

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9389/11 Document Question 11</p>
---

## Key messages

- Stronger responses kept a focus on the specific questions rather than writing in general about the sources.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means viewing the source holistically rather than as being divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Evaluating a source is a two-stage process: first, decide on the reliability of a source by checking the source's argument against either source provenance or contextual knowledge; second, decide how the (un)reliable source affects the balance of the challenge versus support argument. Comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Time-keeping is important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

In summary, the key message is for candidates to read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the particular details of the source and its overall argument. This will ensure candidates are better prepared to tackle both questions.

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger answers understood the need to support the points made with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question. Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarity and difference of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

There is a notable minority who interpret the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually after writing long introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to fully demonstrate their knowledge and conceptual understanding, effective time management is essential.

With regards to the **(a)** question, weaker responses often described the two sources before starting to compare them. Unless linked to the question little to no credit can be given. With regards to the **(b)** question, candidates' efforts to evaluate the sources were often too general and also not used to help answer the question, such as a source is reliable because it is written at the time, or by, say, President Lincoln, is far too general. Stronger answers considered exactly when was the speech made, to whom and why, then considered how these points affected the source's reliability.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Section A, the European Option***

**1(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B on Austrian policy towards Italy after the revolutions of 1848–49.**

Stronger answers kept a clear focus on Austrian policy. They found Source A more straightforward to analyse because it was written by an Austrian general who was based in Italy and writing after the revolutions. Source B was more problematic because it was written by a British diplomat in Italy who was reporting – and commenting critically on – the policies advocated by another Austrian general based in Italy. Most concentrated on the policies advocated by General Hess. Most candidates were able to explain how both generals advocated a policy of repression. Many also identified a difference between the two, namely that Source B was more repressive than Source A. If candidates identified similarities and differences and supported both with relevant quotes then they were awarded a Level 3 mark. If the evidence was absent or incomplete, the answer was awarded Level 2 mark.

**1(b) How far do Sources A to D show that the revolutions of 1848–49 in Italy damaged the cause of Italian unification?**

Most candidates analysed the sources in order to answer the question and used evidence from the sources to support both sides of the argument. Weaker answers did not, and argued that all the sources supported one side of the argument only. This group usually argued that the sources supported the assertion: Sources A and B revealed hard-line Austrian policies, C identified three failed attempts to unite Italy while Source D dismissed a popular insurrection as a means of unification. All but Source A provided some counter-argument: Source B via the author's criticism of Hess's strategy, Source C by saying that 1848–49 inspired Italian nationalists and Source D by saying that the revolutions had made nationalists realise they needed an army to succeed. Most candidates did identify one of these counter-arguments. Very few reached Level 4, as comments about reliability rarely went beyond the very general 'This is a primary source' or 'This is an Italian source' and therefore must be reliable. To evaluate successfully, candidates need to provide some contextual knowledge against which to measure the reliability of a source and also to say how that judgement affects the balance of the argument.

### ***Section B, the American Option***

**2(a) How far do Sources B and C as agree on the purpose of the Crittenden Compromise?**

The key words in this question are 'the purpose of'. Weaker responses mentioned no more than either support for the Crittenden Compromise or its main features, which was not always relevant to the question. Many candidates identified differences in the sources, with the most commonly identified point being Source B's assertion that the Compromise was a 'the only means by which the Union can be saved' as opposed to Source C's argument that the Compromise reinforced the interests of Southern slave owners. Other answers also discussed the contrast between Source B believing the Compromise to be a genuine attempt to resolve North–South differences while Source C argued that it was a trick which benefited one side only. Weaker answers did not often include similarities of purpose. Both sources saw the Compromise as an attempt to resolve North–South differences and both saw it as making concessions to the South. Making the Compromise part of the constitution was seen as a means to an end rather than a similarity of purpose.

**2(b) 'The Crittenden Compromise showed that, by 1861, the North and the South could not remain united.' How far do Sources A to D support this assertion?**

Many candidates did better on part (b) than they did on (a). Most answers identified which sources clearly supported or challenged the assertion. Weaker answers were characterised by some confusion with Source A and its very first sentence, which ends 'the country is rapidly drifting towards Disunion'. Many candidates took this as meaning that Source A supported the assertion. Source A's main message argued the opposite. It said that the Crittenden Compromise would restore the Missouri Compromise [of 1820], which was acceptable to [Northern] Republicans as well as Southern Democrats. That line would probably form the border between North and South 'if Disunion actually occurred. Many candidates overlooked 'if' and its significance. Source A is considering what might happen should Disunion occur, not that it was bound to occur. Candidates analysed the remaining sources well. Source B fairly clearly challenged the assertion when it argued

that all regions of the USA supported the Compromise. By linking Disunion supporters and Breckinridge, the leader of the Southern Democrats, with the Compromise, Source C supported the assertion. Source D conveyed the determination of the South not to accept the Crittenden Compromise, thereby also supporting the assertion. Most candidates managed to correctly identify some, if not all sources, as being on either side the question, which resulted in their reaching Level 3.

### **Section C, International Option**

#### **3(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B regarding the UN Charter.**

Weaker responses overlooked that the focus of the question was the 'UN Charter' and instead wrote about other topics they identified in the Sources. They often combined the UN and the League of Nations to make their comparisons. A minority of weaker responses concentrated wholly on the League of Nations, which limited their answers to Level 1. Those candidates who did focus on the UN Charter usually identified both similarities and differences. Both Sources saw the Charter as having doubts about its ability to create an effective international body, both saw the Charter as no proper improvement on the League of Nations and its Covenant. The main difference was that while Source A was pessimistic about the Charter, Source B was rather more optimistic.

#### **3(b) 'The League of Nations was certain to fail from the start.' How far do Sources A-D support this view?**

The key phrase in this question was 'from the start'. Weaker responses did not focus on the key phrase and wrote generally about the reasons for the failure of the League. 'From the start' means from 1919–20. Stronger answers did indicate that 'from the start' meant from 1919–20 and were aware that the USA never joined the League of Nations. Source C, in its first sentence, states that the 'USA ... neglected' the League, which was used to show that the source supported the assertion. Some candidates also used the next sentence of Source C and its reference to 'never' in order to support the assertion. Source A says that 'there was not a chance of success', which must mean from start to finish, making it another support source. In its second sentence, Source B was more difficult to interpret in terms of 'from the start'. It refers specifically to the failure of the League, which is explained by a loss of vision – by member states, presumably – following the first step. The first step, mentioned in the first sentence, is the establishment of the Covenant. With support, candidates could use these sentences on either side of the argument. If they saw the signing of the Covenant as an initial success, then Source B challenged the assertion because it meant the League did not fail from the start. If the signing of the Covenant predated the formation of the league, then Source B supported the assertion. Many candidates interpreted Source D well and argued it challenged the assertion because it showed that the League of Nations had some success 'in maintaining peace for a number of years'. Candidates often illustrated this statement with some relevant examples, usually from the 1920s. Source D was also evaluated in the stronger answers.

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9389/12 Document Question 12</p>
---

## Key messages

- Stronger responses kept a focus on the specific questions rather than writing in general about the sources.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means viewing the source holistically rather than as being divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Evaluating a source is a two-stage process: first, decide on the reliability of a source by checking the source's argument against either source provenance or contextual knowledge; second, decide how the (un)reliable source affects the balance of the challenge versus support argument. Comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Time-keeping is important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

In summary, the key message is for candidates to read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the particular details of the source and its overall argument. This will ensure candidates are better prepared to tackle both questions.

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger answers understood the need to support the points made with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question. Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarity and difference of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

There is a notable minority who interpret the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually after writing long introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to fully demonstrate their knowledge and conceptual understanding, effective time management is essential.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section C**, Source A which is from a speech by Winston Churchill. In analysing the views of Churchill some candidates picked out the section which reads '*It has been argued that economic sanctions will not really embarrass Mussolini and he knows this or else he would have bowed to them*' and tried to suggest that Churchill was not in favour of sanctions against Italy. However, in the context of the rest of the source this section is being used as a rhetorical device to diminish others arguments. Thus, candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements.

To achieve higher evaluation marks it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example was in **Section A** where Source A from 'The National Zeitung' was provided. Some candidates were able to comment on how the context of the source being published in 1849 meant that it had little hindsight on the actual success of the Constitution and that as a Liberal newspaper it is only to be expected that it would offer such vocal support for the document. In addition, when using these ideas it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Section A, the European Option***

##### **1(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and D of the Constitution.**

There were many strong responses to this question and candidates clearly understood the period and vocabulary involved. Most candidates were able to identify the similarities in the sources, Source A describes the Constitution as 'remarkable' and refers to it as 'this fine Constitution' and Source D praises it as 'a considerable advance' and a 'significant move' towards achieving one nation and liberalism. Stronger responses also identified differences between the two sources, although these were more subtle, Source A says that there has been 'universal support' for the Constitution whilst Source D refers to its defects and points out in contrast that it did 'not really represent the views of many'.

##### **1(b) 'The revolutions of 1848–49 had a positive impact on the cause of German nationalism.' How far do sources A to D support this view?**

This question was generally well answered and stronger responses demonstrated an ability to use the sources to both support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Most candidates identified that strong support for the assertion was shown in Sources A and D which described the step forward that was being taken at the time by launching a Constitution as well as other impacts of the revolutions. In addition, it could be shown that Engels in Source B considered this a valuable 'first step' in undoing the old order and shifting power even if it had not been realised straight away. Many candidates also used Source B to challenge the statement by pointing out the facts which Engels highlights, which were that after the initial spark of the revolution the old order remained in power and not much had changed in a short space of time. Some also used section of Source D to suggest that by 1853 things did not look quite as positive as they did for 'The National Zeitung' in Source A. Source C from Bismarck caused some difficulty for candidates as a result of his rhetorical style. It should be remembered that when Bismarck made this speech to the German Diet he was not a German nationalist; he believed firmly in promoting the power of Prussia; and it was only later that he changed his mind. Thus, this speech must be taken in the context of Bismarck's views at the time. As a result his damnation of the actions of the King may be taken as a positive for German nationalism as Frederick William has accepted the Constitution and strengthened the nationalist cause.

#### ***Section B, the American Option***

##### **2(a) Compare and contrast the responses of Sources B and C to the publication of Uncle Tom's Cabin.**

Some candidates had some difficulty in comparing these sources because Source C did not live up to their expectations of what would be published in a Northern state. Source C is written by an abolitionist but sees the novel as the enemy of the abolitionist cause because the book did not go far enough in its portrayal of the horrors of slavery. Most candidates were able to identify some similarities and differences between these two sources. The most commonly identified similarity was that both sources believe the book to be inaccurate. So, according to the author of Source B 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' is described 'as a most wild and unreal picture of slavery'; whilst in Source C, too, it is not regarded as 'a faithful record'. The main difference is also related to this when Source B thinks it is too harsh on slavery and Source C implies it is not harsh enough – the reason that the abolitionist in Source C is not a fan of the book. The strongest answers used contextual knowledge that the book was not an unqualified success in the Northern states and were able to suggest that some abolitionists thought is offered a rather rose-tinted view of the horrors of the slave trade.

**2(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Uncle Tom's Cabin advanced the abolitionist cause?**

Candidates who attempted this question generally used the sources successfully and identified examples of support and challenge for the assertion. The clearest support for the positive impact of Uncle Tom's Cabin comes from Sources A and D which both clearly have reasons for exaggerating its importance, and the strongest answers discussed the ways in which these two sources lacked weight. The other two sources needed careful reading to ensure clear analysis. Source B was fearful that the book would 'excite the fanaticism' of abolitionists; so offered some support for the assertion. However, the author was also of the opinion that the book would further divide the country making the abolitionist goal harder to achieve. Source C offers challenge to the assertion by implying that there would be no need to abolish slavery if it was as described in the book. The best responses were able to use their contextual knowledge of the period to discuss the growing sectional tension of the 1850s and place the publication of the novel into this picture.

**Section C, International Option**

**3(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of British politicians' opinions about the League of Nations.**

These two sources, which came from British politicians at the time of the Italian crisis, required careful reading and application of contextual knowledge. Many candidates were able to apply both of these in order to identify similarities and differences between the sources but there were a significant minority who struggled with some of the language and syntax used; especially in the Churchill source (Source A). Stronger responses applied their contextual knowledge and identified that this source comes from a period before Churchill was the Prime Minister. The sources disagree about the effectiveness of the League of Nations i.e. Source A regards the League as coming to life and that it 'has passed from shadow into substance' now that it is dealing with Italy; whereas Source B comments that the League 'clearly does not work'. They also disagree about sanctions although it should be noted that this is not the focus of this question. Some candidates who chose to complete the **part (b)** question first were overly focussed on the issue of sanctions when answering **part (a)**. Both sources do agree that sanctions may not stop Mussolini from entering Abyssinia.

**3(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that economic sanctions against Italy never had a chance of succeeding?**

Overall, there were some strong answers to this question. This question required some consideration of what 'success' would look like in regard to the application of sanctions against Italy and what the sources considered to be important in this discussion. Stronger responses took this approach and so could identify support and challenge from the sources. Weaker responses sometimes got distracted into determinism because they knew that the sanctions had failed. Source A gave clear evidence that Churchill believed the sanctions could be successful if carried out over a long period of time and this was supported by Source D. However, Litvinov was more ambivalent suggesting that it would be difficult to stop Mussolini. Source B supported the idea that sanctions could never work; whilst Source C offered a local perspective which could be used to support or challenge the statement. Weaker responses found contextualising the sources difficult. Stronger responses considered when the sources were written as well as who wrote them, and used this effectively to evaluate the utility of the source.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/13**  
**Document Question 13**

- Stronger responses kept a focus on the specific questions rather than writing in general about the sources.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means viewing the source holistically rather than as being divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Evaluating a source is a two-stage process: first, decide on the reliability of a source by checking the source's argument against either source provenance or contextual knowledge; second, decide how the (un)reliable source affects the balance of the challenge versus support argument. Comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Time-keeping is important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

In summary, the key message is for candidates to read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the particular details of the source and its overall argument. This will ensure candidates are better prepared to tackle both questions.

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger answers understood the need to support the points made with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question. Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarity and difference of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

There is a notable minority who interpret the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually after writing long introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to fully demonstrate their knowledge and conceptual understanding, effective time management is essential.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source or did not focus on the question they were asked. An example from this paper can be found in **Section A** where there were mentions in two sources (Source B and Source D) of Garibaldi and Mazzini. Neither of these characters were the focus of the question, rather it was the influence of Cavour, but some candidates found it difficult not to include long narrative sections on Garibaldi in particular. Thus, candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements.

To achieve higher evaluation marks it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example was in **Section C** where Source A

from a Soviet newspaper was provided. Some candidates were able to comment on the opinions of the Soviet Union with regard to the conflict in the far east of Asia and how their previous involvement in the Russo-Japanese war might have a bearing on the opinion of the source. In addition, when using these ideas it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

### **Comments on Specific Questions**

#### ***Section A, the European Option***

**1(a) Compare and contrast the attitudes towards the Piedmontese monarchy in Sources B and D.**

These two sources both offer some balance on the Piedmontese monarchy and the majority of candidates were able to identify similarities and differences between the content of the sources. Both sources give some credit to the King with Source A suggesting that 'he is not a sovereign of no merit' and Source D referring to his intelligence. However, both also suggest that Victor Emmanuel needed to rely on Cavour to assist him when ruling. Stronger answers kept a focus on making comparisons about the Piedmontese monarchy as stated in the question. Weaker responses discussed the activities of Garibaldi, which did not address the question. Stronger answers identified the differences between the sources, Source B being largely critical of the King, (It refers to him as being 'lazy and ill-informed' and 'mediocre') whereas Source D speaks more positively about the King, but interestingly refers more to the monarchy than the King himself.

**1(b) 'Cavour played the decisive role in the struggle for Italian unity.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

This question was generally well attempted and responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Stronger responses were able to make use of the word 'decisive' in order to discuss the subtleties of the question and point out how supportive the sources were. Strong support for the statement was shown in Source C, with stronger responses commenting on the fact that this source, written shortly after the death of Cavour, strays dangerously close to hero-worship and so should be questioned for accuracy. Source A offers the counter to Source C supplying a challenge to the statement by listing the character flaws of Cavour from a Sardinian perspective. There was some good use of contextual knowledge here to place the view of the Sardinian deputy into the relationship between Cavour and the island. Source B and Source D offered more balance and most responses were able to see their positive opinion of Cavour. The best responses had a strong sense of the chronology and characters of the period which they could use to build an argument about the utility of the sources.

#### ***Section B, the American Option***

**2(a) To what extent do Sources C and D agree about the issue that was causing conflict in Kansas?**

Some candidates had difficulty in contrasting these sources as, on the surface, they talk about similar events from a similar perspective. However, on closer reading there are both similarities and differences between the sources and stronger answers identified and explained these well. The most commonly identified similarity is that both sources see slavery as the main issue causing conflict and blame people arriving from Missouri for exacerbating that conflict. However, there are also differences in the opinions of the sources. Source D sees land ownership as the main issue; whereas Source C has no doubt that it is slavery. Source D states that although Southerners were urged to move slaves into Kansas, very few were taken. Whilst Source C suggests that many slaves have been moved into the state. The best responses evaluated the sources, considering the nature of the sources to suggest that Source C may be more motivated to reflect the big sectional issues dividing the country whereas Source D, even in hindsight, may have had a more accurate picture of what was happening on the ground.

**2(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that it was politicians in Washington DC who were responsible for the trouble in Kansas following the Kansas–Nebraska Act?**

This question was well answered, with many candidates using the sources successfully and identifying examples to support and challenge the assertion. The clearest support for the assertion comes from Sources A and B which both use elaborate language and imagery to suggest that politicians bear the blame for the problems following the Kansas–Nebraska Act. Stronger responses commented on the one-sided nature of both sources and highlighted the Whig views of the act as well as the clear abolitionist opinions of Source B. Both of these points have an impact upon the utility of the source and where this was clearly explained candidates were rewarded for evaluation. Sources C and D challenge the assertion by suggesting that individuals and slave-owners entering the state are the ones responsible for conflict. Source C was also used in some answers to suggest that the involvement of politicians was not entirely positive. The best responses were able to use their contextual knowledge of the period to discuss the growing sectional tension of the 1850s and place the passing of the Kansas–Nebraska Act into this picture.

**Section C, International Option**

**3(a) To what extent do Sources B and C agree about the Lytton Report?**

This question is focussed on the Lytton Report and, as such, comparison of the sources needed to be focussed on issues surrounding and responses to the Lytton Report rather than the wider aspect of Japan's relationship with the League of Nations. Stronger responses stuck to the focus of the question were able to respond clear and give similarities and differences. Weaker responses offered a general comparison that was not focussed on the question. Many candidates identified the differences of opinion on the quality of the Lytton Report between the two sources. Source B says the report is admirable and valuable, cannot be criticised and could form the basis of a settlement. Source C, on the other hand, does find some criticism of the report justifiable - that it takes too favourable a view of the future of China. Stronger responses also identified the similarity that both sources imply that there is some blame of Japan in the report. Source B says 'Japan must expect some blame' whilst Source C implies the report blames Japan by mentioning the dissatisfaction in Japan over the report and the fact that the report has denied Japanese claims about Manchukuo.

**3(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that Japan was concerned about the League?**

This question required some consideration of what the word 'concern' meant with regard to the Japanese relationship with the League of Nations and the strongest responses established this clearly. These responses identified points of clear support and challenge from the sources and created a discussion surrounding the utility of the sources. Source B and C both offered evidence to support the assertion by suggesting that Japan had no desire to leave the League. Source B decides that Japan might be prepared to take some criticism whilst Source C shows a difference between the opinions of the army and the civilian population. Source A and D, in contrast, challenge the idea that Japan was concerned about the League by showing them paying little attention to the actions of the League or being prepared to leave the organisation completely. The strongest responses discussed the provenance of these two sources and, importantly, used their contextual understanding to explain the chronology of the period. Those who were able to evaluate the utility of the sources in relation to how this had an impact on the question achieve the highest Level.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 9389/21</b> <b>Outline Study 21</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- Candidates should read all of the questions in the relevant section of the paper before selecting two questions to answer. There have been instances where a whole **part (a)** question has been written, only to be crossed out because of problems with answering the **part (b)** – a significant misuse of the limited time available.
- For **part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show how the factors interacted and to assess their relative significance.
- For **part (b)** questions candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach their full potential.
- Candidates with substantial topic knowledge need to ensure that they apply their knowledge to the specific focus of the question set.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in their answers, but less successful responses did not sustain consistent quality across all four question parts. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between **part (a)** and **part (b)** questions and many candidates clearly appreciated this.

**Part (a)** questions were generally well done by a large majority of candidates. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of factors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being examined.

**Part (b)** questions elicited a wider range of response quality. Stronger responses demonstrated an awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. The most successful responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. There is some evidence that candidates, faced with a very familiar topic were not able to adapt their knowledge to the specific question asked in this paper. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth.

**Comments on specific questions**

**SECTION A: EUROPEAN OPTION; Modern Europe, 1789–1917**

**Question 1 – France, 1789–1814**

**(a) Why was the Tennis Court Oath taken?**

Good responses were able to place the Oath in the context of the calling of the Estates General, the resulting divisions within it, the king's miscalculation in trying to stop the newly formed National Assembly meeting and explaining the Oath's aims. Less successful responses provided lengthy narratives about the profligate spending of the French royal family and/or went beyond the swearing of the Oath (e.g. the Storming of the Bastille).

**(b) Analyse the reasons why Napoleon was popular with the French people?**

Responses which were effective grasped the question's focus of 'popularity' and assessed the relative significance of, for example, Napoleon's military achievements, the creation of the Concordat with the Pope, the setting up of the Napoleonic Code and his use of propaganda as explanations for his popularity with the French people. Less well-focused responses examined why he was both popular and unpopular.

**Question 2 – The Industrial Revolution c.1800–c.1890**

**(a) Why did the Industrial Revolution lead to an expansion of the middle classes?**

Successful responses were able to place the expansion of the middle classes against a range of developments brought about by the Industrial Revolution. For example, the growth of factories required managers and the need to transport the mass-produced factory goods led to developments in transport, such as canals and railways, which led to need for engineers and lawyers. Weaker responses displayed a lack of understanding of the term 'middle classes' and so produced information not focused on the question.

**(b) 'Availability of energy supplies was the most important factor in encouraging industrialisation'. How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Good responses included analysis of a range of energy supplies, for example coal and water, and their application to industry and transport. This was often set against alternative factors such as the agricultural revolution and stable government encouraging industrialisation in Britain whilst political turmoil in France held back industrialisation and the role of the Zollverein in encouraging industrialisation in the German states. Responses which were less successful did not identify alternative factors or a country other than Britain, whilst weaker responses showed confusion as to what constituted 'energy supplies'.

**Question 3 – The Origins of World War I, c.1900–1914**

**(a) Why did Germany remain a member of the Triple Alliance?**

The most effective responses were based on detailed understanding, with reference, for example, to the fear of a two-front war following the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1894 and the concern that Germany faced another potential adversary, Britain, as a result of events such as the Kruger telegram, the Naval Race and the Moroccan Crises. Responses which were less-focused were characterised by a largely narrative approach, in which the origins and terms of the Triple Alliance were set out rather than focussing on why Germany wanted to remain in the Alliance.

**(b) Assess the responsibility of Serbia in increasing tension in the Balkans.**

Good responses were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, leading to well-reasoned judgements supported by appropriate factual evidence. Less well-focused responses were based on a largely narrative approach, in which various events (e.g. the Bosnian crisis of 1908, Russian and Austrian interest in the region and the assassination at Sarajevo) were described without analysis of their relative significance. Weaker responses focused, in a descriptive

manner, on the assassination at Sarajevo and the events which followed, with little (or assertive only) reference to the requirements of the question and, often, saw the Balkans as a single country rather than a geographic region.

**Question 4 – The Russian Revolution c.1894–1917**

**(a) Why did Kornilov attempt a coup in 1917?**

Effective responses were characterised by the identification and explanation of several key factors, such as the growing German threat to Petrograd, Kornilov's belief in the need to destroy the Petrograd Soviet in order to meet this threat and his sense of himself as a Man of Destiny, ordained to save Russia. Less successful responses simply described the coup events.

**(b) To what extent was the Russian economy transformed between 1894 and 1914?**

Successful responses demonstrated good, often very detailed, knowledge of the ways the Russian economy was transformed, for example, examining the reforms carried out by Witte and Stolypin. The most successful responses were fully focused on the extent to which these reforms could be described as transforming the economy; this was achieved by outlining a definition of 'transformed', and using this in order to evaluate the economy in this period. Less focused responses ignored the timeframe and wrote, often at length, about the impact of the First World War on Russia's economy up to 1917. Weaker responses adopted a narrative approach with only limited, and often assertive, reference to how far the economy was transformed.

**SECTION B: AMERICAN OPTION; The History of the USA, 1840–1941**

**Question 5 – The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s**

**(a) Why was the concept of Manifest Destiny so controversial when first outlined?**

Many candidates were able to identify a range of factors and explain why the concept of Manifest Destiny was controversial when first outlined. For example, the imperialistic element was odds with American tradition and values; control over all of North America was likely to lead to war and the newly acquired land would disrupt the balance between free and slave states. More limited responses could have been improved by avoiding lengthy narrative accounts of what the phrase 'Manifest Destiny' meant.

**(b) How far did the Open Door policy towards China benefit the USA?**

Good responses were characterised by a clear understanding of the economic and diplomatic benefits the USA gained from this policy towards China. Less successful responses focused only on economic gains (e.g. increased trade). Weaker responses were dominated by irrelevant material, such as Chinese immigration to the USA, ignoring the existence of the Chinese Exclusion Act (1882–1943), and/or the building of the Trans-Continental railroads, which pre-dated the Open Door policy (1869 and 1883).

**Question 6 – Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877**

**(a) Why was the North divided over its plans for reconstructing the South?**

Successful responses were aware that the Executive and Legislative branches of government clashed over the terms by which former Confederate states should be admitted to the Union, which led to the use of the 'pocket veto' by Lincoln and impeachment proceedings by Congress against his successor, Johnson. Such responses, also, examined the issue of how far ex-slaves should receive Federal support and the impact of the economic downturn of 1873. Responses which were less successful were characterised by limited range and explanatory depth.

**(b) 'Until 1864, Robert E. Lee's military strategy was surprisingly successful' How far do you agree?**

Effective responses grasped the question focus of 'surprisingly successful'. Stronger responses examined why his success in this period can be seen as surprising (e.g. the wealth of resources possessed by the North over that of the South) set against why it was not surprising Lee was

successful (his undoubted military ability over that of his Northern opponents in this period and the gradualist nature of the Anaconda Plan), and to question the extent of Lee's success (e.g. Antietam and Gettysburg). Less successful responses were descriptive, rather than evaluative, in approach, and focused on Lee's successes and why the South eventually lost the war so that the demands of the question were addressed only in an implicit manner.

#### **Question 7 – The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era, from the 1870s to the 1920s**

- (a) Why did the 'votes for women' movement make limited progress in the later nineteenth century?**

Good responses were fully-focused on the precise requirements of the question, based on the identification and detailed explanation of a range of factors which meant only limited progress was made by the 'votes for women' movement in this period. Thus, traditional attitudes towards women, shared by the vast majority of male law-makers in Congress, saw their place being in the home and not participating in elections and politics. Such responses often acknowledged that there was some slight progress in some western states which gave women the right to vote. Less successful responses identified factors and lacked range and depth. Weaker responses lost the question's focus and set out how women eventually got the vote.

- (b) How effective were the anti-trust laws of the Progressive era?**

Effective responses were characterised by the deployment of specific examples of anti-trust legislation in this period and their effectiveness was assessed to create range and depth. Responses which were less focused produced descriptive accounts outlining what constituted a trust and why legislation was needed.

#### **Question 8 – The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, from the 1920s to 1941**

- (a) Why was there so much opposition to the New Deal?**

Successful responses were able to explain a number of factors as to why there was so much opposition to the New Deal. For those on the Left the New Deal was not radical enough and needed to spend more whilst those on the Right feared it was undermining the very foundations of American society, based as they were on individual initiative and minimal-to-no government interference in the country's economy and lives of its citizens. Less successful responses identified few factors and these lacked depth of explanation.

- (b) 'Neither Hoover nor Roosevelt knew how to deal with the Great Depression'. How far do you agree?**

There were a number of excellent responses to this question. Analytical throughout, and supported by appropriately selected factual evidence, these responses developed fully focused arguments and reached well-reasoned conclusions. Other responses had limited understanding of what actions Hoover did take to deal with the Great Depression and/or accepted that Roosevelt's New Deal successfully dealt with the Great Depression. Weaker responses went little beyond stating Hoover did nothing and described what Roosevelt did, with no reference to dealing with the Great Depression.

#### **SECTION C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION; International Relations, 1871–1945**

#### **Question 9 – International Relations, 1871–1918**

- (a) Why did Britain go to war in 1914?**

Good responses were characterised by detailed understanding of a wide range of relevant factors. For example, the German invasion of Belgium was the immediate reason for Britain's declaration of war, whilst acknowledging that growing animosity between the two countries had made war increasingly likely and, indeed, expected. Responses which were less successful were typically a narrative account of the events which followed the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo or asserted that Britain was obliged to join the war because she was a member of the Triple Alliance.

**(b) How different were the foreign policies pursued by Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II?**

Successful responses demonstrated a sound knowledge of Bismarck's foreign policy and, in particular, his series of alliances with neighbouring countries as well as the contrasting actions taken by Wilhelm II in pursuit of *Weltpolitik*. This was then assessed against ways in which the two policies were similar; both were nationalist and both feared the French desire for revenge, hence Bismarck's system of alliances and the Kaiser's Schlieffen Plan. Weaker responses were characterised by limited knowledge and understanding of the foreign policies, particularly Wilhelm II's, and/or confused the two.

**Question 10 – International Relations, 1919–1933**

**(a) Why, during the Paris peace talks in 1919, did Clemenceau insist that harsh terms be imposed on Germany?**

Good responses were able to explain a range of factors, such as the French desire for revenge for not only the defeat in the Franco-Prussian War but, also, for the extensive damage done to France during the fighting in the First World War, as well as the wish to cripple Germany economically and militarily in order to safeguard future French security. Less successful responses lacked range and explanatory depth. Weaker responses often wrote about the aims of USA and Britain and so lacked focus.

**(b) Which did more to ease tension between France and Germany: the Dawes Plan or the Locarno Treaties?**

Responses which were successful provided a fully-focused analysis of detailed knowledge and understanding of both the Dawes Plan and the Locarno Treaties, leading to the development of balanced arguments and convincing judgements. Less successful responses, while containing much the same factual information, tended to be essentially narrative in approach, with only limited (and often assertive) explicit reference to the requirements of the question. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the terms of the Dawes Plan and the later Young Plan and limited knowledge of the Locarno Treaties.

**Question 11 – International Relations, c.1933–1939**

**(a) Why, in 1934, did Mussolini send troops to Italy's border with Austria?**

Good responses explained Mussolini's action in the context of the foreign policies he was pursuing at the time, such as his support for an independent Austria, rather than an expanded Germany, and the Locarno Treaties and his desire to maintain good relations with Britain and France. Less successful responses lacked range and depth, only stating that Mussolini was concerned about Italian security.

**(b) 'Fear of communism was the main reason why Britain followed a policy of appeasement in the 1930s' How far do you agree?**

Successful responses remained fully focused on the question's requirements, provided detailed analysis of a wide range of factual evidence to develop balanced arguments and reach reasoned conclusions. Responses which were less successful adopted a purely narrative approach, describing examples of Britain's appeasement policy, to varying degrees of depth and accuracy. Weaker responses did not place 'fear of communism' in the context of a desire to have anti-communist Germany as a bulwark against communism.

**Question 12 – China and Japan, 1919–1945**

**(a) Why did Japan become a military dictatorship during the 1930s?**

Good responses were able to deploy relevant factual knowledge, often in considerable detail, setting out various factors which led to Japan's becoming a military dictatorship (e.g. the impact of the Great Depression, disillusionment with democratic politicians' inability to deal with the crisis and the virtual independence of the Kwangtung army). Less successful responses identified factors which lacked range and depth.

**(b) 'The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was the logical outcome of Japan's foreign policies.'**  
**How far do you agree?**

Successful responses grasped 'logical outcome of Japan's foreign policies' and assessed the ways the attack was a clear product of Japanese aggressive actions. For example, in China and Indo-China and on the border with USSR in north-east Asia. This was then set against how fear of a Soviet attack from the North preoccupied Japanese policymakers until the German invasion of the USSR in June 1941, and how Japanese foreign policy, at times, had sought negotiated outcomes such as the Washington Naval Conference and attempted to persuade America to abandon trade restrictions and embargoes against Japan. Weaker responses saw 'logical' in terms of the consequences of the Pearl Harbor attack for Japan.

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9389/22 Outline Study 22</p>
---

## Key messages

- Candidates should read all of the questions in the relevant section of the paper before selecting two questions to answer. There have been instances where a whole **part (a)** question has been written, only to be crossed out because of problems with answering the **part (b)** – a significant misuse of the limited time available.
- For **part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show how the factors inter-reacted and to assess their relative significance.
- For **part (b)** questions candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach their full potential.
- Candidates with substantial topic knowledge need to ensure that they apply their knowledge to the specific focus of the question set.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. **Section A** questions were by far the most popular, reflecting teaching choices with regard to topics. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in their answers, but less successful responses did not sustain consistent quality across all four question parts. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between **part (a)** and **part (b)** questions and many candidates clearly appreciated this.

**Part (a)** questions were generally well done. Most candidates are well aware of the need to explain the reasons for actions or events, and even for those with limited factual knowledge it was often possible to produce a creditable simple explanation with some supporting detail. Good responses offered an explanation of several significant factors with, sometimes very full, supporting detail. Only a small number of candidates made the final step to identifying and justifying a prioritisation of these factors by establishing the ways in which they were linked to demonstrate which was most important in order to achieve Level 4.

In answering **part (b)** questions candidates demonstrated a good grasp of basic knowledge about a topic but were not always confident in using that knowledge in answering a question which was not entirely what they might have expected. Consequently, weaker responses were often limited to a descriptive account of events around the topic or, sometimes, focussing on the wrong aspect of a topic –for example writing a general account of factors leading to the outbreak of the First World War when the question asks about the stabilising effect of alliances and ententes. There were many good responses with plenty of relevant detail and a balanced analysis, but only a few which took the final step of making and justifying a comparative judgement about the relative merits of different arguments.

**Comments on specific questions**

**SECTION A: EUROPEAN OPTION; Modern Europe, 1789–1917**

**Question 1 – France, 1789–1814**

**(a) Why was the Bastille stormed?**

Most candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of the events surrounding the beginning of the French Revolution but the ways in which they used this knowledge separated the good from the weaker responses. Strong responses kept a clear focus on the specific event in the question and argued it was the result of the king's actions in relation to the meeting of the National Assembly and his dismissal of the popular finance minister, coupled with the fears of the population of Paris that the king was moving a large armed force to surround the city and their belief that the Bastille had a large store of gunpowder/weapons. Weaker responses wrote generally about the Estates General and the problems of France without focussing on the specific issues of why the Bastille was stormed.

**(b) Which better describes the period of the Directory: 'revolutionary chaos' or 'a period of real achievement'?**

Many candidates who attempted this question showed a good understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the Directory government. Stronger answers often included a comparison of the relative stability of the late 1790s with the real 'chaos' that preceded it under Robespierre and went on to look at other achievements like constructing balanced system of government, holding democratic elections, reducing debt etc. and generally returning to trying to achieve the revolutionary aims the early 1790s. The 'chaos' argument linked to this included the number of attempted coups, financial weakness, general discontent and dependence on the army to maintain order – a relationship that eventually led to its overthrow. Weaker responses were often limited to discussing the failures, Robespierre or they wrote about Napoleon's coup and its consequences, not addressing the focus of the question.

**Question 2 – The Industrial Revolution c.1800–c.1890**

**(a) Why did countries introduce tariffs during the nineteenth century?**

There were few responses to this question and they demonstrated a limited understanding of tariffs. The strongest responses were able to explain the benefits of protecting newly founded domestic industries and raising revenue for government, but more modest answers simply described tariffs as general taxes on trade (i.e. both imports and exports) and thus could not explain accurately the reasons for imposing them.

**(b) 'Rising demand for goods was the major factor in encouraging industrialisation in this period.' How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Few candidates were able to suggest ways in which increased demand encouraged industrialisation and many did the opposite, explaining the technical developments that led to increased production and thus increased demand. Some wrote about agricultural improvements that increase supply. The weakest responses did not provide any reference to any country other than Britain or wrote about industrialisation in general without relating it to the question.

**Question 3 – The Origins of World War I, c.1900–1914**

**(a) Why did nationalism increase tension in the Balkans?**

This question was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to explain why nationalism grew as the power of the Ottoman Empire waned and why this led to struggles in the Balkans often providing accurate and useful detail of the various Balkan conflicts of the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Good responses were able to show how nationalism also drew in the Austrians who worried about nationalistic movements within their multinational empire, and the Russians who saw themselves gaining influence through supporting nationalistic movements amongst the various

Slav groups. Weaker responses mainly focussed on Austro-Russian conflict with little reference to 'nationalism'.

**(b) 'The system of alliances and ententes made Europe more stable.' How far do you agree?**

There were many good responses to this question which used relevant details of the different alliances and ententes to demonstrate the two alternative perspectives. Arguments about stability often included examples about the settlement of disputes between members as in the Anglo-French and Anglo-Russian ententes which reduced the risk of conflict in Africa and the Far East respectively. Other examples used included German support of Austria that led to a 'peaceful' end to the Bosnian Crisis in 1908 and the 'resolution' of the two Moroccan Crises when Anglo-French co-operation forced Germany to step down. The alternative argument provided often referred to the same examples as steadily increasing tensions and resentment so that the July crisis became the trigger for an all-out conflict between the two alliance systems. Weaker answers were often limited to accounts of the causes of the War, writing about the naval race, imperialism and nationalist conflict in the Balkans rather than about alliances and ententes. Many weaker responses also described the outbreak of war and the role of Belgium suggesting that the Treaty of London, that triggered British action, was a part of the alliance system.

**Question 4 – The Russian Revolution c.1894–1917**

**(a) Why, in January 1905, was there a march on the Winter Palace?**

This was the most popular question on the paper and it was well answered. Strong answers demonstrated a clear understanding of the issues that led Father Gapon to lead the industrial workers of St Petersburg on this march to present a petition to the Tsar, a long-accepted means of seeking help from the Tsar. Good responses explained this with the support of relevant detail, including poor working and living conditions and the effects of shortages caused by the war, as relevant causal factors. However, some weaker responses missed the significance of the specific date and wrote instead about the causes of the 1905 revolution suggesting factors like the loss of the war with Japan and peasant dissatisfaction amongst the causes when they were not relevant to this initial march in January, but led to much larger protests later that were a part of the result of how Father Gapon's protest was dealt with. A few weak responses wrote about the consequences of the protest rather than its causes.

**(b) 'The collapse of Tsarism was caused by its failure to keep the support of the industrial workers.' How far do you agree?**

There were many good responses to this question, but some candidates struggled to establish a balanced analysis and others did not necessarily fulfil the requirements of the question. Good responses usually began with a consideration of the difficulties of the Tsar's relationship with the industrial workers over the longer period but focussing on their influence on the events of February 1917 which led to the downfall of the regime. From there they analysed other events leading to the fall of the regime, mainly focussing on the other problems caused by the war including inadequate government, loss of support of the army, the consequences of the Tsar's absence from Petrograd and the effect of opposition groups in the run up to the events of 1917. The best responses presented reasoned judgements about relative importance and thus reached the highest level. Weaker responses were often a general essay about the weaknesses of the Tsarist regime and wrote a description of failings, often rooted in the events of 1905 rather than the immediate causes of collapse in February 1917.

**SECTION B: AMERICAN OPTION; The History of the USA, 1840–1941**

**Question 5 – The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s**

**(a) Why, in the 1850s, did the USA send naval fleets to Japan?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**(b) Assess the significance of the Mexican-American War of 1846–48 for the United States**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**Question 6 – Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877**

**(a) Why was the North unable to achieve all its aims for the reconstruction of the South?**

There were some responses to this question that showed a good understanding of the difficulties that the North faced in imposing its Reconstruction plans on the southern states. The best explained both what these plans included and demonstrated why they were difficult to implement, giving specific examples of southern resistance. Good responses often also considered the difficulties that the North had in even deciding how it should deal with the South. Weaker responses often confused the work of different presidents and few went beyond the issue of southern resistance in general terms, or beyond description of what happened in the 1860's in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War.

**(b) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Jefferson Davis's leadership of the Confederacy.**

Stronger responses considered the strengths Davis's military experience and any particular advantages that the South might have that gave him an advantage. These were assessed against his perceived disadvantages like micro-management and resistance from individual states to an overall Confederate policy. This approach produced a balanced response with the overall level depending of the depth of detail provided. Weaker responses demonstrated a limited knowledge of Davis and provided a general comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of Davis compared to Lincoln or wrote essays about the military advantages of the North compared to the South without any real reference to Davis as leader of the Confederacy.

**Question 7 – The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era, from the 1870s to the 1920s**

**(a) Why did business trusts become the focus of much criticism?**

Most candidates who answered this question wrote confidently about some of the complaints about business trusts including poor treatment of workers, unfair business practices, undermining of competitors and corrupt links with federal government, often providing specific examples to support their arguments. Moderate answers did not cover all the possibilities, but were able to present some explanation of the most obvious reasons for criticism. Weaker responses often described the work of some of the leading 'robber barons' or wrote detailed descriptions of worker conditions without making links to the question.

**(b) 'The Progressive Movement democratised the American political system.' How valid is this assertion?**

Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the Progressive Movement and of the main issues within the political system during the period of its prominence. Stronger responses included detail about the principal constitutional amendments of the period (18th, 19th, and 20th), and explained their purpose in terms of legal changes to the Constitution. This was the positive side of the democratisation process. A common counter-argument was that in practice these changes to the constitution did not lead to great changes in the political system immediately because of other factors which were then explained. The strongest answers showed a commendable understanding of the difference between State and Federal actions with limited progress at Federal level but much better progressive improvement at state level, providing good supporting detail such as party Primaries and State referenda (introduced in 1904). Some weaker responses mistook democratised to be Democratic and wrote about the political parties and their presidents during the early 1900s.

**Question 8 – The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, from the 1920s to 1941**

**(a) Why did the US economy return to recession in 1937–38?**

This was a popular question in this section of the paper and it was generally well answered. Common themes for solid responses included the short term nature of many of the measures introduced in the First New Deal, a return to recession as part of the normal business cycle following the years of recovery from the Great Depression and the effects of a change in policy by Roosevelt in order to return to a balanced budget. Weaker responses focussed mainly on the actions of the Supreme Court in opposing some of Roosevelt's measures, but this was a relatively minor issue in the return to recession.

**(b) How far did the 1920s deserve to be called ‘the Roaring Twenties’?**

Stronger responses demonstrated a good understanding of the things that made this era ‘the Roaring Twenties’ with the best responses covering the whole range from cultural and social changes to industrial and financial developments and even the criminal sub-culture related to ‘Speakeasies’ and Prohibition. Having established the ‘good’ aspects of the Twenties candidates examined those who ‘missed out’ particularly the African-American population, poor farmers, some immigrant groups and women. The best answers then provided a fully supported judgement. Weaker responses described key features of the ‘Roaring Twenties’ and often had a very narrow focus on entertainment and lifestyle with little balance.

**SECTION C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION; International Relations, 1871–1945**

**Question 9 – International Relations, 1871–1918**

**(a) Why was the Anglo–Russian Entente agreed in 1907?**

Stronger responses explained a number of changes in relationships that made the Entente possible including the effects of the Russo–Japanese War and the settlement of issues over control in Afghanistan and Persia. Mutual issues with Germany were included as relevant contributors to the making of the agreement and the significance of each country’s relationship with the French was mentioned in some of the better responses. Some weaker responses focussed on the problems caused by Germany rather than on Russian and British motives.

**(b) Which date better marks the emergence of Japan as a world power: 1905 or 1918?**

The most common approach to this question was to produce an essay of two halves centred around 1905 and 1918 and finish with a conclusion. This approach did produce some strong responses with good balance and relevant detail. Many candidates traced the rise of Japan from a ‘medieval’ state in the mid-nineteenth century to a significant power in 1905. This was often the better half of the answer but good responses were able to identify significant differences by 1918. The best responses differentiated between the idea of a regional power in 1905 and a world power in 1918. Weaker responses tended to be one sided, descriptive and focused mainly on 1905.

**Question 10 – International Relations, 1919–1933**

**(a) Why did the French occupation of the Ruhr damage relations between France and Britain?**

Many candidates were able to provide a clear account of the occupation and why it happened, relating it to the outcome of the Versailles settlement. Weaker responses were limited to providing a general narrative of events. Better responses took Versailles as a starting point to the consideration of strains in the relationship between France and Britain over the eventual settlement and used the different motives that the countries had at Versailles as a basis for explaining why French actions in the Ruhr further worsened Anglo-French relations. Issues of reparations, trade and the risk of worsening conflict were central to successful responses.

**(b) To what extent did the Locarno Treaties of 1925 reduce international tensions?**

Most candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the main terms of the Locarno Treaties and were able to describe them in reasonable detail. Stronger answers outlined some of the issues that Locarno didn’t settle like the possibility of boundary conflicts in Eastern Europe and the dissatisfaction of some countries especially Poland, over this. Other approaches of stronger responses was to set the Locarno process in a wider context including previous efforts like the Genoa Conference or the Dawes Plan, or later developments like the Kellogg-Briand Pact or the Young plan in order to consider what the Treaties did and didn’t achieve.

**Question 11 – International Relations, c.1933–1939**

- (a) **Why, given his hatred of communism, did Hitler sign a non-aggression pact with Soviet Russia in 1939?**

The terms of the Nazi Soviet Pact were well understood and described in some detail by most candidates. Good responses gave reasoned analysis of the circumstances in which it was signed and related them to Hitler's short- and longer-term motives and his perception of the possible response of the Western Allies. Weaker answers tried to suggest that the major reason was so that he could go and attack France and Britain without fear of reprisals from Russia, failing to recognise that he did not expect them to take action in the light of their previous appeasement policy. A few weaker responses discussed of Stalin's motives, though the question was about Hitler.

- (b) **'A foolish strategy, for which there can be no justification.' How far do you agree with this assessment of Britain's appeasement policy?**

Most candidates wrote confidently about the policy of appeasement and provided a range of detailed examples. Stronger responses demonstrated a good understanding of the reasons why this seemed like a good idea at the time in terms of public response and the economic and military circumstances of the 1930's. Balance was an issue with some answers, though better ones explained why at each stage it simply gave Hitler more confidence and some even pointed out situations in which he could have been forced to back down with more positive opposition with examples like the first attempt at Anschluss and the re-militarisation of the Rhineland. Weaker responses struggled with the concept of 'foolish strategy' or ignored it and wrote about the pros and cons of the policy.

**Question 12 – China and Japan, 1919–1945**

- (a) **Why did Sun Yat-sen establish 'The Three Principles'?**

There were few responses to this question and mostly they described the Three Principles, without examining the underlying circumstances in China that led to their creation. Moderate responses provided a general description of the situation in China at the time, but few gave specific details.

- (b) **How far do you agree that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor ended in failure?**

Weak responses were limited to a basic narrative built around the premise that it ended in failure because the Japanese were defeated in the end. Better responses focussed on the successes and failures of the attack set against the possible motives of the Japanese and/or considered short term vs. long term indicators of failure. Most answers were still not well-balanced.

