Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

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

Summer 2023
Question Paper Log Number P71814A
Publications Code WHI04_1B_2306_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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
	0	No rewardable material
1	**1–4**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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	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. 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 Serbia was the country most responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in August 1914. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • In June 1914, the assassination of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian Empire by a Serb nationalist was a direct attack on the integrity of the Austro-Hungarian Empire • The assassination provoked the summer crisis of 1914 that would lead to war • There was evidence to suggest that the team of assassins had been aided in their plans by members of the Serbian authorities; they had been armed with Serbian weapons and helped by the Serbian military • Evidence of Serb interference suggested that the Serbian government held so much ill-will towards Austria-Hungary that its government decided that a war against Serbia was required. Extract 2 • The German Kaiser had indicated, as early as January 1914, that he expected that Germany would make a decision to go to war • In 1914, there was a belief amongst many within the German elite that war in Europe was inevitable and, under the backdrop of growing militarism and nationalism, a pre-emptive war would be necessary • It was Germany that insisted that Austria-Hungary should take action against Serbia and pushed Austria-Hungary into making a provocative ultimatum that the Serbs could not accept • All elements of the German government, including the Chancellor, were willing to risk a wider European war; the outbreak of war was not an accident but a result of deliberate German policy decisions. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Serbia was the country most responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in August 1914. Relevant points may include: • As a recently independent state, Serbia aimed to bring all ethnic Serbs under its control and, as a landlocked country, to gain access to the sea; this created hostile tensions with the Austro-Hungarian Empire • Many Bosnian Serbs believed that, as a result of the revolution in the Ottoman Empire in 1908, Bosnia-Herzegovina should have been absorbed into Serbia rather than being annexed by Austria-Hungary • The Serbian government through its military intelligence was supportive of Serbian nationalist groups intent on disrupting Austro-Hungarian rule,

Question	Indicative content
	such as the Black Hand group that carried out the June assassination • Serbia was allied to Russia; Serbia's failure to accept all of the Austrian-Hungarian ultimatum in July 1914 led to war with Austria-Hungary and started a chain of events which brought the European alliances into play. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Serbia was the country most responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in August 1914. Relevant points may include: • There was no clear evidence that the Serbian government had directly sponsored the June assassination, Serbia accepted most of the July ultimatum demands and it was Austria-Hungary that initiated hostilities • Germany had been pursuing a policy of *Weltpolitik* but also had fears of encirclement by the Triple Entente powers; the June assassination gave Germany an opportunity it had been looking for to strike pre-emptively • The June assassination created localised hostilities over Bosnia but it was the German offer of unconditional support for Austria-Hungary – the 'blank cheque' – that created the conditions for a general European war • The German Chancellor spent the weeks after the June assassination quietly, but determinedly, preparing Germany domestically for war; German businessmen knew of German intentions in advance • Other countries were responsible, e.g. it was Austria-Hungary that took the lead in creating a hostile environment in July, Russian mobilisation kickstarted the chain reaction of events related to military planning.

Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether, in the years 1933-41, Hitler's foreign policy was driven mainly by his aim to prevent the spread of communism. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1933-41, Hitler's foreign policy was driven mainly by his aim to prevent the spread of communism should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • From 1933, Hitler's foreign-policy rhetoric highlighted the communist-led Soviet Union, and its leader Joseph Stalin, as Germany's prime enemy • Hitler's first direct intervention outside of the German territorial sphere was to support the Nationalists in Spain against the Republicans; he feared a Republican victory would spread communism across Europe • Germany's Axis alliance with Japan and Italy was initially created specifically as an anti-communist alliance – the Anti-Comintern Pact (1937) • Hitler's decision to expand into eastern Europe was influenced by a desire to prevent the spread of communism beyond Russian borders • The invasion of the Soviet Union, despite being allied to the USSR at the time, shows Hitler's desire to destroy communism; the Nazi-Soviet Pact (1939) was never intended to be permanent. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1933-41, Hitler's foreign policy was driven by other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The desire to overturn the terms of the Versailles Treaty; from 1933-39 most of Hitler's foreign policy decisions were related to Versailles • The desire to create a new world order based on fascism and militarism, e.g. alliances with Italy and Japan (1936-39), war in western Europe (1940 onwards), invasion of Russia (1941), war against the USA (1941) • The desire to create a greater Germany, e.g. regaining the Saar (1935), take-over of the Rhineland (1936), Anschluss (1938), invasion of the Sudetenland (1938) • The need for *lebensraum*; Hitler believed that Germany required more 'living space' for its population and to provide resources. This could be achieved by expansion eastwards and victory against western Empires • German security; Hitler felt that international foreign policy since 1919 had conspired to undermine Germany as a power and so his foreign policy was carried out mainly to defend Germany • The Nazi-Soviet Pact (1939), in which an alliance was agreed for a decade, showed that Hitler's antagonism to the communist Soviet Union was secondary to other foreign-policy aims. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the significance of the impact of the Battle of Midway in the defeat of Japan in the war in the Pacific. Arguments and evidence that the impact of the Battle of Midway was significant in the defeat of Japan in the war in the Pacific. Relevant points may include: • Midway brought about the first significant setback for Japan. Japan postponed attempts to gain further strategic advances, while the US made advances • The Japanese suffered critical material losses for both the navy (4 carriers and a heavy cruiser) and airforce (320 aircraft), and also lost nearly 3,000 sailors and airmen; US losses were much lighter • US success maintained the security of important US strategic sites, e.g. the Hawaiian Islands, the island of Midway itself, Pacific areas vital for communication and supply links to the US command in Australia • The Battle of Midway highlighted the effectiveness of aerial warfare in facilitating the defence of strategic points in the Pacific and in aerial supremacy in aiding the war on the ground and at sea • The use of new forms of intelligence-gathering during the Battle, and intelligence gained as a result of the Battle, contributed to US knowledge of Japanese military capabilities, particularly naval, for the rest of the war • The outcome of the Battle had psychological effects on both sides; for the US it was the first real victory in the Pacific and for the Japanese military command an indication of US resolve and capacity. Arguments and evidence that the impact of the Battle of Midway in the defeat of Japan in the war in the Pacific was of limited significance/ other factors were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • US commanders did not take immediate advantage of the clear and material defeat of Japan at Midway; later engagements destroyed the Japanese navy, e.g. Philippine Sea and Leyte Gulf • The Battle of the Coral Sea (May 1942) was the first real indication that the Japanese naval forces could be challenged, and that the US navy had regrouped after Pearl Harbour • The resolute, determinedness of the US island-hopping ground war brought about Japanese defeat, e.g. the Guadalcanal campaign, seizure of the Marianas Islands (1944) facilitated the effective bombing of Japan • The imbalance of resources available to US and Japanese soldiers ultimately meant that the US prevailed, e.g. for every US soldier there were 4 000 kg of supplies compared to 1 kg for every Japanese soldier • The Japanese over-stretch in China, the Far East and the Pacific region, and the response to their authoritarian rule in these regions, weakened their ability to concentrate on the increasingly superior US military • The bombing campaign of mainland Japan starting in 1942, and gaining intensity until 1945, brought the reality of the war to mainland Japan. The two atomic bombs dropped in August 1945 brought Japanese surrender. Other relevant material must be credited.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom