

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/11 Document Question</p>
--

Key messages

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both part questions. In **part (a)** evidence from the sources should be given to support the comparison being made and quotations should be precisely selected. Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments and should be avoided.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the prompt. The argument should be explained rather than asserted and the response should focus on the question.
- 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.
- In **part (a)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to explain the similarities and differences between them. Commentaries on utility or reliability are not relevant unless they are used for explanation, together with contextual detail.
- 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 argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they contribute to the evaluation of the source in context.

General comments

Many responses showed good comprehension of the sources and demonstrated understanding that the **part (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 prompt. Most responses made effective use of source content to provide relevant quotations to support comparisons or to explain whether the sources supported or challenged the statement in the question. Some responses did not select precise detail to evidence their arguments and included fragments of quotations with ellipses. To be relevant, comparisons need to be based on an inference which is relevant to the question. Word matching, for example in **Question 1(a)** pointing out that both sources used the word 'excuse', is not making a valid comparison.

In each of the **part (a)** questions, candidates were required to identify and explain similarities and differences between two sources; in **Question 1(a)** the focus was about the strength of Prussia, in **Question 2(a)** the question required comparisons on the decision-making of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, and in **Question 3(a)** the question asked candidates to make comparisons about Hitler's attitude towards Britain. In response to **Question 2(a)** many candidates focused on reactions to the Dred Scott judgement rather than the decision-making of the Court. This was also seen in **Question 1(a)**, although to a lesser extent, where some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which were focused on Napoleon III rather than the strength of Prussia. Weaker responses often asserted similarities or differences which were not like for like or simply wrote about source content or the provenance.

Although most responses showed good awareness of the topic, some lacked the contextual understanding which would have enabled a more thorough use of the sources. Knowledge is also key to achieving marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)** knowledge is required to explain why the sources are similar or different. However, responses often contained comments about the reliability of the sources based on the attribution statement instead. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. Effective responses understood that these evaluative comments must be linked to the question to be relevant. These responses considered whether contextual knowledge supported the claims made in the sources and therefore could develop a position about value.

Many responses addressed **part (b)** first. The assessment is structured to be helpful to candidates. By focusing on two sources, **part (a)** is designed to help the candidates ease themselves into the sources and the topic before moving onto **part (b)** which requires work on all four sources.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European option: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815 – 1871

Question 1

- (a) **Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these sources as evidence of the strength of Prussia.**

For comparisons to be effective it was essential that inferences were made about the strength of Prussia. Simply comparing details in the sources without explaining what they showed about the strength of Prussia was not enough. One of the most frequently seen comparisons was that both sources suggested that Prussia was strong. The point about Prussia having a '*superior military system*' in Source B was matched against the idea that Bismarck was ready for war in Source C or that Prussia had '*become great*'. The most frequently seen difference was about whether Prussia was strong enough to win a war against France. Source B was ambivalent and stated that the two sides were '*evenly matched*'. However, in Source C Bismarck showed great confidence of victory with the comment '*We shall win.*' A few responses demonstrated specific contextual knowledge and understood Bismarck's comments about manoeuvring Napoleon III out of territory at the end of the war against Austria. Weaker responses sometimes resulted from making general comparisons of the sources and focusing on France rather than Prussia.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. 'Napoleon III was to blame for the war between France and Prussia.' How far do the sources agree?**

There was evidence of effective source use in many responses to this question. Source A was generally identified as a support source. Responses explained that Napoleon's depiction as a wolf showed that he was the aggressor and Bismarck merely the defender of the German states. A few answers argued that Bismarck was being careless with the sheep, and some went so far as to blame him for unleashing a '*stampede of sheep*'. Source B, on the other hand, was a challenge source, although some responses tried to argue that it was neutral or had nothing to do with who was being blamed for the war. The most effective answers understood that the source blamed both sides. They argued that '*an excuse can always be found*' suggested that both sides were spoiling for a fight. Source C was also argued as a support source, responses pointing out that Bismarck's comments that war '*will be forced upon us by the French Emperor*' or that '*he will use some excuse for picking a quarrel with us.*' However, a small group of candidates understood that this source could also be used to challenge as Bismarck had outmanoeuvred Napoleon over territory and this may have made him keen to seek revenge. Many candidates were familiar with the story of the Ems telegram told by Bismarck in Source D. Most understood that Bismarck was to blame for altering the telegram with the intention of provoking France and so argued the source as a challenge.

Section B: American Option: The origins of the Civil War, 1820 – 1861

Question 2

- (a) **Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast the views in these sources as evidence about the Supreme Court's decision-making in the Dred Scott case.**

The most frequently explained similarity was that both sources agreed that many people thought the Supreme Court had no right to rule in the Dred Scott case. However, some responses misrepresented the argument of Source C and suggested that both sources agreed that the judgement was unlawful. While this could be supported from Source B, in Source C Lincoln described the case as *'lawfully settled'*. Another valid similarity was that both sources showed that the decision-making was biased in some way. Source B argued that the judges were slaveholders and that *'determined their ruling.'* Source C also suggested vested interests playing a part in the decision with the Democrats doing what they could to win over the Chief Justice and *'increase the influence of their party'*. It was also possible to argue a difference around these ideas. Source B argued that *'Slavery not politics'* influenced the decision. On the other hand, Lincoln argued that politics was to blame for the decision saying that *'the decision (was) a purely political one'*. A minority of answers were less effective because of a lack of focus on the question. These compared the sources as evidence about the reaction to, or impact of, the decision. Many responses added a discussion of reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question. In some instances, contextual knowledge was limited and responses claimed that President Lincoln was a reliable source of evidence even though his speech was made in 1858.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that the Dred Scott decision would finally settle the issue of slavery?**

There were several one-sided answers to this question which only included challenge arguments. Stronger responses were able to offer both challenge and support arguments. Source A could be used on both sides of the argument. Southerners were delighted that *'the issue is now settled forever in their favour'*, a view which was glumly accepted by the newspaper, and this was argued as a support. On the challenge side, the source also claimed that slavery was not settled and was now *'the major political issue of our time.'* Source B was used as a challenge source and responses often pointed out that the source claimed the Dred Scott decision had *'lit a fire'* and had *'shocked the moral sense of the great majority of the people in the North'*. Source C could be used on both sides of the argument. Although Lincoln did not like the judgement, he agreed the issue was *'lawfully settled'* and would likely spread slavery. This could be explained as supporting the prompt. However, Lincoln also said that he would continue to *'vote peacefully only for those who think the decision wrong'* which implied that the issue was far from settled. Most responses understood that Source D was a challenge source, the judges may have thought they had settled the issue but in a few years, new judges would be in the Court and the speaker foresaw *'the seeds of future conflict'*. Some tried to argue the source as a support but missed the scepticism of the speaker. Some weaker responses were not focused on the question and wrote about whether the sources agreed with the Dred Scott decision.

Section C: International Option: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

Question 3

- (a) **Read Source C and Source D. How far do Sources C and D agree about Hitler's attitude to Britain?**

Both sources suggested that Hitler had a positive attitude towards the British Empire or admired the strength of Britain. In Source C, Hitler admired a small country which had taken over *'a large part of the world'* and in Source D Hitler commented that the *'British Empire is of importance to mankind'*, also suggesting admiration. Another similarity was that Hitler would like to secure peace with Britain. Some responses tried to argue that Hitler had a positive attitude towards Britain in both sources, but this was not valid as Source D contained negative sentiments. When considering differences, many noted that while Hitler's view was hopeful of achieving peace in Source C, Source D doubted this, arguing that *'Britain will always oppose Germany'*. It was also possible to argue a difference in attitude towards the Empire. Although Source C was admiring, Source D commented that Britain had used *'brutal force'* to achieve control over the colonies.

(b) Read all of the sources. 'Hitler wanted peace.' How far do the sources support this statement?

Source A was correctly used as a challenge source in many answers, with candidates recognising the argument that Hitler wanted peace for ten years, but only so that he could strengthen Germany to *'engage their rivals one by one'*. Source B was also offered a challenge and gave a similar argument to Source A. Several responses misunderstood the details of the cartoon and argued that the figure which represented Germany was Hitler, missing that he was portrayed separately in the second picture. Source C could be used on both sides of the argument and strong responses noted that although Hitler wanted peace with Britain, a support argument, he also wanted to destroy communism which challenged the idea that he wanted peace. Source D could also be argued as a support and challenge source. Again, Hitler wanted peace with Britain and would *'never rob a state of its rightful possessions'*. Responses generally did not demonstrate the contextual knowledge to point out the irony of this comment in relation to recent developments in Czechoslovakia and the Polish Guarantee. On the other hand, Hitler also promised an extreme reaction should Germany be attacked. While many responses recognised the nuance in at least one of the sources, few demonstrated contextual knowledge and wrote generic comments, for example about Ribbentrop being unreliable as he was on trial.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/12 Document Question</p>
--

Key messages

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both part questions. In **part (a)** evidence from the sources should be given to support the comparison being made and quotations should be precisely selected. Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments and should be avoided.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the prompt. The argument should be explained rather than asserted and the response should focus on the question.
- 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.
- In **part (a)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to explain the similarities and differences between them. Commentaries on utility or reliability are not relevant unless they are used for explanation, together with contextual detail.
- 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 argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they contribute to the evaluation of the source in context.

General comments

Most responses showed a good understanding of the requirements of the assessment and demonstrated understanding that the **part (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 view in the question. Many responses used evidence from the content of the source and provided relevant quotations or paraphrases to support the comparison or explain whether the sources supported or challenged the view in question. Some responses included fragments of quotations with ellipses from the start and end of sentences which did not select and deploy the precise detail needed to strongly evidence their arguments.

In each of the **part (a)** questions, candidates were required to identify and explain similarities and differences between two sources; in **Question 1(a)** the focus was evidence about Bismarck's involvement in the Franco-Prussian War, in **Question 2(a)** evidence about Wilmot's reasons for introducing the Proviso, and in **Question 3(a)** comparing and contrasting evidence about the Non-Intervention Committee and intervention in the Spanish Civil War. For **Question 1(a)** some responses were not focused on Bismarck's involvement, but focused on the war in general, or the actions of the king. This was also notable in **Question 3(a)** where some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question but instead focused on the Spanish Civil War in general rather than specific details related to intervention. Weaker responses across the options asserted similarities or differences which were not comparable or simply wrote about the provenance.

Although most responses showed good awareness of the topic, some lacked the contextual understanding which would have enabled a more thorough use of the sources. Knowledge is also key to achieving marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)** knowledge is required to explain why the sources are similar or different. However, responses often contained comments about the reliability of the sources based on the attribution statement instead. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence and effective responses understood that these evaluative comments must be linked to the question to be relevant. These responses considered whether contextual knowledge supported the claims made in the sources and therefore could develop a position about value.

Many responses addressed **part (b)** first. The assessment is structured to be helpful to candidates. By focusing on two sources, **part (a)** is designed to help the candidates ease themselves into the sources and the topic before moving onto **part (b)** which requires work on all four sources.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European option

Question 1

- (a) **Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Bismarck's involvement in the Franco-Prussian War.**

Most responses identified relevant similarities between the sources; for the most part these focused on Bismarck's commitment to the bombardment in both sources. However, there was some misunderstanding of Bismarck's attitude to the bombardment of Paris in source B, and candidates' reasoning for the need for this strategy. Many responses identified valid differences with the sources, with most candidates identifying the difference of portrayal of Bismarck's involvement with the king. However, some responses compared the sources as a whole without taking care to focus specifically on evidence about Bismarck and instead focused the actions of the king or Moltke. To make effective use of knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources, and it was pleasing to see some candidates using their knowledge of the chronology of the war and the formation of the French Government of National Defence after the defeat at Sedan to develop their explanations.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. 'France was defeated easily.' How far do the sources agree?**

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Source A was identified as a support source, with many candidates identifying Prussia's superior resources, and the lack of support for France from other European powers. Sources B and C were both used to challenge, both containing evidence of French resistance and the war not being as straightforward for Prussia as it might have seemed. However, the nuance in source C was less well identified. Source D was recognised as challenge source, with many responses showing good knowledge of Moltke, but which were less confident of using the provenance in unison with this knowledge to evaluate the source. The most effective responses were able to harness knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. In weaker responses attempts at evaluation were quite general, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable without any links to the context or the question. Some of these also described the source content without making a clear link to the question.

Section B: American Option

Question 2

- (a) **Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Wilmot's reasons for introducing the Proviso.**

Most responses dealt with this question very well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. Most responses offered support from the sources to explain and develop their points and remained focused on Wilmot's reasons for introducing the Proviso. However, there were some responses which attempted to include wider detail of the context of popular sovereignty, which distracted their focus from identifying valid similarities and differences. Some responses did not provide relevant material from both sources to support their comparison or provided the first and last word from a sentence as a truncated version of evidence. This was not sufficient as it does not provide the precise detail needed.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. How far do the sources agree that the main impact of the Proviso would be changes to American political parties?**

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the view that the main impact of the Proviso would be changes to American political parties. Source A was argued in support of the view, with some good knowledge demonstrated of the position of the Northern Whigs. Source C was also a support source, and many candidates identified the potential consequence of dividing the Northern and Southern Democrats and its view that it might 'destroy the Whigs'. Source B was also used effectively to challenge the view with many candidates identifying the 'constitutional crisis we all fear'. Some candidates found source D more difficult to use to challenge, as, although many identified the profound constitutional issues which were its main focus, several were distracted by the sub-message about the 'public mind' on the issue of enslavement and lost some focus. The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less valuable when answering the question. Many responses demonstrated some contextual knowledge, for example, concerning sectional division in Congress or free-soil ideology, but few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. In weaker responses attempts at evaluation were quite general, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable without any links to the context or the question. Some of these also described the source content without making a clear link to the question.

Section C: International Option

Question 3

- (a) **Read Source A and Source B. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Non-Intervention Committee and intervention in the Spanish Civil War.**

Most candidates were able to recognise similarities in the sources, with many candidates identifying joint attitudes to communism, the considerable intervention which was undertaken and ineffectual nature of the London committee and differences including Hitler's motives for intervention. To make effective use of contextual knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. Some responses added a stand-alone discussion of the provenance and reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question. Some responses did not have secure knowledge about the committee itself and its remit, and the nature of the intervention by Germany and Italy, which led to attempts to compare details on face value.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. 'Germany and Italy developed a strong bond after 1936.' How far do the sources support this view?**

Most responses engaged with the sources to offer support and challenge for the view that Germany and Italy developed a strong bond after 1936. Source A was used well by candidates as a support source, although some responses were preoccupied by personal comments from Ribbentrop rather than statements which supported his ambassadorial role. Source B was also used effectively and several responses used wider contextual knowledge of the Hoare-Laval pact in their consideration of the source. Most candidates successfully used source C's depiction of the two leaders to both support and challenge, with good use being made of wider knowledge to evaluate the different messages within the source. Source D from Ciano was generally used well to challenge the view, and wider knowledge of the Nazi-Soviet pact was deployed effectively to substantiate Ciano's position. Some stronger responses used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. Many responses attempted to consider the authorship of the sources and commented on reliability, but this did not add to the evaluation effectively. These focused on Ribbentrop's writing of his memoirs while on trial for war crimes, without reflecting on his position in 1936 as Ambassador to Britain with close contact with the London Committee. Provenance of each of the sources must be taken together with contextual detail to weigh up how far the source supports the view, considering the contextual knowledge to inform substantiated judgements of the source material.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/13 Document Question</p>
--

Key messages

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both part questions. In **part (a)** evidence from the sources should be given to support the comparison being made and quotations should be precisely selected. Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments and should be avoided.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the prompt. The argument should be explained rather than asserted and the response should focus on the question.
- 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.
- In **part (a)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to explain the similarities and differences between them. Commentaries on utility or reliability are not relevant unless they are used for explanation, together with contextual detail.
- 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 argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they contribute to the evaluation of the source in context.

General comments

Most responses showed a good understanding of the requirements of the assessment and demonstrated understanding that the **part (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 view in the question. Many responses used evidence from the content of the source and provided relevant quotations or paraphrases to support the comparison or explain whether the sources supported or challenged the view in question. Some responses included fragments of quotations with ellipses from the start and end of sentences which did not select and deploy the precise detail needed to strongly evidence their arguments.

In each of the **part (a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons based on evidence about Prussia's position in Germany for **Question 1(a)**, comparing sources as evidence about Douglas' support for the Kansas-Nebraska Act in **Question 2(a)** and comparing evidence about Germany's decision to leave the Disarmament Conference in **Question 3(a)**. To be valid, the points of comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and relates to the question. Some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question and discussed wider concerns, sometimes led by approaching the sources by answering **part (b)** first. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable or simply wrote about the provenance.

Although most responses showed good awareness of the topic, some lacked the contextual understanding which would have enabled a more thorough use of the sources. Knowledge is also key to achieving marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)** knowledge is required to explain why the sources are similar or different. However, responses often contained comments about the reliability of the sources based on the attribution statement instead. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks required evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence and effective responses understood that these evaluative comments must be linked to the question to be relevant. These considered whether contextual knowledge supported the claims made in the sources and therefore could develop a position about value.

Many responses addressed **part (b)** first. The assessment is structured to be helpful to candidates. By focusing on two sources, **part (a)** is designed to help the candidates ease themselves into the sources and the topic before moving onto **part (b)** which requires work on all four sources.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European option

Question 1

- (a) **Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Prussia's position in Germany.**

Most responses identified valid similarities between the sources, with most candidates identifying that both sources supported the idea that it would benefit Prussia's position in Germany to ally with Austria, and many candidates identified that both sources suggested there was hostility and tension towards Prussia from the German states. Most responses also identified relevant differences between the sources which included Austria's position towards Prussia and points of difference concerning the assessment of superior power between both states. To make effective use of knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant contextual details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. This was often general rather than specific to the question, and many responses attempted discussions of reliability of sources which is not necessary in **part (a)**. Stronger responses used specific contextual detail together with the provenance to explain the reasons for similarities and differences.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. 'Prussia pursued a hostile policy towards Austria.' How far do the sources agree?**

Many candidates gave organised responses to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Source A was used to support the view with candidates identifying clear evidence about Bismarck's idea of the inevitability of war with Austria 'sooner or later' to support their arguments. Source B was a nuanced source which could be used for either or both sides of the argument if read closely, as it described a change of policy for security against France. Source C was a clear challenge to the view, with the details of the 'strong alliance' used well by candidates. Source D supported the idea that Prussia always intended to fight Austria to establish its dominance over Germany – 'a struggle long foreseen and calmly prepared for'. However, many responses included detailed information about Moltke and his endeavours without due reflection on the dating of the source and its role in constructing his own reputation.

To access the higher levels in the mark scheme, candidates should consider whether their contextual knowledge and the nature, purpose, motive or audience of the source has a positive or negative impact on its value as evidence in relation to the statement in question. The strongest responses effectively evaluated the sources on this basis, while in weaker responses attempts to evaluate were general, often simply stating that the source was biased or unreliable.

Section B: American Option

Question 2

- (a) **Read Source C and Source D. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Douglas's support for the Kansas–Nebraska Act**

Most responses dealt with this question very well and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Most responses identified several relevant similarities and differences between the sources, including the similarities of Douglas's own self-interest including presidential ambitions and business interests, and the differences surrounding the principles of the Compromise of 1850 being upheld or not. Weaker responses did not explain the similarities and differences using their specific contextual knowledge.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. How far do the sources agree that the main reason for opposition to the Kansas–Nebraska Act was hostility to slavery?**

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Source A was a clear challenge source with Aitcheson opposing the Act, not because of his hostility to slavery but for what it could lead to in terms of the abolitionists. On the other side, Source B was confidently used as a support source by most candidates, who clearly interpreted opposition to slavery and the possibility that the Act was 'forcing slavery down the throats' of States which wished to remain free. Source C was a nuanced source, and many responses identified that while mostly supporting the view, it also contained suggestions that there were those who opposed the Act because they saw it as a ploy by Douglas to further his own ambitions. Source D was a challenge source, which also highlighted Douglas acting on his own interests, but most clearly underlined the political reasons for opposition.

Section C: International option

Question 3

- (a) Read Source B and Source D. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Germany's decision to leave the Disarmament Conference.**

Most responses identified valid similarities between the sources, with most candidates identifying that both sources supported the idea that Hitler took a central role in proceedings and that Germany left the Disarmament conference because of perceived unfairness and the restrictive terms. Many responses also identified the similarity that both sources indicated that the decision to leave the League of Nations took place at the same time. Most responses identified relevant differences between the sources which included contrasts in Hitler's motives, and to what extent this was a joint or individual decision. To make effective use of knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant contextual details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. While many responses had relevant and specific knowledge, this was not generally well targeted in explaining the reasons for similarities and differences, and in some cases took the form of long introductions or attempts to infer reliability of the sources which is not necessary in **part (a)**.

