

HISTORY

Paper 9489/11 Document Question 11

Key messages

- This assessment focusses on source analysis, and evaluation. As such, this should be central to candidates' approach. Candidates should focus on how their historical knowledge of the period helps them to interpret the sources and use this knowledge to comment.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- In **part (a)** the top level can be achieved by explaining the similarities and/or differences between the sources. This explanation should be based on a developed comparison which considers similarities and differences and shows awareness of the context of the source. Commentaries on the context or discussions on reliability, are not relevant unless they are used in this way.
- In **part (b)** it is necessary to explain how the source supports or challenges the statement in the question and candidates should show their understanding of how the source supports the point being made.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the support or challenge argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they are used in this way to link to the 'how far' element of the question.
- Short quotations are appropriate but quoting long passages of the source or the use of ellipses should be avoided.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated understanding that the **(a)** question requires identification and explanation of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant, precise, quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or support/challenge argument. Strong responses understood the nuance offered in some of the sources, recognising where it was possible to use a source for both support and challenge. Some made good use of their contextual knowledge to show understanding of the source beyond face value.

In **part (a)** responses sometimes made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The comparisons should also be focused on the specific question rather than just general similarities and differences that might be apparent. Weaker responses also often included large sections of contextual knowledge or paragraphs of broad and quite general evaluation rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e., identifying similarities and differences.

To achieve marks in the higher levels, it is necessary to evaluate the sources by considering the context in which they were produced. However, to be creditworthy evaluation must relate to the question. In **part (a)** candidates need to decide how the sources are similar and different and to consider why the similarities or

differences exist. For instance in **Question 1(a)** it was possible to use contextual knowledge of the events of the 1905 Revolution to explain the similarities between the sources. In **Question 3(b)**, effective responses understood that evaluative comments must be linked to the question to be relevant. It is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or audience, they should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. For example, some used their knowledge of the outbreak of war in the Asia-Pacific to assess whether what was argued in Source D was a valid representation of Japan's policies before the Second World War. The weight of the source as evidence was then considered to decide if it weakened the challenge element of the answer.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

Question 1

(a) How far do Sources A and C agree about the Tsar's attitude towards the granting of the October Manifesto?

Most responses made a relevant comparison between the sources and the most frequently discussed similarity being that the Tsar was concerned about the situation facing Russia and intended to use the October Manifesto to bring the disturbances to an end. This similarity was supported with effective use of source details. For example many pointed out the Tsar's evident sorrow in Source A, supported with detailed such as '*fills my heart with great and deep grief*' led him to impose the October Manifesto. Often this was matched to the comment in Source C that the Tsar wanted to avoid '*rivers of blood*' or '*lead my dear Russia out of intolerable chaos*'. The important point about the comparison was that it needed to be linked to the Tsar's attitude towards granting the October Manifesto to be valid. Some comparisons fell short because they simply pointed out agreements between the sources, such as Russia was experiencing violence or chaos without focusing on the terms of the question. Many responses also identified a valid difference, spotting that the Tsar's attitude in Source A seemed to be wholly in support of the October Manifesto, while Source B suggested that he had some hesitation and had considered using force to end the rioting instead. Weaker responses sometimes resulted from misreading one of the sources. Some thought that the Tsar demonstrated a negative attitude towards the Manifesto in Source A. This was based on contextual understanding rather than what was argued in the source. Many responses demonstrated contextual knowledge, explaining the references to Witte and Trepov in Source C or the events of the 1905 revolution which were referred to in both sources. To make the most effective use of this knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use it to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. General evaluation based on the idea that Source C was likely to be true as the Tsar would be unlikely to lie to his mother or that Source A was a public speech and therefore bound to be a lie, was seen quite frequently but was usually based solely on the attribution of the sources and not contextual understanding of the situation facing Russia in 1905.

(b) How far do these sources agree that the Russian people would benefit from the October Manifesto?

Most candidates gave a two-sided response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in many responses. Most identified Source A as a support source, explaining that the rights of '*freedom of person, conscience, speech*' which would be granted would benefit the people. Others offered an equally valid explanation with reference to the Tsar's desire to protect peaceful citizens and end the rioting. Source C was also seen as a support source as it showed the Tsar agreeing to give in to the people's demands for a constitution. Some responses tried to use Source A as evidence of a challenge, stating that the Tsar was only interested in his own power misreading his comments about bringing peace to the 'Empire' as entirely self-interested. Although contextual knowledge could be used to undermine the Tsar's words in Source A, the source itself presented a positive image of the October Manifesto. Some stronger responses picked up on the hesitation in Source C and suggested that the Tsar's lack of support for a constitution was quite clear and some linked this to his introduction of the Fundamental Laws in 1906. Source B was used as a challenge source, Trotsky's argument being that all kinds of freedoms appeared to be given, but all of them would immediately be revoked. A few tried to argue the source both ways but Trotsky's argument against the October Manifesto bringing benefits was too clear for this to be effective.

Source D was also generally used as a challenge source although some explanations lacked clarity on the message of the source. Effective responses were often based on the bubbles in the cartoon which contained words such as *'Manifesto'* and *'Amnesty'*. These bubbles were sometimes described as *'illusions'* or *'pipe dreams'* which would soon burst, leaving the angry people no better off than before. Many responses demonstrated some contextual knowledge, often about Trotsky, but only a few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. Most attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable because it was from a speech or letter without any links to the context or the question. Several weaker responses took a one-sided approach to the question, while others described source content without making a clear link to the question.

Section B: American Option: Civil War and Reconstruction 1861–77

Question 2

- (a) **Read Sources A and B. Compare and contrast these sources as evidence about the role of officers within the Freedmen's Bureau.**

Many responses identified valid points of similarity and difference between the sources but some did not distinguish between the role of the officers and more general points about the Bureau as a whole. A frequently explained similarity between the sources was that the officers were not considered to be capable of carrying out their role. In Source A it was argued that the officers were more *'men of enthusiasm than ability'* which was echoed in Source B's comment that the officers lacked *'sound judgement.'* A considerable proportion of candidates also pointed out a difference between the sources, often focusing on the role of the officers in relation to the freedmen. While Source A argued the officers stopped the freedmen gaining *'unrealistic expectations'*, Source B argued that the officers paid too much attention to the freedmen and were biased against white Southerners. Most responses offered support from the sources to explain and develop their points. However, there were some who asserted that the sources were similar or different but did not provide relevant material from both sources to support their comparison. Others wrote about each of the sources in turn without making a link between them. Many responses added a paragraph of contextual knowledge, or a discussion of the provenance and reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question. To be valid, contextual knowledge should have been used to explain the similarities or differences between the sources.

- (b) **'The Freedmen's Bureau was a failure.' How far do these sources support this view?**

Many responses made effective use of the sources and produced a balanced answer. Source A could be used on both sides and this was pointed out by many candidates. Evidence from the source, such as comments on the incompetent officers, could be used to suggest failure. However, Source A also admitted that things may have been even worse if the Bureau had not been established. Source B was used as a supporting source with many responses referring to its claims that the Bureau had *'encouraged disunion'*. Source C was generally seen as a challenge source with candidates pointing out that it saw the Bureau as a *'necessity'*. However, some responses also pointed out that Source C argued the Bureau was useful only up to 1867 and that it had fallen into the hands of the *'incompetent'* which undermined the positive impression given at the start of the source. Source D was used most effectively as a support source, arguing that the Bureau encouraged laziness and dishonesty and was a failed experiment. Some attempted to argue that the Bureau was successful because it had done all that it could and should not be blamed for the dishonest colonists. However, this was a misrepresentation of the main argument of the source. While some responses attempted to consider the authorship of the sources and comment on their reliability, this was often not effective. It was common to see general evaluation such as Source D was bound to be reliable as it was from a private letter. Some one-sided responses were also seen and, as is the case in all **part (b)** questions, the set of sources will always provide evidence which can be used to address both sides of the argument.

Section C: International Option: China and Japan 1912–45

Question 3

- (a) **Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence about Japan's economy.**

Many responses supported a valid difference that while Source A took a negative view, showing that Japan faced serious economic problems, Source C was much more positive about Japan's potential economic power. Source A pointed out that *'The economic situation is serious and may become desperate'*, while Source C showed a different picture, explaining that foreign powers would *'not be able to cope with our economic power based on our productive ability'* which gave the impression of Japan having economic strength. Identifying and supporting valid similarities seemed more challenging. However, some saw that there was a clear similarity between the sources and pointed out that Japan's economy was suffering because of poor relations with foreign powers. In Source A, Japan had tried and failed to secure loans from foreign powers and in Source C the reference to *'trade barriers and import quotas'* suggested a similarly difficult situation. Several responses included contextual knowledge or comments on the reliability of the sources. In many instances this consisted of using the source attributions to speculate about the different purpose of each source. The most effective answers used their contextual knowledge to explain the reasons for similarities or differences. For example the similarities could be explained by reference to the impact of the depression on Japan and other world powers. It was also possible to explain the differences by exploring the reasons why the writers of each source would portray the situation in such different ways. Going beyond what was written in the attribution and displaying clear contextual understanding was key to offering an effective explanation. Weaker responses generally resulted from losing focus on the question. Such answers drifted into accounts about Japan being involved in war, not linking the Manchurian incident or relations with foreign powers to the economic issue.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that Japanese militarism created a threat to international peace?

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the idea that Japanese militarism created a threat to international peace. Source A was used as a support source, quotations such as *'The Japanese military machine has been built for war, and would welcome war.'* were used to show that the *'hot-headed military clique'* intended to bring about war. Source B could be used on either side of the argument. Some pointed out that Japan was a threat as it would *'fight to the last'* if required. Others argued that Japan had less threatening intentions, often citing the comment in the source that its intention for Manchukuo was to *'establish a realm of peace and prosperity'*. Source C was mostly used as a challenge source. The comments that *'Japan does not seek war'* and Japan's desire for the *'prevention of war'* were often used to illustrate this point. However, stronger responses often argued that the admiration shown in the source for Hitler's Germany suggested more ominous motives. Source D was usually seen as evidence that militarism in Japan was not a threat. Many quoted the argument that *'Japan never planned to wage a war for the purposes of aggression'* and that Japan had been forced into a war by the *'unbearable demands'* of the United States. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to challenge the claims made in Source B and Source D, often explaining the aggression that Japan had shown in invading Manchuria and pointing out that Japan had attacked Pearl Harbor in an attempt to gain a free hand in the Asia-Pacific. This was only creditable as evaluation if it was linked to the question. While many responses included contextual knowledge, few made the necessary link to the question. Weak responses sometimes resulted from misreading sources such as Source D, therefore arguing that all the sources showed Japan's militarism created a threat. It will always be possible to argue both support and challenge in response to **part (b)** questions.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/12 Document Question 12

Key messages

- This assessment focusses on source analysis, and evaluation. As such, this should be central to candidates' approach. Candidates should focus on how their historical knowledge of the period helps them to interpret the sources and use this knowledge to comment.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- In **part (a)** the top level can be achieved by explaining the similarities and/or differences between the sources. This explanation should be based on a developed comparison which considers similarities and differences and shows awareness of the context of the source. Commentaries on the context or discussions on reliability, are not relevant unless they are used in this way.
- In **part (b)** it is necessary to explain how the source supports or challenges the statement in the question and candidates should show their understanding of how the source supports the point being made.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the support or challenge argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they are used in this way to link to the 'how far' element of the question.
- Short quotations are appropriate but quoting long passages of the source or the use of ellipses should be avoided.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated understanding that the **(a)** question requires identification and explanation of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant, precise, quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or support/challenge argument. Strong responses understood the nuance offered in some of the sources, recognising where it was possible to use a source for both support and challenge. Some made good use of their contextual knowledge to show understanding of the source beyond face value.

In **part (a)** responses sometimes made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The comparisons should also be focused on the specific question rather than just general similarities and differences that might be apparent. Weaker responses also often included large sections of contextual knowledge or paragraphs of broad and quite general evaluation rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e., identifying similarities and differences.

When analysing the sources many responses identified sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source, and several were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. It is important to look at the whole source and not dissected sections of it when making links to the

questions and further judgements. Responses should also focus on placing the sources in context and applying historical knowledge. Many weaker responses did not really engage with the historical context to deal with the sources successfully.

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 of where this could be achieved was in **Section C, Source B**. Good responses used this source to comment on the difference between what Chiang Kai-shek is saying in this passage versus other commentators. They were also able to use the context of this speech to make clear evaluative links between what is said in the source and the question of corruption. As such, 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: European Option: The Russian Revolution, 1894 – 1921

Question 1

(a) How far do these sources agree about the strikes in Russia in October 1905?

This question focused on the strikes in Russia in 1905 and asked candidates to identify similarities and differences in the two sources. The strongest responses to this question used their historical knowledge of the events in 1905 to interpret ideas from the sources. They also focused on the strikes rather than government reactions to the strikes or decisions made because of them. As such, they were able to recognise similarities and differences in who took part in the strikes as well as which parts of the country were affected by them. Weaker responses struggled to make such clear points of comparison because they did not know enough about the events of 1905 and often concentrated on the impact as detailed in the sources. This meant that they were sometimes confused by the motivations of the strikers as described in the sources and could not draw clear comparisons.

(b) ‘Tsarism was in danger of collapse during 1905.’ How far do the sources support this view?

This question was well attempted, and responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement e.g., in **Source D** which highlights that although the protests are not well organised and Trepov remains loyal to the Tsar, there is also a clearly political element to the striking movement which has moved into a new territory. The strongest responses were able to use their historical knowledge of the period to explain the context of these sources in 1905. Most candidates were able to recognise both support and challenge in the sources and good responses used clear quotations or paraphrases to support their points. This was done best when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further. There were also a significant minority of responses which started to use the provenance of the sources to weigh up the evidence they gave. This meant that answers began to evaluate sources for use in the question. However, there were still a number of responses which struggled to contextualise the sources because they did not know enough about the arguments surrounding the events of 1905 and the immediate consequences. Some spent time writing about the 1917 revolution which had very little relevance to this question.

Section B: American Option: Civil War and Reconstruction

Question 2

(a) Compare and contrast the views in these sources on the role of newspapers and the telegraph in wartime.

Some responses dealt with this question well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. The strongest responses showed that candidates had read the sources they were given carefully rather than assumed that they knew what the content was from the given attributions. The use of contextual knowledge and understanding of how the US government tried to challenge the freedom of the press was vital here. Once again, those responses with a secure

knowledge of the period were able to analyse the sources most successfully. Weaker responses often used the time to write long descriptions of e.g., the narrative of the beginning of the Civil War, which was not strictly related to the question and such long descriptions should be avoided as this rarely adds to the quality of the response.

(b) 'Civil liberties were destroyed during the Civil War.' How far do the sources support this view?

This was well attempted and there were many responses which were able to show how the sources both supported and challenged the assertion in the question. Stronger responses also showed a clear grasp of relevant contextual knowledge which helped them expand on and analyse the sources. This was most often done by using Sources A to comment on the complexities of the Merryman case and how this was viewed by the wider public. This meant that they were beginning to read the sources beyond face value. However, there were still a number of responses which misunderstood the meaning of the sources because they did not have an accurate grasp of the period. For example, some responses became confused about the different approaches to Civil Liberties from the governments of the North and South. Although many responses described the provenance of the sources using general evaluation, very few used this to test how useful the sources were when answering the question. Candidates should concentrate on making clear comments about how the nature, origin or purpose impacts on the utility of the source for answering the question rather than describing general evaluation.

Section C: International Option: China and Japan, 1912 – 1945

Question 3

(a) Compare and contrast these sources as evidence about the Chinese response to the Japanese invasion.

This question required candidates to focus on China's response in both source extracts. Some responses confused this with trying to look at wider issues surrounding corruption – this was not credit worthy as it often overlapped with the focus of the second question. Therefore, it should be remembered that **part (a)** questions have a specific focus which should be followed. Most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Strong responses were able to use their knowledge of the period to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them, as mentioned in the General comments about Source B. The strongest responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between them using provenance which went beyond rote evaluation.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang were corrupt?

Most responses engaged with the sources thoughtfully to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss different views of corruption in the period, and the strongest responses began to use their contextual knowledge to do this. Many candidates were able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question. Most of these used evidence from the sources to clearly support their argument. Source C was sometimes particularly well used as it enabled responses to discuss both sides of the argument and place the writer in context. The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/13 Document Question 13

Key messages

- This assessment focusses on source analysis, and evaluation. As such, this should be central to candidates' approach. Candidates should focus on how their historical knowledge of the period helps them to interpret the sources and use this knowledge to comment.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- In **part (a)** the top level can be achieved by explaining the similarities and/or differences between the sources. This explanation should be based on a developed comparison which considers similarities and differences and shows awareness of the context of the source. Commentaries on the context or discussions on reliability, are not relevant unless they are used in this way.
- In **part (b)** it is necessary to explain how the source supports or challenges the statement in the question and candidates should show their understanding of how the source supports the point being made.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the support or challenge argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they are used in this way to link to the 'how far' element of the question.
- Short quotations are appropriate but quoting long passages of the source or the use of ellipses should be avoided.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated understanding that the **(a)** question requires identification and explanation of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant, precise, quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or support/challenge argument. Strong responses understood the nuance offered in some of the sources, recognising where it was possible to use a source for both support and challenge. Some made good use of their contextual knowledge to show understanding of the source beyond face value.

In **part (a)** responses sometimes made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The comparisons should also be focused on the specific question rather than just general similarities and differences that might be apparent. Weaker responses also often included large sections of contextual knowledge or paragraphs of broad and quite general evaluation rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e., identifying similarities and differences.

When analysing the sources many responses identified sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source, and several were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. It is important to look at the whole source and not dissected sections of it when making links to the

questions and further judgements. Responses should also focus on placing the sources in context and applying historical knowledge. Many weaker responses did not really engage with the historical context to deal with the sources successfully.

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 of where this could be achieved was in **Section A, Source D**. Good responses used this source to comment on the reasons for Trotsky writing this history at the time he did and analysed how much this might relate to the reality of the pre-war period. As such, 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: European Option: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

Question

(a) How far do these sources agree about the state of the Russian economy?

This question was well attempted, and candidates showed a good understanding of the sources in relation to the Russian economy before the First World War. The strongest responses used their historical knowledge to interpret ideas from the sources. They also focused on specific comparisons of the economy as illustrated by the sources. Where this question was not answered so well, responses were sometimes confused about appropriate comparisons, or the statistics used in the sources. Candidates should also be careful not to distrust sources or ignore information just because they are created by a certain person i.e. Trotsky. The focus of this question should always be on comparing the content of the sources in relation to the question asked.

(b) ‘The Tsarist regime became more secure in the years up to 1914.’ How far do these sources support this statement?

Many responses to this question showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. The strongest responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement e.g., in **Source C** which could be used to show the increased repression and control of the regime or, reading against the grain to discuss the growing instances of rebellion in the years before 1914. Most candidates were able to recognise both support and challenge in the sources and good responses used clear quotations or paraphrases to support their points. This was done most effectively when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further. There were also a significant minority of responses which started to use the provenance of the sources to weigh up the evidence they gave. This meant that answers began to evaluate sources for use in the question. However, there were still several responses which struggled to contextualise the sources because they did not know enough about the arguments surrounding the Tsarist regime in this period. Some spent time writing about the 1917 revolution which had very little relevance to this question.

Section B: American Option: Civil War and Reconstruction

Question

(a) Compare and contrast the opinions about President Grant in the two sources.

Some responses dealt with this question well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. Strong responses showed evidence of having read the sources carefully. These responses used contextual knowledge and showed understanding of how Grant was viewed as president. Weaker responses tended to produce long descriptions such as narratives of Grant's Civil War career, which was not strictly related to the question, and this rarely added to the quality of the response.

(b) ‘Reconstruction failed.’ How far do the sources support this view?

This was often well attempted and there were many responses which were able to show how the sources both supported and challenged the assertion in the question. Strong responses also showed a clear grasp of relevant contextual knowledge which helped them expand on and analyse the sources. This was most often done by using Source A to comment on the nature and origin of the source compared to the others given. However, there were still a number of responses which misunderstood the meaning of the sources because they did not have an accurate grasp of the period. For example, some responses demonstrated confusion or lack of knowledge about the actions of Grant after his election. Although many responses described the provenance of the sources using general evaluation, very few used this to test how useful the sources were when answering the question. These responses could be strengthened if they made clear comments about how the nature, origin or purpose impacts on the utility of the source for answering the question rather than describing general evaluation.

Section C: International Option: China and Japan, 1912–1945

Question

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence about the actions against the Communists in 1927.**

This question required candidates to focus on evidence of actions against the Communists in both source extracts. Some responses confused this with listing what the Communists did in 1927 and therefore missed the central message of the sources. Therefore, it should be remembered that **part (a)** questions have a specific focus which should be followed. Most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Strong responses were able to use knowledge of the period to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them. The strongest responses began to use knowledge of the period to explain the differences between them using provenance which went beyond rote evaluation. However, there were still a significant minority of responses which did not know enough about the events of 1927 to accurately comment on the sources in relation to the question.

- (b) How far do the sources support the view that Chiang Kai-shek was responsible for destroying the United Front with the Communists?**

Most responses engaged with the sources thoughtfully to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss different views of corruption in the period, and the strongest responses began to use contextual knowledge to do this. Many candidates were able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question. Most of these used evidence from the sources to clearly support their argument. The strongest responses used their knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question. However, in weaker responses there was sometimes elements of confusion especially when using Sources A and B. These show different perspectives of the events of 1927 and contextualisation was important for developing a response.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/21 Outline Study 21

Key messages

- In **part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected, and reach a supported conclusion.
- In **part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Candidates need to be fully aware of the meaning of time related phrases and dates used in questions. For example, the late nineteenth century means from around 1870 to 1900 and not beyond, and similarly early twentieth century means from 1900 onward to a date up to around 1930 that is appropriate to the question. If an end date is given, for example 'in the period 1850–56', references to events/figures after this date are not relevant to the question as posed.

General comments

Part (a) questions are about causation. Answers which were effective displayed a detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short term. Such responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected, and produced reasoned conclusions. Strong responses made the identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors. Weaker responses tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. These responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

For **part (b)** questions, most candidates were able to offer some explanation of events. Most recognised the need to consider different possibilities and made some effort at providing details to support different interpretations of events. Good responses included detailed knowledge of the topics and were characterised by carefully considered and well supported analysis of alternative perspectives. The best responses were able to compare the relative strengths of different arguments and draw reasoned conclusions in answer to the specific questions that had been set. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance, often by ignoring a timeframe given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why Napoleon’s domestic policies were popular.

Successful responses were characterised by both a clear knowledge of the various aspects of Napoleon’s domestic policies and a good understanding of why they appealed to many in France. These responses could have been improved by showing the connection between the factors explained. Less successful responses described Napoleon’s domestic policies while weaker responses focused on his military successes.

(b) ‘War caused the French monarchy to fall in 1792.’ How far do you agree?

Good answers grasped the question’s timeframe and were able to produce high quality analysis based on the deployment of appropriate factual evidence to aid the development of fully focused and balanced arguments. This meant war was assessed against a range of influences (e.g. Louis XVI’s lukewarm support for the changes since 1789/the flight and capture of the royal family in June 1791/the growing radicalism of the revolution/the impact of the poor harvest of 1792). Other responses focused solely on the role of war and, as a result, lacked balance. Less successful answers did not grasp the timeframe and wrote at length about the background to the events of 1789 with no link being established to 1792 or they described events which followed 1792 (The Terror).

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why developments in textile machinery increased industrialisation after 1780.

Responses which were successful identified and explained several factors, such as the move from cottage to factory production, the need to move raw materials and finished goods in bulk which led to changes in transport, and how these, in turn, impacted the production of coal and iron. Less focused responses described the various developments in textile machinery without linking them to increased industrialisation after 1780.

(b) How far was Chartism’s failure caused by opposition from government?

Good answers were able to assess the role government opposition played in Chartism’s failure against several other influences. For example, the government were willing to accede to middle class wants (Reform Act of 1832 and ending the Corn Laws in 1846) which undermined the middle class and working class acting together. Also, the division within Chartism over moral force versus violent action and the impact unemployment/employment had on support for Chartism. Other responses described the aims of the Chartist movement while weaker ones confused the actions of the Luddites and/or the events of the Peterloo Massacre with Chartism.

Question 3: Liberalism and Nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why France lost the Franco–Prussian War.

Many good responses were seen as they identified and explained several factors which caused France’s defeat. For example, Bismarck’s diplomatic skill in ensuring France had no allies in the war, the support of the Southern German states for Prussia left France at a numerical disadvantage in the fighting, and France’s inability to transport men and material in an efficient manner meant they could not bring their forces to bear as forcefully as Prussia. Other responses identified a factor/s while weaker responses wrote at length about the Ems telegram.

(b) To what extent did economic issues cause the German revolutions of 1848–49?

Good answers showed a depth of knowledge in the context of fully focused and balanced arguments. This meant economic influences (e.g. poor harvests/potato blight/low wages) were assessed against the impact of German nationalism, liberal aspirations and the events in Paris in February 1848. Less successful answers showed a limited depth of knowledge and weaker

responses provided lengthy descriptions of the Zollverein which were not linked to the question's focus.

SECTION B: The History of the USA, 1820–1941

Question 4: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

(a) Why did the Lincoln–Douglas debates attract so much attention?

Answers which were successful displayed a good knowledge and understanding of the context of the debates, for example, the growing sectionalism caused by slavery, the issue of 'Bleeding Kansas', the impact of the Dred Scott decision and the arguments of Douglas and Lincoln. These responses could have been improved by showing the connection between the factors explained. Other responses described the debates. Weaker responses showed confusion in seeing the debates as part of the 1860 presidential election or saw the debate as being between Lincoln and Frederick Douglass.

(b) To what extent were changes in the party-political system the cause of increased sectionalism in the period 1850–56?

The most impressive responses were based on focused, balanced and well supported assessment of the extent to which changes in the party-political system were the cause of increased sectionalism in this period. Good knowledge was shown about the demise of the Whigs, the creation of the Republican Party and growing division between Northern and Southern Democrats. This was then analysed against other influences, such as the terms of the Compromise of 1850 (particularly the reinvigorated Fugitive Slave Act), the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the violent events of late May, 1856. Other responses focused on factors other than the changes to the party-political system and, as a result, were unbalanced in their assessment. Weaker responses ignored the timeframe and wrote, often at length, about events post-1856 (e.g. the Dred Scott judgement/Harper's Ferry/the 1860 election and subsequent secession of several states).

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why the US economy experienced periods of economic recession in the late nineteenth century.

Good responses identified and explained several reasons why the US economy experienced periods of economic recession and kept to the question's timeframe. Less successful responses did not keep a consistent focus on the timeframe and the weakest responses wrote about poor working and living conditions.

(b) To what extent did presidents in the early twentieth century successfully enact Progressive policies?

The most effective responses were able to provide specific examples of Progressive policies enacted by presidents and used appropriate factual evidence to demonstrate the extent of their success. This approach enabled the development of focused and balanced arguments, leading to well-reasoned conclusions. More moderately successful responses consisted largely of descriptive accounts of Progressive policies, often focusing on a single president. Responses which were less successful would have benefitted from greater range and depth.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

(a) Explain why unemployment had such a large social impact after 1929.

The key to a good answer was to grasp the question's focus of 'social impact after 1929'. Such answers identified and explained several factors (e.g. Hoovervilles/growth in crime/health issues). Other responses explained a factor and less successful answers identified a factor/s. The weakest answers wrote at length about the causes of unemployment.

(b) To what extent were the actions taken during his First Hundred Days key to the success of Roosevelt's presidency?

Good answers understood the need to assess the First Hundred Days in the context of Roosevelt's presidency up to 1941. Such answers displayed a firm knowledge and understanding of the policies enacted in the First Hundred Days which allowed them to assess the extent of success for his presidency against their efficacy and the impact of later policies. Other responses focused on the First Hundred Days which meant their analysis was unbalanced. Less successful answers described Roosevelt's actions.

SECTION C: International Relations, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

- (a) Explain why the United States became involved in the Cuban War of Independence.**

Successful responses displayed clear knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the United States became involved in the conflict. Such responses were able to show both long- and short-term reasons (e.g. USA's own history as a colonised people who fought for independence, the influence of the press and the sinking of the 'USS Maine'). These responses could have been improved by showing the connection between the factors explained. Other responses identified a factor/s. Weaker responses lost the question's focus and described what the United States gained as a result of its war with Spain.

- (b) 'Trade was the main reason for international involvement in China in the late nineteenth century.' How far do you agree?**

The most effective responses were based on focused, balanced and well supported assessment of the extent to which trade was the main reason for international involvement in this period. Trade was assessed against other influences such as the need for prestige, the growing imperialism of Japan, and US assertiveness after its success in the war with Spain. Other responses focused on trade and so were unbalanced in their analysis. Less effective responses did not adhere to the timeframe and wrote at length about the Opium Wars earlier in the century and/or the Russo-Japanese War.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

- (a) Explain why the Rapallo Pact was signed in 1922.**

Good answers identified and explained several factors (e.g. the diplomatic isolation imposed on Germany and Bolshevik Russia after the First World War, the failure of the Genoa Conference, and the realisation that both countries would benefit from forming the Pact, as it would end their isolation and afford economic and military gains). Other answers identified a factor/s. Weaker responses showed confusion over which countries formed the Pact and/or wrote lengthy accounts about the terms of the Versailles Treaty.

- (b) To what extent did the Locarno Treaties resolve international tensions in the second half of the 1920s?**

Answers which were successful had a clear knowledge and understanding of the Locarno Treaties and what followed their agreement. This meant the responses were able to assess the extent to which the Treaties eased international tensions by looking at not only their achievements (e.g. better Franco-German relations) but also their limits (e.g. Germany's eastern borders were not addressed/Kellogg-Briand Pact showed France still felt insecure despite Locarno). Other influences on the easing/not easing of international tensions were assessed (e.g. the reduction in Germany's reparations payments in the Young Plan/the lack of progress over disarmament/the immediate fallout from the Wall Street Crash). Other responses focused on the Locarno Treaties which led to an unbalanced analysis. Less successful responses showed some understanding of the treaties but ignored the question's timeframe by writing at length about events in the first half of the 1920s and/or the 1930s.

Question 9: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

- (a) Explain why Italy left the League of Nations in 1937.**

Responses which were successful identified and explained a number of reasons for Italy's withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1937. The central role of the Abyssinian invasion such as the imposition of sanctions on Italy and the League's handling of the issue illustrated its weakness and irrelevance and the growing rapprochement between Mussolini and Hitler (e.g. the Rome-Berlin Axis, 1936). Other responses identified a factor/s. The weakest responses ignored the timeframe and wrote about the Corfu Crisis in 1923.

(b) 'Britain's military weakness prevented it from pursuing a more active policy against Hitler in the 1930s.' How far do you agree?

Effective answers were based on focused, balanced and well supported assessment of the extent to which military weakness prevented Britain from pursuing a more active policy against Hitler in this period. Military weakness was assessed against the impact of economic pressures, the belief that the Versailles Treaty was too harsh on Germany, which meant Hitler had some justification for his actions, and the desire to avoid another World War, one which would be far more destructive than the Great War of 1914–18. Other responses focused on appeasement without addressing military weakness which undermined any balance in the analysis. Less effective answers described aspects of Hitler's foreign policy in this period.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/22 Outline Study 22

Key messages

- In **part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected, and reach a supported conclusion.
- In **part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Candidates need to be fully aware of the meaning of time related phrases and dates used in questions. For example, the late nineteenth century means from around 1870 to 1900 and not beyond, and similarly early twentieth century means from 1900 onward to a date up to around 1930 that is appropriate to the question. If an end date is given, for example 'in the period 1850–56', references to events/figures after this date are not relevant to the question as posed.

General comments

Part (a) questions are about causation. Answers which were effective displayed a detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short term. Such responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected, and produced reasoned conclusions. Strong responses made the identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors. Weaker responses tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. These responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

For **part (b)** questions, most candidates were able to offer some explanation of events. Most recognised the need to consider different possibilities and made some effort at providing details to support different interpretations of events. Good responses included detailed knowledge of the topics and were characterised by carefully considered and well supported analysis of alternative perspectives. The best responses were able to compare the relative strengths of different arguments and draw reasoned conclusions in answer to the specific questions that had been set. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance, often by ignoring a timeframe given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why the insurrection of 10 August 1792 happened.

Candidates were often able to provide at least two explanations for this question. The most common responses were those that dealt with the perceived betrayal of the King through the Flight to Varennes, or through the threat posed by the Brunswick Manifesto. Stronger answers were also

able to explain the particular economic situation of 1792, while weaker responses offered more general answers that were limited to vague statements about poverty. The strongest responses linked these factors to the rise of republicanism and were able to relate it to the role of the *sans culottes*, thereby producing a top level answer. For example, *'Out of these points it can be said that it as the king's constant opposition and counter-revolutionary acts that were most significant in causing the insurrections as these acts gave radicals ammunition to stir up the sans culottes and make them even more radical leading to the insurrection as it was increasingly hard for the moderates to defend the king's actions.'* There were a significant number of responses that clearly did not know what the insurrection was, and these answers either gave very generalised responses about issues that were relevant to the entire period, or wrote about an incorrect event, normally the storming of the Bastille, or the September Massacres

(b) 'The Concordat of 1801 was Napoleon's greatest domestic achievement.' How far do you agree?

This question was often answered very well, with candidates attempting a balanced answer. Some excellent responses were seen that were confident in their understanding of the Concordat, and the stability it brought to France, as well as the popularity for Napoleon. This was often supported with details of earlier uprising such as in the Vendee. On the other side of the argument candidates were able to show how the Napoleonic Code, and the economic and educational reforms also brought benefits to France in terms of stability, prosperity and social progress. Concluding for example, *'Economic reforms like the Bank of France and the legal changes in the Code Napoleon achieved great success in preventing opposition domestically. The Concordat was also introduced to reduce opposition and stop risings against him. In evaluation both have the same level of achievement, one settling things down in religion and the others in politics so they have equal importance and thus I disagree with the statement that the Concordat was Napoleon's greatest achievement.'* Weaker responses often suggested that the Napoleonic Code encompassed the whole raft of economic and social reform rather than being a codification of the different legal systems found in France at that time. Many answers were able to provide a reasoned account to the successes and failings of Napoleon's domestic reforms and only a few strayed into the issue of military achievements which were not part of this question.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why governments started to regulate working conditions.

Many responses were aware of what the regulations were, but not necessarily why they were introduced. Or they showed understanding of the nature of the poor working conditions but described them rather than linking them to causation. Often a link between the conditions and the government response could just about be credited, but it was rare for answers to go much beyond this. A few better responses were seen that placed the regulation in the context of concerns about unrest and a few linked the action to the idea that better conditions might lead to a more productive workforce. Weaker answers gave general descriptions of the entire period, thereby including aspects of housing and disease.

(b) How far did mechanisation lead to the Industrial Revolution?

There were many good responses seen, though weaker ones tended to write a general description of industrialisation in which all the factors were simply described. There was plenty for candidates to say on both sides of the argument, with mechanisation being relevant for agriculture, factories, and the development of transportation. Better responses recognised that whilst agriculture is not 'industrial' it was the effects of the agricultural revolution on industry that had real significance for this question and as such it represented an 'other factor'. In term of alternative explanations, the most common themes were the role of entrepreneurs, stability in Britain, and also the role of trade. Many good responses had a clear grasp of the importance of investment and entrepreneurship and produced balanced overall judgements, for example, *'Overall mechanisation did contribute to the Industrial Revolution greater than other factors. Without it the inventions of machinery and development of a new main source of energy would not have taken place meaning that the growth of production would not have been as rapid. Its contribution to transport can also be argued in the same way as it improved the speed with which resources and good could be moved around.'* Weaker answers were often still relevant and were either descriptive or contained assessment without support.

Question 3: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why the Frankfurt Parliament collapsed.

This was a well answered question, with many secure responses which were able to explain the significance of Frederick William IV's rejection of the 'crown of mud' to accept the crown, and the unrepresentative nature of the members. Some responses focused on the division over Gross- or Klein-Deutschland and commented on the lack of credibility of the parliament, either in terms of the lack of an army, or their lack of support. Most responses were able to provide a reasoned explanation of at least one factor and the best were able to demonstrate how several factors could be linked to provide a better explanation. For example, *'Out of all these reasons for their collapse the most prominent would be their reliance on Prussia. While Austria actively opposed the Parliament, the King of Prussia appeared more sympathetic to German Nationalism, and they looked to Prussia for implementation of their plans as they did not have enough popular support to carry them out without such support. So when Prussia pulled out it inevitably led to a loss of their overall significance and to the collapse of the Parliament.'*

(b) To what extent was German unification the result of Bismarck's actions?

This question was also well answered, with many responses able to explain both Bismarck's actions, and other reasons for unification. When explaining Bismarck's role the most common approach was to take a chronological approach, showing his manipulation of events culminating in the war with France. Some excellent answers were seen, however, which took an alternative and thematic approach. Such answers for example, considered the role of war in his plans, his ability to ensure the neutrality of other powers, or his use of nationalism. Such answers were well constructed and resulted in a much less descriptive approach. On the other side of the argument, many responses compared Prussia's military strength with the comparative weakness of Austria and France, and the role of other individuals such as Moltke and Von Roon. Weaker responses were tended to description of the events leading up unification, but even these often managed to include some assessment, however undeveloped. Few responses considered the culpability of the French in their response to Bismarck's provocation

Section B: The history of the USA, 1820–1941

Only a small number of candidates attempted questions from this section so only limited commentary is possible.

Question 4: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

(a) Explain why there was a battle at Fort Sumter in 1861.

Candidates who attempted this question were often aware of the events surrounding the start of the Civil War but were less able to account for this specific event. Some answers were able to place the events in the context of secession, and occasionally an answer was seen that additionally had a clear awareness of the roles of Anderson and Beauregard. Most responses were just general assertions about the start of the war.

(b) 'The Missouri Compromise effectively dealt with the issue of slavery throughout the period 1820–1850.' How far do you agree? War of 1848–9

A few good responses were fully conversant with the agreement and explained it in detail, showing why it was initially successful but then demonstrating how it became increasingly untenable with the steady expansion westwards and incorporation of new territories which wanted to become states like Texas, California and the gains from the Mexican War of 1848–9. This approach produced a few very good responses.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why political machines and party bosses in the big cities were criticised by Progressives.

There were a few good responses to this, but weaker responses seemed to confuse the idea of what party machines meant though they did have some knowledge of Boss Tweed and described

how he operated but without reference to Progressive concerns about the system. Weaker responses also seemed to confuse party bosses with robber barons. Stronger responses were able to explain at least two reasons, normally criticism of the political influence, or an understanding that the result was often poor living conditions for immigrants in the cities. Few answers went beyond these two reasons.

(b) To what extent did the rapid economic growth in the late nineteenth century benefit Americans?

This question was generally answered well. Stronger answers were able to explain the positive benefits of employment, and that this prosperity was then reinvested into the economy through purchasing and how the expansion encouraged development of new ideas and inventions that further promoted growth. Such answers were also able to argue that this prosperity was not uniform, benefitting some more than others. Stronger answers were also aware that rapid growth led to poor living conditions in the cities and exploitation of weaker groups like immigrants. Weaker responses concentrated on the development of monopolies and the robber barons, rather than making any attempt to look at the consequences for Americans generally.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

(a) Explain why Hoover's response to the Great Crash was ineffective.

Some good answers were seen to this question. Strong responses concentrated on the Laissez-faire nature of Hoover's presidency and his belief in 'rugged individualism', and the belief that there would be a natural recovery. A few stronger responses actually considered the attempts that he did make, and why these were ineffective.

(b) 'Opposition to the New Deal had little impact on the policies pursued by Roosevelt.' How far do you agree?

Most responses did not go much further than simple comments about the New Deal being unconstitutional and being opposed by the Supreme Court was extremely limited. There were a few better responses that showed awareness of opposition from different groups on the left and right wing of politics as well as the Supreme Court and these produced reasoned argument groups, though even these tended to simply explain the opposition without really assessing whether there was any significant effect on Roosevelt's policies.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

(a) Explain why Wilhelm II, sent the Kruger Telegram in 1896.

Responses were mostly secure in their understanding of the historical context, both in terms of the Kaiser's ambitions and the Jameson raid. Stronger responses were able to provide distinct explanations, with some better answers also explaining that it was an attempt to isolate Britain thereby pushing them towards Germany, which backfired. Weaker responses wrote extensive narratives about the Boer Wars, often with some confusion over the chronology, without focussing their answer on explanations of causation. Whilst these sometimes concluded with a single cause, they often did not reach the higher levels of the mark scheme.

(b) 'Up to 1917 the USA consistently avoided involvement in the affairs of European nations.' How far do you agree with this statement?

There were some very good answers to this question which provided balanced assessment with specific support. A good start often helped in this process, for example, *'For much of the 19th century the US was occupied with its internal problems like the Civil War and westward expansion and was only concerned about what happened in the Americas, setting out their view in the Monroe Doctrine. They became more involved with European countries when it was necessary as in the Spanish American war and in expansion of trading interests in the Far East. When the First World War broke out, they supplied war material to European countries but stayed out of the war until attack on shipping by German U boats led to a change in policy.'*

Arguments most often considered for isolation concentrated on the Monroe Doctrine, the need for internal growth at the beginning of the period, and also the lack of involvement in the war before 1917. Counter arguments often centred around the situation in Cuba, the growth of the navy, and supplying the allies at the start of the war. These answers tended to take a chronological approach, and they were often very successful. Weaker responses concentrated mainly on the war and went through to involvement in the peace treaties and beyond.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

(a) Explain why the Treaty of Sevres led to conflict in Turkey

There were some general responses to this question either because they only had a general understanding of the Treaty, or because they did not know anything and therefore talked about the Peace Treaties as a whole. Most commonly responses understood that land was taken away, and that reparations and military restrictions were imposed, but struggled to explain how that led to conflict in Turkey. Better responses were aware of the actions of Mustafa Kemal and were able to link that to dissatisfaction caused by the Treaty recognising that it was the acceptance of the Treaty by the last Sultan the led Mustafa Kemal to lead to the revolt against the sultanate in rejection of the term of Sevres, for example, *'The Treaty of Sevres was very harsh on Turkey, forcing them to give up much of their territory in the Middle East and even in Europe. The Sultan agreed to it because he was afraid of being deposed by the British and French. But the army, led by Mustapha Kemal did not believe that they had deserved such harsh treatment and when Kemal began a revolt, claiming he would create a new Turkey and replace the Treaty of Sevres, many people followed him.'*

(b) To what extent had Germany regained its position as a major power by 1929?

There were some excellent responses to this question, often from candidates who adopted a thematic rather than a chronological approach. As such, they considered the situation after the Treaty of Versailles, developments during the 1920s, and then considered whether at the end Germany had regained their strength. Arguments seen were often that economically and in terms of international relations Germany had regained their strength, whereas less so militarily and in terms of alliances. Some good answers which took a chronological approach were also seen, often with excellent support, but these had more of a tendency to become descriptive, rather than focussing directly on the question. The strongest responses were able to produce a balanced judgement often based on an assessment of how far the progress made had dealt with German issues regarding the Treaty of Versailles. Weaker responses were rare, but often described events, mainly focussed on the situation immediately after the Treaty of Versailles or on the rise of Hitler.

Question 9: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

(a) Explain why Danzig was an important factor in the worsening of German Polish relations in the late 1930's.

Strong responses knew what Danzig is and recognised it as an important port, and that the population was largely German. They were also then able to explain how this was affected by Hitler's foreign policy moves in the 30s. Weaker responses wrote about Poland as a whole, with no mention of Danzig at all in their answer, or the name being used interchangeably with 'Poland'. Better responses recognised there was a link between Danzig and the Polish Corridor, but even these often did not have specific knowledge about Danzig. Such answers were confident of their knowledge of Hitler's plans for Poland, and also that the issues over the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia made Poland nervous. This could be credited in L3 at times. As such, few errors were seen, but few answers reached the highest level.

(b) How far did the Japanese takeover of Manchuria undermine the credibility of the League of Nations?

Strong responses often had a sound understanding of what the League did in response to the Japanese aggression and generally argued that the Lytton Report was 'too little too late' and were aware that Japan left the League having voted against acceptance of the report, thus weakening the League. The counter-argument was often stronger than the side about Manchuria. Candidates were confident in their ability to argue that Abyssinia undermined the credibility more due to the

lack of meaningful sanctions, closing the Suez Canal, and the Hoare-Laval Pact. They were less confident in their arguments about Manchuria, and the only very successful arguments were ones that focussed on credibility through failure to effectively tackle a large power, or that credibility was damaged since they weren't able to keep Japan in the League, for example, *'Although the League wanted to stop the Japanese taking over Manchuria, as shown in the Lytton report and other moral condemnations, the League could not provide useful enforcement to force the Japanese to withdraw, like military actions or economic sanctions. So, it is undeniable that the Manchurian Crisis undermined the credibility of the League and the exit of Japan from the League showed other aggressive countries such as Germany and Italy that they didn't have to follow the rules of the League of Nations.'* Too often, however, detailed descriptions of the incident were followed by a simple statement about the failure of the League, rather than assessing the impact of the failure. Weaknesses on the other side of the argument tended to be generic paragraphs about problems with the structure of the League without linking them to the League's credibility.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/23 Outline Study 23

Key messages

- In **part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected, and reach a supported conclusion.
- In **part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Candidates need to be fully aware of the meaning of time related phrases and dates used in questions. For example, the late nineteenth century means from around 1870 to 1900 and not beyond, and similarly early twentieth century means from 1900 onward to a date up to around 1930 that is appropriate to the question. If an end date is given, for example 'in the period 1850–56', references to events/figures after this date are not relevant to the question as posed.

General comments

Part (a) questions are about causation. Answers which were effective displayed a detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short term. Such responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected, and produced reasoned conclusions. Strong responses made the identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors. Weaker responses tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. These responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

For **part (b)** questions, most candidates were able to offer some explanation of events. Most recognised the need to consider different possibilities and made some effort at providing details to support different interpretations of events. Good responses included detailed knowledge of the topics and were characterised by carefully considered and well supported analysis of alternative perspectives. The best responses were able to compare the relative strengths of different arguments and draw reasoned conclusions in answer to the specific questions that had been set. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance, often by ignoring a timeframe given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

- (a) **Explain why Napoleon's coup of 1799 against the Directory was successful.**

This question was well answered by most candidates. Many were normally able to provide at least two explanations – most commonly the unpopularity of the Directory and the popularity of Napoleon. Better responses also included commentary on the role of other key individuals such as

Lucien Bonaparte and Sieyes. Many were also able to provide links by examining the relative popularity and unpopularity of Napoleon and the Directory. However, some weaker answers described the entire history of the French Revolution, without really engaging effectively with the question.

(b) How far do you agree that the failure of the Estates General was caused by Louis XVI?

Strong responses were able to show the issues caused/not resolved by Louis, with the most common being the problems with the voting system, or his reluctance to accept change/deal with the cahiers. On the other side some good arguments were seen linking the Enlightenment to the determination of the third estate to press for change, leading to the establishment of the National Assembly. Other arguments seen were that it was the nature of the Ancien Regime, or that it was the serious nature of the problems facing France that caused it to fail. Some answers also used the issues with the voting system as an alternative reason, which was valid. For example, *'Louis own weakness undoubtedly caused problems. He was easily swayed by the queen who thought he should resist all changes to his powers, and the nobles at court who were only interested in defending their privileges. Louis failed to take control of the meeting and decided to set aside the cahiers which highlighted the issues that needed dealing with, even though he had invited members to bring those to the meeting. On the other hand, the Ancien regime was highly rigid and difficult to change and everyone in the Assembly was interested in their own issues and not prepared to listen to others.'* Weaker responses understood many of the general concepts, but were either descriptive, or failed to provide support for the arguments.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why the Industrial Revolution led to the development of the middle classes.

Many responses misunderstood this question – particularly the terms 'development' and 'middle classes'. Many responses discussed workers getting jobs in factories that earned them enough money to become middle class, but better responses argued that there were new jobs that offered higher wages such as engineers and architects or argued that new inventions generated income that was re-invested, increasing wealth and thus social status. A few answers were able to use the Great Reform Act as an example of the middle classes getting a greater say in politics, or that access to education enabled their development. For example, *'Due to the Industrial revolution there was a massive increase in capital raised by businesses and government as a result projects to develop schools and universities received more money allowing more people access to education that enabled them to move into middle class occupations such as engineers and architects whilst the growing number of factories required managers. Inventions require funding but also created more wealth for the investors and this also expanded the middle classes.'* Weaker responses, however, either gave a general idea of people having greater wealth, or even just descriptions of the changes during the Industrial revolution.

(b) How far were governments opposed to the demands for change that were caused by industrialisation?

Stronger responses were able to provide balanced assessments based on the changing view of the government over time or showing the difference between the government's response to demands from the middle class as opposed to demands from the working class. Other good responses were also able to argue that even when changes were made, they were often ineffective or permissive. Most candidates seemed comfortable with the subject content, with the difference in responses mainly being how well they analysed rather than described the events. On the side of opposition, nearly all responses were able to show the repressive nature of the government to events such as Peterloo and the Swing Riots. On the other side candidates were able to show changes that were made such as the Great Reform Act, the Factory and Mines Acts, and also the introduction of the Public Health Board. Weaker answers often confused the details of the protests or the reforms or described the problems/protests without linking them to the requirements of the question.

Question 3: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why Austria was opposed to the development of German nationalism.

Many responses were able to explain at least one relevant factor, with most able to show how several factors contributed to Austria's perspective, though sometimes this was not linked

effectively to show a greater depth of analysis. The most common response was Austria's concern about losing their dominance over the German states, and many candidates were also able to explain the need to preserve the position of the monarchy or the fear of a strong Prussia. Many candidates were able to provide substantial detail of the specific role of Metternich, though for weaker responses this did not go beyond description to motive. Some better answers also considered the multi-ethnic nature of the Austrian Empire. Weaker responses were often able to identify at least one reason, but were also very descriptive, particularly about the Zollverein. These often produced simple judgements, for example, *'Conclusively Austria opposed German nationalism primarily due to their exclusion from idea of Kleindeutschland. This would remove Austria from its position of power in Germany and its leadership role. Therefore, Austria opposed German nationalism.'*

(b) To what extent did liberals in the Prussian Landtag present a challenge to Bismarck in the period 1862–1866?

Many candidates had a firm understanding of the problems caused by military funding, and how Bismarck was able to resolve this. Many also argued that liberals were not in a position to cause Bismarck issues, partly through his manipulation of them, and also through the support from the king for his military policies. Weaker responses knew that the issue of unification was significant but provided long descriptions of the wars without relating them to conflict between Bismarck and the Landtag. There were also some unbalanced answers that dismissed the liberals as a challenge completely without really justifying this perspective. Stronger responses produced reasoned conclusions but did not provide details to support them, for example, *'Conclusively the liberals in the Prussian Landtag presented somewhat of a minor challenge for Bismarck, more of an inconvenience than a challenge. Although the liberals demanded more rights, representation, and decisive power, ultimately Bismarck had the power to veto any of their demands. Therefore, the liberals were only a minor challenge.'*

Section B: The history of the USA, 1820–1941

Question 4: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

(a) Explain why Kansas became a focus of sectional divisions in the mid-1850s.

Responses displayed good contextual knowledge, and understanding of at least one reason, but normally more. Stronger responses were able to explain the impact of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and popular sovereignty, and also the issues of Bleeding Kansas. Leading to effective judgement, for example, *'Thus, Kansas became a focus of sectional interests as its existence as a territory and a state threatened the sectional balance of power as well as perpetuating northerners suspicions of conspiracies about southern expansion and Slave Power. It also showed the extent to which differences between North and South could erupt in conflict and death signalling an inevitable conflict between the two groups.'* Weaker responses adopted a descriptive approach and therefore blurred the reasons together in a chronological way, rather than examining the issues separately. A few weaker responses tried to introduce detail they knew from outside the period that were not relevant to the question.

(b) 'The Lincoln-Douglas debates were the main reason for Lincoln's victory in the 1860 presidential election.' How far do you agree?

Stronger responses were able to use the debates not only to demonstrate that they enabled Lincoln to gain popularity through his views and publicity surrounding them, but also that they did the opposite for Douglas, especially as the popular sovereignty specifically its clarification in the Freeport Doctrine, increasingly divided the South. Alternative reasons often considered the split in the Democrats and some of the best responses showed awareness of the growing anti-slavery movement in the north as fuelled by the writings of Harriet Beecher Stow, and so offered a range of other factors as well as assessing the impact of the debates. They also adopted simple introductions to structure the development of an argument, for example, *'The Lincoln-Douglas Debates certainly played a prominent role in bringing Lincoln wider public attention and demonstrating Douglas' weaknesses, but this was linked to the existing political climate of distrust between North and South and the wider issues of state rights and individual liberty.'* Weaker responses seemed to think that Lincoln had called for the abolition of slavery during the debates, while some did not recognise the context of the debates, characterising them as a national event

prior to the election rather than an election campaign for the state senate of Illinois, which Lincoln lost.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

- (a) **Explain why some leading businessmen of the late nineteenth century were known as robber barons.**

This question was generally answered well, with most responses displaying a very good understanding of the nature of the robber barons, for example, *'In the economic boom that followed the Civil War many industries expanded rapidly this led to some key people establishing monopolies in industries using restrictive practices like cheap labour and price fixing. This led to the exploitation of immigrant labour in order to build up their own wealth.'* Responses concentrated on their corrupt practices, unfair competitive arrangements, their use of monopolies, and their exploitation of workers/consumers. Weaker responses tended to concentrate on describing the activities of a few of the better known 'robber barons' rather than why they were given this critical nickname.

- (b) **How successful were attempts to limit the power of party bosses in this period?**

Strong responses examined the impact of the seventeenth Amendment and were able to assess its strengths and weaknesses. They also considered other electoral reforms, often first introduced at State level, like primary elections and recall motions. Some also considered the arrest of Boss Tweed to show powers being limited, whilst also arguing that other party bosses remained powerful. Weaker responses answered this question in terms of trust-busting, interpreting 'bosses' as having something to do with industry and went into lengthy explanations of this. Other weaker responses did not focus on the specific demand of the question and had lengthy accounts of the 1920s, the progressives or prohibition.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

- (a) **Explain why Roosevelt faced legal challenges to the New Deal.**

Few responses were seen to this question but of these most were able to argue that the Supreme Court deemed aspects of the ND unconstitutional but didn't attempt to provide any more reasons. Weaker responses described aspects of the ND without focussing on legal challenges.

- (b) **'Unemployment was the most significant consequence of the Great Depression.' To what extent to you agree?**

Most responses were able to describe the problem of unemployment, but weaker responses did not get beyond this. Stronger responses explained the effect this had on individuals e.g. homelessness/starvation, or on the economy more generally, e.g. the lack of spending power led to further economic decline. Alternative factors seemed to challenge candidates, with better responses able to explain the problems caused to banks, but many other answers choosing not to provide any alternatives.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

- (a) **Explain why economic pressures led to changes in US foreign policy in the late nineteenth century.**

This question was well answered. Candidates seemed confident in their understanding of the question, and the contextual knowledge required. Most were able to explain the role of the Spanish-American war, and the closing of the frontier, though weaker responses did not always have a full grasp of the economic implications of these but simply saw them as factors. Stronger responses were also able to explain the consequences of the earlier depressions.

- (b) **To what extent had Japan been transformed into a world power by 1905?**

Stronger responses constructed some good analytical answers that considered both sides. The approach of these responses often considered how internal reforms, which transformed Japan's military capability, combined with external factors such as victory in 1905, and the 1902 Treaty, brought about a transformation whilst considering other factors like the relative weakness of Russia in 1905, and the British motivation behind the Anglo Japanese Treaty. Weaker responses went outside the time period set in the question and talked about the situation up to and including 1918.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

(a) Explain why the United States was involved in European affairs in the 1920s.

There were many confident responses, that were aware of the need by the US to protect their economic interests, to prevent war, and to achieve political stability in Europe. These answers were also able to provide specific support such as the Dawes Plan or the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Some good responses were also those that recognised that all of these factors were linked in that they were the US protecting their own interests. Few weak responses were seen and those wrote about US involvement in the Treaty negotiations at the end of the war, even going into details of Wilson's fourteen points.

(b) To what extent was German dissatisfaction with the Treaty of Versailles resolved by international negotiations in the 1920s?

Strong responses had a solid grounding in the situation at the beginning of the decade, and changes that were made during it. They were able to recognise the main areas of dissatisfaction and analyse aspects of improvement or not through events such as Locarno, the Dawes and Young Plans, and the Rapallo Pact. This analysis was often grouped into factors such as economic, military, and territorial which prevented it from becoming descriptive. Weaker responses were often focussed on the situation at the beginning of the 20s, with descriptions of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and little reference to the events of the 20s. These responses also often went into detailed descriptions of events like the hyperinflation and the invasion of the Ruhr without showing how these fitted into the overall picture of progress or continuing dissatisfaction. Some less detailed responses still produced some reasoned conclusions, for example, *'Overall, German satisfaction can be seen as largely achieved by 1929. This is shown through them joining the League of Nations in 1926 and through the Locarno Pact which secured its western borders and settled a major issue with the French. In the late 1920s the German economy was recovering, and the Young Plan saw a further easing of reparations. But underlying dissatisfaction with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles which had taken much land from Germany and prevented them have many armed forces, remained, and quickly returned after the Wall Street Crash leading to the Great Depression.'*

Question 9: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

(a) Explain why German remilitarisation of the Rhineland was not resisted by Britain and France.

Responses showed good understanding of the historical context and also the British belief that the remilitarisation was to an extent justified. Some stronger responses were able to link these to show that given the context, it just didn't seem worth going to war for since they were 'going into their backyard'. Appeasement was commonly used as a reason, and this was sometimes less convincing as it was given more as a statement than an explanation. Weaker responses often cited Chamberlain as a factor, though he did not become Prime Minister until later in May 1937.

(b) 'The main reason for the eventual failure of the League was its members' unwillingness to take decisive action against Japanese aggression.' How far do you agree with this claim?

Stronger responses had a good understanding of the work of the Lytton Commission and were able to use this in a wider analysis of failure to act. Looking at alternative reasons usually produced more balanced results, with many looking at Abyssinia. Weaker responses tended to adopt the idea that the League 'did nothing' which did not focus clearly on the question and resulted in limited attempts to explain how the actions impacted the League. This often led to unbalanced answers and simple conclusions, for example, *'Overall, the main reason of the League's failure was the members' unwillingness to take decisive action against the Japanese aggression and thus I agree with the statement. This is proven through the long waiting period of the arbitration process in*

which Japan was angry as well as allowing it to take decisive military action while the League did nothing. This in total led to a large loss of the Leagues influence in Asia.'

HISTORY

Paper 9489/31 Interpretations Question 31
--

Key messages

- The first thing all candidates must do in the examination is to read the extract carefully. The best approach is to read it through once, and then to take some time to think about what it says. Then read it again, this time highlighting or making notes on those bits of the extract that seem most important in indicating the historian's interpretation and approach.
- The best answers are properly planned. This means that the interpretation has been identified, and the answer constructed in such a way as to illustrate and explain it, using appropriate examples taken from the content of the extract.
- Almost always, the interpretation will relate to the overarching question that underpins the Interpretations Study: *Who was to blame for the First World War?; Why did the Holocaust occur?; Who was to blame for the Cold War?* Candidates should make sure that their answers have addressed the issue of what the historian thinks about the overarching question, and how the extract indicates this. The only exception to this point occasionally arises on the Holocaust topic, where the historiography relating to victims, perpetrators and bystanders does not address Holocaust causation in quite the same way.

General comments

The best answers consider the extract as a whole. If one section of the extract appears to argue against another section, they find a plausible way to reconcile the apparent contradictions. They do not make assumptions based on single words, phrases or paragraphs. They understand that everything in the extract will be capable of being explained as part of, or having some relation to, the overall interpretation. Less successful answers do not have this level of understanding. Those that adopt a paragraph by paragraph approach to the extract frequently reach contradictory conclusions. Others try to explain what they see as shortcomings in the interpretations by detailing what they think the historian has ignored, or even got wrong. Such comments can demonstrate a lack of understanding of the nature of this assessment task.

Less successful answers write about what the extract says, rather than about what the historian thinks. At its most extreme, an entire answer can consist of a paraphrase of the extract with perhaps one or two assertions about 'the historian'. Fortunately, these examples are rare, and most candidates manage to make some inferences about the historian's opinions, most often, and most importantly, at the beginning and end of the answer. These answers can be improved by shifting the emphasis so that they are built upon statements about the historian's ideas, and source content then used to explain how these ideas can be detected and to help comment on their significance. The weakest answers include significant amounts of unfocused narrative on the. The only valid reason for writing about context is to help explain a point being made about the content of the extract. Other candidates use context to evaluate what the extract says; in effect, trying to prove the historian right or wrong. This is unnecessary and does not address the question asked in this assessment.

It is very common for candidates to use historiographical 'labels', such as functionalist, revisionist and so on, to help them in their analysis of the historian's approach. This is appropriate and can certainly help to produce a focused and relevant answer. However, it is vital that candidates understand what is implied by these labels. Many answers show significant misunderstanding about their meaning, and this misunderstanding inevitably has an impact on the quality of the answer.



Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Austria and/or Germany were to blame for following an irresponsible policy risking war, and that Russia was left with no choice but to respond. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Amongst those candidates who explained how the extract blamed Austria/Germany, there was a clear divide between those who got the interpretation correct regarding Russia, and those who got it wrong by seeing Russia as also being blamed. On this topic, candidates appeared keener than on others to write about the context. Even good answers that had provided a sound answer addressing the interpretation still included lengthy unnecessary contextual narrative. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the origins of the war with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that, despite the fact that the implementation of the Holocaust was confused and chaotic, genocide was intended. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The fact that the Holocaust was a matter of 'grand policy' and not 'stumbled into' was explicit and ruled out any attempts to see the historian as having a functionalist or structuralist approach. Weaker answers were deflected by the material in the first three paragraphs, which described the confusion over how to deal with deported German Jews, into thinking that this was all evidence of no plan for genocide. Yet even Kube and Lohse did not question the underlying intent to kill, merely how this was to be carried out, and in any case Bräutigam's reply to Lohse left little doubt about the matter.

In weaker responses candidates made assumptions based on single words or phrases and were misled. For example, the reference to 'improvised solutions' was seized on as evidence of a functionalist approach, despite the fact that the succeeding sentence clearly refuted this possibility. There also seems to be an assumption among some candidates that the moment an historian talks about the role of Hitler's subordinates in carrying out his plans, this is signalling a structuralist approach. 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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Stalin was responsible for the Cold War because of his domestic policies, and that ideology gave him a way of asserting his authority over the Soviet Union by providing him with an external enemy. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The strong focus on Stalin, viewing him as ideologically motivated, but as a rational, autocratic leader, suggested a post-post-revisionist approach.

The lack of exoneration of the West made suggestions of a traditional approach implausible, and the slight suggestion of Western culpability fell well short of being sufficient to support revisionism. Mentions of ideology distracted some candidates into thinking the argument was simply on the clash of ideologies between the USA and the Soviet Union, whereas the twist in this interpretation was Stalin's manipulation of ideology for his own internal purposes – the USA just provided him with a useful external enemy.

Overall, although the extract was clear enough in arguing the importance of Stalin's domestic considerations, many candidates seemed slightly taken by surprise by the historians' interpretation and tried to fit the extract into more familiar lines of explanation, such as inevitability, or arguing that both sides were to blame. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the origins of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/32 Interpretations Question 32
--

Key messages

- The first thing all candidates must do in the examination is to read the extract carefully. The best approach is to read it through once, and then to take some time to think about what it says. Then read it again, this time highlighting or making notes on those bits of the extract that seem most important in indicating the historian's interpretation and approach.
- The best answers are properly planned. This means that the interpretation has been identified, and the answer constructed in such a way as to illustrate and explain it, using appropriate examples taken from the content of the extract.
- Almost always, the interpretation will relate to the overarching question that underpins the Interpretations Study: *Who was to blame for the First World War?; Why did the Holocaust occur?; Who was to blame for the Cold War?* Candidates should make sure that their answers have addressed the issue of what the historian thinks about the overarching question, and how the extract indicates this. The only exception to this point occasionally arises on the Holocaust topic, where the historiography relating to victims, perpetrators and bystanders does not address Holocaust causation in quite the same way.

General comments

The best answers consider the extract as a whole. If one section of the extract appears to argue against another section, they find a plausible way to reconcile the apparent contradictions. They do not make assumptions based on single words, phrases or paragraphs. They understand that everything in the extract will be capable of being explained as part of, or having some relation to, the overall interpretation. Less successful answers do not have this level of understanding. Those that adopt a paragraph by paragraph approach to the extract frequently reach contradictory conclusions. Others try to explain what they see as shortcomings in the interpretations by detailing what they think the historian has ignored, or even got wrong. Such comments can demonstrate a lack of understanding of the nature of this assessment task.

Less successful answers write about what the extract says, rather than about what the historian thinks. At its most extreme, an entire answer can consist of a paraphrase of the extract with perhaps one or two assertions about 'the historian'. Fortunately, these examples are rare, and most candidates manage to make some inferences about the historian's opinions, most often, and most importantly, at the beginning and end of the answer. These answers can be improved by shifting the emphasis so that they are built upon statements about the historian's ideas, and source content then used to explain how these ideas can be detected and to help comment on their significance. The weakest answers include significant amounts of unfocused narrative on the. The only valid reason for writing about context is to help explain a point being made about the content of the extract. Other candidates use context to evaluate what the extract says; in effect, trying to prove the historian right or wrong. This is unnecessary and does not address the question asked in this assessment.

It is very common for candidates to use historiographical 'labels', such as functionalist, revisionist and so on, to help them in their analysis of the historian's approach. This is appropriate and can certainly help to produce a focused and relevant answer. However, it is vital that candidates understand what is implied by these labels. Many answers show significant misunderstanding about their meaning, and this misunderstanding inevitably has an impact on the quality of the answer.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

There were insufficient scripts on this topic for any meaningful comments to be made.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that maintaining their Jewish identity was important in helping Jewish women to resist the impact of the Holocaust, and that this resistance could be defined very broadly. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In focusing on issues of identity, gender and the nature of resistance, this was one of those extracts that did not directly address the overarching issue of *'Why did the Holocaust occur?'* Some candidates nonetheless tried to introduce arguments about causation, and claimed that the historian's approach was intentionalist, using quotes such as *'The Nazis had genocidal plans for all Jews'*.

Most candidates identified that resistance was an important aspect of the interpretation, but could get little more out of the extract than the ideas that Jewish women resisted and did so in various ways. Better answers raised points about the historiography of resistance and compared traditional views on the relative lack of overt resistance with the views expressed in the extract. Few, however, explicitly pointed out that what this raised was the question of how resistance can be defined – even though this is an aspect that is listed for study in the syllabus. Many candidates also missed the point about Jewish identity being an essential component in the will to resist. If this was included, the argument was inverted so that maintenance of Jewish identity became the purpose of resistance. 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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the USA was to blame for the Cold War because of its pursuance of open-door economic expansionism, and because of its insistence on having the right to determine the future of the world. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian's approach was clearly revisionist, and being able to detect and explain this was essential in producing a successful answer. Despite this, there were plenty of responses that saw at least some of the blame being placed on the Soviet Union, or of the USA being excused for its behaviour. This often involved mistaking the voice of participants in the events – for example, *'the need to become missionaries of capitalism and democracy'* – with the opinions of the historian.

Other misunderstandings arose from contextual arguments. Thus, many assumed that since the Marshall Plan was self-evidently a 'good thing', then US economic expansionism must be too, which was not what the extract said. A similar point arose over the atom bomb, mention of which provoked many to start writing about atomic diplomacy, despite the extract saying that it was *not* possession of the bomb that prompted US leaders to get tough with the Soviets. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the origins of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/33 Interpretations Question 33
--

Key messages

- The first thing all candidates must do in the examination is to read the extract carefully. The best approach is to read it through once, and then to take some time to think about what it says. Then read it again, this time highlighting or making notes on those bits of the extract that seem most important in indicating the historian's interpretation and approach.
- The best answers are properly planned. This means that the interpretation has been identified, and the answer constructed in such a way as to illustrate and explain it, using appropriate examples taken from the content of the extract.
- Almost always, the interpretation will relate to the overarching question that underpins the Interpretations Study: *Who was to blame for the First World War?; Why did the Holocaust occur?; Who was to blame for the Cold War?* Candidates should make sure that their answers have addressed the issue of what the historian thinks about the overarching question, and how the extract indicates this. The only exception to this point occasionally arises on the Holocaust topic, where the historiography relating to victims, perpetrators and bystanders does not address Holocaust causation in quite the same way.

General comments

The best answers consider the extract as a whole. If one section of the extract appears to argue against another section, they find a plausible way to reconcile the apparent contradictions. They do not make assumptions based on single words, phrases or paragraphs. They understand that everything in the extract will be capable of being explained as part of, or having some relation to, the overall interpretation. Less successful answers do not have this level of understanding. Those that adopt a paragraph by paragraph approach to the extract frequently reach contradictory conclusions. Others try to explain what they see as shortcomings in the interpretations by detailing what they think the historian has ignored, or even got wrong. Such comments can demonstrate a lack of understanding of the nature of this assessment task.

Less successful answers write about what the extract says, rather than about what the historian thinks. At its most extreme, an entire answer can consist of a paraphrase of the extract with perhaps one or two assertions about 'the historian'. Fortunately, these examples are rare, and most candidates manage to make some inferences about the historian's opinions, most often, and most importantly, at the beginning and end of the answer. These answers can be improved by shifting the emphasis so that they are built upon statements about the historian's ideas, and source content then used to explain how these ideas can be detected and to help comment on their significance. The weakest answers include significant amounts of unfocused narrative on the. The only valid reason for writing about context is to help explain a point being made about the content of the extract. Other candidates use context to evaluate what the extract says; in effect, trying to prove the historian right or wrong. This is unnecessary and does not address the question asked in this assessment.

It is very common for candidates to use historiographical 'labels', such as functionalist, revisionist and so on, to help them in their analysis of the historian's approach. This is appropriate and can certainly help to produce a focused and relevant answer. However, it is vital that candidates understand what is implied by these labels. Many answers show significant misunderstanding about their meaning, and this misunderstanding inevitably has an impact on the quality of the answer.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

There were insufficient scripts on this topic for any meaningful comments to be made.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler was relatively uninvolved in Jewish policy, with no early plan for genocide, and that it was the structure of the Nazi Party that produced the drive for Jewish policy to become ever more extreme. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In focusing on the manner in which rival factions in the Nazi Party could produce rival policies, each of which in turn became more extreme, until in the end only murder remained, the extract put forward a clearly structuralist interpretation. In giving Hitler a relatively passive role, with no suggestion that in the pre-war period he envisaged genocide, the historian clearly located the mechanism for a process of cumulative radicalisation within the Party structure itself.

Many candidates produced well developed answers which included these aspects. However, attempts to argue that the approach was anything other than structuralist indicated misreading of the extract. Something not noticed by weaker answers was that the extract focused on the pre-war period, and was therefore about the development of Jewish policy prior to the genocide. Some of these candidates even found themselves arguing for a functionalist approach on the basis that the extract showed little intent on Hitler's part. 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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Stalin was to blame for the Cold War because of the tensions created by his drive for security, but that the West should have reacted more firmly against this. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The crucial element in producing a successful answer was to perceive that aspects of blame were placed on both Stalin and on the West, but that the primary blame was on Stalin and the West's sins were merely ones of omission. In short, this was not a post-revisionist interpretation blaming both sides. Given how the West was portrayed in a fairly unflattering manner, seeing the approach as traditional was much less satisfactory than perceiving it as post-post revisionist, and there were many well argued responses that took this line.

However, the way in which the extract first portrayed Stalin as being concerned only with security and not seeking confrontation, and then shifted to arguing that he took the search for security too far, made some candidates less than sure about whether Stalin was being blamed or not. They then tended to retreat into a stereotyped view of Stalin as an ideologically driven expansionist, and missed the nuances in the interpretation.

This was another extract in which candidates' expectations of what the extract ought, in their view, to say got in the way of what it actually was saying. The point about the Allies being invited by Stalin into Hungary was so unexpected that it was very often misunderstood entirely, and the accuracy of what the extract said about Yalta and Potsdam was often questioned. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the origins of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/41
Depth Study 41

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question posed is critical in enabling candidates to access the higher mark levels.
- The strongest answers are consistently analytical and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations for events.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before choosing and writing is strongly advised.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489, and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

General comments

The majority of responses answered questions from **Section A**, particularly **Questions 1, 2 and 3**. Those who tackled **Section C** questions invariably answered **Questions 9 and 12**, with some responses to **Question 10** also seen. There were very few responses to **Section B** questions.

The best responses were fully analytical in approach and contained a clearly defined argument, well supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge in order to reach a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 9** where the strongest answers examined the reasons for the US response to the Cuban Revolution, provided examples and clearly explained how this then motivated Soviet support for Castro, leading to the Missile Crisis.

Centres should be aware that questions might be set on individual bullet points within the specification and ensure that candidates have enough knowledge on which to base an answer. It was evident in responses to **Question 1** that many candidates lacked sufficient grasp of Mussolini's policies towards youth and provided generalised comments on education and youth groups which lacked specific detail.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European history in the interwar years, 1919–41

1 Assess the impact of Mussolini's social policies on young people.

The focus of this question was on the impact on young people of social policies. The strongest responses kept a focus on policies which specifically related to young people, rather than discussing a variety of examples with an attempt to link them to youth. The latter approach, however, was common, with few candidates possessing detailed knowledge of the use of education and youth groups to mould the attitudes and characters of young people. When responses did address these examples, the material and analysis was often general in nature and lacked specific detail of policies and of their impact. It was common for candidates to discuss the control that Mussolini's regime took over education, with the goal of indoctrinating young people, and that this was successful. Some reflected on the attempt to tackle illiteracy and that teachers were forced to join the party. It was very rare, however, to read of the

architects of Fascist policy, such as Gentile and Bottai, or of the impact of policies on people of different ages, for instance those at university.

Some candidates were able to refer to the existence of youth groups with varying degrees of supporting knowledge, but many were not. Other examples provided which had some merit were policies towards the church and sport. Examples such as the Battle for Births, which was usually considered to be a great success, did not advance the argument very far. Although the scale of these policies allowed candidates to assert their success, it was rare for candidates to explain that collapse of support for Mussolini after 1941 suggested that young people were not sufficiently indoctrinated. This is an area that centres should focus on to ensure that candidates have sufficient depth of knowledge with which to tackle a question, rather than simply as part of a wider survey of social policies.

2 Evaluate the importance of propaganda in the Soviet Union in the period 1928–41.

The focus of this question was on the success of propaganda in allowing Stalin to establish his dictatorship and to maintain control over the Soviet Union in these years. It was not expected that candidates would make a direct comparison with other factors, although some of the best responses were able to link both economic policies and terror to the use of propaganda in order to evaluate it. Good answers were knowledgeable about the personality cult and were able to discuss methods and impact, although it is permissible for candidates to acknowledge that this is not always easy to measure in a totalitarian state.

There were responses that attempted to cover for a lack of knowledge on propaganda with detailed information on industrialisation and collectivisation, which did not fit the requirements of the question. However, better responses considered how propaganda was used to increase support for those policies, for example by considering the success of the Stakhanovite campaign. It was also possible to use the purges to assess how successfully propaganda was employed, and some candidates astutely argued that if propaganda had been successful, there would have been little need for such widespread repression. Commentary on the use of propaganda was often generalised in nature, with many candidates discussing the use of television. It was relatively rare for responses to include knowledgeable discussion of Socialist Realism in the arts.

3 Analyse the effectiveness of Nazi economic policy in dealing with the effects of the Great Depression.

Some of the best responses made clear from the outset what economic problems afflicted Germany in the early 1930s, and went on to discuss how they were dealt with and to what degree of success. Commonly, candidates identified unemployment as the most obvious issue, with various solutions offered. The majority of candidates, however, were unable to specify how high unemployment reached and the extent to which it had fallen by 1939. Many were able to introduce public works schemes as a major method, although few were able to refer to the autobahn network as a specific example. There was also a good deal of coverage of the RAD in providing employment, with the best informed candidates understanding who qualified. Rearmament and conscription were also offered as effective solutions, although precise details of numbers involved in either were fairly rare.

Candidates were less able to explain the limitations in Nazi policy, which might have included the debt built up by Schacht's use of deficit financing or that removing Jews and women from the workplace and counting part-time jobs as full-time were used to exaggerate the scale of the achievements. Some candidates discussed the extent to which living standards improved, which did not address the question directly, but did offer a counter-argument to Nazi success. There was some discussion of the policy, which often revolved around agricultural policy rather than industrial production. A common misconception, which has been highlighted in previous reports, is that inflation was a problem in Germany in the early 1930s, rather than deflation.

4 Analyse the problems facing the traditional industries in Britain in the inter-war period.

An understanding of the problems afflicting Britain's staple industries was required, with the best answers able to reach a conclusion on the relative significance of these challenges. Some responses identified examples of the traditional industries, such as coal mining, shipbuilding, iron, steel and textiles. There was generally a range of factors identified and explained. Common examples included the loss of trade markets during the First World War, which were then lost to rivals, although relatively few responses included an analysis of how a failure to invest in modern technology led to industries such as coal being less competitive than others, who were using state of the art machinery. Churchill's decision to return the

pound to the Gold Standard in 1925 which led to higher export prices was also cited by some candidates as a contributory factor. Another common example used was the General Strike, although a more convincing argument would have been to discuss the strength of trade unions and the impact of poor industrial relations more widely, rather than focusing on one, albeit notable, example. The Great Depression and the impact on international trade was also used, although a less convincing argument revolved around regional differences and the so-called north-south divide, which is perhaps more of a consequence of the decline of the traditional industries than a cause.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

There were insufficient responses to **Questions 5 to 8** for any comment on performance.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 ‘US reaction to the Cuban Revolution was the main cause of the Cuban Missile Crisis.’ Assess this view.

This was a popular question within this section of the paper and was generally well understood and answered. The question related to the causes of the Cuban Missile Crisis, with successful responses comparing the USA’s reaction to the Cuban Revolution of 1959 to other factors, most notably the Soviet role. Balance was also achieved by discussing the role of Castro. Care needed to be taken to ensure that answers did not become narrative descriptions of events and included sufficient analysis of causation. In assessing the US role, candidates tended to highlight the impact of the revolution on US interests in Cuba and to explore the policies carried out in its aftermath, for example the trade embargo and Bay of Pigs invasion. Many candidates argued that this was of primary importance, as Soviet support for Cuba, such as trading and military support, culminating in the placing of missiles on the island, were purely in response. A further argument was that Khrushchev used Cuba in order to neutralise the threat of nuclear missiles placed in Turkey and was using the situation to his own advantage.

10 Analyse how far the issue of Taiwan affected Sino–US relations during the Cold War.

Some candidates found this a challenging question, but some good responses were seen. It was expected that the focus would be on the impact of Taiwan on Sino-US relations, and successful responses were able to use examples to argue about the levels of tension produced, often varying in their analysis of the impact. A range of different events which also affected US-Sino relations were also included for balance, although this was not specifically required by the question.

11 Assess the extent to which Cold War tensions influenced the civil war in Mozambique.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 Assess the extent to which Jewish resistance to the British mandate contributed to the creation of the state of Israel in 1948.

This question focused on the causes of the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, requiring consideration of the role of Jewish resistance in comparison to other factors. This was a popular question within this section of the paper and it was often done reasonably well. The best answers tended to focus mainly on the crucial 1946–48 period and did not get too involved in the 1920s and 30s, which were relevant but should not have dominated the argument. Strong candidates were confident in discussing the actions of Haganah and Irgun, and were able to provide specific examples. Others were less certain in this area but were able to examine alternative explanations in more depth, with US support and its influence within the UN, British exhaustion at the end of the Second World War, and the impact of the Holocaust on world opinion all being considered fruitfully. The most successful analysis tended to explore how these factors interacted and to respond directly to the matter of the ‘extent’ to which the stated factor was significant in comparison to the alternatives.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/42
Depth Study 42

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question posed is critical in enabling candidates to access the higher mark levels.
- The strongest answers are consistently analytical and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations for events.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before choosing and writing is strongly advised.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489, and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

General comments

The majority of responses answered questions from **Section A**, particularly **Questions 1, 2 and 3**. Those who tackled **Section C** questions invariably answered **Questions 9 and 10**. There were very few responses to **Section B** questions.

The best responses were fully analytical in approach and contained a clearly defined argument, well supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge in order to reach a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 1** where the best responses explored the importance of the Catholic Church in Italian society and what steps Mussolini took to secure its support, before discussing alternative explanations, such as foreign policy successes, such as in Abyssinia.

Centres should be aware that questions might be set on individual bullet points within the specification and ensure that candidates have enough knowledge on which to base an answer. It was evident in responses to **Question 9** that many candidates lacked sufficient understanding of events in Berlin between 1958 and 1961 upon which to base an essay.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European history in the interwar years, 1919–41

- 1 ‘Maintaining good relations with the Catholic Church was the main reason for Mussolini’s popular support.’ Assess this view.**

This was a popular question and was often answered well. The focus of the question was on reasons for Mussolini’s support and the best responses took careful note of the reference to ‘popular’ in the question. To access the higher levels of the mark scheme required some attention to be paid to the stated factor of the Catholic Church, and many candidates were able to explain both its importance in Italian society and Mussolini’s policies towards it, such as the Lateran Treaty. Balance was achieved by exploring other reasons for support, of which foreign policy and propaganda were popular examples. Astute analysis suggested that the main reasons changed over time, with Mussolini’s promises and the unpopularity of Liberal governments counting for more in the early years. Candidates who discussed terror were perhaps stretching the concept of popularity somewhat.

2 Assess how far the economic conditions of workers improved in the Soviet Union in the period 1928–41.

This was a popular question, but many responses provided descriptions of industrialisation and collectivisation and did not address the question properly. Some candidates wanted to discuss how successful Stalin's economic policies were and did not consider the impact on the workers. The better responses were based on a balanced analysis of the outcomes of these policies for both urban and rural workers. Examples provided included the ready availability of work in the growing industrial centres, greater opportunities for promotion and training for productive workers, with many references made to the Stakhanovite movement, and also for women. This was weighed against poor working conditions and tight controls in the workplace. The latter sometimes drifted into detailed discussions of the purges, which were not necessarily relevant here. Some candidates showed awareness of the poor living conditions experienced by workers and discussed overcrowding, poor sanitation and lack of consumer products, but many lacked this knowledge. In the countryside, the impact of collectivisation was usually shown to be negative, with the famines and dekulakisation commonly discussed. Social improvements like healthcare and education were also valid here and some stronger responses included references to them.

3 'Reducing unemployment was the main aim of Nazi economic policy.' Discuss this view.

This was another popular question and responses were variable in quality. The question was on the aims of Nazi economic policy and the best responses maintained their focus, often arguing astutely that they varied over time, beginning with the battle against unemployment to meet Hitler's promises before turning towards rearmament, which was in fact always the main goal. Autarky was also commonly considered and good responses again often argued for its subordination towards military preparation. Weaker answers were hindered by a limited grasp of Nazi economic policy, for example relating autarky towards agriculture rather than industry. Common errors related to confusion between the economic problems facing Germany in 1923 and from 1929 onwards, a belief among some candidates that reparations continued to be paid after 1933, and a tendency among some to discuss social policies such as those towards young people.

4 Evaluate the reasons why the Labour Party was able to form two governments in the period 1919–31.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

There were insufficient responses to **Questions 5 to 8** for any comment on performance.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 Evaluate the extent to which the Berlin Crisis of 1958–61 led to increased tension between the United States and the Soviet Union.

There was a tendency among the candidates who answered this question towards confusion over events surrounding the Berlin Blockade, while others wrote a potted history of the Cold War generally. More successful answers remained focussed on the events of 1958–61, showing knowledge and analysis of their impact, were often unable to provide balance and focused for the most part on how tensions were increased. Knowledge of events was adequate at best and some candidates adopted a narrative structure that made higher AO2 marks difficult to secure.

10 Evaluate the consequences of the United States' failure in Vietnam.

There were a variety of responses to this question, with some candidates choosing to focus on the impact of failure in Vietnam purely on the US, both domestically and in terms of foreign policy. Better responses tended to have a wider focus and took into account the consequences for Superpower relationships and on Southeast Asia generally.

11 Assess the extent to which nationalist movements contributed to African nations gaining their independence.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 'Israel did not benefit from the Suez Crisis.' Assess this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/43
Depth Study 43

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question posed is critical in enabling candidates to access the higher mark levels.
- The strongest answers are consistently analytical and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations for events.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before choosing and writing is strongly advised.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489, and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

General comments

The majority of responses answered questions from **Section A**, namely **Questions 1, 2 and 3**. Those who tackled **Section C** questions invariably answered **Questions 9 and 10**. There were very few responses to **Section B** questions.

The best responses were fully analytical in approach and contained a clearly defined argument, well supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge in order to reach a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 1** where the strongest responses initially set out the aims of Mussolini's foreign policy as criteria on which to base judgements about success, before going on to explore various examples of success and failure. Most candidates understand how to structure essays and the need to provide a balanced argument.

As noted below, some candidates did not initially grasp the specific focus of **Question 9**; careful reading of the questions is essential to avoid such misunderstandings.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European history in the interwar years, 1919–41

1 Assess the success of Italian foreign policy in the period 1922–41.

A common approach to this question was to set out Mussolini's aims in his foreign policy as criteria on which to make a judgment against. These included the acquisition of personal prestige and support for Mussolini himself, empire-building and distracting from domestic problems. Some reached the conclusion that what success there was tended to be superficial and not long lasting. Another approach was to contrast periods of success in the 1920s and encompassing examples such as Locarno and Corfu with the failures of the 1930s, which ended with Italy's disastrous involvement in the Second World War. Some candidates were able to show knowledge of a range of examples, but tended to group them into success and failure without a sustained line of reasoning about overall success, and therefore scored more highly for AO1 than AO2.

2 'Stalin's fear of opposition was the main cause of the Great Terror.' Discuss this view.

A question which required knowledge of the causes of the purges was popular and drew some strong responses. Candidates who were confident about the nature of the potential sources of opposition to Stalin in these years were able to balance this argument well against alternatives. There was a good deal of discussion of the murder of Kirov as being the starting point and of the events of the Seventeenth Party Congress. The army was also identified as a threat to Stalin and led to material relating to the Purge of the Generals. For balance, some candidates competently explored the idea that the terror was driven 'from below' and other factors which were introduced included external threats, the need for cheap sources of labour, and the social instability caused by rapid industrial change. Less successful approaches became rather narrative and descriptive, leading to lower AO2 marks being awarded. Those candidates who focused on consequences rather than causes also did not score highly.

3 Evaluate the success of Nazi policies towards the Christian churches.

A sound understanding of Nazi policy towards the Christian churches was required and candidates needed to make a decision on what criteria they would base their analysis of success. The best AO2 marks were awarded to those who made judgements on the level of acquiescence among Germany's Christians and whether it was passive or active in nature. Responses which reached the highest levels for AO1 invariably discussed the regime's relationships with both Catholic and Protestant churches. The former was generally more common, with candidates often focusing on the Concordat and, in the best examples, how this agreement broke down and its consequences, such as Pope Pius XI's encyclical. There was also good knowledge shown of Galen's opposition to the T4 programme. Knowledge of the Protestant church was less secure, although stronger responses referred to the Reich Church and Müller and opposition through the Confessing Church and the likes of Bonhoeffer. Discussion of the impact of the German Faith Movement was also valid with the general consensus being that it was a failure. Weaker responses did not differentiate and discussed the Christian Church as one entity, often finding it difficult to decide upon criteria.

4 'Britain had largely recovered from the effects of the Great Depression by 1939.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

There were insufficient responses to **Questions 5 to 8** for any comment on performance.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 'Gorbachev ended the Cold War by causing the collapse of the Soviet system.' Assess this view.

This was a very popular question within this section of the paper. The focus here was on the causes of the ending of the Cold War, with Gorbachev's role in the collapse of the Soviet Union as the stated factor. Candidates who grasped this were able to explain how Gorbachev's policies, such as Glasnost and Perestroika, contributed, although the latter is often not clearly understood, before going on to discuss alternatives in order to construct a balanced argument. It was common to see good responses argue that economic collapse within the Soviet economy made both Gorbachev's reforms and his willingness to negotiate with the USA necessary. Discussion of the so-called Sinatra Doctrine also featured in many of the better responses. Reagan's hard-line approach towards the Cold War, for example SDI, was also credited as a significant influence on Gorbachev. Some candidates also considered Thatcher's role. Those responses which focused on reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union rather than the ending of the Cold War were less successful, and candidates are advised to take careful note of the precise wording of questions.

10 Analyse the reasons why the division of Korea led to war in 1950.

Along with **Question 9**, this was a popular question in **Section C**. Many of the responses to this question were well focused on the issues, often arguing that war was inevitable given the ideological differences and desire for unification within both North and South Korea. Balance was achieved through the introduction of alternatives, such as the developing Cold War, including the attitudes of Stalin and Mao, apparent initial American ambivalence towards Korea, and ultimate determination to uphold United Nations principles and to avoid a repetition of appeasement in the 1930s. Less successful approaches

included narratives of the course of the Kreen War, which did not address the terms of the question directly.

11 ‘The United Nations failed in Somalia because it underestimated the scale of its task.’ Assess this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 ‘Saddam Hussain’s hostility towards the Iranian Revolution was the main cause of the Iran–Iraq War.’ Assess this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.