

PAPER 1 Abyssinia

First question a: According to Source B how should an Italian invasion of Abyssinia be executed?

- a) Italian invasion on Abyssinia should be carried out as fast as possible, without notice and should be absolute, meaning that it should be a “total conquest”.

MARKSCHEME:

- *The objective is to crush Abyssinian forces.*
- *Italy must act quickly to avoid diplomatic complications.*
- *No declaration of war is needed; Italy should claim it is taking defensive action.*
- *Mussolini should reassure Britain and France that, following Italy’s action, their interests would be recognized.*

Comment: It’s easy to receive 3 marks on this one, but you need to make sure you answer the question completely! Make at least three statement and show the support for each statement with a quote from the text!. As an ex-examiner on this paper, I would have rewarded you one mark on this answer

First question b: What is the message of the artist in Source A?

- b) The message of source A is that Italian forces at Abyssinia are heroic and are a great, powerful military force. This is portrayed by the soldiers’ body stance and the visible vigor to fight.

MARKSCHEME:

- *Italian forces are brave and ready for battle.*
- *Italian forces are well supported from the air.*
- *Abyssinian forces have fallen back or are in retreat.*

Comment: My comment is a bit similar to the one above (1a). It’s very important to make at least two statements that’s supported by what we see in this image. Once again I as an ex-examiner on Paper One would have rewarded you one mark for the answer above.

Second question: With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyze the values and limitations of Source B for historians studying the Italian invasion of Abyssinia.

The value of source B is that it directly showcases what the aims and way of thinking of Italian armed forces were, as it is an extract of Chief of General Staff to Mussolini, who would be the most reliable person when it comes to the strategy and purpose behind the invasion of Abyssinia. However, the limitations of source B is the fact that Badoglio could have altered the message into a one that Mussolini would have wanted to hear, instead of what he really thought should be done. Another issue is that it only showcases the standpoint of Italy’s highest ranking people, yet does not provide any proof to what other nations thought about Italian’s invasion of Abyssinia because the part “no one in Europe would raise any difficulties” cannot be taken for granted, as it is claimed only by the Italian general and not any of the European nations mentioned.

MARKSCHEME:

VALUE

- *A value of the origin is that the author was an Italian commander and would therefore understand Italy’s military position and military goals in Abyssinia.*
- *It was written in December 1934, on the eve of the invasion, which means it provides an insight into the views of the Italian military at the time.*
- *The content suggests that the author played a key role in advising Mussolini’s government on policy and, as a commander in the field, he would have knowledge and understanding of the Italian position on the ground.*
- *A value of the purpose is that, as an official memorandum from the commander to Mussolini, it is a frank assessment of how the invasion of Abyssinia should be executed and offers insight into Italian planning at the time, which was not open to public or international scrutiny.*

LIMITATIONS

- *The source was written in 1934, which means that the author lacks hindsight on events.*
- *It was written by a military commander prior to the invasion.*
- *This might not be the perspective of others in the military nor indeed Mussolini’s view on the matter.*

- *The content seems focused on presenting a positive view of an invasion both in terms*
- *of its use of language and in its selection of supporting evidence.*
- *The author's role as commander-in-chief may mean that he is more belligerent with regard to an invasion than other elements of the regime.*

Comment: When you go through the value and limitations of a source you should try to address the following: author (and the author's background if this is included in the text – you should be able to see if this affects the source or not - if for example the author is a professor of history the author has a professional background that influences the source value in a positive way in comparison with an author who is a professional politician and who obviously tries to get you to adopt different ideas that the politician stands for); the purpose of the source (why did the "author / speaker / etc ..." create this source and for whom in this context); which genre does the source belong to (is it a fiction book; a fact book; a textbook; a memoir; a political pamphlet; a daily newspaper; a law; a cartoon; a photograph; etc... - each genre has its special purpose which you should try to take with when you assess the source) – and of course the four different specific source-critical criteria; time, dependence, tendency and if it's authentic or not. We do not address authenticity because the sources used in the IB Exams are always what they claim to be (according to IBO). Remember to divide your text into different paragraphs so that the reader understands when you start a new statement (and it should be fairly fluent).

Your answer is too short. You need to cover the different parts (value, purpose and content) and clearly show in what way the source has both positive (value) and negative (limitations) parts. I would have given this answer two marks.

Third question: Compare and contrast the views expressed in Source A and Source B regarding Mussolini's motives for invading Abyssinia.