- (b) Read all of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that Germany wanted agreement on the issue of armaments?**

Most responses engaged with the sources to offer support and challenge to the view that Germany wanted agreement on the issue of armaments. There was clear scope in Source A to support and challenge with a wealth of detail from the illustration to identify the Allies' failure to follow the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles and Hitler's claims that they had dishonoured their pledge. However, Hitler's heavily armed depiction also gave the opportunity to challenge to the sincerity of that position. Source B could have also been used for both sides, evidencing long discussions by the German delegation but also underlining that Germany had then 'banged the door' on talks. Source C was a clear challenge with a straightforward discussion of German tactics and motives with a conclusion that Germany was determined to rearm and was not interested in other countries cutting down their armaments. The strongest responses used wider knowledge of American foreign policy at this time to evaluate the source's opinions in context. Source D gave clear support that 'an agreement on equality of armaments between Germany and the rest of Europe' was sought by the German government. Some weaker responses sought to highlight Ribbentrop's unreliability without explaining the reasons why he was motivated to minimise any responsibility he had in leaving the talks, or the nature of his role and likely knowledge of Nazi strategy or planning, including his involvement of negotiating the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/21
Outline Study

Key messages

- **Part (a)** questions require explanation as to why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show understanding of the connections between causes to 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 should note and act on any timeframe given in the question.
- Having a good understanding of the chronology of key events is important as this will help candidates to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.

General comments

In **Part (a)** the questions are about causation and stronger responses included good knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific course of action as adopted, or event happened. The strongest responses had a clear focus on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a good range of factors, showing how they were connected. Weaker responses tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. These were often characterised by factual inaccuracy or a confused chronology.

In **Part (b)** strong responses demonstrated understanding that historical issues can be interpreted in many ways, while other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses included narrative accounts of the topic with implicit reference to the question focus. Others included some relevant arguments based on a limited range and depth of factual support. The weakest responses tended to misconstrue the question demand and were characterised by factual inaccuracy or assertion. In several of these responses the time frame of the question was also ignored.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why Napoleon was able to establish order in France after 1799.

Stronger responses were able to provide several reasons for why Napoleon was able to establish order, showing a good level of understanding. Many were able to explain for example, how Napoleon created a positive image for himself through propaganda or his military successes or argued that after the troubled history of the Directory and Robespierre, Napoleon represented stability. Some stronger responses were also seen that considered the role played by the Concordat set against the background of prior religious resistance. To achieve the highest level, these answers could have been improved by showing connections between the factors. Weaker responses were able to identify reasons, but were unable to support these statements, for example by saying that he had been a good leader as First Consul but without providing evidence such as the financial reforms or Napoleonic Code.

(b) To what extent were Robespierre and the Jacobins responsible for political instability in France in the period 1790–1794?

Some good responses were seen to this question, with many candidates able to provide a balanced argument. When considering the role of Robespierre and the Jacobins, stronger answers considered the chaos caused by the Reign of Terror, and the religious discontent caused by the introduction of the Cult of the Supreme Being. Weaker responses were aware of the executions and use of the guillotine but did not show how this caused political instability. Some good responses were seen that considered the actions of the King, particularly the impact of the Flight to Varennes. Fewer responses considered other factors such as the war with Austria, the weakness of the 1791 constitution or the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Additionally, when engaging with other factors, several responses strayed into the pre-1790 period, especially when discussing Louis XVI, for example his actions leading to the Tennis Court Oath. Others referred to the storming of the Bastille, which also did not fall into the ambit of the dates and was not relevant. Many conclusions adopted a summative rather than comparative approach.

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

(a) Explain why cooperative societies began to develop after 1800.

Some good responses were seen to this question, but many showed a limited understanding of what cooperative societies were, often confusing them with trade unions or general acts of mutual support. As a result, these were vague or descriptive, focusing on poverty or industrial hardship without linking these to the formation of cooperatives. Often responses would mention the harsh realities of industrial life, including long working hours, low wages, and unsafe environments, but would not go further to explain how these conditions motivated workers to come together and form cooperative societies in their quest to find solutions for their problems. Stronger responses were able to draw that essential link, recognising that the workers' struggles led them to seek collective solutions and mutual support systems. These responses correctly identified that through unity and shared resources people began establishing cooperative societies as a means to improve their economic and social well-being.

(b) 'The main cause of industrial growth was the slave trade.' How far do you agree?

Whilst there was broad awareness of the topic of slavery, many responses did not engage directly with the specific role of the slave trade in driving industrial growth. Stronger responses recognised that the raw cotton produced through slave labour was exported to Britain, where it was processed in textile factories therefore providing essential input for one of the major industries driving the Industrial Revolution. Some responses also explained the role that slavery played through the investing of profits from the slave trade into industrial development. Many responses were more confident discussing alternative causes of industrial growth, such as the Agricultural Revolution and population growth, access to coal and iron and technological innovations like the steam engine and spinning jenny. These sections often included clear, relevant examples and were generally stronger than the sections addressing the slave trade. Weaker responses were often able to identify or describe the causes of industrial growth, but did not include assessment since the descriptions did not show how the factor led to industrial growth. Additionally, a significant number of weaker responses misunderstood the concept of the slave trade, with many incorrectly stating that slaves were working in British factories and directly contributing to industrial growth.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why Witte's industrial reforms were a success.

Stronger responses remained focused on Witte's role and the specific outcomes of his industrial policies, such as the rapid expansion of the railway network, the growth of heavy industry, and the use of foreign investment to modernise the Russian economy. In contrast, weaker responses tended to offer a general description of Russian industry or agriculture without linking back to Witte or the idea of 'success'. Other responses confused Witte with Stolypin, leading to discussions of agricultural reform and repression, which were not relevant to this question. Some weaker responses listed reforms or described the state of the Russian economy without analysis or supporting evidence.

(b) 'Lenin's leadership was the reason for Bolshevik success in October 1917.' How far do you agree?

Stronger responses focused on Lenin's leadership qualities, including his decisive actions, persuasive speeches and the appeal of slogans such as '*peace, bread and land*', effectively linking these to Bolshevik popularity and revolutionary momentum. Many also recognised Lenin's strategic timing of the revolution. When considering alternative perspectives, many gave significant attention to Trotsky's role in organising the Red Guard and leading the seizure of power. Other responses explained the failures of the Provisional Government and to a lesser extent, the Kornilov Revolt, and how these events helped the Bolsheviks to gain weapons and, in turn, seize power in October 1917. The most effective responses engaged in evaluative discussion, weighing Lenin's leadership against other factors such as Trotsky's organisational skills or the broader dissatisfaction with the Provisional Government. Weaker responses tended to be overly descriptive, focusing on social conditions and popular discontent rather than the political context or Lenin's leadership. The most common error seen were responses that considered the reason for Bolshevik victory in the Civil War which was not relevant.

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

Question 4: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why by 1864 the Union had changed its strategy to a war of attrition.

Strong responses had a clear understanding of what the war of attrition was, although weaker responses often confused it with the Anaconda Plan. Successful approaches had a strong understanding of the reasons for the change and were able to state the reason and then explain the significance of this decision. These responses remained focused on the question and had strong conclusions supporting the factors, and many were also able to successfully link factors together. Common factors considered were the slow progress of the Anaconda plan, coupled with the failures of generals such as McLellan and the resulting appointment of Ulysses Grant, the Emancipation proclamation and the Union's strong supplies of men and equipment, all of which were explained in such a way that clearly demonstrated that this change was to end the war swiftly. Weaker responses often either described the war of attrition without explaining why it was introduced or correctly identified the reasons without providing a sufficiently developed answer to show why it was necessary.

(b) How far do you agree that the main aim of Radical Reconstruction was to rebuild the Southern economy?

There were some strong responses to this question while less effective ones did not focus on Radical Reconstruction, instead providing a narrative account of the whole reconstruction period, or general reasons for why reconstruction was necessary after the end of the Civil War. Strong responses often argued that sharecropping, or industrialisation of the South, was a way of fixing the economy, or showed understanding of the economic benefits brought by Radical Reconstruction such as the improvements to infrastructure such as railroads. Weaker responses only stated the negatives of sharecropping with little support. Attempts at balance were often successful, with arguments centred around the desire for punishment of the south through implementation of the Force Acts and military occupation. Many responses also considered the wish to help African Americans through the introduction of the Amendments – these arguments were usually handled with clarity and understanding. Weaker responses lacked focus on Radical Reconstruction, with answers discussing the motives for Lincoln's 10 per cent plan, or Johnson's aims.

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

(a) Explain why successive US governments took little action to limit private corporations.

Strong responses focused directly on the importance of large corporations and the influence of captains of industry to the US economy and the resultant lack of will to interfere with this. Many were also able to identify the belief in laissez-faire or the fundamental American principle of freedom from unfair taxation or meddling government. Some answers explained that the philanthropy of the captains of industry also made US governments reluctant to take action. Other valid explanations considered the corrupt nature of the relationship between big business and the government. A successful approach taken in a few responses was to show how the above factors very clearly linked to one another, since the profits generated by those large corporations meant that, not only were large corporations driving the US economy; but the robber barons were able

repaint themselves as captains of industry through their philanthropic endeavours, and influence politics with their unlimited capital. Weaker responses often went beyond the date range of the topic into the late 1920s, for example discussing the presidency of Hoover, especially in the wake of the Great Crash. Other responses were able to describe or identify factors but were unable to give any examples of this for an explanation.

(b) How important were the railroads to the industrialisation of the USA?

This question required candidates to consider both how railroads contributed to the industrialisation of the USA, and how other factors befitted industrialisation in order to provide balance. Stronger responses made links to how railroads facilitated the speedy and efficient transportation of raw materials and manufactured goods, thus contributing to industrialisation. This was particularly important for heavy bulky goods like coal, iron ore and manufactured steel. The rapid construction of railroads also served to connect all regions of the US to a national market, providing manufacturing companies with the facility to sell to a nationwide market. Valid counterarguments referenced the importance of technological innovations, a common example being the Bessemer Converter used by Carnegie in the steel industry, with stronger responses making direct links to how the mass production of steel enabled the rapid spread of railroads, thus facilitating industrialisation. Another factor explained was the importance of electricity, particularly the invention of the lightbulb which enabled factories to operate at night. Reference was sometimes made to immigration, but this was often not well developed, failing to link the supply of relatively cheap labour to the expansion of factory work. Weaker responses confused 'industrialisation' with the general growth of the economy and the development of consumerism. These responses often provided generalised discussion of what railroads were used for without showing how this helped industrialisation. Other responses provided comment which was both outside of the timeframe of the topic and after the period of industrialisation of the USA, for example arguing that large numbers of urban workers used the railroads to commute to the factories. Some less effective responses did not develop a counterargument.

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

(a) Explain why many banks failed after the Great Crash.

Stronger responses were able to clearly explain that the crash was caused by unregulated banks who were therefore able to use patron's money in speculations which was subsequently lost during the Great Crash. Other explanations considered the nature of the bank runs, whereby people withdrew as many savings as they could, causing the banks to fail. Consideration of this factor was usually supported by evidence suggesting that regional banks were small and did not have reserves, which were further compounded by the lack of support from the federal reserve. Weaker responses were more generalised and descriptive, for example by describing at length the speculation and buying on the margin that was occurring prior to the Great Crash, but without making this relevant by linking it to the failure of the banks. Other weaker responses lacked focus, instead explaining how Roosevelt helped the banks recover through the bank holidays, which was outside of the question focus.

(b) 'Roosevelt won the 1936 presidential election because he was seen as the champion of the "have-nots".' How far do you agree?

Some strong responses were seen to this question, but several also misread the question and discussed the 1932 election. Arguments that were based in 1936 were able to consider Roosevelt's actions through the New Deal and the benefits that had been brought to voters, for example through the alphabet agencies, and how his positive record increased his support, leading to his subsequent re-election. Candidates were also able to show how his fireside chats had also created a positive view of him, encouraging people to vote for him. Assessment of the alternative perspectives was generally less effective, with few responses able to assess the weakness of his opponents, for example through the death of Huey Long and the ineffective campaigning of Landon. Some responses were seen that contained an alternative but valid argument that it was not only the 'have-nots' who voted for Roosevelt, but the entire American country due to the economic changes he had made. Weaker responses showed understanding of the period, but missed the focus of the question, writing extensively about the 1932 election. These responses contained comparisons between Hoover and Roosevelt through explanations of Hoover's laissez-faire policies compared to Roosevelt's hands on approach and promises during his campaign.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

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

(a) Explain why there was a conference of European powers in Berlin in 1884–85

Stronger responses were able to explain why the ‘Scramble for Africa’ led to the Berlin Conference, usually highlighting the need for regulating European powers’ claims to lands in Africa so that conflict would be lessened and the consequential risk of a European War was reduced. Another common explanation concerned linking the growth of interest in acquiring colonies in Africa with having to set rules for future expansion there. Economic resources of raw materials – such as diamonds, gold and copper – and possible markets for European goods were usually selected evidence in support. A less popular explanation concerned the motives behind the Conference from German merchants and industrialists who wanted to gain openings to African resources and markets. Weaker responses identified some of the relevant factors concerning the ‘Scramble for Africa’ without necessary supporting knowledge.

(b) To what extent had the USA abandoned an isolationist foreign policy by 1914?

The strongest responses provided balanced arguments with a good range of supporting evidence. These responses were able to show how USA did abandon its isolationist foreign policy by 1914 with detailed explanations of the Spanish American War in 1898 and the resulting acquisition of Spanish territories such as Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines, in addition to the Spanish withdrawal from Cuba. In addition, the more imperialist influence of Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt was assessed in connection with the Panama Canal Project or the expansion of the US navy. Sometimes, other evidence in support of abandoning isolation was shown by the push for Asian markets in China, especially in connection with the ‘Open Door Policy’ and the American involvement in putting down the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. Balancing evidence to show why isolation was not necessarily abandoned was much less common in responses. The main reason to show this was that USA did not enter World War One in 1914 as President Wilson saw no benefits for America to enter a European conflict, and this was supported by many Americans. Candidates also demonstrated knowledge on the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine to preserve their commercial and economic interests in the Americas and ward off European powers that threatened this. Weaker responses were characterised by narratives of events with little reference to the question focus. Usually this was a description of the events leading to the Spanish American War in 1898 or of expanding trade in Japan, China and the ‘Open Door Policy’. The most common weakness seen was responses which concentrated on the abandonment of isolation due to USA entering World War One in 1917. Detailed knowledge was shown about the events in 1915–17, such as the sinking of the Lusitania and the Zimmermann Telegram. Unfortunately, this detailed knowledge was not relevant as it was outside the focus period of the question.

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

(a) Explain why France and Belgium took control of the Ruhr in 1923.

The issue of non-payment of reparations was the dominant causal factor, with candidates confident in their knowledge and understanding of the reasons behind the reparation and the failure of Germany to pay them before the invasion. Stronger responses were also able to explain that the invasion was due to the underlying motivation of France and Belgium gaining revenge for Germany’s actions in the First World War, or that it was the economic motivation from France and Belgium to recover their war-ravaged economies and repay US loans. These responses could then access Level 4 by showing that all these factors could be connected due to the resources that were available in the Ruhr which would satisfy the different motivations. Weaker responses were often able to identify the issue of reparations but were unable to provide the support necessary to explain how the invasion of the Ruhr was linked to this. Other responses were either unable to identify Germany’s involvement, assumed that the Ruhr was a sovereign country that was invaded to increase their empires, or that France and Belgium were against each other.

(b) ‘The League of Nations carried out its work successfully in the 1920s.’ How far do you agree?

Responses were able to draw on good knowledge and understanding to argue success of the League – most commonly by referring to the successful outcomes in the Aaland Islands dispute, or

the dispute over Upper Silesia. The strongest responses also went beyond territorial disputes to assess the success of the agencies such as the Refugee Committee's work such as the creation of the Nansen Passport. When assessing the failure of the League, the most common approach was to argue that the Corfu and Vilna incidents failed to achieve a fair resolution, and some also considered the advisory nature of much of the work of the ILO. Some comparative judgements were seen, but many conclusions were summative. Weaker responses often contained inaccurate details of the disputes or humanitarian efforts, for example by confusing the Health Committee with the Red Cross, or by arguing that Vilna was a success. Other such responses offered general discussion of the weaknesses of the League such as the USA not joining, and whilst this could be made relevant, most responses failed to link it to events in the 1920s which was the focus of the question. Some responses ignored the dates in the question, discussing at length the work of the League in the Manchurian and Abyssinian disputes.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

(a) Explain why the Manchu dynasty was removed from power in 1912

Stronger responses were able to explain the long-term underlying factors as well as the events immediately prior to the removal of the Manchu dynasty. Such responses initially considered the deepening unpopularity of the dynasty, for example, after the Boxer Rebellion and the increasing European influence but would also explain the rise of Sun Yat Sen and the agreement reached with Yuan, resulting in Pu Yi's abdication. Other responses, however, had limited arguments only discussing historical factors such as the opium wars, without showing any understanding of the events immediately prior to the dynasty ending. Weaker responses were very generalised and lacked contextual support.

(b) 'The Nanjing Decade (1928–37) was a period of success for the Kuomintang' How far do you agree?

Some strong responses were seen to this question, with candidates displaying both a breadth and depth of contextual knowledge and understanding of this period. These responses provided a balanced assessment considering both the successes and failures of the Nanjing Decade for the Kuomintang. When considering failure, these responses were clear in their assessment of the KMT's poor handling of the CCP, or how the peasants threw their support in behind the CCP. Additionally, there was clear understanding shown of the Xi'an incident and Chiang Kai Shek's inability to deal with the Japanese. The arguments when providing balance through consideration of the KMT's success were often less developed, and whilst stronger responses understood that the KMT built schools or supplied electricity, these achievements were often listed without much development. Weaker responses often faced some problems with chronology, instead writing very generalised descriptions that were not specific to this period of Chinese history.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/22
Outline Study

Key messages

- **Part (a)** questions require explanation as to why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show understanding of the connections between causes to 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 should note and act on any timeframe given in the question.
- Having a good understanding of the chronology of key events is important as this will help candidates to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.

General comments

In **Part (a)** the questions are about causation and stronger responses included good knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific course of action was adopted, or event happened. The strongest responses had a clear focus on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a good range of factors, showing how they were connected. Weaker responses tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. These were often characterised by factual inaccuracy or a confused chronology.

In **Part (b)** strong responses demonstrated understanding that historical issues can be interpreted in many ways, while other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses included narrative accounts of the topic with implicit reference to the question focus. Others included some relevant arguments based on a limited range and depth of factual support. The weakest responses tended to misconstrue the question demand and were characterised by factual inaccuracy or assertion. In several of these responses the time frame of the question was also ignored.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why the March of the Women, 6 October 1789, happened.

Most candidates showed a clear understanding of this question, focusing on the immediate issues that led to the March including the supply and price of bread and the king's reluctance to agree to reforms produced by the National Assembly. The strongest responses showed how they had a cumulative effect leading to action being taken, providing detailed evidence to support their ideas. Weaker responses provided a general description of issues facing the *Ancien Regime* during the lead up to the Revolutions like tax inequalities and financial problems.

(b) To what extent did the Directory, 1795–1799, restore order?

Most responses understood the strengths and weakness of the Directory though a few provided a general description of political developments from 1789 onwards. Strong responses set their answers in the context of what happened immediately before the Directory was established, outlining the effects of the Terror and the fall of Robespierre. Most responses also showed a clear

understanding of the structure of the Directory and whilst weaker ones described this, stronger ones demonstrated well the strengths and weaknesses of the system. The strongest responses considered the extent of success, often citing over reliance on the military, and particularly on the skills of Napoleon, as sowing the seed of their own downfall: *In conclusion the Directory restored order to a moderate extent. The terror ended and the economy improved, especially the tax system. In comparison with the period before, with its different constitutions, there was now order again. Despite this it was an order that the revolution had not aimed at, making it rather unreal. In the sense of being a fixed government that passed laws and held elections and stayed in power for four years it restored order. But this order was only temporary due to an overreliance on the military and the dislike of the majority of the population.*

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

(a) Explain why agricultural output had increased by 1800.

Most responses were well-supported explanations of the changes that produced a steady increase in agricultural production in the period leading up to 1800. The strongest were able to link these, often suggesting that enclosure was the key factor that allowed for mechanisation, selective breeding and other improvements that led to increased income and encourage further investment, for example: *Enclosure ended traditional farming methods and redistributed land to the most productive farmers encouraging them to use the farmland to generate profits. It also led to greater production as incentives for farmers to produce more food increased significantly. By using the new farming methods like selective breeding and crop rotation they were able to grow more which they sold to earn larger incomes. They could then reinvest them in more development. So, enclosure was the key to unlocking greater productivity using improved methods.* Weaker responses often focused on peripheral issues like the decline of cottage industry and the move to urban areas which was not the focus of the question.

(b) ‘The political impact of the Industrial Revolution on Britain in this period was huge.’ How far do you agree?

The strongest responses had well supported analysis of the links between the industrial revolution and political change, most often referring to the rise of the middle-class entrepreneurs and their pressure which led to the Great Reform Act of 1832. Effective responses understood the limitations of this act and used this to demonstrate why the impact was not huge but still significant. These responses also demonstrated that, whilst there was no direct improvement in political involvement for most of the population, other factors led to increasing political awareness and protest which did impact on the political system in that Parliament began to produce more legislation that, in the long run, benefitted even those who could not vote. Some weaker responses wrote about how government affected the development of the Industrial Revolution which was not the focus of the question.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why there was a march on the Winter Palace in January 1905.

There were many well supported responses to this question as most candidates understood the basis of the complaints of the workers of St Petersburg, like poor working and living conditions and the effects of the war against Japan on the supply and price of food. Most responses included some reference to the role of Father Gapon though depth and accuracy of knowledge varied. Common misconceptions were that the peasants were heavily involved and that the War with Japan was over. Weaker responses were often general descriptions of dissatisfaction with the tsarist regime, with a lot of focus on Russification, rather than focusing on specific requirements the question.

(b) ‘The Constituent Assembly was dissolved in January 1918 because the Bolsheviks were weak.’ How far do you agree?

Several responses were unclear as to what the Constituent Assembly was and those which were clear about it sometimes struggled to produce any significant evidence to support an argument in favour of the assertion. These responses did, often, produce a strong counterargument about the strength of the Bolsheviks in terms of successfully seizing power, the support of the Red Guard and the fact that they were able to arbitrarily close the assembly. A few weaker responses confused the

Constituent Assembly with the Provisional Government and wrote about the Bolshevik seizure of power whilst other focused on the signing of the Treaty of Brest Litovsk and the Bolsheviks success in the Civil War as evidence of Bolshevik strength, both of which were beyond the focus of the question.

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

Question 4: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why the US Congress imposed military rule on the South in 1867?

Many responses were able to offer some description of the situation in the South in the years following the end of the Civil War. Most were then able to follow this up by offering some general reasons for the imposition including the creation of the Black Codes and the development of organisations like the Ku Klux Klan. The strongest responses often also included some reference to the clash between the Radical Republicans in Congress and the Southern sympathies and leanings of the President, Andrew Johnson. Weaker responses tended to list events without clearly explaining why military rule was necessary. A few responses lacked detail or confused the timeline of Reconstruction and did not identify the specific motivations for the 1867 Reconstruction Acts.

(b) ‘The Confederacy lost the Civil War because it lacked the necessary resources.’ How far do you agree?

There were some detailed and well-balanced response to this question including some effective analysis of ‘necessary resources’. Strong responses had clear introductions such as: *The lack of resource was definitely a main factor as to why the Confederacy lost the Civil War. They simply could not match the quantity of supplies and the number of men the Union could commit to winning the war. However poor leadership by the Confederate government, issues over state contributions, the reaction of foreign governments and the different tactics used also contributed to the eventual Union victory.* These stronger responses did not restrict themselves to only material resources but included comparative population figures and accessible transport. They also considered a range of other factors including leadership and tactics before reaching a clear and reasoned overall judgement. Weaker responses relied heavily on generalizations and lacked detailed examples.

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

(a) Explain why many Progressive laws were passed during Woodrow Wilson’s presidency.

Most responses demonstrated good awareness of some of the laws passed by Wilson especially prohibition and votes for women but only the stronger responses related this detail to an explanation of why he did it. These referenced the importance of public support and the political climate, particularly growing awareness of workers’ rights and anti-trust sentiment. Some of these successfully contextualised Wilson’s reforms within the Progressive Era noting that much of the work for early changes in his presidency had already been instigated under previous administrations.

(b) To what extent were trade policies the cause of rapid industrial growth in the late nineteenth century?

There were several very successful responses to this question. Strong responses acknowledged the significance of high tariffs, government land grants, and lack of regulation in encouraging rapid industrialisation. These were often weighed against other contributing factors like immigration, natural resources, and innovation. A few responses successfully analysed the links between policy and entrepreneurship. Weaker responses focused too narrowly on trade or confused internal improvements with external trade policies. A few of these misunderstood the chronology or continued their analysis beyond the end of the nineteenth century.

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

(a) Explain why the conservative right viewed the New Deal as anti-capitalist.

Most responses showed good awareness about who opposed the New Deal, and why, even if they were not entirely familiar with the term ‘conservative right’: *The conservative right viewed the New*

Deal as anti-capitalist because of its focus, especially in the Second New Deal on welfare and on the reform of employment laws and workers' rights, seen through the New Deal to varying degrees. Stronger responses focused on the idea of anti-capitalist and were able to characterise the New Deal as excessive government interference, identifying legislation which helped the poor and workers as socialist, contrary to the free-market economy, and so un-American and anti-capitalist. Weaker responses were often confined to general comments about the New Deal and references to the Supreme Court without specific focus on the question.

- (b) The weakness of financial institutions was the main cause of the Great Depression.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses were confident discussing banks, though in less successful instances this was limited to what happened to banks after the Great Crash with little mention of the lack of direction/control from the Federal Reserve. Few responses dealt with weaknesses in the Stock Market itself in causing the Crash which led to the Great Depression. Stronger responses often recognised the impact of existing weaknesses in the economy especially the ongoing depression in agricultural sector and many also reviewed the role of the federal government and especially the Hoover administration in dealing with the problem effectively. Weaker responses often wrote more generally about a *laissez faire* approach to running the economy without including specific detail. Most responses provided effective analysis but in the less effective ones the argument was lacking in depth.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

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

- (a) Explain why Roosevelt introduced the Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine in 1904.**

Most responses showed a good understanding of the Monroe Doctrine, but weaker responses did not demonstrate why Roosevelt felt the need to add to this in creating the Corollary. Stronger responses recognised the way in which Roosevelt extended US interest to active intervention in states and cited the effect of relevant influences in producing this change. These included the Spanish American War and involvement in the Columbian Civil War over Panamanian independence, often recognising also the significance of taking over the French interest in construction of the Panama Canal.

- (b) To what extent did the Second Boer War lead to a change in British relations with other imperial powers?**

Strong responses identified Britain's diplomatic isolation, military weaknesses, and the global criticism of its tactics in South Africa as pivotal in reassessing imperial strategy. Many candidates successfully connected the war's outcomes to Britain's shift away from 'splendid isolation' and the forging of the Entente Cordiale. Strong responses were able to explain the complexities of international relations at the time, recognising that the growing power of Germany, partly manifested in their support for the Boers, led to a reassessment of relations with that country and also France, viewed as a potential ally especially after the resolution of the Fashoda Crisis in 1898. These often also recognised the significance of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902. Some weaker responses confused details of the First Boer War, the Jameson Raid and the Second Boer War and produced general narrative.

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

- (a) Explain why Lloyd George organised the Genoa conference in 1922.**

Most responses had a good understanding of the post-war economic and political issues that led Lloyd George to convene this conference in an effort to ease the problems that were left unresolved after the conclusion of the Paris Peace Conference. Weaker responses often did not distinguish between cause and effect, writing about the failings of the Conference rather than why it was called in the first place so details of, for example, the Rapallo Pact were not relevant. Strong responses were clear about the economic aftermath of the Great War and the issues around the question of reparations as well as the deep divide between France and Germany that had developed before and during the war. The impact of these and the withdrawal of the US from European affairs had left an unstable economic and political situation and stronger responses were

able to explain this in detail. Some weaker ones characterised this as a League of Nations initiative, despite the specific focus on Lloyd George, and provided only general narrative.

- (b) **'Border disputes were the biggest problem facing the successor states in the 1920s.' How far do you agree?**

Less effective responses tended to list conflicts without evaluating their relative significance or broader implications, while others discussed the role of the League of Nations in international relations at this time. Stronger responses covered several disputes as relevant examples before providing an effective counter argument in analysis of economic, political and ethnic issues that continued to trouble these states. The strongest responses demonstrated how all of these were linked in creating a potentially unstable situation in many of the states identified showing for example how ethnic and economic issues led to the imposition of political dictatorship in Poland (1926) and Yugoslavia (1929).

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

- (a) **Explain why Chiang Kai-shek became leader of the Kuomintang following the death of Sun Yat-sen.**

Most responses were able to identify some factors that helped Chiang in his assumption of leadership including his existing position in the KMT, his close links with Sun, and his strong military background at a time when the key issue to be dealt with was the warlords of Northern China. Weaker responses confused cause and effect and instead of writing about factors that helped establish Chiang as leader, wrote about his achievements as leader, like the success of the Northern Expedition and the encirclement campaigns of the late 1920s and early 1930s.

- (b) **To what extent did the Long March represent a defeat for the Chinese Communist Party?**

The basis of many successful responses was the distinction between short and long-term consequences. Short term analysis concentrated on the need to escape from the Kiangsi Soviet, the heavy losses and internal conflicts and the difficulties facing the CCP on their arrival in Ya'nan. These would be set against the longer-term advantages of the emergence of Mao as undisputed leader and the propaganda potential of their heroic exploits and their fair-handed treatment of those with whom they came into contact along the march, for example: *In conclusion the Long March represented defeat for the CCP to a significant extent. In the short-term the intense casualties, the dwindled numbers and being confined to Yanan made the CCP appear as weak and not able to thrive in China. In the long-term the Long March represented success for the CCP as it enabled them to rebuild and have a safe base away from the KMT's extermination campaigns allowing them to grow and establish the Yanan Soviet Republic which provided the propaganda necessary for the CCP to portray itself as the ideal Chinese society.* Strong responses also recognised the potential for further gains in building a strong base supported by the local peasant community, and the opportunity offered for further gains because of the formal outbreak of the Second Sino Japanese War and the formation of the Second United Front. Weaker responses tended to focus exclusively on military setbacks or offered only narrative accounts of Mao's career and actions.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/23
Outline Study

Key messages

- **Part (a)** questions require explanation as to why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show understanding of the connections between causes to 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 should note and act on any timeframe given in the question.
- Having a good understanding of the chronology of key events is important as this will help candidates to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.

General comments

In **Part (a)** the questions are about causation and stronger responses included good knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific course of action as adopted, or event happened. The strongest responses had a clear focus on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a good range of factors, showing how they were connected. Weaker responses tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. These were often characterised by factual inaccuracy or a confused chronology.

In **Part (b)** strong responses demonstrated understanding that historical issues can be interpreted in many ways, while other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses included narrative accounts of the topic with implicit reference to the question focus. Others included some relevant arguments based on a limited range and depth of factual support. The weakest responses tended to misconstrue the question demand and were characterised by factual inaccuracy or assertion. In several of these responses the time frame of the question was also ignored.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why the Jacobins fell from power in 1794.

Most responses offered good reasons why the Jacobins fell from power with many understanding the fear generated amongst the general population by the Reign of Terror. Robespierre was often cited as a critical figure in the fall though a few weaker responses wrote a synopsis of his career as a leader of the extremist republicans from 1789 onward without focusing on the question. In addition to understanding the significance of the Terror, stronger responses were able to link this to wider circumstances including continuing shortages and the change of fortunes in the war against the First Coalition, as well as the widespread unpopularity of Robespierre's Cult of the Supreme Being. The most effective responses combined these into a well-structured analysis, and some were able to establish the way in which different factors combined to lead to the fall of the Jacobins.

(b) 'Repressive rather than reformist.' How far do you agree with this view of Napoleon's regime?

Most responses provided good detail on Napoleons reforms including the Civil Code, the Concordat, economic reforms and social changes as well as Napoleons enforcement methods including propaganda censorship and use of the secret police. Weaker responses included relevant description of some of these aspects of government, often divided simply between reform and repression with little analysis of how they fitted into an overall pattern of government and establishment of post-revolutionary stability. Stronger responses produced balanced analysis, and the strongest of these usually produced a supported conclusion demonstrating how Napoleon's policies were a combination of both, with the overall effect of creating a stable government based largely on the early objectives of the Revolution. Successful responses included conclusions that provided judgement: *All in all, Napoleons regime can be said to be 'repressive rather than reformist' to an extent. He did use repression and propaganda to control people. However, he reformed the economy in a very significant way that contrasted to previous revolutionary governments. Most importantly he reformed France socially and made sure everyone benefitted from it.*

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

(a) Explain why the factory system was important in the development of the Industrial Revolution in Britain.

Most responses showed good understanding of how the factory system changed the nature of industry in Britain, though in weaker responses this often just involved identifying some of the inventions and innovations that led to the changes. Many responses went beyond this simple approach and were able to link specific developments in technology to the need for factories and the effect that had on production and urbanisation, therefore accelerating the industrial revolution. Strong responses often make a clear start by identifying the key factors and then writing a short paragraph about each: *The factory system contributed to industrialisation in several aspects. It provided large profits that could be reinvested, allowed for the development of mechanisation and produced cheaper goods that boosted demand....* Strong responses were able to develop causation showing how each factor was linked to others therefore providing a growing impetus to industrial development. There were some well structured and supported assessments of the link between factories and industrial development.

(b) 'The Swing riots were a response to economic hardship.' How far do you agree?

Strong responses recognised that the Swing riots were a rural phenomenon and were a response to mechanisation in the agricultural industry. These responses also critically examined other causes such as the breakdown in traditional labour relations, and resentment of the Poor Laws. Some of the strongest responses highlighted how economic and social grievances were intertwined. Weaker responses often involved general explanations of poor conditions, insanitary and overcrowded housing and the problems of living in towns and working in factories generally. These less effective responses did not really acknowledge the rural aspect of the riots.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why Lenin issued his April Theses.

Most responses were able to explain the motive behind the key slogan of 'Peace Bread and Land' but several went on to consider their effects in the months leading up to the October Revolution rather than focusing fully on causation. The strongest responses not only understood the slogan but were aware of, and explained, the situation Lenin found on his return; his need to restore discipline and focus the Bolshevik cause which had been diluted by co-operation with other parties in opposing the Provisional Government. Weaker responses tended to write at some length about Lenin and his return to Russia but did not explain the April Theses.

(b) 'By 1914 the Tsarist regime was secure.' How far do you agree?

There were many very effective responses to this question. Most showed a good understanding of the key events between the 1905 revolutions and the outbreak of war in 1914, and this is the area where the most successful answers were focused. Some less effective responses were general critiques of the Tsarist regime and its weaknesses going back as far as the emancipation of the serfs, whilst others discussed its failings by writing about what happened in 1917. Strong

responses were able to identify the moves, following the 1905 revolutions, that created a superficial impression of stability, whilst outlining the underlying pressures from various groups which emphasised the fragility of that situation: *To evaluate, the Tsar was mostly secure, and the most significant reason was disunity amongst the opposition. This was because, though the tsar was unpopular, there was no alternative that would be acceptable for most people. The workers opposition and the Duma had little real impact because the workers and the bourgeoisie only composed a small part of the total Russian population and had no strong and clear leadership. The economic position was poor but not bad enough to cause revolution and the army was strongly behind the Tsar. It was developments after 1914 with the impact of the World War that changed the situation and led to his downfall.* A common theme of the most successful answers was the extent to which the regime was dependent on the army highlighting the army reforms that followed the 1905 as critical to maintaining stability.

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

Question 4: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why the Confederacy was able to resist the Union for four years.

Most responses were able to identify some of the key features – military leadership, defensive strategy, and initial morale – as strengths of the Confederacy. Strong responses recognised the wider difficulties of the Union in the early stages, stemming from Lincoln's primary objective of restoring the Union without any specific reference to the possible abolition of slavery. The Anaconda plan was designed to force the Confederacy back to the negotiating table rather than crush them, and early leaders adopted cautious strategies. Only following the Emancipation Declaration and the appointment of Grant and Sherman did the North adopt more aggressive tactics to end the war. Some responses mentioned the inadequacy of the Union blockade or European sympathy for the South. Weaker responses described some of the key campaigns without explaining why resistance was possible for so long and a few confused Union and Confederate strategies.

(b) 'Sharecropping was the main reason there was little change in the position of ex-slaves in the South.' How valid is this view of the Reconstruction period?

Some responses had limited understanding of how sharecropping worked and therefore how it affected the status of ex-slaves. Those which did show understanding of it were focused with clear analysis. These were then able to contrast sharecropping with the effects of other factors on the continued oppression of ex-slaves. These included government failures, introduction of Black Codes and the rise of the KKK. Less effective responses with little focus on sharecropping managed to consider the effects of these factors. A few responses reinterpreted the question to provide answers which contrasted the failure implicit in sharecropping with possible success in other areas. This was not within the parameters of the question.

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

(a) Explain why Thomas Edison and Alexander Graham Bell were able to become successful businessmen.

Most candidates were aware of the work of these two pioneers and were able to describe their work and make some comment on its impact. Stronger responses linked their commercial success to the utility of their inventions and the effect they had in speeding up processes and allowing for the extension of working hours, development of more complex machinery and improvement of communications. A few stronger responses even referenced their understanding of patents and business strategy, while the strongest answers noted Bell's use of monopoly and Edison's research lab. Weaker responses tended to write general and descriptive answers with little reference the question of how they utilised their inventions to become successful businessmen.

(b) To what extent do you agree that the 'boss' system was responsible for poor living conditions in cities in the late nineteenth century?

Stronger responses evaluated the role of political corruption while considering structural urban challenges such as rapid immigration, weak infrastructure, and slum landlords. They weighed how much blame could be assigned to bosses versus systemic urban planning failures. Weaker

responses described city conditions but lacked evaluative focus. Some responses conflated bosses with industrial capitalists or confused political machines with trade unions. Some weaker responses were centred around Boss Tweed without really focusing on the issue of poor living conditions other than to describe them.

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

- (a) Explain why Roosevelt needed to encourage Southern Democrats to support the New Deal coalition.**

Few responses had detailed knowledge of the Southern Democrats and many just provided details of some of the difficulties Roosevelt faced in establishing the New Deal and made general comments about his need for support from different groups. Stronger responses identified the importance of Southern Democrats in securing congressional support for New Deal legislation and understood the complex dynamics of party loyalty versus regional conservatism. A few of the strongest responses even considered the importance of state rights and racial politics in shaping Southern Democrats hesitation.

- (b) ‘Over-production was the most serious problem facing US agriculture in the 1920s.’ How far do you agree?**

Many candidates were able to identify over-production as a key issue, especially in relation to falling prices and declining demand following the conclusion of the Great War when demand for agricultural produce in Europe fell rapidly and normal production returned to most European countries. Strong responses successfully weighed over-production against other significant problems such as debt, declining exports, and lack of federal support. These candidates often referenced legislative failures and President Coolidge’s vetoes to show how structural neglect worsened the sector’s condition. Weaker responses were sometimes too focused on describing over-production without offering evaluative comparisons. Some weaker responses lacked chronological precision, referencing the 1930s or the Dust Bowl rather than maintaining focus on the 1920s. Some confused agriculture with industrial decline.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

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

- (a) Explain why the Jameson raid led to worsening relations between Britain and Germany.**

Most candidates recognised that the key element of any explanation of the decline in Anglo-German relations was the Kruger Telegram though some weaker responses did not understand the chronology of this in relation to the two Boer Wars, characterising it as response to Boer success in the First Boer War. Stronger responses focused on the immediate political consequences in raising British governments concerns over German motives and considered these in the context of the effect such an incident had on public opinion via the increasingly jingoistic national press. Weaker responses often only provided a few general details about the situation in which the Jameson raid occurred without really considering the wider implications.

- (b) The closing of the frontier was responsible for the change in the United States’ attitude towards overseas expansion.’ How far do you agree?**

Most candidates were aware of this key event and were able to offer some suggestion of its importance in the history of American expansion, with more successful responses often linking it to the concept of Manifest Destiny as a driving ethos. Responses that dealt effectively with this side of the analysis were also usually fully aware of the other factors like the economic panic of 1893, the growing influence of the yellow press, the pressure from big business and the expansionist imperialism of major European Powers which was seen as a threat to the Monroe Doctrine. Strong responses combined these factors into a detailed analysis and produced clear supported judgements with effective conclusions that demonstrated the links between factors, for example: *In conclusion the closing of the frontier led to the development of ideas about the opportunities offered by overseas expansion and that the USA had a duty to help underdeveloped countries, as a justification for expansion. This idea was further supported by the economic downturn that showed that economic growth could not be maintained without expanding overseas markets. What finally solidified this conclusion was the Spanish American War that united different groups of*

Americans against European interference in breach of the Monroe Doctrine. With support from the yellow press, this united much of the nation in favour of increased overseas expansion, development and defence of their own overseas territories. Some weaker responses described increasing activity surrounding the Spanish American War and subsequent territorial acquisitions without relating this to the question.

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

(a) Explain why the terms of the Treaty of Sèvres were unpopular with Turks.

Most responses showed good awareness of some of the terms of the Treaty of Sevres and the stronger ones linked specific terms to the issue of unpopularity though others assumed that the Treaty included heavy reparations which caused outrage when in fact reparations were not part of this treaty. Many candidates showed a clear understanding of the response of the Young Turek movement under Kemal Ataturk and were able to link their response to general discontent over the acceptance of the terms. Stronger responses linked specific losses and terms to unpopularity, especially losses of territory to their traditional enemy, Greece, and the mandating of all the Middle Eastern territories to winning powers. Weaker responses sometimes tried to take the opportunity to explain the Treaty of Lausanne, which was an outcome of, not a cause of discontent.

(b) 'Relations between Germany and France were unfriendly during the 1920s.' How far do you agree?

Many candidates displayed a sound knowledge of key events like the Versailles Settlement, the Reparations issue, the Ruhr crisis, the Dawes and Young Plans and the Locarno Treaties and of the part they played in the changing status of Franco-German relations. In weaker responses this led to a descriptive answer with varying levels of accurate detail, whilst stronger responses were able to link the events to changes in relationships, mostly noting the change from the outright hostility of the early years to the general improvement from the mid-decade onwards. The strongest responses noted the role of key individual's, specifically Stresemann and Briand and some also considered the extent of reconciliation in the light of the economic crisis that ended the decade.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

(a) Explain why Japan's international policies during the 1930s became increasingly aggressive.

Most responses were well-focused on the question, and they were able to build a solid answer based on the effects of the Great Depression of the early 1930s coupled with the failure of democratic government and the steady rise of support for militarism. Stronger responses illustrated this with reference to key events like the invasion of Manchuria, withdrawal from the League of Nations and further incursions into China, with the emphasis on explaining why these events were important rather than just describing them. The strongest responses attempted an integrated summary of the effect of a range of factors: *To sum up, the failure of democracy, the weakness of western nations and the economic depression all caused Japanese international policies to become increasingly aggressive in the 1930s. The most important factor was the economic depression because this affected so many ordinary people's lives. Without the depression the people may not have been so fully disappointed with democratic government and so ready to accept the military taking over control.*

(b) To what extent was Yuan Shih-kai responsible for the failure to establish a strong central government in China after the 1911 revolution?

Strong responses clearly outlined Yuan's political manoeuvring, including his dismissal of parliament, suppression of the KMT, and his ill-fated imperial ambitions to demonstrate the part he played in the failure of democracy. These then went on to consider other factors like the divisions of China and the rise of the warlords, along with the ongoing conflict with Japan and the issue of the 21 demands, to reach a balance conclusion. In the most effective responses these conclusions supported an overall judgement. Weaker responses confused Yuan Shi-kai with Chiang Kai-shek and, ignoring the date, were descriptive discussions about the Northern expedition and other events in Chiang's bid for power. Most responses showed good awareness of Yuan Shi-kai and were able to describe his role in the political development of China in the early years of the 20th century.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/31 Interpretations Question</p>

Key messages

- Candidates should read the extract carefully enough to be familiar with all that it says and identify those parts of it that are the most significant in indicating the historian's interpretation. Spend some time reading and thinking about the extract, making notes and/or underlining sections of the extract that will be useful in a response.
- The interpretation concerns who or what the historian blames. The most effective responses identify this and then illustrate how the extract can be used to explain the interpretation by making careful selections from it. There will be parts of the extract that are of central importance to the interpretation, and some parts that are less significant. Taking the extract as a whole, rather than working through it paragraph by paragraph, is therefore an effective approach which avoids including the less important material.

General comments

The most effective responses constructed their arguments around relevant material selected from the extract for the purpose of explaining the interpretation. These responses took the extract as a whole and engaged with the overall interpretation. Less effective responses also used the extract to discuss the historian's interpretation, but these tended towards a paragraph-by-paragraph approach which either resulted in a summary of what the extract said, with little focus on the issue of blame, or drew inferences only on specific points within the extract rather than the overall interpretation. Often these inferences were contradictory with each other, for example in suggesting that the historian is using mutually exclusive approaches in different parts of the extract.

Part of explaining the historian's interpretation is recognising the approach that has been taken. Many responses use historiographical 'labels' to identify approaches and this is a valid undertaking. If this approach is adopted, it is important that the label is used correctly. If the label used is misunderstood this could affect the response as the candidate may miss important references in the extract that would help explain the approach properly.

When using the extract, many responses did not use a full quotation but instead gave an incomplete one and used ellipses. The use of these 'truncated quotes' can leave unclear what exactly is being referred to in the omitted material, or exactly how it is supposed to constitute support. A full quotation is a more effective approach.

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 s/he blames **(i)** the European Great Power system for being on the point of collapse by 1914, **(ii)** so that in the July crisis nobody could stop the slide to war. The most effective responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Weaker responses did not consider the balance of power and claimed instead that the author was blaming something else, most often the impacts of the alliance system or militarism, which were sub-messages of the broader interpretation. Most responses recognised that the historian was not blaming any single nation, and the reference to the 'slide down into bloody horror' produced frequent references to Lloyd George's 'slide to war' thesis and to Clark's 'sleepwalkers'. So, in responses where the specifics of the historian's interpretation were not detected, they still had a reasonable

understanding what was being argued. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins of the First World War with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Hitler because (i) although he did not initially have a plan for genocide, he always intended harm to the Jews, and (ii) he was clear that war would bring their destruction. The strongest responses were able to recognise these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them effectively using material from the extract. Weaker responses often misunderstood the labels they used. For example, among those who identified the interpretation as intentionalist, several insisted that the historian was arguing that Hitler intended genocide from the start, despite the explicit rejection of this in the extract. These responses seemed unaware that intentionalists can disagree about what exactly was intended and when. Some of these responses offered contradictions as to whether Hitler intended genocide, using different quotes from the extract to suggest both that he did and that he did not. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins of 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 s/he blames Stalin/the Soviet Union (i) for worsening relations by their intransigence, despite (ii) Truman genuinely trying to reach agreement with them. The most effective responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates recognised that the extract was blaming the Russians and could give some examples from it to illustrate the stubbornness. Some less effective responses thought they could also detect some blame being placed on the USA, perhaps on the basis of Truman's 'inexperience' or naivety. A small number took this a step further, and claimed that the historian was exonerating Russia, for example by showing that neither 'Stalin nor Molotov ever tried any tricks or subtleties'. Many responses included a lot of contextual material on events that postdated those in the extract, such as the Berlin Airlift, Berlin Wall and even the Cuban missile crisis. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins and development of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/32 Interpretations Question</p>

Key messages

- Candidates should read the extract carefully enough to be familiar with all that it says and identify those parts of it that are the most significant in indicating the historian's interpretation. Spend some time reading and thinking about the extract, making notes and/or underlining sections of the extract that will be useful in a response.
- The interpretation concerns who or what the historian blames. The most effective responses identify this and then illustrate how the extract can be used to explain the interpretation by making careful selections from it. There will be parts of the extract that are of central importance to the interpretation, and some parts that are less significant. Taking the extract as a whole, rather than working through it paragraph by paragraph, is therefore an effective approach which avoids including the less important material.

General comments

The most effective responses constructed their arguments around relevant material selected from the extract for the purpose of explaining the interpretation. These responses took the extract as a whole and engaged with the overall interpretation. Less effective responses also used the extract to discuss the historian's interpretation, but these tended towards a paragraph-by-paragraph approach which either resulted in a summary of what the extract said, with little focus on the issue of blame, or drew inferences only on specific points within the extract rather than the overall interpretation. Often these inferences were contradictory with each other, for example in suggesting that the historian is using mutually exclusive approaches in different parts of the extract.

Part of explaining the historian's interpretation is recognising the approach that has been taken. Many responses use historiographical 'labels' to identify approaches and this is a valid undertaking. If this approach is adopted, it is important that the label is used correctly. If the label used is misunderstood this could affect the response as the candidate may miss important references in the extract that would help explain the approach properly.

When using the extract, many responses did not use a full quotation but instead gave an incomplete one and used ellipses. The use of these 'truncated quotes' can leave unclear what exactly is being referred to in the omitted material, or exactly how it is supposed to constitute support. A full quotation is a more effective approach.

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 s/he blames Bethmann Hollweg **(i)** for being willing to risk war, and **(ii)** for believing that he had to act in order to save Germany's status as a great power. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them effectively using material from the extract. Most candidates understood that Germany was being blamed, but also often correctly noted that the blame was not of the kind that Fischer would have perceived. Bethmann's actions were motivated by a sense of desperation, not by a desire for aggrandisement. However, this also led some weaker responses to think that the historian was actually exonerating Bethmann – by saying that he genuinely had no choice – based on the misreading of relevant sections of the extract as the historian's, rather than Bethmann's, views. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins of the First World War with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Hitler/the Nazis because (i) they knew beforehand that any expansion to the East would mean radicalisation of Jewish policy, and (ii) in newly conquered territories in the East they established ruling structures that were bound to be harmful to the Jews. The most effective responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Labelling this extract proved problematic in less effective responses. These did not consider the point about the Nazis knowing in advance what the impact of expansion would be, and they assumed the radicalisation was simply a result of war. The extract explicitly rejected the notion that the approach could be functionalist – ‘the recognised radicalising effects of war were not some purely external factor, influencing but separate to longer-standing perpetrator intent. The very decision to go to war presupposed a radical mindset’ – pointing instead to an intentionalist aspect. Given the nature of the second half of the extract, which dealt with structuralist ideas, the best overall label was synthesis, which was suggested in many responses. With regard to this second aspect, the most common limitation was to focus so much on what it said about battles for control within the Nazi Party, and the shortcomings of the Gauleiters’ rule, that the impact on the Jews of all this was often omitted or not made clear. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins of 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 s/he blames Stalin (i) for withdrawing into ideologically motivated policies towards the West, and (ii) for behaving in an expansionist manner. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates knew that Stalin/ the USSR was being blamed, so the issue was whether the reasons for blame were properly identified and explained. Some responses focused only on Stalin’s personality without getting to the main interpretation. More common was not to make a distinction between ideology and expansionism, but to treat them as a single cause for blame, which was understandable but not showing complete understanding. Often the reason for this was misunderstanding of the word ‘ideology’, seen in many responses as a synonym simply for ‘ideas’. There were also responses that viewed the extract as blaming the West, either sharing blame with the Russians in a post-revisionist manner or bearing all of it in a revisionist interpretation. These responses would typically focus on single points from the extract, rather than viewing it as a whole. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins and development of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/33 Interpretations Question</p>

Key messages

- Candidates should read the extract carefully enough to be familiar with all that it says and identify those parts of it that are the most significant in indicating the historian's interpretation. Spend some time reading and thinking about the extract, making notes and/or underlining sections of the extract that will be useful in a response.
- The interpretation concerns who or what the historian blames. The most effective responses identify this and then illustrate how the extract can be used to explain the interpretation by making careful selections from it. There will be parts of the extract that are of central importance to the interpretation, and some parts that are less significant. Taking the extract as a whole, rather than working through it paragraph by paragraph, is therefore an effective approach which avoids including the less important material.

General comments

The most effective responses constructed their arguments around relevant material selected from the extract for the purpose of explaining the interpretation. These responses took the extract as a whole and engaged with the overall interpretation. Less effective responses also used the extract to discuss the historian's interpretation, but these tended towards a paragraph-by-paragraph approach which either resulted in a summary of what the extract said, with little focus on the issue of blame, or drew inferences only on specific points within the extract rather than the overall interpretation. Often these inferences were contradictory with each other, for example in suggesting that the historian is using mutually exclusive approaches in different parts of the extract.

Part of explaining the historian's interpretation is recognising the approach that has been taken. Many responses use historiographical 'labels' to identify approaches and this is a valid undertaking. If this approach is adopted, it is important that the label is used correctly. If the label used is misunderstood this could affect the response as the candidate may miss important references in the extract that would help explain the approach properly.

When using the extract, many responses did not use a full quotation but instead gave an incomplete one and used ellipses. The use of these 'truncated quotes' can leave unclear what exactly is being referred to in the omitted material, or exactly how it is supposed to constitute support. A full quotation is a more effective approach.

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 s/he blames Balkan problems because (i) the Great Powers were unable to resolve them, and (ii) it was Balkan nationalism that actually brought about war in 1914. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. However, relatively few responses satisfactorily explained the situation in the Balkans as a factor in its own right. Most read the first paragraph of the extract as blaming individual countries, such as Russia or Austria, or general factors such as imperialism or nationalism. Similarly, most responses noted the references to nationalism in the rest of the extract, but many treated this generally, missing the vital dimension that Balkan nationalism, and its uncontrollable nature, was what actually brought about war in 1914. The central explanatory point, that it was Serbia's inability to control its own nationalists, leading to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, was often not argued effectively to explain the

interpretation, but just seen as something which led to the Alliance System causing the war. The weakest responses paraphrased the extract or wrote about the origins of the First World War with little or no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames **(i)** the circumstances of war for producing an ad hoc radicalisation of the Jewish issue, and **(ii)** the impact of fanatical Nazis seeking to win Hitler's approval through a process of cumulative radicalisation. Strong responses recognised these features of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The extract had both functionalist and structuralist aspects, so the most appropriate label was synthesis, but, as always, the label was secondary to the interpretation. Most responses identified functionalism in the first couple of paragraphs, but for some this was simply 'because of the war', and whilst many went beyond this to note the 'sudden change... in the late summer of 1941', relatively few showed how the extract suggested a process of ad hoc radicalisation ('... after various plans for reservations were shattered by the unexpected course of the war'), which is essential to explaining the functionalist approach. Similar challenges arose with structuralism, which in several responses meant any reference to the structure of the State. These responses got stuck in detail about the Army, the railway system and the bureaucratic elite. The essential element in a structuralist explanation is the process of cumulative radicalisation, which this extract addressed. Weaker responses spent time discussing what, for the historian, were simply preconditions – anti-Semitism, propaganda, the general administration – but did not consider the reference to the 'actual shove towards the Holocaust' provided by a 'minority of fanatical racists (who) provided the true dynamic initiative'. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract, or did not use it at all, writing about the Holocaust generally.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Truman for **(i)** the change in US policy in early 1946, and **(ii)** the new consensus this brought about in US policy-making circles to 'get tough' with the Russians. The most effective responses were able to see these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Keeping a focus on Truman was a characteristic of all the stronger responses, whilst the most common weakness was being deflected into other issues, and specifically into Kennan and the Long Telegram. Many responses spent far more time on Kennan than on Truman, which produced conclusions that the USA was being blamed, rather than Truman. Whilst this was not completely inaccurate, it was certainly a different emphasis from that intended by the historian and suggested a degree of misunderstanding. Weaker responses thought the USSR was being blamed, a conclusion generally based on the idea that Truman was being exonerated, though there were also a few references to the Soviets (their 'paranoid aggression' according to Kennan) that could serve the purpose of seeing them as blameworthy. The weakest responses paraphrased the extract or wrote about the origins and development of the Cold War with little or no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/41 Depth Study</p>
--

Key messages

- The most successful responses tailored their knowledge to the specific demands of the question and ensured that the material they used related to the correct chronological timeframe specified.
- Effective responses avoided narrative and description of events and provided a balanced, clear, analysis of relevant issues that supported a directed argument and reached a judgement.
- Using the question to determine what criteria will be used to make judgements is good practice.

General comments

Most candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and should aim for balanced analysis. Stronger responses attempted to consistently compare the relative significance of different factors and attempted to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left overall judgements to the conclusion. The most effective responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the specific enquiry and were able to ensure that their answers directly addressed the wording of the question.

An understanding of chronology is important and less effective responses struggled with this – for example in **Question 5**, where some were unable to distinguish developments which took place in the 1950s from the 1960s. Several responses to **Question 7** also related more to the 1960s than 1980s and 1990, and in **Question 8** responses often contained detailed material on the Korean War. Some responses adopted an overly narrative approach and relied on assertions for analysis, in particular in **Question 6** where descriptions of the Watergate Affair sometimes replaced a full examination of its consequences.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 ‘Mussolini only became prime minister because of the impact of the First World War on Italy.’ Assess this view.

Stronger responses were able to introduce a good range of examples. Most dealt with the stated factor through reference to the so-called ‘Mutilated Victory’ and to Italian dissatisfaction with their prize at the end of the conflict. The strongest responses were able to consider the economic and human toll that the war took on the country and clearly showed how Mussolini was able to exploit these issues to his advantage. Other responses were aware of the threat of communism and commented on the events of the Biennio Rosso, but did not always make explicit how this helped Mussolini, particularly in gaining the support of the economic élite and elements of the Catholic church. The role of the king was generally not considered and Mussolini’s own ideological flexibility in this period was discussed only in stronger responses.

2 ‘Trotsky’s mistakes and weaknesses were the main reason for Stalin’s rise to power by 1928.’ Discuss this view.

There were many good responses to this question although some lacked depth of supporting material and comparative analysis. The most cited ‘mistake’ made by Trotsky was the failure to attend Lenin’s funeral, with the strongest responses able to explain his personal short-comings and lack of political nous. The

opportunity to directly contrast this with Stalin's cunning was not taken by many responses, although there was good knowledge of how he used his role in the party, most notably as General secretary to his advantage. Most responses showed some understanding of the twists and turns of the power struggle, although there were misunderstandings and misidentifications of the major players. Lenin's own role, in failing to secure the succession, was generally underused, although some responses did discuss the significance of his Testament.

3 Analyse the extent to which the lives of women and children were improved as a result of Nazi policies in the years 1933 to 1941.

Most responses included a good range of knowledge about policies towards both women and children, with the stronger ones focusing effectively on the concept of 'improvement.' The strongest responses were able to make some very effective observations about how some women felt valued by the enhanced focus on their domestic roles, whilst others were resentful of the limited career and educational opportunities open to them. Most responses were able to discuss this emphasis, although analysis about how this impacted life was often only implicit. There was also good knowledge about education and youth groups used to discuss children, with the examples of opposition groups also regularly cited. Explicit discussion about 'improvement' was limited in weaker responses, which tended to assert that their lives had either improved or not.

4 'British governments followed a policy of appeasement in the 1930s because it was popular with the public.' Assess this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 'Progress towards greater civil rights in the 1950s was mainly brought about by federal institutions.' Evaluate this view.

The strongest responses understood what was meant by federal institutions and were able to provide a range of examples, typically the executive, legislative and judiciary. There was discussion of both Truman and Eisenhower's roles in desegregating the military and supporting the Little Rock 9, respectively. The role of Congress in passing the 1957 Civil Rights Act also featured, although only the strongest responses were able to offer much detail of what it entailed. Most commonly, the Supreme Court was linked to the Brown v Board of Education judgement in desegregating education. Stronger responses often considered their limitations, with a particularly interesting argument about the lack of focus on civil rights in the 1960 presidential election campaign. Balance was achieved by addressing the role of institutions and individuals – usually King, Parks and the NAACP, with, most commonly, discussion of the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Stronger responses understood the outcome of this event, although only the strongest were able to link it to the Supreme Court's decision making. In responses less confident about the role of federal institutions, it was common to assert that grassroots action was far more significant.

6 Assess the political importance of the Watergate affair in the 1970s.

Most responses understood the events surrounding the Watergate scandal and the strongest ones were able to go on to provide some effective analysis of its impact, keeping the term 'political' at the forefront of their discussions. Relevant examples included the impact of the Supreme Court in US v Nixon, the changing relationship between executive and legislature, the consequences for the Republican and Democrat parties – including in some cases the 1974 mid-term elections and more commonly the 1976 presidential election. Some candidates went on to incorporate Reagan's Republican party in their arguments. Most understood that Ford's pardoning of Nixon exacerbated the impact of the original events. Less successful approaches relied on narrative accounts of the actions of the 'plumbers' and of the aftermath, without dealing with their consequences beyond broad assertions about 'loss of trust' in politicians. Commentary on the 'Imperial Presidency' was often introduced, although it was evident in several cases that this term was not fully understood and often led to responses losing focus by moving into discussions of Johnson and Vietnam.

7 Analyse the reasons for the increased concerns about drug abuse in the 1980s and 1990s.

Responses deployed a good range of examples of why there were concerns during this time period. Valid examples included the rising crime figures, impact on minority groups, links to the AIDS epidemic and the attitude of the authorities and to Nancy Reagan's anti-drugs crusade. Stronger responses included analytical comment on the rise of the conservative right and the backlash against the counterculture. Less effective responses did not have the correct chronological focus and tended to discuss hippies, Vietnam and

Woodstock. Others described the horrors of drug addiction in depth, without any clear attempt to locate this in the context of the 1980s and 1990s.

8 Evaluate how far relations between China and the United States improved in the years 1963 to 1979.

Effective responses were able to maintain the correct chronological focus and avoided lengthy details about the Korean War. There was a general acceptance that relations improved because of 'ping-pong' diplomacy and some details of the roles of Kissinger and Nixon. Stronger responses also discussed American attitudes towards China's membership of the United Nations and the issue of Taiwan. However, only the strongest responses were able to go further and address the 'how far' aspect of the question effectively by considering the challenges that remained and the very real ideological differences that continued despite the obvious thawing of the Cold War in the 1970s and impact of the Sino-Soviet Split.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 'The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was the main cause of the Second Cold War.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

10 Assess the extent to which Cold War hostility was responsible for the United States' growing involvement in Vietnam in the years 1954 to 1968.

Responses deployed good knowledge of a range of examples, with the focus on Containment and Domino Theory being the most typical. There was also valid commentary on the wider Cold War context, with reference made to the Berlin and Cuba crises, for instance. Candidates generally found themselves very much in agreement with the proposition, although some of the strongest responses were able to discuss Kennedy's motivations and the desire not to be seen as 'soft' on communism. There was also some effective discussion of Johnson's policies to address the issue of 'growing involvement.'

11 'The People's Republic of China's support for nationalist movements in Africa was mainly motivated by its rivalry with the USSR.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 'The most important contribution to the Arab–Israeli peace process in the 1970s was made by Anwar Sadat.' