



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9489/31

Paper 3 Interpretations question

May/June 2023

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of 7 printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

AO4	Analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented.	Marks
Level 6	- Responses use the extract in a detailed and accurate manner and demonstrate a complete understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. - These responses explain all elements of the historian's interpretation.	18–20
Level 5	- Responses use the extract in a detailed and accurate manner and demonstrate a sound understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. - These responses engage with elements of the historian's interpretation, but without explaining it as a whole – they are consistent and accurate, but not complete and may cover less important sub-messages.	15–17
Level 4	- Responses use the extract, but only demonstrate partial understanding of the interpretation and approach(es) of the historian. - These answers identify elements of the historian's interpretation, but without adequately explaining them, typically explaining other less important message(s) as equally or more important.	12–14
Level 3	- Responses demonstrate understanding that the extract contains interpretations, but those explained are only sub-messages. - Responses may use a part of the extract to argue for an interpretation that is not supported by the whole of the extract, or may refer to multiple interpretations, often a different one in each paragraph.	9–11
Level 2	- Responses summarise the main points in the extract. - Responses focus on what the extract says, but explanations of the extract as an interpretation lack validity.	5–8
Level 1	- Responses include references to some aspects of the extract. - Responses may include fragments of material that are relevant to the historian's interpretation.	1–4
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

AO1	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and effectively.	Marks
Level 6	Demonstrates detailed and accurate historical knowledge that is entirely relevant.	18–20
Level 5	Demonstrates detailed and mostly accurate historical knowledge that is mainly relevant.	15–17
Level 4	Demonstrates mostly relevant and accurate knowledge.	12–14
Level 3	Demonstrates generally accurate and relevant knowledge.	9–11
Level 2	Demonstrates some accurate and relevant knowledge.	5–8
Level 1	Demonstrates limited knowledge.	1–4
Level 0	Demonstrates no relevant historical knowledge.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	The Origins of the First World War Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is <u>that the historian blames Germany for desiring European dominance, which in the circumstances of 1914 was bound to produce a general European war</u>. Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve explanation and illustration from the extract of both these aspects. This is an interpretation that sees the nature of Wilhelm's Germany as being the underlying cause of the war. It accepts that the participants had different motives, but the issue that brought all the contributory factors together was Germany's push for dominance. Britain, France and Russia had to react, but it was Germany's actions that forced them to do so. In this sense, Germany bears greatest blame of the war, even if a general European war was not their intent. <u>Glossary</u>: Early post-WW1 interpretations tended to blame Germany, but quickly a reaction against this occurred, with a variety of interpretations blaming other nations. This may be termed revisionism. The turning point in the historiography was Fischer's work of the early 1960s which went back to blaming Germany – sometimes known as anti-revisionism. Since then there has been a vast variety of interpretations, looking at the importance of culture, individuals, contingent factors etc, with no clear consensus, though most historians would still place a significant burden of responsibility on Germany.	40

Question	Answer	Marks
2	The Holocaust Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is <u>that the historian blames the Holocaust on the nature of the Nazi state (specifically the way Hitler ruled/competition between other Nazi leaders – both needed for L6) which produced a process of cumulative radicalisation of Jewish policy</u>. Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve explanation and illustration from the extract of both these aspects. This is a structuralist extract. Hitler is seen as relatively uninvolved in the development of the Final Solution. Instead, the driving force is the competition for Hitler's favour and for personal power between party leaders. There was no logical plan, but rather a process of constant escalation. To achieve L5 or L6, the only acceptable 'label' would be structuralism. Functionalism is not a satisfactory label as there is little mention of the war, and then with no argument based on circumstances driving genocide, so L3 max. Intentionalism can also be dismissed, so L3 max. Arguments for a synthesis could be L4 if the structuralist element is properly explained. <u>Glossary</u>: Candidates may use some/all of the following terms: <i>Intentionalism</i> – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start. <i>Structuralism</i> – interpretations which argue that it was the nature of the Nazi state that produced genocide. There was no coherent plan but the chaotic competition for Hitler's approval between different elements of the leadership produced a situation in which genocide could occur. <i>Functionalism</i> sees the Holocaust as an unplanned, ad hoc response to wartime developments in Eastern Europe, when Germany conquered areas with large Jewish populations. Candidates may also refer to <i>synthesis</i> interpretations, i.e. interpretations which show characteristics of more than one of the above. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.	40

Question	Answer	Marks
3	The Origins and Development of the Cold War Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is <u>that the historian blames the development of the Cold War on the Russians for their lack of trust of the West/reversion to anti-capitalism (i.e. attitudes) and for pursuing aggressive and uncooperative policies (i.e. actions), which exonerates the West which has no choice but to take steps to resist.</u> Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve explanation and illustration from the extract of both these aspects. The interpretation repeatedly identifies examples of Russian obstructionism and uses loaded language to describe them. This marks the historian out as a traditionalist (or orthodox) because the extract has no particular focus on Stalin and clearly seeks to exonerate the West. Only traditional/orthodox can reach L6 if both aspects of the interpretation are covered. It will be L5 if only Russia is dealt with (but must have both attitudes and actions). L4 if Russia is dealt with, but only one of attitudes/actions. Labelling it as post-post-revisionist can get L5 max if properly arguing on Russia. As there is no blame allocated to the West, post-revisionist will be L4 max if Russia properly argued. Arguing West to blame will be L3 max. <u>Glossary:</u> <i>Traditional/Orthodox</i> interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after WW2. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War. <i>Revisionist</i> historians challenged this view and shifted more of the focus onto the United States, generally through an economic approach which stressed the alleged aim of the US to establish its economic dominance over Europe. <i>Post-revisionists</i> moved towards a more balanced view in which elements of blame were attached to both sides. Since the opening of the Soviet archives post-1990 there has been a shift to attributing prime responsibility to Stalin – a <i>post-post-revisionist</i> stance which often seems very close to the traditional view, but which often places great importance on ideology. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.	40