



Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2021

Pearson Edexcel International
Advanced Level in History (WHI04/1B)

Paper 4: International Study with
Historical Interpretations

Option 1B: The World in Crisis,
1879–1945

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2021

Publications Code WHI04_1B_msc_20210304

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if **the candidate's response** is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a **candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.**
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Section A

Targets: AO1 (5 marks): 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.

AO3 (20 marks): Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|-------|-------|---|
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| 1 | 1–4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence. |
| 2 | 5–8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit. |
| 3 | 9–14 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts. |
| 4 | 15–20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge. • Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation. |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| 5 | 21–25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.• A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate. |
|---|-------|--|

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): 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.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|-------|-------|--|
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| 1 | 1–4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision. |
| 2 | 5–8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision. |
| 3 | 9–14 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision. |
| 4 | 15–20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision. |

| | | |
|---|-------|---|
| 5 | 21–25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision. |
|---|-------|---|

Section A: Indicative content

Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879–1945

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|---|
| 1 | <p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.</p> <p>Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the outbreak of general war in Europe in August 1914 was due to the military planning of the European Great Powers.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1914 the decisions made by the Great Powers were influenced by existing military plans • German military plans committed Germany to support Austria-Hungary and to an offensive war against France • Russian and French military planning envisaged the rapid mobilisation of forces in the event of war • In the event of a major international crisis the military planning of the Great European powers meant that the military commanders were likely to take control of the situation. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The political leaders of the Great Powers were not pressurised into war by military commanders • Although the German and Austro-Hungarian generals had long wanted war, it was the political leaders of Germany and Austria-Hungary who made the decision to go to war • Russia, France and Britain joined the war in response to decisions made by Germany and Austria-Hungary and in order to defend themselves • The outcome of previous Balkan crises suggested that war could have been avoided if German and Austro-Hungarian leaders had wanted to resolve the situation. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the outbreak of general war in Europe in August 1914 was due to the military planning of the European Great Powers. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The war plans of the continental powers relied on rapid mobilisation that had been planned in advance and in relation to highly detailed schedules, including train timetabling, which once initiated would be hard to stop • The German Schlieffen Plan was devised in 1905 as a military response to German concerns regarding the threat posed by the French-Russian alliance. It formed the basis of German military planning in 1914 • The French Plan XVII envisaged that, in the likelihood of war, France would mobilise swiftly and early enough to be able to strike against |

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|---|
| | <p>Germany while the Russians were simultaneously attacking East Prussia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The German and Austrian Chiefs of Staff, von Moltke and Conrad, were both advocates of militarism and very influential figures within their own countries. During 1914 their political influence had been growing • The Russian decision to mobilise on 28 July led to a chain reaction of events that brought the plans of the major continental powers into play, including the German Schlieffen Plan and the French Plan XVII. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the outbreak of general war in Europe in August 1914 was due to the military planning of the European Great Powers. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The military plans of the European powers, although detailed and planned to schedules, were not set in stone and required political decisions to be made before they could be implemented • It was the decision of the Kaiser and Bethmann-Hollweg to hand Austria-Hungary the 'blank cheque' in relation to Serbia (July 5) that transformed the July crisis into a general European war • Russia mobilised in response to Austria-Hungary's decision to bombard its ally Serbia (July 28) and France mobilised in response to the German declaration of war on Russia (August 1) • Britain's membership of the Triple Entente did not automatically mean that it would enter a general European war; Britain entered the war in defence of Belgium and only declared war on Austro-Hungary on 12 August • Previous crises in the Balkans (1908, 1912–13) and Morocco (1905–6, 1911) had all been resolved through diplomacy or an unwillingness to see a general war break out in Europe. |

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879–1945

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|--|
| 2 | <p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether gaining the support of Italy was the most significant diplomatic achievement of Britain and France during the First World War.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that gaining the support of Italy was the most significant diplomatic achievement of Britain and France during the First World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Italy's decision to end its neutrality in 1915 and enter the war on the side of the Entente ended any chance of the Central Powers reconstituting the strategic bloc of the Triple Alliance that had existed before August 1914 • Italy's entry into the war opened up an Italian-Alpine Front against Austria-Hungary targeted to split the resources of the Central Powers • After 1915, Italian troops were available to fight in various theatres of war, including the Balkans, the Western Front and the Middle East • Italian victories on the Italian-Alpine Front in 1918 resulted in Austria-Hungary asking for an armistice in early November 1918 • Other attempts at diplomacy were less significant, e.g. the US only entered as an 'associate' power, US troops only arrived in 1917, and the Sykes-Picot agreement undermined Arab support in the Middle East. <p>Arguments and evidence that counter and/or modify the statement that gaining the support of Italy was the most significant diplomatic achievement of Britain and France during the First World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From 1916–17, stalemate and Italian defeats on the Italian-Alpine Front undermined the war effort of the Entente powers and Italy's presence in Libya extended the war in North Africa so draining resources further • Concerted diplomatic pressure, particularly in relation to trans-Atlantic communication and German influence in Mexico, contributed to the US decision to enter the war in April 1917, with it subsequent significance • Before the Sykes-Picot agreement and the Balfour Declaration became public, the British had been extremely successful in harnessing the Arab Revolt in their fight against the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East • Success in negotiating the Romanian entry into the war in 1916 opened up a further front in the war in the Balkans, and the potential to cut off German oil supplies and rail communications with Turkey. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|--|
| 3 | <p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the foreign policy of Hitler, in the years 1933–41, and the foreign policy of Mussolini, in the years 1933–41, were similar.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the foreign policy of Hitler in the years 1933–41 and the foreign policy of Mussolini in the years 1933–41 were similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both conducted their respective foreign policies based on nationalist ideals, e.g. Mussolini's desire to make Italy great and respected, Hitler's policy of <i>lebensraum</i> • Both conducted their respective foreign policies based on some dissatisfaction with the outcome of the Versailles settlement • Both supported the Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War and both conducted aggressive foreign policy actions against other nations • Both bolstered their aggressive foreign policy aims through armaments programmes and attempts to achieve autarky • Both withdrew from the League of Nations: Hitler in 1933 and Mussolini in 1937 • Both joined forces in signing the Anti-Comintern Pact with Japan (1937) and the Pact of Steel (1939) and both fought as allies in the Second World War. <p>Arguments and evidence that the foreign policy of Hitler, in the years 1933–41, and the foreign policy of Mussolini, in the years 1933–41, were different should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mussolini carried out his foreign policy based on a desire to be seen as an international statesman whereas Hitler was focused on his desire to further German interests • In the years 1933–37, Mussolini had hoped to develop a foreign policy of mutual agreement with Italy's 'Versailles allies', Britain and France; failure to establish a working relationship pushed Mussolini towards Germany • Mussolini conducted an overseas colonial policy, e.g. Abyssinia whereas Hitler did not • Mussolini was not supportive of the Nazi-Soviet Pact brokered by Germany and the Soviet Union in 1939 • Despite the Pact of Steel, Mussolini was unwilling to fight a war in 1939 and Italy did not join the war in Europe until June 1940. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |