



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2022

Pearson Edexcel International A Level in  
History (WHI04 1B)

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)

January 2022

Publications Code WHI04\_1B\_2201\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## Introduction

**Please note:** that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different options within WHI04 1A-1D and previous series to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement. It is also highly recommended that centres read the general Introduction and Section A and B introductions in the Principal Examiner Reports for June 2017. These generic introductions outline the assessment requirements for WHI04 and give an indication of the skills required.

Centres may wish to refer to the *Getting Started* guide that is to be found on the IAL History Pearson Edexcel website. It is also useful to take note of the indicative content in the mark schemes.

Further resources that may be of use are the *Applying Criteria* and *Developing Student's Understanding of Historical Interpretations* documents to be found on the Pearson Edexcel History GCE website along with the Principal Examiner Reports for Paper 1 of the Pearson Edexcel History GCE. The *Applying Criteria* document gives guidance with regard to the application of criteria for the different AOs tested at A level. The GCE Paper 1 Reports will be particularly useful for exemplification of AO3 interpretations skills (but please be aware that there are slight differences within the general Level descriptors).

## General Comments

In light of the ongoing global pandemic, and the challenging circumstances in which students are being prepared for public examinations, it is not possible, or indeed helpful, to make comments about series-on-series developments. However, there are some general observations that can be made about candidate performance (see below for more specific feedback):

**Selection and deployment of knowledge** - Candidates, in general, produce interesting responses that it is a pleasure to read and reward. The candidates were usually very well prepared in relation to knowledge of the specification and centres are to be commended for this. Candidates have good, detailed knowledge of the specification content and this is a facet that often stands out. Many responses were well-informed and well-written. However, there does need to be more discrimination in the selection and deployment of knowledge in both Section A and Section B. Some candidates write 'all they know' about a topic without selecting and deploying information and evidence relevant to the question being asked. In Section A, to reach the higher levels, the use of own knowledge is required to discuss the views being presented in Extracts, not as stand-alone information, and in Section B, to reach Level 5, knowledge should be '*precisely selected*' (L5-BP2).

**Conceptual understanding and application of skills** - Despite good knowledge, candidates were not always able to access high Level 3 marks and above due to a limited understanding of the conceptual focus of questions and the application of analytical skills. Some candidates are still not using the Extracts as the basis of their response in Section A and candidates do need to reach a judgement on the given view to access the higher Levels. In Section B, lower-Level responses often lack focus on the wording of the question and/or the second-order concept being targeted.

As in previous reports, it is worth noting that the responses are marked using a 'best-fit' process. Each bullet point strand within the generic mark scheme is considered to create an overall sense of level and a mark applied within the level. If a response has qualities which exemplify a variety of levels or a strand is missing then this will be reflected by applying a 'best-fit' level and mark. For responses which do not address an aspect of a particular

strand, for example reaching a judgement in bullet point 3 for Q1, this will be reflected in the mark rewarded.

Some candidate responses reflect the wording of the generic descriptors and the format of the indicative content in such a way that it becomes detrimental to the overall analysis and organisation of the response. The descriptors reflect the qualities examiners would expect to see in an essay answering the question set rather than a scaffold on which responses should be built. It is the examiner who determines whether criteria are valid or if the analysis is sustained rather than the candidate by asserting 'so it can be seen by the valid criteria I have used...' or 'In conclusion, this sustained analysis...'. This does not necessarily add value to the response and can be detrimental if this assertion is clearly not substantiated. The indicative content is also not intended to provide a scaffold and is organised to give examiners an overview of what evidence might be included in a response.

Despite the ongoing challenges faced by candidates, very few failed to attempt both sections, and most were able to produce two balanced responses, so enabling them to show their ability across AO1 and AO3 skills.

General candidate performance on each section and specific performance on individual questions for Paper 1B are considered below.

## Section A

**Please note:** it would be particularly useful to access the [2019 Examiner Report](#), where the detailed general commentary on Section A responses continues to be extremely relevant.

It is important that candidates read the Extracts carefully and are able to determine the overarching view being put forward before analysing more closely some of the more nuanced points being made. It is clear that some candidates only use the first few sentences of the Extracts and/or select some sentences out of context without fully reading the whole Extract. There is sufficient time available at IAL to consider the Extracts carefully before planning an answer based on the differing viewpoints being presented.

### Question 1

Question 1 is a compulsory question.

For WHI04 1B, it was very pleasing that there were very few candidates who wrote Level 1 or Level 2 responses for Section A. Most candidates were aware that they were required to discuss the Extracts in relation to the view given in the question but often only utilised Extract 1 effectively. Extract 1 suggested that the existence of the alliance system led to the outbreak of war in 1914 while Extract 2 provided a counter argument that the alliance did not necessarily lead to the outbreak of war. Candidates who utilised both Extracts were able to discuss the validity of both views, using the evidence from the Extracts and their own knowledge, and reach a judgement on both views in the course of the essay and/or in a conclusion. Those candidates who only referred to Extract 1 often provided an alternative reason for the outbreak of war from their own knowledge, which although valid, meant that they were not able to reach a judgement on views in both Extracts and so were unable to access higher Level marks. There were some good Level 3 responses that analysed the evidence provided in one or both of the Extracts but, as in previous series, did not show an awareness of the Extracts as historical interpretations and/or did not reach a judgement on the views being presented.

## SECTION A

Answer Question 1. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 How far do you agree with the view that it was the existence of the two great power alliances that led to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914? <sup>entente</sup> <sup>+ triple alliance</sup>

Explain your answer using Extracts 1 and 2 and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

The existence of the two great powers alliances was a key factor into the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914.

As in Extract 1 & 2 The Austro-German Dual alliance as well as the Franco-Russian alliance did cause heightened tension within Europe, but these simple alliances did not give enough reason into why war broke out in Europe in 1914, only after the extension of the Austro-German Dual alliance into a triple alliance with Italy and Franco-Russian alliance with its addition of Britain in an triple entente, after the initial Franco-British entente cordiale of 1904 (Egyptian influence and also over Morocco territory) did the alliances of the two great powers create enough tension to be written a cause of why the war broke out in Europe in 1914.



Extract 1 states the time period of 1905 and 1914 as being the foundations of deterrence. This is true as for the occurrence of diverse disputes, mainly on territory but also on machinery and naval power.

1905/06 saw the arise of the 1st Moroccan crisis. The crisis occurred during the building of the French project, the Suez Canal.

It had originally been agreed between France and Britain to set Morocco under a shared governmental control to restore order. The agreement had been mutual promising a 50/50 sphere of interest with France pulling their troops out in the last instance. It was solely up to Britain to restore order and assert control over Morocco as well as Egypt. After having to do so the 50/50 agreement ran out of balance causing disputes between France and Britain. And the second Moroccan crisis just few years later occurred due to Germany trying to provoke France as well as test how strong the entente cordiale of 1904 and other agreement between those powers really were.

germany's big hope was to isolate france so that  
in case of an invasion germany would not face  
the british or russian empires defensive armies.  
the attempts for isolation ultimately failed.

Extract 2 provides further evidence into why the  
existence of the two powers alliances was not  
the only reason for the outbreak of war in europe  
in 1914.

with britain being the leading naval power in  
europe and king of the seas, germany was  
keen to keep up with its military advancements in  
1914. By building great battleships such as  
dreadnaughts, as well as torpedoes and  
submarines, it was a armament race which  
further heightened tensions in europe and also  
becoming partial cause into why the war broke  
out in europe. It was the peace negotiations  
in berlin and london which ended the vicious  
naval race and ensured a short term peace between  
those powers.

Further false sense of peace was provided by the  
russo-japanese war in 1905 which weakened  
russia and therefore did not pose a threat to  
germany as the japanese were the  
winning party.



Evidently, the existence of the two power alliances became the war cause after the assassination of the austrian - hungarian archduke franz ferninand and his wife sofie in 1914, in sarajevo by the serbian assassin garip.

Extract 1 mentions the 1914 endangerment of austria with the regional conflict which resulted in the outbreak of the first world war.

Following the assassination of austria's throne heir on the 28th of june 1914 a month of threatful ultimatums arised.

The july crisis of 1914 consists of the ultimatum given to serbia in which all terms except point 6 were accepted. point 6 implying that austria gets total controll over serbian police force as the assassin as well as 5 others had been provided the weaponry and training for the act of killing the archduke.

serbia didnt except that term within 48 hours from the 23rd to 25th of july and on the 3rd of august war seized over europe making it an international war due to the existance of the two power alliances!

austria-hungary also had the following agreement of a blank cheque resulting in germany's full support towards austria's declaration of war.

↳ resulting in Italy leaving the triple alliance

and allying with britain and france which had already declared war on austria-hungary and germany by mid august 1914.

belgium got involved by the ultimatum of germany which caused britain to come to belgium's defence.

Therefore in conclusion both extracts agree to a major extent by implying that the existence of the two great power alliances eventually did lead to the outbreak of war in europe in 1914.

Commentary: This is a Level 3 response. Some understanding and analysis of the extracts is demonstrated by selecting some relevant key point and explaining them in relation to the enquiry. The extracts are mainly used to illustrate elements of the enquiry rather than using them as viewpoints for discussion of the enquiry question. There is an attempt to discuss the extracts and to reach a judgement.

SECTION A

Answer Question 1. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 How far do you agree with the view that it was the existence of the two great power alliances that led to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914? The point is still there

Explain your answer using Extracts 1 and 2 and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

<del>Two great power alliances led to war</del>	<del>Something else was the main factor into war</del>
<del>E1: Alliances created peace but were also allowed a crisis situation war ↳ "any change..." ↳ crisis</del>	<del>E1: Military planning created a much quicker descent into war ↳ "armaments increased" ↳ Plan XVII / Plan Schlieffen</del>
<del>The alliance system was what dragged France into the war</del>	<del>E2: The alliance system was too weak ↳ falling badly out of</del>

The view that the existence of the two great power alliances was what led to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 is heavily debated between historians today. In Extract 1 D. Stevenson creates the claim that although alliances were originally created for deterring war,

They allowed for a very swift shift into war itself. Stevenson, however, also notes that strategic military planning made the descent into warfare much more rapid. In Extract 2, M. Hastings writes that the existing alliances in the years before were fickle and weak and therefore created tension and made them unreliable. Hastings provides the view that it was the Naval Arms race which damaged relations between Britain and Germany which led to war. Both extracts ~~do~~ agree on the perspective that war was not inevitable, and could be avoided. The view that the two great power alliances led to war is correct, however it is ~~the~~ only the core or ~~the~~ rising tensions due to <sup>several</sup> crises which created the spark for war.

In Extract 1, D. Stevenson notes that the alliances were "fundamental to ideas of both deterring war and strategic advantage in war". This is correct as the existence of alliances discouraged belligerence due to the implied threat of an ally. The two great power alliances were the ~~Triple~~ Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance. The alliance system clearly led to the war as it placed countries which had <sup>no</sup> reason for conflict, into war. This is seen by Austria-Hungary's blank cheque in ~~1914~~ 1914 which made Germany invade Serbia. Serbia's Russia's religious and economic influence over Serbia made it crucial

To protect them, France's alliance to Russia made France declare war on Germany. And Britain's Protection pact with Belgium (Treaty of London 1871) made Britain join the war after Germany marched through Belgium. Stevenson further proves his point by claiming that "any clash between the powers could trigger a conflagration between the two blocs" which is what happened after the June-July crisis with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914. After Serbia rejected the last of Austria-Hungary's demands (to check inside the government for any plans or assassinations) it initiated a Europe-wide war due to the alliances and a domino effect.

However, Stevenson in Extract 1, also claims that military planning made the descent into war caused by the alliance system even more quick and efficient. Stevenson mentions the interaction that the great powers thought that "if deterrence failed it would be perfectly appropriate to use [military plans]. The evidence of military plans is seen through the rapid mobilization of Russia in 1914 after Serbia was invaded, French Plan XVII developed in <sup>1913</sup> ~~1914~~ as a way to counter Germany with horse cavalry and the Schlieffen German Schlieffen Plan ~~also~~ created in 1905 as a way to defeat France in order to have a war on one front with Russia. Although it could be seen that the Schlieffen Plan led to war, the alliance



System clearly created the perfect conditions for every Great Power to participate in the war, through the <sup>division</sup> ~~engagement~~ of each Power into two blocs.

In Excerpt 2, Hastings ~~provides~~ <sup>interprets</sup> the view that the alliance system was too weak and fickle. They provide the evidence that Russia was close to making an agreement with Austria-Hungary in 1912, yet failed, as well as the evidence that Britain ~~and~~ and Germany collaborated on the "design and manufacture of shell jackets". Another source of ~~British-German~~ collaboration is the Berlin-Baghdad railway in 1908. The fickle nature of alliances could also be viewed through the failure of the Dreikaiserbund in 1887. Russia, which was in an alliance with ~~Austria-Hungary~~ and Germany had abandoned the Dreikaiserbund (Three Emperors League) due to a falling out with Austria-Hungary over the Balkans. Although the alliance system was without a doubt not the best kind or to create system, it was clearly strong enough to hold the in 1914. The alliance system worked and brought the two blocs of superpowers against each other.

The Hastings also mentions how the "Anglo-German 'mud race' seriously damaged relations between the two countries". Both Admiral Jackie Fisher in Britain and Tirpitz were focused with the construction of dreadnoughts. Britain ended with

29 and Germany with 17. Britain made the Royal Navy and later on the ocean made Germany a bitter enemy due to them attempting to bolster their strength. This definitely created pressure for war in both countries, however, it is not fair to say that the naval arms race was the what led to the outbreak of war in 1914 without the acknowledgement of the alliance system.

In conclusion, the view that the existence of the two great power alliances was what led to the outbreak of war will still be debated by historians in the future. However, expert's view that alliances especially the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance was what led to war, with the catalytic effect of military planning is correct, soon moving the domino effect of each great power joining the war after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.

SECTION A

Answer Question 1. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

1 How far do you agree with the view that it was the existence of the two great power alliances that led to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914?

Explain your answer using Extracts 1 and 2 and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

Plan

existence of the two  
great power alliances

Agree

Disagree

Ex 1. the threat of alliance  
system avoided war

Ex 2. other crises could've led to war

Ex 1. military planning caused  
by tension initially, i.e. naval race

my argument: long term causes: crises

FA



The issue that the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 was caused by the existence of the two great power alliances has been heavily debated by historians. In Extract 1, D. Stevenson argues that the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance were used as a way to avoid war until the rivalry between them reached its peak. However, in Extract 2, M. Hastings presents the argument that the alliances were not solid, and that conflicts ~~could not~~ <sup>could have</sup> been resolved through diplomacy. The interpretation that the existence of the two great power alliances led to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 is not correct because it is important to examine the causes as to why they were developed in the first place. Although the two great power alliances certainly enabled the powers to go to war with each other, ~~it is~~ it is due to the ~~long-term~~ <sup>long-term</sup> rivalry between Britain and Germany ~~that~~ that war broke out in 1914, particularly because it served to divide Europe and contributed to the mounting tension.

In Extract 1, Stevenson clearly argues that the threat of the alliance system being activated avoided war, ~~and it was not until~~ the ~~military rivalry intensifying between the two blocs that it~~ Stevenson claims that "any clash between two powers could trigger a ~~local~~ confrontation between the two blocs." This is correct: if we consider the July crisis in 1914, when the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand by the Black Hand caused a local conflict to escalate into a full-scale war. Once Russia mobilised partially on the 28<sup>th</sup> of July and fully <sup>on</sup> the 30<sup>th</sup> of July 1914, Germany felt threatened and was bound to protect its ally, Austria-Hungary. However, it should be considered that other confrontations between the

two great power alliances were solved diplomatically. This is corroborated in Extract 2, where Hastings claims that "in both 1905 and 1911, it had been possible to reduce the acute tensions between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente by diplomacy." This can be supported by examining the Second Moroccan crisis of 1911, where Germany sent the Panzer gunboat and Britain intervened by mobilizing the Royal Navy. This was arguably the first use of force, but it was solved diplomatically. Germany failed to extract any major territorial concessions from the French, ~~and~~ and this diplomatic humiliation served to fuel its long-lasting rivalry with Britain. Overall, it ~~was~~ would be wrong to exaggerate the rigidity of the alliance system because ~~the reason~~ when looking at its origins, it is clear that the two great power alliances were developed as a result of the <sup>existing</sup> tension between the powers, particularly Britain and ~~Germany's~~ Germany's.

~~Another point~~ <sup>point</sup> that is made by Hastings

In Extract 2, Hastings argues that although there were attempts to improve international relations, they ultimately failed because the Great Powers were already used to conflict. He highlights the "violence in the Balkan region" and how <sup>in 1914</sup> the general European situation was thought to be less dangerous than it had been in 1905 and 1911." This is ~~correct~~ correct if we consider the First Balkan War in 1912, which threatened the alliance system between Germany and Austria-Hungary and France <sup>and</sup> Russia. Britain also revealed

that they wouldn't stay neutral in a major confrontation. However, this was ~~eventually~~ solved diplomatically, thus again diminishing the importance of the two great power alliances. In Extract 1, Stevenson also highlights how "the Balkans intensified political hostility," but he also looks at how "military strategic planning was also built into these alliances." This is correct, because Germany created the Schlieffen Plan in 1905, outlining how they would defeat France by going through Belgium and then move on to deal with Russia, or the creation of France's Plan 17 in 1912. However, the reason as to why these military plans were developed should be considered. It was arguably due to the economic and naval rivalry between Britain and Germany that led Germany to ~~plan~~ pre-plan a ~~defensive~~ defensive strategy. In Extract 2, Hastings corroborates this by emphasising how the "Anglo-German 'naval race' seriously damaged relations between the two countries." The <sup>naval</sup> rivalry between Britain and Germany dates all the way back to British Naval Conference in 1889, where they introduced the two power standard. This was then accelerated with the construction of Dreadnoughts in 1906, to which Britain won out by 1914 with ~~roughly~~ 29 Dreadnoughts to Germany's 17. There was also an element of economic rivalry as Germany became an economic giant between 1900-1914, undercutting rivals abroad by 40% in their iron and steel industries. This challenged Britain's unchallenged <sup>industrial</sup> supremacy abroad, and caused these two powers to form alliances with other <sup>European</sup> powers to defend themselves from each other. Overall,

the existence of the two great power alliances <sup>was</sup> undoubtedly  
~~a factor that led to~~ an important factor in deciding  
whether a <sup>great</sup> power goes to war, but the root cause was  
the long-term rivalry between Britain and Germany that  
separated Europe ~~into~~ into two peace blocs. This rivalry was  
not only political and economic, but it was also personal between the  
unstable Kaiser Wilhelm II and the Queen of England, which was his grandmother.

To conclude, the interpretation that the existence of two great  
power alliances led to the outbreak of war in Europe  
in 1914 is not correct when considering the long term causes.  
The tension between Britain and Germany attributed ~~mainly~~  
to the deteriorating situation in Europe, which by 1914 was  
more divided ~~and more~~ than it had ever been before.

Commentary: Both of these responses are low Level 5. Each of the responses have limitations within all the Level 5 strands but they both analyse the issues and show understanding of the extracts on the basis of the arguments offered by the authors, select precisely and integrate their own knowledge when discussing the evidence and arguments in the extracts and present a sustained evaluative argument on the views given. Both responses do provide judgements on the views in the extracts in the course of the response but these are not always reinforced substantially in the conclusion (see 2019 Report for an example of strong concluding judgement).

## Section B

**Please note:** it would be particularly useful to access the 2019 Examiner Report, where the detailed general commentary on Section B responses continues to be extremely relevant.

Candidates have a choice of one question from two - Question 2 or Question 3. Candidates answered both questions but Question 2 on the League of Nations was more popular than

Question 3 on the Battle for the Atlantic. Most candidates had good knowledge but differentiation in marks was mainly determined by the ability to deploy focused knowledge effectively in relation to the second-order concepts being assessed. Centres should note that an understanding of chronology is important in the organisation of responses and that some candidates showed insecure chronology at times.

### Question 2

Question 2 required candidates to determine whether the League of Nations was ineffective organisation that was unsuccessful in solving international disputes. Most candidates argued that although the League had some minor successes in the 1920s, its structure and actions showed that it was not an effective or successful organisation. There was some excellent detailed knowledge of the League, which was deployed to reach a substantiated judgement. Candidates referred to incidents over Corfu, Memel, Aaland Island, Manchuria and Abyssinia, as well as European 'great power' dominance and the absence of the USA. Some responses, however, were quite formulaic in approach and, although considering strengths and weakness, did not address specific wording of the question to determine effectiveness and success in solving disputes. A small number of responses deployed inaccurate or irrelevant information that undermined the argument being put forward, e.g. referring to mainly to events in the build up to the First World War or attributing successes to the League of Nations that were dealt with externally.

### Question 3

Question 3 required candidates to determine the significance of the Battle of the Atlantic to the success of the British and Americans in the war against the Nazis. Candidates can approach this by focusing on the Battle of the Atlantic as being significant/not significant or by determining relative significance in relation to other factors/events. However, it is important where significance is being evaluated that a judgement is made clearly about the given factor and not just dismissed in favour of a one that is more significant; relative significance needs to be addressed. Candidates had some knowledge of the Battle of the Atlantic but this was not always secure and particularly so in relation to the chronology of events. Some responses appeared to confuse the naval situation in the First World War with that of the Second World War. Other factors/events that were addressed included the bombing of Germany, the war on the eastern Front and the D-Day landings.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

<del>Frage ist irrelevant !!</del>	↳ weber to turn on only ↳ relief or great powers
• The Covenant made it useless	• Åland islands - Finland Sweden
↳ weber to turn on only ↳ relief or great powers	• The Council held 3 representatives for every nation ↳ lets other smaller nations
• Paris 1919 / Lytton report 1932	↳ make themselves be heard
• Geneva 1923 → Rio de Janeiro 1933	• ILO
• Inaction on Abyssinia 1935	• The WHO
the assembly	

X

The League of Nations was an extremely ineffective organisation which could not resolve almost any of the international disputes which were put forward to the League. At its creation it was made obsolete through its Covenant and the existence of the Conference of Ambassadors. At its best the League of Nations could solve minor non-confrontational matters such as the dispute in the Åland islands. The League of Nations was a huge failure and was seen as such by the whole world.

An early example of the League of Nations inability to

international matters was the Corfu incident in 1923. After Benito Mussolini took control in Italy in 1922 he made a plan to invade Corfu in Greece. By using the fact that Italian troops saw Greek fleet troops in Italy he claimed it was enough of an excuse to invade Italy, and so he did. Mussolini invaded the Greek area of Corfu, and Greece put the issue forward to the League of Nations. The League responded by forcing Greece to pay 50,000 <sup>100,000</sup> Greek Lira to Italy. ~~The League of Nations is made~~ This is clearly a massive failure to resolve or solve an international dispute as the aggressor state was paid by the victim for invading it.

The Corfu incident links to how the Covenant of the League made it impossible to solve any major disputes when a superpower or a great power is involved in the incident. A huge constitutional weakness of the League of Nations is its reliance on the Assembly. The Assembly is made up of originally 4 countries; Britain, France, Italy and Japan, while later when Germany joined. By its own Covenant the League could not gather an army in case of an international emergency, and was reliant on the Assembly for funding. The Assembly held a meeting every year in order to discuss international matters. They held most of the power and only they had the power to take issues. Because of its ~~constant~~ constitutional weakness of the Covenant the League was extremely ineffective.







After Japan had captured Manchuria over the Mukden incident when Japanese railway tracks were <sup>bombarded</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>Mukden</sup> <sup>area</sup>, the matter was assigned to the League. In 1931 the League <sup>sent</sup> <sup>out</sup> Lytton to write a report about the situation. After a year, the Lytton report was announced ~~by~~ which highlighted the wrongdoing of Japan. The fact that it took so long for the League to come up with a solution is a clear testament to how ~~ineffective~~ <sup>ineffective</sup> it truly is. Japan and China had made their own bilateral agreement in 1933 with the Tanggu treaty, which ceded Manchuria to Japan. The Tanggu treaty ~~proved~~ <sup>proved</sup> the uselessness of the League when it came down to solving international diplomatic affairs. After the Tanggu treaty, the League's failures were too obvious and blatant.

By its early stages the League was made obsolete and rendered useless by the existence of the Conference of Ambassadors. In each international dispute, the Conference of Ambassadors had to step in. For example when Poland had annexed the Lithuanian area of Vilna. For a year the League could do nothing, until the Conference of Ambassadors stepped in, and then Vilna was ceded to Poland.

In conclusion, the League had too many failures in solving international matters to even consider ~~the~~ the League as being effective in resolving international disputes. ~~From~~ Due

to its Constitutional weakness in its Government, it was unable to solve any matter which had international or ~~foreign~~ the League of Nations Covenant is what made the League itself so ineffective in solving international ~~cases~~ ~~cases~~.

Commentary: This is a Level 5 response. The response focuses clearly and securely on the specific wording of the question and discusses key issues relevant to the question by a sustained analysis of precisely selected and deployed knowledge to respond fully to the demands of the question. A clear connection is made between the effectiveness of the League as an organisation and its ability to solve international disputes. The argument is well organised and criteria for effectiveness are established and applied in the process of reaching an overall judgement.

### Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

#### Section A (A03/A01)

- Candidates should use the time available to read both extracts carefully all the way through before planning their answer; the information in the extracts should be the foundation upon which the answer is constructed
- Candidates should aim to interpret both extracts by analysing the issues raised and showing an understanding of the arguments presented by both authors
- Candidates should come to an overall judgement with regard to the view stated in the question; it is not sufficient just to summarise the views presented in the extracts.

#### Section B (A01)

- Candidates should provide more precise contextual knowledge as supporting evidence. Use knowledge to provide evidence to support a sustained evaluation in relation to the conceptual focus of the question. Secure chronological knowledge enables candidates to produce a logical and coherent answer.
- Read the wording of the questions carefully, particularly if the time period of the question is stated; responses that refer to the wrong time period deploy irrelevant and inaccurate knowledge that does not directly address or only implicitly addresses the question.
- Use conclusions to state the judgement reached clearly and to show the relative significance of or the inter-relationship between key issues discussed in the main body of the essay; leave the examiner in no doubt as to what your judgement is and why.

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