While both source C and D agree that one of the factors was the nationalist ambition of fascists and especially their leader, source C claims that the economic conditions were one of important factors that led to the invasion, whereas source D disagrees and states that they were not at all. Instead, the reason for the invasion laid solely in the doctrine of fascism and Mussolini's ambitions, as fascists needed the surge in morale caused by the euphoria of emerging victorious from a great battle. Moreover, source D states that it was Mussolini's character that shaped the decision to invade Abyssinia, yet source C does not mention anything about it. Therefore, while source C focuses on Mussolini wanting to make Italy a great European power by expanding his empire, yet also driven by economic factors, source D claims that not only did he want to fulfill his nationalist drive but also he was following the doctrine of fascism as well as his nature of character.

MARKSCHEME:

Comparisons:

- *Both sources see the conquest of Abyssinia as a key objective for Mussolini.*
- *Both sources discuss economic problems in Italy.*
- *Both sources discuss Fascism and Mussolini's need for conflict or war.*

Contrasts:

- *Source C mentions military limitations, whereas Source D focuses on economic factors.*
- *Source C suggests that the interests of Britain and France should be a consideration, whereas Source D suggests interests of industrialists in Africa.*
- *Source C suggests that Italy wanted to increase Italy's status as a European power whereas Source D suggests that its motives were due to Fascism and the Il Duce cult.*

Comment: In the textbook you find the following comment to how to approach this question: "The key to this question is linkage, i.e. you are expected to discuss the sources together throughout your response. The examiner is looking for a running commentary. At no time should you talk about one source without relating it to the other. "End-on accounts" - where you write about the content of one source followed by the content of the second source – do not score well." You do this part fairly well and manage to not fall into the "end-on-accounts" trap. As you can see in the markscheme a few more things could be mentioned. I have always found this question "tricky" because you can spend a lot of time and still miss some of the points – therefore I think you did the correct thing – mentioned a few similarities and a few differences in a fairly fluent text. I would have given your answer four marks. Still be aware of the Examiner's hint of what not to do: "The focus of this question is how the sources are similar or different - it is asking you to look at the content of the source. This question is not asking you why the sources might be similar or different. Do not use grids, charts or bullet points - always write in full paragraphs. It is not a full valid contrast to identify what is simply mentioned

in one source but not the other (i.e. "Source A mentions that... played a role, whereas Source B does not mention this" is not developed linkage)."

Fourth question: Using the sources and your own knowledge, analyze the reasons for the Italian invasion of Abyssinia
Italian forces under the leadership of Benito Mussolini invaded Abyssinia in 1935. This work will investigate the reasons underlying Italian's decision for that conduct.

One of the most important factors that led to Italian armed forces invading Abyssinia was Italy's, mostly fueled by Mussolini, need to become a respected, powerful nation in Europe. As stated by source D it was a "nationalist dream". However, due to the fact that Italy lacked economic prowess and a sufficiently equipped armed forces it had to settle for a place for conquest that would not be too difficult to secure as claimed in source C. Moreover, another factor caused Italians to settle for a relatively easy territory to invade, namely other European countries' disapproval if the act were not to be carried out fast and they would face a completed act, as stated in source B.

Another reason often put forward by historians is the fact that the doctrine and fascist ideology needed the thrill of excitement, glory and triumph in order to satisfy the public. Therefore, a fast and glorious conquest was needed to fulfill the expectations of the society. Moreover, country's leader, Mussolini, was a man whose personality also dictated rapid action as well as whose worldviews demanded speedy and clear outcomes of his actions.

In conclusion, the Italian invasion of Abyssinia was caused by three main factors: the ambition of Italian fascists to raise the status of Italy on an international level, the economic conditions and external forces in the form of foreign countries that forced Italian forces to take on a territory that would be fairly easy to conquest as well as Mussolini's personal drive to achieve a fast, visible result.

MARKSCHEME:

These are the points that you could get from the sources to help you answer the question:

- **Source A:** *The suggestion is that the Italian armed forces could easily overwhelm the Abyssinian forces. The invasion would be an easy conquest.*
- **Source B:** *The conquest of Abyssinia was necessary before Italian imperial ambitions could be achieved. There would not be much resistance to expansion in this territory if the interests of Britain and France were assured.*
- **Source C:** *Mussolini's long-term goal was*
- *to expand the Italian Empire. He wanted to increase Italy's status as a European power. Abyssinia would be a cheap and easy conquest because of its limited economic and military resources.*
- **Source D:** *The main aim was for Italy to realize its long-term nationalist ambition.*
- *A key motive was Fascist ideology and the need for excitement and conflict. Another factor was the nature of the cult of Il Duce.*

You could bring in these points from your own knowledge:

- *The fascist doctrine dictated a dynamic foreign policy and glorified war. Mussolini said:*
- *"The character of the Italian people must be moulded by fighting". Mussolini's ambition was to recreate or emulate the Roman Empire of the classical period that had controlled African territory. This would provide revenge for the Italian defeat to the Abyssinians at the Battle of Adowa in 1896.*
- *Italy had failed to acquire any new colonies at Versailles. Abyssinia was the only uncolonized African territory.*
- *The Italians had already colonized territories on the border of Abyssinia (Eritrea and Somaliland) and the border lacked clarity, which could provide a good opportunity for an incident triggering a confrontation.*
- *The Abyssinians lacked modernization and the country's army was poorly equipped, therefore a war could be won quickly and inexpensively.*
- *The Italian military was limited and a conquest in East Africa could offer colonial troops to bolster its forces. There were potential economic gains: oil, coal and gold.*
- *Mussolini believed that East Africa could be used to settle the surplus Italian population.*
- *The potential obstacle of British and French opposition was, if not removed, at least reduced by their fear of a resurgent Germany, and Mussolini had left the Stresa Front meetings of 1935 believing that he had their acquiescence.*

Comment: This should be a mini-essay that at least includes the following three parts: A clear answer to the question stated (usually in the exams it's a statement that you have to evaluate – Yes or No...); the use of all sources in the answer (which needs to be noted by writing "Source A states..." / "as mentioned in Source C" etc... otherwise the examiner does not know you used the sources); and own knowledge (that clearly adds something to the answer and

not just repeat what already has been mentioned in the sources). In the end you should have a conclusion that answers the question. You add these parts to your “mini essay”, but it’s short. The text above would end up in the middle “level descriptor” (Five marks). A short finishing advice – it’s never a bad idea to include something about what kind of sources you dealt with – info about the authors, what type of sources they were (primary, secondary, tertiary, contemporary, etc ...) and also come to certain conclusions about the source value of the different sources. These conclusions as well as the purely factual conclusions from your sources and your own knowledge make it possible for you to give a complete answer to the question...

13 MARKS / GRADE = 5-

How to approach the source questions on Paper 1

First question

This is in two parts. It is made up of a 3-mark and a 2-mark component - giving you a possible total of 5 marks. It is assessing your historical comprehension of the sources. You do not need to give your own detailed knowledge in your response. This is the only question that asks you to **explain** the content and meaning of the documents.

Part a

The 3-mark question asks you to comprehend, extract and possibly infer information. Here are some suggestions for answering this question:

- Write: firstly... , secondly... , thirdly... to ensure that you make at least three separate points.
- Do not repeat the same point you have already made.
- Do not overly rely on quotes - make your point and then briefly quote two or three words of the source in support.

Part b

- You should try to make two clear points for this question.
- For each point, refer specifically to the content of the source to provide evidence for your answer.

For parts a and b you should not need to bring in your own knowledge; however your contextual understanding of the topic and sources should enable you to understand more clearly the content and message of each source.

Second question

As you know, historians need to use and evaluate sources as they research a historical era or event. For the second question, you need to evaluate one source in terms of its "*value*" and "*limitations*" by examining its origin, purpose and content. This question is worth 4 marks.

To find the origin and purpose look carefully at the provenance of the source:

For origin	Who wrote it/said it/drew it? When did the person write it/say it/draw it? Where did the person write it/say it/draw it? What is the source – a speech/cartoon/ textbook, etc.?
For purpose	Why did the person write it/say it/draw it? Who did the person write it/say it/draw it for ?
For content	Is the language objective or does it sound exaggerated or one-sided? What is the tone of the source? What information and examples do they select or focus on to support their point?

From the information you have on the origins of the source, and what you can infer about the document's purpose, you must then explain the value and limitations the source has for historians researching a particular event or period in history.

What are the values and limitations associated with secondary sources?

The most common secondary source that you will have to deal with is one from a textbook or historian. Again, the key questions of "What is the origin of the source?" and "What is the source's purpose?" need to be addressed in order to work out the value and limitation of the source in question.

Third question

This will ask you to **compare** and **contrast** two sources. Your aim is to identify similar themes and ideas in two sources, and to also identify differences between them. It is marked out of a total of 6 marks. The key to this question is *linkage*, i.e. you are expected to discuss the sources together throughout your response. The examiner is looking for a *running commentary*. At no time should you talk about one source without relating it to the other. "End-on accounts" - where you write about the content of one source followed by the content of the second source – do not score well.

