French and the effect of this upon Hitler and Mussolini.</li> <li>• Answers might consider the lack of response to the invasion of the rest of Czechoslovakia in 1939 and the futility of the guarantees offered to Poland, Greece and Romania.</li> <li>• <b>In arguing Anglo-French policies were not responsible,</b> answers might consider the impact of the Wall St Crash and the Great Depression on both Britain and France.</li> <li>• Answers might consider the impact of public opposition to war in both Britain and France during the 1930s following the experiences of World War One.</li> <li>• Answers might consider the scale of the problems facing Britain and France with threats from Japan and</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 the relative suitability of the term.</li> <li>• At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge the causes of Anglo-French foreign policy.</li> <li>• To be valid, judgements 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>
---	--	--	----	---

		<p>Italy as well as that from Germany combined with the weakness of the League and the isolation of the USA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Answers might consider the difficulty of dealing with the ambitions of Hitler whose aims and methods were scarcely typical.</li><li>• Answers might consider the importance of understanding appeasement was not simply another word for cowardice and that in Britain it was combined with rearmament.</li><li>• Answers might consider that Italian foreign policy in the years 1938-9 proved that appeasement was a realistic and potentially successful policy, given Mussolini's reluctance to go to war and enthusiasm for a negotiated settlement.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

3		<p><b>'Only one of the great European powers that entered the war in August, 1914 had any clear idea of what they hoped to gain by victory: Austria-Hungary.'</b></p> <p><b>Terry Morris and Derrick Murphy, <i>Europe 1870 – 1991</i>.</b></p> <p><b>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation of the war aims of Europe's great powers in 1914, making reference to other interpretations you have studied</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This historical debate centres around the extent to which the war aims of the great powers in 1914 reflected a continent set upon an inevitable path towards war.</b></li> <li>• <b>In analysing the strengths and limitations of the interpretation,</b> answers might consider the claims that all – or at least some - of the great powers were guilty of deliberately pursuing policies which would lead to war in an attempt to stave off domestic difficulties; alternatively, answers might consider the claim that war in 1914 was 'accidental' as the aims of the great powers were far from clear.</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>• The determination of Austria-Hungary to defeat Pan-Slavism no matter what the cost.</li> <li>• The vagaries during the preceding years of German foreign policy which, though apparently especially aggressive during the Bosnian Crisis, the July Crisis of 1914, the Moroccan Crises and the Anglo-German Naval Race, could nevertheless also be seen as search for security both internally and externally and a reluctant</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 evaluation of the interpretations 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 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 and for level 4 supported evaluation of both, in line with levels descriptors.</li> <li>• Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation.</li> </ul>
---	--	---	----	--

		<p>response to the perceived threat of its rivals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The problems Russia faced in going to war, her lack of preparedness and her previous reluctance to champion Pan-Slavism in, for example, the Bosnian Crisis of 1908.</li> <li>• The argument that British antagonism towards Germany was occasioned by a bewilderment at German foreign policy and a reluctant series of agreements with France and Russia, powers with whom she had no tradition of cooperation.</li> <li>• The combination of a reluctance to go to war on the part of France with an absolute need to maintain Russian support.</li> </ul> <p><b>In analysing the limitations of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that Austria’s war aims were equally as varied as any of the other powers. She might have argued that she was fighting simply due to the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand by Slav terrorists, but, in fact, her animosity towards Russia stretched back many decades.</li> <li>• Germany faced distinct difficulties in maintaining an eighteenth century monarchical system in an industrial society. Since at least the dismissal of Bismarck she had pursued clearly ambitious policies regardless of the effects of this on the <i>Entente</i> powers. She could not allow the break-up of the Austrian Empire. In addition, one could consider the Schlieffen Plan and some of its aims.</li> <li>• Defeat for Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904/5 had inevitably encouraged her to turn her attention away from Asia and towards Europe. Military success was essential to the prestige of her outdated political system.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Britain was equally concerned with the survival of her empire. She could not allow Germany to dominate the continent since it would then threaten that empire and, equally, she could not risk France and Russia defeating Germany since their latent antagonism towards the British Empire would then resurface.</li><li>• Having been defeated by Prussia in 1871, France could not allow further German aggrandisement and her path towards war with an aggressive Germany could be traced back to the conclusion of the Russo-French alliance of 1894.</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 which examine the impact of the <i>alliance system</i>.</li><li>• Arguments which examine the arms race and the military planning of the great powers.</li><li>• Arguments which examine the concept of 'war by timetable'.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 1 – this contains a generic mark scheme grid

	<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>A03: 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)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019

