

Mark scheme

International Advanced
Level in History (WHI04/1B)

Paper 4: International Study
with Interpretations

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

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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: A01 (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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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

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 that 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. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that Germany's decisions in 1914 were primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First World War.</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"> • Germany strongly backed Austria-Hungary following the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand to stabilise the Habsburg Empire, strengthen their alliance, and create a more acceptable political situation in the Balkans. • Russia's partial mobilisation indicated that the Tsarist regime would not back down and, in response, Germany rejected a diplomatic climb-down in favour of action that made war with Russia likely. • Germany's decision for war was partly based on an assessment of Russia's military potential and the assumption that 'encirclement' by hostile powers could only be broken by force. • Sections of Germany's ruling elite saw a successful war as a means of preserving their domestic power and undermining their socialist opponents. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The leaders of the great powers decided to go to war in 1914 in order to preserve what they saw as core national interests. • These great power national interests were partly defined in territorial/strategic ways. • These great power national interests leading to war were also defined in wider terms, including the balance of power and imperialism ('National interests were also defined ... the role of empire as the prerequisite for victory'). • The populations of the great powers largely accepted the need for war in order to protect their nation and way of life. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Germany's decisions in 1914 were primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the July 1914 crisis, Germany made the critical decision to give the Habsburg monarchy its unconditional support with a 'blank cheque' to confront Serbia and this led to a general European war • Germany's decisions in 1914 were partly motivated by a determination to break out of 'encirclement' – the German perception that the Reich was hemmed in and threatened by hostile powers, notably France, Britain and Russia

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the summer of 1914, German political leaders and the German General Staff decided to launch a pre-emptive strike against Russia and France before they completed their military build-ups • The German ruling elite resorted to social imperialism in 1914 by pursuing an aggressive foreign policy in an attempt to resist social, political and constitutional change within the Reich. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that Germany's decisions in 1914 were primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the great powers decided to go to war in 1914 to safeguard key territorial or strategic interests (for example Russia supported Serbia in the July crisis to maintain its influence in the Balkans and Austria-Hungary saw Serbia as a dire threat to the stability of its multiracial empire) • Broader national interests also played an important role in provoking the conflict (for example the British decision for war was based on the assumption that a victorious Germany would dominate the continent, thus altering the European balance of power) • The particular issues at stake in the July crisis enabled each great power to mobilise significant public support without which war would have been impossible (for example popular domestic reaction influenced Austro-Hungarian and Russian responses after the Sarajevo assassination) • Important developments in the belligerent countries contributed to the general mood that made war possible by 1914 (for example the intensification of nationalist and imperialist feeling, and a growing sense that war would not be completely undesirable).

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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the constitutional weaknesses of the League of Nations account for the League's failures in resolving international disputes in the years 1920–33.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the constitutional weaknesses of the League of Nations account for the League's failures in resolving international disputes in the years 1920–33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The peace-makers at Versailles, in their determination to preserve state sovereignty and their national interests, made no binding constitutional provisions for enforcing the will of the League of Nations (for example British reluctance to intervene over the Corfu incident (1923)) • The Council, consisting of permanent great power members, together with some smaller states, could act only unanimously so that any one of its members could block all action (for example French resistance to proposed action against Italy over the Corfu incident (1923)) • The League could only with great difficulty, and as a last resort, raise a military force, which meant that, in reality, it was unable to impose its will on combatants in an armed dispute (for example Manchuria (1931–33)) • Parties to a dispute were not allowed to vote on it in the Council, but this was not enough to make sure that parties to a dispute would abide by a Council decision or plan (for example Poland's seizure of Vilnius (1920)). <p>Arguments and evidence that other reasons/factors account for the League's failures in resolving international disputes in the years 1920–33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US withdrawal from the League undermined the institution from the start and had an enormous negative impact (for example American isolation made it impossible to consider any specific action over Manchuria (1931–33)) • Anglo-French differences over the purpose of the League (for example France saw the League as part of a security system but Britain regarded it as a system of conciliation) prevented it from assuming a clearly defined role regarding international disputes • The League lacked moral authority because it was part of a post-war settlement that reflected the interests of the 'satiated' nations (for example Britain and France) so 'have not' powers (for example Germany and Russia) were likely to reject the League and the post-Versailles order • The League's procedures successfully resolved certain disputes (for example over possession of the Åland Islands (1920–21)), which suggests that constitutional weakness alone did not account for the League's failures. <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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether strategic considerations were more significant than ideological considerations in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that strategic considerations were more significant in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In July 1940, Hitler maintained that an invasion of the USSR would secure Nazi dominance over Europe as a springboard for war against the British Empire, and probably the United States • Hitler calculated that a successful Nazi campaign against the USSR would remove the Soviet Union as a potential ally for Britain and induce the latter to negotiate • Operation Barbarossa was a pre-emptive strike against the Soviet Union because Stalin was planning an offensive war against Nazi Germany and this compelled Hitler to invade before Soviet military preparations were completed • A successful invasion of the USSR would secure for Hitler huge sources of raw materials for the Nazi war effort and ensure that there would be no interruption to oil supplies from Romania • Hitler reasoned that a Nazi victory over the USSR would free up Japan to pursue expansionist policies in the Pacific region and this would force the US to focus on checking Japanese ambitions in the Far East, leaving Nazi Germany with a free hand in Europe. <p>Arguments and evidence that ideological considerations were more significant in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union rested on the Nazis' long-term ideological goal of securing <i>lebensraum</i> or 'living space' in the east at the USSR's expense in order to establish a permanent German Empire • For Hitler, the attack on the USSR primarily represented an ideologically-driven anti-communist crusade, which was designed to destroy the home of 'Jewish-Bolshevism' • Operation Barbarossa was also based on Nazi ideological assumptions about Aryan superiority (for example Slavs as racial inferiors would offer little military resistance and would become a slave labour force under Nazi control) • Hitler's ideologically driven determination to invade the Soviet Union ultimately outweighed important strategic considerations (for example his desire to avoid a two-front war). <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>