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9389/23 Outline Study 23</p>
---

## Key messages

- Candidates should read all of the questions in the relevant section of the paper before selecting two questions to answer. There have been instances where a whole **part (a)** question has been written, only to be crossed out because of problems with answering the **part (b)** – a significant misuse of the limited time available.
- For **part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show how the factors inter-reacted and to assess their relative significance.
- For **part (b)** questions candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach their full potential.
- Candidates with substantial topic knowledge need to ensure that they apply their knowledge to the specific focus of the question set.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. **Section A** questions were by far the most popular, reflecting teaching choices with regard to topics. **Section B** was the least popular. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in their answers, but less successful responses did not sustain consistent quality across all four question parts. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between **part (a)** and **part (b)** questions and many candidates clearly appreciated this.

**Part (a)** questions were generally well done. Most candidates are well aware of the need to explain the reasons for actions or events, and even for those with limited factual knowledge it was often possible to produce a creditable simple explanation with some supporting detail. Good responses offered an explanation of several significant factors with, sometimes very full, supporting detail. Only a small number of candidates made the final step to identifying and justifying a prioritisation of these factors by establishing the ways in which they were linked to demonstrate which was most important in order to achieve Level 4.

In answering **part (b)** questions candidates demonstrated a good grasp of basic knowledge about a topic but were not always confident in using that knowledge in answering a question which was not entirely what they might have expected. Consequently, weaker responses were often limited to a descriptive account of events around the topic or, sometimes, focussing on the wrong aspect of a topic – for example writing a general account of factors leading to the outbreak of the First World War when the question asks about the stabilising effect of alliances and ententes. There were many good responses with plenty of relevant detail and a balanced analysis, but only a few which took the final step of making and justifying a comparative judgement about the relative merits of different arguments.

**Comments on specific questions**

**SECTION A: EUROPEAN OPTION; Modern Europe, 1789–1917**

**Question 1 – France, 1789–1814**

**(a) Why was the National Assembly formed?**

Candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the events that led to the outbreak of the French Revolution and many provided detailed accounts of the calling and working of the Estates General. Stronger responses explained why the National Assembly became necessary in the eyes of certain groups. Weaker responses often provided a list of problems that led to the French Revolution and left some groups dissatisfied, without linking this information to the specific focus of the question.

**(b) Assess the reasons why Napoleon was able to bring stability to France.**

Many candidates were familiar with the reforms that Napoleon introduced and his method of maintaining order. Strong responses produced a balance response analysing both the positive achievements that won popularity and the repressive measures that limited opposition. More sophisticated responses drew attention to the combination of revolutionary ideas with more traditional approaches to control. Weaker responses provided limited detail about a narrower range of issues. Few candidates were able to reach supported judgements about the relative importance of different measures

**Question 2 – The Industrial Revolution c.1800–c.1890**

**(a) Why was there technical innovation in manufacturing in this period?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**(b) 'Industrialisation had limited impact on the standard of living of all social classes.' How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**Question 3 – The Origins of World War I, c.1900–1914**

**(a) Why, in 1914, did Austria adopt such an aggressive approach towards Serbia?**

There were many responses to this question and most candidates were able to explain at least one reason for Austria's attitude to Serbia. Stronger responses demonstrated an awareness of the complex nature of the situation in the Balkans in the early twentieth century and focussed on this particular aspect. Many candidates focussed heavily on the events of June 28th 1914, in Sarajevo, and their aftermath, with stronger responses showing a good understanding of the longer term issues raised by Serbia's nationalist ambitions following the collapse of Ottoman control in the Balkans. Weak responses described some aspects of the relationship between the two countries but did not develop this into explanations.

**(b) Assess the reasons why the Great Powers expanded their armies and navies in this period.**

There were many good responses to this question but some that did not focus on the requirements of the question. One approach seen in stronger answers was to deal with the major powers of Europe individually analysing the motives of each of them and, where appropriate assessing the ways in which their issues and ambitions were linked to those of other states. Weaker examples of this approach provided a list of states and some of the measures they took to expand their navies and/or armies. Stronger responses had a good balance but weaker answers tended to focus on one aspect much more than the other – usually the naval race between Britain and Germany.

**Question 4 – The Russian Revolution c.1894–1917**

- (a) **Why, between 1905 and 1914, was the Tsarist regime able to survive the opposition to it?**

Most candidates identified a number of factors that ensured the survival of the Tsarist government. Stronger response included an explanation of at least some factors; most frequently the effects of the October Manifesto and of Stolypin's 'carrot and stick' approach to reforms. Few candidates identified that survival might have been due to the limited nature of the opposition.

- (b) **How far were the military setbacks suffered by Russia between 1914 and 1916 responsible for the downfall of the Tsar?**

There were many good responses seen, but they were differentiated by how successfully they established a balanced analysis. Good responses usually began with a consideration of the military setbacks and their effect on the army and Tsar's position, then considered other events leading to the fall of the regime mainly focussing on the other problems caused by the war: inadequate government, industrial unrest, the consequences of the Tsars absence from Petrograd and the effect of opposition groups in the run up to the events of 1917. The best responses presented reasoned judgements about relative importance. Weaker answers wrote in general terms about the weaknesses of the Tsarist regime and wrote a description of failings, often rooted in the events of 1905 rather than the immediate causes of collapse in February 1917.

**SECTION B: AMERICAN OPTION; The History of the USA, 1840–1941**

**Question 5 – The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s**

- (a) **Why did the USA go to war with the Philippines in 1899?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

- (b) **How far did the USA follow the policy of dollar diplomacy in the Caribbean and Central America in the early twentieth century?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**Question 6 – Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877**

- (a) **Why was the federal government ultimately unable to defeat the opposition of White Southerners to Reconstruction?**

Most responses included some explanations of the failure of Reconstruction, often focussed on the underlying resistance of the White Southerners to the Emancipation Amendments with specific laws like the Black Codes or more subversive activities like the KKK. Weaker responses focussed only on the conflict between Radical and Presidential Reconstruction which was not really about the 'opposition of White Southerners'.

- (b) **'Living conditions in the South during the Civil War became harsh only in 1864–65.' How far do you agree?**

Stronger responses presented two distinct arguments in their response to the question. Sound responses recognised that with the tightening control of the blockade of the South plus the change of policy of the northern armies that targeted the whole population rather than just seeking to engage the opposing armies in battles, things got worse towards the end of the War. At the same time, an argument was identified that things had been difficult from the start and just got worse as the War went on – i.e. that there was no sudden worsening in the later stages. This approach produced some sound answers. Weaker responses were limited to writing about the relative disadvantages of the South compared to the North which did not answer this question.

**Question 7 – The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era, from the 1870s to the 1920s**

- (a) **Why, in 1908, did Theodore Roosevelt decide not to run for a third term as US President?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

- (b) **How far did the federal governments of the later nineteenth century help American farmers deal with the problems they faced?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**Question 8 – The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, from the 1920s to 1941**

- (a) **Why was investing in the stock market so popular in the 1920s?**

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper and most candidates were able to offer some explanation for the interest in investment in this period. Terms like ‘buying on the margin’ were not always fully understood but stronger responses used them confidently and explained their significance correctly. Most candidates were able to establish clearly how conditions in manufacturing and technology were key to this expansion.

- (b) **‘A well-meaning dictatorship.’ How far do you agree with this judgement on Franklin Roosevelt’s presidency?**

Some candidates struggled to provide balance between the two highlighted possibilities in their answer. Most candidates successfully addressed the possibility that Roosevelt was ‘well-meaning’ and spent a lot of their answer demonstrating this. Weaker responses tended to be limited to a list of the actions that Roosevelt took, usually focussing on the work of the ‘Alphabet Agencies’. Better responses showed careful thought about how ‘well-meaning’ applied to these organisations. Many candidates struggled with the idea of Roosevelt being dictatorial, often just centring their arguments on the issue of his clashes with the Supreme Court, though the best answers analysed events more closely and considered whether his radical policies were actually ‘unconstitutional’.

**SECTION C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION; International Relations, 1871–1945**

**Question 9 – International Relations, 1871–1918**

- (a) **Why were Austria-Hungary and Russia in conflict over the Balkans in the years leading up to the First World War?**

Most responses included explanation of Austro-Russian clashes over influence in the collapsing Ottoman territories and demonstrated a good understanding of the issues raised by the rapid growth of an independent Serbia, though some weaker responses suggested that Serbia was seeking ‘Great Power’ status. Most were aware of the potential problems this created for Austria’s polyglot empire and had a good grasp of Russian claims to a significant role as ‘protector of the Slavs’ and were able to explain why these led to conflict. Good answers often included a detailed explanation of specific issues like the Bosnian Crisis and some revisited longer-term enmities between the two powers.

- (b) **‘The development of the Schlieffen Plan clearly demonstrated Germany’s warlike intentions.’ How far do you agree?**

Stronger responses often began by demonstrating a strong understanding of the Schlieffen Plan and the explained its evolution as the French emerged from the isolation imposed on them by the Bismarckian alliance system. Well-focussed responses dealt with alternative interpretations arguing that it might be considered as an offensive plan, especially given the consequences of its ultimate implementation, and why its intention might be looked upon as primarily defensive in the face of a hostile alliance threatening war on two fronts. Weaker responses explained the causes of the First World War and were often narrative in nature.

**Question 10 – International Relations, 1919–1933**

- (a) **Why, despite the USA’s isolationist policy, did Americans help to resolve the issue of German reparations in the 1920s?**

There were some good responses to this question which demonstrated a clear understanding of the links between reparations and the loans that the US made to European Allies during the First World War. Strong responses explained the underlying economic circumstances which made it necessary, out of economic self-interest, for the US to intervene in trying to solve the crisis created by the Franco Belgian occupation of the Ruhr. Many candidates explained why the Dawes Plan, and later the Young Plan, were a necessary contribution the US needed to make to trying to solve the reparations issue. Better responses also identified the maintenance of peace in Europe being a significant issue for the US, despite not joining the League of Nations. Weaker answers described the German Economic Crisis of 1923–24 and/or the Dawes and Young Plans.

- (b) **How far do you agree with the view that international relations were more stable in 1930 than they had been in 1919?**

The changes that took place in international relations in the 1920s were well understood by many of the candidates who attempted this question. Many strong responses began with a summary of problems that still existed following the signing of the Peace Treaties in 1919 and then proceeded to demonstrate how various agreements and treaties of the 1920s reduced these problems. The Locarno Treaties were often the main focus, but other frequently mentioned agreements included, the Washington Naval Treaties the Dawes Plan, the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Young Plan. These responses tended to end by suggesting things were better in 1930 and often lacked a more balanced interpretation. A different approach was to directly compare the situations in 1919 and 1930 looking at the positive and negative features of both periods. Some stronger responses included comment on the position of Russia and Japan, the growing threat of extremism by 1930, problems in Eastern Europe and issues involving the League of Nations.

**Question 11 – International Relations, c.1933–1939**

- (a) **Why was there a lack of unity on the Republican side during the Spanish Civil War?**

Most candidates were aware of the major divisions in the Republican side and were able to identify the different and conflicting aims and intentions of the various political groups. Stronger responses also analysed the divisions that affected the army and its operational capabilities especially problems with the International Brigades and the intervention of the Russians. Weaker responses attempted to compare the weaknesses of the Republicans with the effectiveness of strong centralised leadership on the Nationalist side which was not relevant to the question.

- (b) **‘Hitler’s foreign policy was based on his willingness to take major risks.’ How far do you agree?**

Good responses demonstrated a sound knowledge of the major steps Hitler took in the 1930s and assessed the level of risk involved in each. This was done equally effectively by dealing with them as a chronological series of events, analysing each in turn, or by explaining the balance between risk vs. little risk policies, with appropriate illustration. Weaker responses often provided a list of major events in Hitler’s foreign policy with a summative assertion about risk that did not offer any significant explanation. This was not a very successful approach.

**Question 12 – China and Japan, 1919–1945**

- (a) **Why, up to 1927, was Chiang Kai-shek prepared to collaborate with the Chinese Communist Party?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

- (b) **To what extent was the need for economic self-sufficiency the reason for Japanese aggression during the 1930s?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 9389/31</b> <b>Interpretations Question</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- Before starting their answer, candidates should read the extract carefully and to spend some time identifying the parts of the extract they can use to illustrate the historian's interpretation.
- The question asks about the historian's interpretation and approach. These are not what the historian writes; they are things you can infer from what s/he writes. Stronger answers use the extract to show how inferences about the interpretation and approach have been reached.
- The historian's interpretation is valid for the whole of the extract. Answers which suggest that an extract has more than one interpretation indicate a lack of understanding. If candidates see what appear to be inconsistencies in the extract these need to be resolved in their understanding of the interpretation, for example maybe the historian has deliberately raised a point in order to reject it or maybe the historian is acknowledging alternative arguments even though not agreeing with them.
- Good answers are not necessarily long answers. Rather they keep a consistent focus on explaining the interpretation using relevant parts of the extract.

## General comments

The strongest answers were concise and focused. They stated what they thought the historian's main interpretation is, and then constructed the answer around those sections of the extract that illustrate this interpretation. These answers continually referred back to the interpretation, explaining how the extract reveals it. Their conclusion was often a summary of the points made throughout the answer, explicitly linking them to the interpretation. Weaker answers did not maintain a consistent focus. This may simply be a matter of being distracted temporarily into writing about the topic, in which case the threads of the argument can still be picked up later. Many candidates start their answers by asserting the historian's interpretation, but then continue to paraphrase the extract, rather than linking this back to the interpretation by using specific points from the extract to illustrate it.

Stronger answers tend not to be constructed by working through the extract paragraph by paragraph. Instead they select the parts of the extract they will need to use in explaining the interpretation. One disadvantage to the paragraph by paragraph approach is that often the answer does not provide an overview of the extract as there is greater focus with points of detail rather than with the historians' broader arguments. This can lead to inconsistencies in the argument as conclusions are reached on part, and not the whole, of the extract. Weaker responses were characterised by including contradictions or arguing that there were multiple interpretations. If candidates realise that their answer contains apparent inconsistencies, they should try to resolve them.

Finally, there were some instances of candidates attempting to illustrate points using truncated, incomplete quotes from the extract – e.g. *I can tell the historian is a revisionist because the extract says 'It is equally... ..western politicians'*. This often affected the flow of the arguments and weakened the strength of support. Candidates are advised to give the full material they are offering as support for a point.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939**

There were insufficient scripts on this section for meaningful comments to be made on them.

### **Section B: The Holocaust**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler's own brand of anti-Semitism was the driving force behind the Final Solution, but that this operated in a specific cultural context. The best answers recognised both aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many answers focused simply on Hitler and concluded that the interpretation was intentionalist, and therefore missed an important element of the argument. Some answers struggled to address the point made by the historian about the war. The extract mentions it, but as the occasion of the Final Solution, rather than as its cause. Some assumed that this still amounted to a functionalist approach, but it was hard to support an argument based on contingent factors. The heart of the interpretation was located in what it said about the 'ideological and cultural' context. According to the historian, this was ready to set fire, but without Hitler this would not have happened. This suggested that Hitler's intent was necessary, but not sufficient, to ensure that the fire 'spread as far as it did'. Explaining this very particular synthesis of factors was required for answers to reach the highest level, though arguing a synthesis of intentionalism and functionalism was still well rewarded. More modest answers used material from the final paragraph to argue for a structuralist approach, but this was not persuasive, as it did not address central aspects of the interpretation in the previous paragraphs. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

### **Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that in the post-war period the USSR was an aggressive revolutionary state that posed a real threat to the West, which was meanwhile trying to protect the principles of democracy and freedom as the basis for the peace settlement. The best answers recognised both aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In practice most candidates found no difficulty in identifying how the extract viewed the USSR as being to blame for the breakdown of the wartime alliance, and more often than not labelled this approach as traditionalist. The strongest answers also showed how the extract exonerated the West. It was possible to argue that the interpretation was post-post-revisionist, but this was not as convincing, and few attempted it. Candidates who argued that the extract was in any way blaming the West tended to base their arguments on contextual knowledge rather than what the extract said, and could not therefore make much progress. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 9389/32</b> <b>Interpretations Question</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- Before starting their answer, candidates should read the extract carefully and to spend some time identifying the parts of the extract they can use to illustrate the historian's interpretation.
- The question asks about the historian's interpretation and approach. These are not what the historian writes; they are things you can infer from what s/he writes. Stronger answers use the extract to show how inferences about the interpretation and approach have been reached.
- The historian's interpretation is valid for the whole of the extract. Answers which suggest that an extract has more than one interpretation indicate a lack of understanding. If candidates see what appear to be inconsistencies in the extract these need to be resolved in their understanding of the interpretation, for example maybe the historian has deliberately raised a point in order to reject it or maybe the historian is acknowledging alternative arguments even though not agreeing with them.
- Good answers are not necessarily long answers. Rather they keep a consistent focus on explaining the interpretation using relevant parts of the extract.

## General comments

The strongest answers were concise and focused. They stated what they thought the historian's main interpretation is, and then constructed the answer around those sections of the extract that illustrate this interpretation. These answers continually referred back to the interpretation, explaining how the extract reveals it. Their conclusion was often a summary of the points made throughout the answer, explicitly linking them to the interpretation. Weaker answers did not maintain a consistent focus. This may simply be a matter of being distracted temporarily into writing about the topic, in which case the threads of the argument can still be picked up later. Many candidates start their answers by asserting the historian's interpretation, but then continue to paraphrase the extract, rather than linking this back to the interpretation by using specific points from the extract to illustrate it.

Stronger answers tend not to be constructed by working through the extract paragraph by paragraph. Instead they select the parts of the extract they will need to use in explaining the interpretation. One disadvantage to the paragraph by paragraph approach is that often the answer does not provide an overview of the extract as there is greater focus with points of detail rather than with the historians' broader arguments. This can lead to inconsistencies in the argument as conclusions are reached on part, and not the whole, of the extract. Weaker responses were characterised by including contradictions or arguing that there were multiple interpretations. If candidates realise that their answer contains apparent inconsistencies, they should try to resolve them.

Finally, there were some instances of candidates attempting to illustrate points using truncated, incomplete quotes from the extract – e.g. *I can tell the historian is a revisionist because the extract says 'It is equally... ..western politicians'*. This often affected the flow of the arguments and weakened the strength of support. Candidates are advised to give the full material they are offering as support for a point.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the First World War dealt a terminal blow to the British Empire, despite attempts in the inter-war period to carry on as normal. The best answers recognised both aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many answers were based around the idea that the extract dealt with imperial decline, but importantly did not link

this to the impact of the First World War. Weaker responses, often worked through the extract a paragraph at a time were misled by the first paragraph into thinking that the interpretation was economic in nature, or that it was about the growth of the Empire. Other weaker answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Empire with no reference to the extract.

### ***Section B: The Holocaust***

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that whilst Hitler willed some kind of final reckoning with the Jews, he did not order the Holocaust, but rather left it to others to determine what in practice would happen. The best answers recognised both aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. A central aspect of this extract was the lack of an order for genocide. Many candidates undermined their answers by not reading the first paragraph carefully enough, and by claiming that it said Hitler had ordered the physical destruction of the Jews. But these were not the words of the historian – they were Eichmann recalling what Heydrich had said to him. The historian immediately cast doubt on this by questioning whether a decision to kill the Jews had been made even by autumn 1941. Weaker answers found it hard to address was the position of the war in the explanation. Because the time covered by the extract coincided with the war, many candidates assumed that the historian was arguing that the Final Solution occurred because of the war. There is little in the extract to sustain this. Instead there are structuralist arguments reflecting the notion that when Hitler indicated a direction for policy to take, he could rely on others putting his wishes into effect without needing precise orders. But here too some responses thought they detected elements to the interpretation that simply were not there. They thought they saw Hitler as a weak dictator and subordinates competing for his favour, but the extract made no such suggestions. Overall numbers few responses detected the precise nature of the intentionalist/structuralist synthesis in this interpretation, with many answers restricted to the obviously flawed interpretation that Hitler ordered the Holocaust, but his subordinates actually carried it out. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

### ***Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950***

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that in the immediate post-war period both sides gave the other reasons for suspicion, but that overall the United States was more to blame for this than the Soviet Union. The strongest answers recognised both aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. There were good numbers of candidates who saw the interpretation as post-revisionist, with blame being attached to both sides. There were perhaps even more answers that saw the interpretation as revisionist, with the United States being blamed. There were, however, very few who managed to reconcile these two aspects as the historian clearly suggests. This was an extract where the usual historiographical labels did not quite summarise the nature of the interpretation. Answers which argued for post-revisionism included plenty of support in the references to mutual suspicion and each other's hostile intentions, but were unable to accommodate the clearly more hostile portrayal of Truman compared with that of Stalin. Answers which argued for revisionism faced the same problem of contradictory evidence simply posed the other way around. Post-revisionism was argued in the stronger responses as it included the criticism of the United States but added to it the element of blame placed on Stalin, but without the qualification on greater blame for the United States, it still was not a complete resolution of the interpretation. A few answers tried to argue that the extract showed the Soviet Union was to blame, but this was not convincing given the overall content of the extract. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/33**  
**Interpretations Question**

## Key messages

- Before starting their answer, candidates should read the extract carefully and to spend some time identifying the parts of the extract they can use to illustrate the historian's interpretation.
- The question asks about the historian's interpretation and approach. These are not what the historian writes; they are things you can infer from what s/he writes. Stronger answers use the extract to show how inferences about the interpretation and approach have been reached.
- The historian's interpretation is valid for the whole of the extract. Answers which suggest that an extract has more than one interpretation indicate a lack of understanding. If candidates see what appear to be inconsistencies in the extract these need to be resolved in their understanding of the interpretation, for example maybe the historian has deliberately raised a point in order to reject it or maybe the historian is acknowledging alternative arguments even though not agreeing with them.
- Good answers are not necessarily long answers. Rather they keep a consistent focus on explaining the interpretation using relevant parts of the extract.

## General comments

The strongest answers were concise and focused. They stated what they thought the historian's main interpretation is, and then constructed the answer around those sections of the extract that illustrate this interpretation. These answers continually referred back to the interpretation, explaining how the extract reveals it. Their conclusion was often a summary of the points made throughout the answer, explicitly linking them to the interpretation. Weaker answers did not maintain a consistent focus. This may simply be a matter of being distracted temporarily into writing about the topic, in which case the threads of the argument can still be picked up later. Many candidates start their answers by asserting the historian's interpretation, but then continue to paraphrase the extract, rather than linking this back to the interpretation by using specific points from the extract to illustrate it.

Stronger answers tend not to be constructed by working through the extract paragraph by paragraph. Instead they select the parts of the extract they will need to use in explaining the interpretation. One disadvantage to the paragraph by paragraph approach is that often the answer does not provide an overview of the extract as there is greater focus with points of detail rather than with the historians' broader arguments. This can lead to inconsistencies in the argument as conclusions are reached on part, and not the whole, of the extract. Weaker responses were characterised by including contradictions or arguing that there were multiple interpretations. If candidates realise that their answer contains apparent inconsistencies, they should try to resolve them.

Finally, there were some instances of candidates attempting to illustrate points using truncated, incomplete quotes from the extract – e.g. *I can tell the historian is a revisionist because the extract says 'It is equally... ..western politicians'*. This often affected the flow of the arguments and weakened the strength of support. Candidates are advised to give the full material they are offering as support for a point.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850 – 1939**

There were insufficient scripts on this section for meaningful comments to be made on them.

**Section B: The Holocaust**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler willed the Final Solution from the start, and that it is not credible to think that it was improvised. This interpretation is therefore an explicit rejection of the significance of contingent factors. The best answers recognised both aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Perhaps a majority of answers simply argued that the interpretation was intentionalist and used what the extract said about Hitler to support this. A few thought that there was an element of structuralism in the mention given in the extract to the people who would do his bidding without formal orders, but in practice it contained no argument to suggest that this was a causal factor for the Holocaust. Better answers identified the nuances in the ways the historian sought to undermine functionalist interpretations, and how this served to buttress the more explicit comments on Hitler's culpability. Weaker responses were deflected into contextual discussion, for example on whether or not Hitler gave an explicit order for genocide, or into misunderstanding such as thinking that the SS had no idea of what was going on until the construction of the first extermination camps. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

**Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941 – 1950**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the A-bomb had the effect of intensifying tensions between the United States and Soviet Union, and that the United States can be blamed for this. The best answers recognised both aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. There were some invalid inferences made, notably that the A-bomb caused the Cold War – here the extract clearly states that the United States had resolved to take a stand against the Soviet Union before it had the A-bomb. Despite the fact that the extract is not particularly strong in its criticism of the United States, most answers concluded that the approach was revisionist, perhaps because the views of Alperovitz on the atomic diplomacy of the United States are so familiar. There was enough material in the extract on which to construct this kind of answer. Weaker responses argued for labels other than revisionist. Many answers conflated arguments about the A-bomb and US culpability, rather than explaining the two elements of the interpretation separately, which generally produced a curtailed argument that did not constitute a full explanation. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/41  
Depth Study

## Key messages

- Keeping a sustained focus on the specific focus of the question, rather than the topic in general, is essential to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Answers should be analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information and this knowledge should be in depth.
- Candidates should pay careful attention to the chronological timeframe of the question.

## General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge. These answers then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 4**, where stronger answers examined how far the Nazis had created a totalitarian state by 1941, and gave a clear argument in favour and against and then reached a logical conclusion.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 5**, where a lack of knowledge of the domestic policies of the Democrats and Republicans in the 1940s and 1950s prevented many answers from accessing higher levels of the mark scheme.

Maintaining a balanced answer is very important. **Question 10**, on the importance of the USA in the collapse of the Soviet Union by 1991, was a key example of this. Stronger answers examined and evaluated the role of the USA, but also assessed other factors and then reached a reasoned judgement.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941**

#### **1 Assess the role of the Cheka in securing Bolshevik control over Russia.**

Candidates often did not focus on the Cheka but wrote rather more broad and descriptive answers on terror in general. Stronger answers tried to assess the role of the Cheka, whereas weaker answers just tended to describe. Stronger answers also assessed the relative importance of the Cheka, and did so by looking at other factors such as Trotsky, the Civil War and the role of Lenin. Lenin's pragmatism and popular appeal were also successfully examined.

#### **2 'A dictator in name only.' Discuss this view of Mussolini.**

Candidates produced some very good responses that looked at the limitations of Mussolini's power and, indeed, the fact that he was later deposed. They examined and assessed how he had to keep various groupings happy, such as the Southern Landlords and the Northern Industrialists. There was much discussion of his arrangements with the Papacy, the use of terror, indoctrination in education, propaganda and the lack of effective political opposition. The best answers were nuanced and argued a balanced case. Weaker responses tended to present a one-sided case and descriptive narrative.

**3 To what extent was Trotsky responsible for Stalin's rise to power?**

This was a popular question and there were some good answers. Weaker responses tended to ignore the role of Trotsky and look at the reasons for Stalin's rise to power in more general terms or to give a broadly chronological description of the rise to power. Stronger answers assessed the strengths and weaknesses of Trotsky and how this impinged on Stalin's rise to power. Stronger answers maintained a balance between Stalin and Trotsky and their differing roles in the rise to power of Stalin. The most important feature of top quality answers was a balanced case being made that reached a logical and reasoned judgement, with in-depth factual support.

**4 How far had the Nazis created a totalitarian state in Germany by 1941?**

A feature of weaker answers was that they did not define 'totalitarian state' or did not really understand the term. As a result, these answers tended to describe the repressive nature of the Nazi state with detail of the Gestapo, SS and concentration camps. Stronger answers did attempt to define 'totalitarian' and then assessed how far the Nazis had achieved their aim. Supported analysis was needed here, and some candidates did discuss the nature of control and then opposition to Nazi rule. Some candidates attempted to use material that was after 1941 in their answers and this illustrates the importance of the chronological scope of the question.

**Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–90**

**5 'There were no great differences of domestic policy between the Democratic and Republican parties in the late 1940s and 1950s.' How far do you agree?**

This question was very popular. Many answers could have been improved with a greater level of subject knowledge on the policies of the two parties in the stated period. Weaker responses tended to ignore the 'domestic' focus of the question and talked at length about the Cold War and foreign policy, and a few also talked about Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Stronger answers examined the policies of Truman and Eisenhower and explained the general policy positions of the two parties. The most successful answers explained that both the Republicans and Democrats were divided over the issue of Civil Rights and tried to assess how far the policies of the two parties agreed and differed.

**6 How far was the policy of affirmative action counter-productive?**

Weaker responses showed little understanding of what affirmative action was, nor could they fully explain counter-productive. There was some lively discussion either in favour of or against affirmative action, usually with little supporting factual material. Better responses explained the policy and tried to assess whether it was a generally good or bad policy. Stronger answers looked at a range of areas that affirmative action had been applied to, such as education, employment and women. Supreme Court cases such as the Bakke v. University of California case were examined, and then a discussion of the 'white backlash', demeaning black Americans, and reverse discrimination was undertaken and a reasoned judgement reached.

**7 'The growth of deficits in both the federal budget and US trade in the 1980s is evidence of the failure of Reaganomics.' How valid is this judgement?**

Weaker responses did not really know what Reaganomics was. Modest responses did explain supply-side economics and trickle-down theory and explained why there was a trade deficit. Several candidates explained the economic problems that Reagan had inherited and the successes and failures of his economic policies. Many answers would have benefitted from greater statistical information for support. Stronger answers provided a balanced view of Reagan's economic policies and assessed the aims, successes and failures. They explained why there was a federal deficit and why US trade slumped in this period. There was much examination of military spending and winning the Cold War.

**8 How far were the Helsinki Accords of 1975 a victory for the US policy of détente?**

This question was not very popular and produced weaker responses. Candidates tended to give a broad overview of détente rather than focus on the Helsinki Accords themselves or whether they were a success for the US policy of détente. Stronger responses examined the motives for the Helsinki Accords and why they might be seen as a success or not for US policy. There was also some useful examination of the effectiveness of the Accords and to what extent the Soviet Union followed them.

### **Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991**

**9 ‘American policy in the 1950s regarding the spread of communism was inconsistent.’ How far do you agree?**

Weaker responses were characterised by providing a narrative account of events of the 1940s, 1950s and even 1960s. Some candidates did not heed the time span of the question and a few chose to focus on McCarthyism. Stronger responses assessed events such as Korea, Hungary in 1956 and the rise to power of Fidel Castro in 1959. More importantly, they defined what the US policy towards communism was, using the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid as the basis for the policy of containment and roll-back. They exemplified this with Korea and then contrasted it with inaction over Hungary, and explained the difference in approach and the practicalities in each case. Stronger responses attempted to explain ‘inconsistent’ and assess US policy in the light of the statement given in the question.

**10 How important was the USA in the collapse of the Soviet Union by 1991?**

This was a popular question and there were some excellent responses. These evaluated the role of the USA in contrast to the internal and external problems of the Soviet Union under Gorbachev, such as Afghanistan, the Sinatra Doctrine, Perestroika and Glasnost and the collapse of the economy. At the same time, they examined the pressure put on the Soviet Union by the Second Cold War and the US policies of increased military spending and funding of Solidarity in Poland. Evaluating whether it was the US policy or other factors was the key to success in this question. Some weaker responses tended to give a narrative description of the events leading up to the fall of the Soviet Union without any judgement being made.

**11 ‘Mass demonstrations in the late 1980s posed a serious threat to the Chinese Communist Party’s control over China.’ How far do you agree?**

This question was rarely attempted, but where it was, it was generally done well. Stronger answers provided detailed knowledge about the events of the late 1980s and what they revealed about the threats to and stability of the Chinese Communist Party’s control over China. Again, a balanced judgement was needed to access the higher levels of the mark scheme and most candidates tended to argue that there was no real threat to Communist Party control.

**12 How far were Arab-Israeli relations affected by the Cold War in the period from 1956 to 1979?**

This was a less popular question, but those who attempted it knew the material well and were able to explain how the Cold War and, in particular, allegiance to either the USA or the Soviet Union were to impinge on relations. Key events in Arab-Israeli relations during this period were assessed through the prism of Cold War relations and an assessment was offered as to how much the Cold War did impinge on Arab-Israeli relations and to what extent other factors were involved.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/42  
Depth Study

## Key messages

- Keeping a sustained focus on the specific focus of the question, rather than the topic in general, is essential to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Answers should be analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information and this knowledge should be in depth.
- Candidates should pay careful attention to the chronological timeframe of the question.

## General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 3**, where stronger answers examined both the benefits and the negative results of Stalin's rule. They ended with a balanced judgement, supported by very good in-depth factual knowledge. Weaker responses tended to just describe the events of the period and offered no real opinion.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 6**, where many candidates did not explain who the 'silent majority' were, nor what their impact was. Many of the answers chose instead to describe the successes of the minority groups and did not fully engage with the question.

Maintaining a balanced answer is very important. **Question 10** highlighted this, and strong answers debated the importance of the national uprisings in Eastern Europe and tried to assess whether they were a cause or a consequence or possibly even a little of both. They then reached a logical and cogently argued conclusion and there was a clear argument throughout the answer.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941**

#### **1 How far did the Bolshevik party change in the period from 1918 to 1924?**

The key to success was focusing on the party and the very best responses did. They examined the policies, structure, membership and general approach and how it changed and to an extent how it remained the same. The Ban on Factions featured prominently. Weaker responses tended to give an account of the events between 1917 and 1924 and focused at length on War Communism and the New Economic Policy. The best answers had a clear structure, argument and reasoned and supported judgement.

#### **2 How successfully did Mussolini manage opposition to his regime?**

This was a popular question and was often done very well. High quality responses explained the idea of 'managed' and examined the use of policies to placate the influential elites in society and the use of the Acerbo Law, the Concordat with the Roman Catholic Church and the clever use of propaganda and populist policies. The use of terror and brute force was also explained and assessed. There was also a clear judgement as to how successful his approach was. Weaker responses tended to describe the events of the period but not integrate that subject knowledge with analysis to fully address the question.

**3 'The benefits of Stalin's rule to the Soviet Union outweighed the harm.' How far do you agree?**

This question produced many high quality answers and the subject material was clearly well known and understood by many candidates. Stronger responses showed balance and a clear weighing of the benefits and negatives of Stalin's rule. There were some interesting discussions as to whether all the suffering was a necessary feature of modernising the Soviet Union. Better answers kept a clear focus on the Soviet Union and avoided lengthy narrative sections on the Purges and the Five Year Plans. More sophisticated answers assessed by topic, looking at both the benefits and drawbacks of each policy rather than just producing a list of positive and negative features of his rule.

**4 'During 1933–1934 Hitler established his dictatorship using lawful methods.' How far do you agree?**

There were many very good and excellent answers to this question. It was a popular choice and both subject knowledge and understanding were clearly evidenced. Stronger answers kept to the prescribed time frame of the question and examined the methods used and also assessed whether they were legal or not. Some candidates even suggested that Hitler tried to give a veneer of legality, whilst actually using illegal methods and brute force. Weaker responses tended to either give a chronological description of the period or to look at the rise to power and not at his consolidation of power in the period 1933–1934, and did not provide an analytical answer that discussed the question posed.

**Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–1990**

**5 Assess the causes of US economic growth in the 1950s.**

This was a very popular question. Weaker responses tended to describe the outward signs of economic prosperity and look at the consequences rather than the causes of economic growth in the 1950s, or at times they gave a list of causes, but 'assess' was not examined. Higher quality responses examined the multiple causes, both domestic and global, and the very best answers examined each cause and tried to assess the importance of that factor and how the factors might have been interlinked.

**6 How far did the 'silent majority' limit the influence of the vocal minorities of the 1960s and 1970s?**

Weaker responses did not really understand or define the 'silent majority' and tended to give extensive narrative descriptions of the activities of minority groups in the 1960s and 1970s. There was also a tendency to recount the successes of various minority groups and to ignore the influence of the 'silent majority'. Better answers did look at the people and groups that made up the silent majority and what political and social influence they had. The strongest responses clearly tried to gauge the influence of both the vocal minorities and the silent majority and come to a reasoned judgement.

**7 'The dominance of the Republican Party in the 1980s was based more on ideology than on their choice of presidential candidates.' How valid is this judgement?**

This question was quite popular and candidates demonstrated good subject knowledge about President Reagan, but they often ignored President Bush. Less-developed answers tended to recount the policies and successes of Reagan, but without addressing the question of whether it was ideology or personality or a mixture that resulted in Republican success. The unpopularity of the Democrats was often examined. Stronger responses tried to assess the relative importance of ideology, personality and the Democrats and how each might be judged. The impact of the New Right and the Moral Majority was assessed together with its impact on Republican ideology and political tactics.

**8 How far did the Eisenhower administration follow the policy of rollback to which the Republican Party had committed itself in 1952?**

This was not a popular question. Stronger answers defined the policy of rollback and then attempted to show the foreign policy actions of the Eisenhower administration and analyse the extent to which these actions fulfilled the commitment to rollback. Analysis, rather than pure description, characterised better answers.

**Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991**

**9 Assess the impact of the nuclear arms race on the conduct of the Cold War in the period from 1950 to 1963.**

Stronger answers to this question focused firmly on ‘assess’ and ‘impact’. There were some impressive answers that combined a clearly analytical approach with in-depth subject knowledge. A close examination of the Cold War from Korea to Cuba and the role of nuclear weapons characterised the highest quality responses. Weaker answers fell back on a description of the Cold War in the stated period but did not get to grips with the actual question. A few candidates ignored the stated timeframe of the question and included material that was beyond the time period and therefore not relevant.

**10 ‘National uprisings in Eastern Europe were a consequence, rather than a cause, of the decline of the Soviet Union in the 1980s.’ How far do you agree?**

Weaker answers were prone to describing the fall of the Soviet Union, often in some detail but not addressing the issue of the national uprisings in Eastern Europe and the role they played. Others discussed national uprisings but sometimes went back to Hungary in 1956 or they explained the end of the Cold War. Stronger answers looked at the role and importance of the national uprisings to the fall of the Soviet Union and addressed whether they were a cause or consequence or indeed a mixture of both. The reforms of Gorbachev, the abandoning of the Brezhnev Doctrine and the rise of nationalism in Eastern Europe were all analysed well in stronger answers.

**11 Should Deng Xiaoping be seen more as a reformer than a hardliner?**

This was a popular question and produced some very good answers. Most argued that he was a reformer in economic terms, but a hardliner politically. There was good depth of subject knowledge and many answers examined both reformer and hardliner and then attempted a reasoned judgement. Several candidates suggested that he was both reformer and hardliner and substantiated their view. Weaker answers lacked analysis and tended to be descriptive or failed to try to reach a judgement on the question asked.

**12 ‘The Suez crisis of 1956 was caused by Western fears regarding Egypt’s increasingly close relations with the Soviet Union.’ How far do you agree?**

There were some very strong answers to this question which demonstrated real independence of thought. Many argued that Nasser wished to be non-aligned and was simply an Arab nationalist. The role of the Soviet Union was examined, as were the motives of Britain, France and Israel and the self-interest of each nation was explained. Strong answers included firm and rational judgements that were supported by in-depth subject knowledge. The weaker responses relied on descriptions of the Suez crisis and did not fully engage with the question asked.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/43  
Depth Study

## Key messages

- Keeping a sustained focus on the specific focus of the question, rather than the topic in general, is essential to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Answers should be analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information and this knowledge should be in depth.
- Candidates should pay careful attention to the chronological timeframe of the question.

## General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 4**, where the question asked candidates to examine the extent to which Hitler came to power because of the prior failings of Weimar's leaders, or was it because of the appeal and tactics of Hitler and the Nazis or a combination of multi causal factors? Good quality answers addressed these points clearly.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 1**, where candidates often did not explain 'Marxist in theory but not in practice' and lacked sufficient subject knowledge to be able to analyse and reach a judgement on this question.

Maintaining a balanced answer is very important. **Question 9** highlighted this, with strong responses examining at the role of the US government and their fear of communism, but also looking at other factors, not least the actions of the Soviet Union, and then reaching a factually well supported judgement. Weaker responses tended to give a narrative description of the events of the Cold War but did not attempt to fully argue a case for the globalisation of the Cold War.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941**

#### **1 'Marxist in theory but not in practice.' To what extent is this true of Lenin's government by 1924?**

This was a quite popular question and there were some excellent answers. These addressed what 'Marxist in theory' might mean and then examined what happened in practice, comparing War Communism and the New Economic Policy in depth. Some top-level answers argued that Lenin had rewritten Marxism to gain power and so the government policy was never Marxist. Good answers made a clear case for and against the statement and then reached a logical and factually well supported conclusion. Weaker answers liked to give a chronological account of the period and did not address the question asked.

#### **2 How far did Mussolini rely on the use of terror to retain power?**

This question was less popular but produced some very good quality answers. These were characterised by a clear focus on terror and then a close examination of other factors and their importance. These factors often included popular policies at home, propaganda and a successful foreign policy as well as the Acerbo Law and the ability to keep key components of society on side,

such as the Roman Catholic Church, the industrialists and the landowners. Weaker answers tended to describe the policies of terror and other policies, but did not analyse their importance or they lacked sufficient factual knowledge to support any analysis that was presented.

**3 To what extent was a desire to increase his own power the reason for Stalin's collectivisation policy?**

This was a very popular question and candidates demonstrated very good subject knowledge and it was deployed analytically. The reasons for the policy of collectivisation were examined in depth, with convincing analysis and factual support in depth. The strongest answers examined the various motivations for the policy and then assessed them in relation to Stalin's desire to increase his own power. More nuanced answers realised that there were a mixture of motives including modernising the Soviet Union, punishing the peasant class and eliminating political rivals; increasing his own power was only one of them. Weaker answers tended to give an in-depth description of collectivisation or at times a list of the reasons for collectivisation, but did not always address the actual question asked.

**4 To what extent did Hitler become Chancellor because of the failings of Weimar's leaders?**

This question was the most popular question on the paper and there were some excellent answers. The distinguishing feature of the higher quality answers was a clear focus on the question and an examination of the failings of the Weimar leaders, but also other factors that resulted in Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in 1933. Several candidates took a very long-term view and looked back to the Treaty of Versailles, and then gave a chronological account of the problems facing Weimar from 1919 to 1933. When analytical, this was very useful and when purely descriptive, it did not address the demands of the question. There was also some very useful analysis of the actions of the Weimar leadership in the period 1932–33. The best answers also evaluated the other causes of Hitler's appointment and looked at organisation, funding, appeal and tactics employed by Hitler and the Nazis and the impact of the Great Depression. Weaker answers tended to produce a rather stock answer on the rise to power of Hitler, sometimes rather ignoring the role of the Weimar leaders.

**Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–1990**

**5 'A vast boom of consumer spending.' How far does this explain the economic growth of the 1950s?**

Many candidates successfully deployed their subject knowledge and understanding of this popular US topic. Higher quality answers were analytical in style and looked at the causation of the economic growth of the 1950s. They assessed whether it was a product of consumer spending, or whether a combination of other factors was at play. Consumerism, motor cars, homes, the baby boom, credit cards, Eisenhower's fiscal policies were all examined successfully. Less successful answers were prone to describing the economic growth, but not explaining the causes. These answers also often failed to assess the importance of consumer spending to the economic growth of the 1950s.

**6 'Changes in US society in the 1960s and 1970s were revolutionary.' How far do you agree?**

Defining revolutionary was a key aspect of the better quality answers. Candidates described the changes of the 1960s and 1970s and then explained to what extent they felt they were revolutionary. There was much coverage of Civil Rights, Gay Rights and Women's Rights. There was also a great deal of discussion about protest groups and the rejection or questioning of traditional American values. The impact of Vietnam was assessed; balanced answers then considered the extent to which these new values were typical of the US. Very good answers brought in the idea of the 'silent majority' and the election of President Nixon. Weaker answers were unbalanced and narrative in style, often describing the events of the 1960s and 1970s, but not evaluating them or trying to assess how 'revolutionary' they really were.

**7 How far, in the 1980s, did the US Supreme Court protect the rights of ethnic minorities?**

This was not a popular question. Those who did attempt it displayed knowledge of the role of the Supreme Court and cited several key cases. They also discussed the attitude of President Reagan towards his appointments to the Supreme Court and towards ethnic minority rights in general. Stronger answers highlighted the judicial struggle over Affirmative Action but pointed out that the Court did not

always decide against this policy. Weaker answers lacked enough evidence to allow them to analyse the actions of the Supreme Court effectively.

**8 Evaluate the reasons why US policy towards China failed in the period from 1945 to 1950.**

Better answers addressed the question of 'why' and were analytical in nature. Weaker responses were purely descriptive of the events and lacked factual depth of knowledge. Higher quality responses examined the opposition of the United States towards the communists and Mao, the underestimation of Mao and his ability to win the Civil War, and the question of whether the USA really wanted to concentrate on Asia or Europe at this time. The Korean War in 1950 and deteriorating relations were also usefully examined. Weaker answers tended to focus on just 1949 and 1950 and lacked the required factual depth to permit effective analysis and answering of the question.

**Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991**

**9 'It was the US government's excessive fear of communism which caused the globalisation of the Cold War.' How far do you agree?**

This question was both popular and well answered. Stronger answers looked at the US fear of communism and examined other causes for the globalisation of the Cold War. They examined US and Soviet Union actions in spreading the Cold War to an ever wider global theatre. US policies such as containment, rollback, the 'domino theory' and the nuclear arms race were all successfully assessed and how these led to US involvement in Korea, Cuba and Vietnam and hence globalised regional conflicts. Strong answers gave balanced arguments about the threats posed by the Soviet Union and China; these were analysed and a balanced conclusion reached. High quality answers were characterised by in-depth analysis and good subject knowledge and coverage. Weaker answers tended to be more descriptive in nature; they did not present a clear argument or they adopted a one-sided approach, simply agreeing or disagreeing with the question.

**10 To what extent was the USSR more responsible than the USA for ending the period of détente in the 1970s?**

This was a popular question in this section of the examination. Answers were of a good quality and candidates were able to present arguments about the respective roles of the USSR and the USA in ending détente in the 1970s. More sophisticated answers took a more nuanced view and looked at how both countries had a role to play before making a final sustained judgement. Levels of factual knowledge were impressive and were often used in an evaluative manner to support a clearly analytical approach, and often suggested that the USA had a key role to play in ending the policy of détente. Weaker answers tended to describe the events of the 1970s rather than analyse them or alternatively there was some analysis, but it was not factually well supported.

**11 Evaluate the reasons for the introduction of the Hundred Flowers Campaign.**

Candidates who attempted this question demonstrated very good subject knowledge and were able to identify the two main strands in the interpretation of why Mao introduced the Hundred Flowers Campaign. They identified the idea that Mao wanted open dialogue and to improve socialism in China, but that he was unpleasantly surprised by the amount of criticism that was levelled at him and the Communist Party. The alternative view proposed was that Mao simply intended to identify and root out dissidents. These two interpretations were explained well and usually with very good subject knowledge. Descriptive narrative characterised the weaker answers which did not really deal with the motivations for the policy but tended to just describe it without explanation.

**12 Analyse the impact of the Camp David Agreements on Arab-Israeli relations.**

This was a less popular question in this section. Candidates successfully demonstrated very good subject knowledge of the Camp David Agreements and were able to explain cogently how these impacted Arab-Israeli relations. The answers were analytical in style and highlighted both the positive effects and also the failure to solve long term issues and tensions. The condemnation of most Arab states was explained, as were the attitude of Israel and the consequences of the assassination of President Sadat. Weaker responses lacked depth of subject knowledge and analysis, and there was no reasoned argument.