



Pearson  
Edexcel

Mark Scheme

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel

International Advanced Level

In History (WHI04)

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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2019

Publications Code: WHI04\_1B\_1906\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## 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.

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
---	-------	---

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>
----------	--------------	---

## 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 crises of 1905–13 created the conditions that explain the transformation of the June/July crisis of 1914 into a general 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"><li>• The crises between 1905 and 1913 boosted the arms race and the military planning of the European alliances</li><li>• The European powers found themselves drawn more tightly into alliances that had been made and widened the differences between themselves and their 'opponents'</li><li>• In 1914 the legacy of the 1905–13 crises influenced the decisions of politicians and fuelled public reaction</li><li>• The crises of 1905–13 did not make war in 1914 inevitable but created a pattern of reactions, which included war readiness, that had become more and more difficult to change.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There were underlying forces that influenced the outbreak of war in 1914 but these do not explain why war actually broke out in 1914</li><li>• Militarism, nationalism and diplomatic obligations within Europe had existed previously and not led to war amongst the European powers</li><li>• In each of the previous crises at least one of the major powers had made the decision either to not intervene or not provoke a general European war</li><li>• It was the specific events at Sarajevo that brought Europe to war in 1914; it resulted in the death of the one person who could have prevented the Austrian military from going to war with Serbia.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the crises of 1905–13 created the conditions that explain the transformation of the June/July crisis of 1914 into a general war.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The events of the Bosnian Crisis (1908) left a legacy of bitter Serbian hostility towards Austria-Hungary</li><li>• The Agadir Crisis (1911) drew Britain more deeply into the Entente and in Germany public opinion became increasingly hostile towards Britain and supportive of the naval arms race</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The events of the Balkan Wars (1912–13) strengthened Serb and Austro-Hungarian antagonism and created German expectations that Britain was unlikely to go to war in Europe</li> <li>• Once the Russians mobilised, the German Schlieffen Plan (approved in 1905 and modified in 1911) was actioned making it virtually impossible to avoid war.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the crises of 1905–13 created the conditions that explain the transformation of the June/July crisis of 1914 into a general war.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the summer of 1914 the European alliances appeared to be more fragile than at any point since 1905, e.g. Anglo-German naval visits, potential French-German rapprochement, Italian uncertainties</li> <li>• There was no clear pattern to the crises, e.g. in 1913 the Germans had curbed Austrian desires to declare war on Serbia but in 1914 they issued the 'blank cheque'</li> <li>• The assassination at Sarajevo was planned purposefully to have maximum impact on Austro-Hungarian relations with Serbia</li> <li>• Archduke Franz Ferdinand believed that an aggressive stance towards Serbia would lead to open confrontation between Austria and Russia and would have a detrimental effect on Austro-Hungarian power.</li> </ul>

## 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 how successful the treaties of the Versailles Settlement (1919–23) were in fulfilling the aims of making peace and establishing self-determination.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the treaties of the Versailles Settlement (1919–23) were successful in fulfilling the aims of making peace and establishing self-determination should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Peace terms were agreed between the major belligerent powers of the First World War who had still been fighting in November 1918</li><li>• The League of Nations was created as an organisation dedicated to maintaining peace between nations and pursuing disarmament</li><li>• There was no formal outbreak of hostilities between the signatories of the Versailles treaties during the 1920s, e.g. the Chanak Incident and the Ruhr Crisis led to major confrontation but conflict did not result</li><li>• In general, the treaties adhered to the 'spirit of self-determination'; economically viable states were established, e.g. Yugoslavia, with more Europeans being governed within their own nations than ever before</li><li>• When the Treaty of Sèvres (1920) with Turkey resulted in regional, and potentially wider, conflict a compromise was reached and the settlement revised in the Treaty of Lausanne (1923).</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the treaties of the Versailles Settlement (1919–23) were not successful in fulfilling the aims of making peace and establishing self-determination should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Treaties created long-term resentment and some hardship within the 'defeated' nations, e.g. the War Guilt Clause and reparations in Germany, Austrian loss of industrial wealth</li><li>• Millions of Europeans remained living in territory not controlled by governments of their own nationality, e.g. three million Germans in Czechoslovakia and one million in Poland</li><li>• Self-determination was not applied to the ex-colonial territories of Germany or to the majority of Arabs previously under Turkish rule</li><li>• The League of Nations was undermined by the absence of major powers such as the USA and the 'victorious' powers proved reluctant to commit to disarmament despite having enforced it on Germany</li><li>• Throughout the 1920s agreements and conferences were required to deal with the legacy of the Versailles Settlement, e.g. Locarno Treaties, Kellogg-Briand Pact, Dawes and Young Plans.</li></ul> <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 statement that British and French appeasement of Germany and Italy was mainly responsible for the outbreak of conflict in Europe in 1939.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that British and French appeasement of Germany and Italy was mainly responsible for the outbreak of conflict in Europe in 1939 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• British and French failure to take actions against Hitler's early attempts to undermine the Versailles Treaty, e.g. remilitarisation of the Rhineland, encouraged Hitler to believe that he could take ever increasing risks</li> <li>• The failure to challenge Hitler's early foreign policy successes brought him domestic popularity, so giving him the confidence to undertake further expansion in the later 1930s</li> <li>• The impact of the Hoare Laval Pact and the limited response of Britain and France to the Italian conquest of Abyssinia helped to undermine completely the League of Nations as a peace-keeping organisation by 1939</li> <li>• British and French determination to avoid war in the summer of 1938 and the compromise made over the Sudetenland at Munich convinced Hitler that expansion eastwards was unlikely to be challenged</li> <li>• British and French failure to honour their guarantee to Czechoslovakia (March 1939) meant that Hitler had no reason to believe that the Anglo-French agreement to guarantee Polish security would be honoured.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that British and French appeasement of Germany and Italy was not mainly responsible for the outbreak of conflict in Europe in 1939 other factors were more responsible should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conflict was a result of the long-term aggressive expansionist foreign policy of Hitler's Nazi regime</li> <li>• Hitler's tendency to pursue an opportunist foreign policy led to miscalculation in September 1939; Hitler expected the invasion of Poland to lead to a limited regional conflict</li> <li>• Conflict became inevitable once the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact had been signed and the partition of Poland agreed (August 1939)</li> <li>• The conflict was the result of long-term factors, such as the failure of the Versailles peace settlement and the rise of nationalism in Europe</li> <li>• Appeasement did not create the environment for the outbreak of conflict but gave Britain and France time to rearm; programmes were in place to be ready to counter German aggression by 1939–40.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