How do you approach this question?

You must find **both** similarities and differences. This is best presented as two separate paragraphs – one for comparisons and one for contrasts. Here are some tips:

- You could practice using highlighter pens - highlight the similarities in each source in one colour and the differences in another colour.
- You must make sure that you mention **both** sources in every sentence you write. The skill you are demonstrating is linkage.
- Always be clear about which source you are discussing.
- Find both the more "obvious" similarities and differences, and then go on to identify the more specific comparisons and contrasts.
- Deal with similarities in your first paragraph and differences in your second.
- Ensure that each point you make is clearly stated. If you quote from the sources, make this brief - quote only two or three words to support your point.
- Do not introduce your answer or attempt to reach a conclusion. This is not necessary and wastes time.
- Do not waste time explaining what each source says.
- Do not discuss **why** the sources are similar or different.

How to draw comparisons/show similarities

Both Source A and Source B ...

Source A suggests... ; similarly, Source B suggests...

Source A supports Source B...

Like Source B, Source A says...

In the same way that Source B argues... , Source A points out that...

How to draw contrasts/ show differences

Source A suggests... ; however, Source B says...

Source B disagrees with Source A regarding...

Source A claims... as opposed to Source B which asserts...

Source B goes further than Source A in arguing... while A focuses on...

Examiner's hint – what not to do: *The focus of this question is **how** the sources are similar or different - it is asking you to look at the content of the source. This question is **not** asking you **why** the sources might be similar or different.*

Do not use grids, charts or bullet points - always write in full paragraphs.

*It is **not** a full valid contrast to identify what is simply mentioned in one source but not the other (i.e. "Source A mentions that... played a role, whereas Source B does not mention this" is not developed linkage).*

Third question

Question Three will be assessed using generic markbands, as well as exam specific indicative content. The markbands are:

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is discussion of both sources. Explicit links are made between the two sources. The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some discussion of both sources, although the two sources may be discussed separately. The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is superficial discussion of one or both sources. The response consists of description of the content of the source(s), and/or general comments about the source(s), rather than valid points of comparison or of contrast.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Examiners will apply the "*best fit*" to responses and attempt to award credit wherever possible.

Fourth question

This is worth the most marks, 9 of the total of 25. It requires you to write a mini essay. The key to this question is that an *essay* is required – not a list of material from each source. However, you are required to *synthesize* material from the sources with your own knowledge in your essay.

How do you approach this question?

It is recommended that you plan your answer as you would any essay question. The difference here is that you will use evidence from the sources as well as from your own detailed knowledge to support your arguments.

- First make a brief plan based on the sources and group them into either those which support the point in the essay title and those which suggest an alternative argument, or group them under themes if the question is open, e.g. "Examine the reasons for the changing alliances...". Add the sources to the grid as shown below.
- Then add your own knowledge to the grid. This should be detailed knowledge such as dates, events, statistics and the views of historians.
- When you start writing, you will need to write only a brief sentence of introduction.
- When using the sources, refer to them directly as Source A, Source E and so on.
- You can quote briefly from the sources throughout the essay but quoting two or three words is sufficient.
- Use all the sources.
- Include own detailed knowledge
- Write a brief conclusion which should answer the question and be in line with the evidence you have given.

Sources that suggest X	Sources that suggest other factors
Source A	Source B
Own knowledge: events, dates, details	Own knowledge: events, dates, details
Source D	Source C
Own knowledge: historian	Own knowledge: events, dates, details
Source E	Source A makes more than one point, can be used to support more than one argument or theme
Own knowledge: events, dates, details	

Example – planning grid for the fourth question (mini-essay)

The Fourth question will be assessed using generic mark bands, as well as exam specific indicative content. The mark bands are:

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The response lacks focus on the question.References to the sources are made, but at this level these references are likely to consist of descriptions of the content of the sources rather than the sources being used as evidence to support the analysis.No own knowledge is demonstrated or, where it is demonstrated, it is inaccurate or irrelevant.
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The response is generally focused on the question.References are made to the sources, and these references are used as evidence to support the analysis.Where own knowledge is demonstrated, this lacks relevance or accuracy. There is little or no attempt to synthesize own knowledge and source material.
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The response is focused on the question.Clear references are made to the sources, and these references are used effectively as evidence to support the analysis.Accurate and relevant own knowledge is demonstrated. There is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material.

Examiners will apply the "*best fit*" to responses and attempt to award credit wherever possible.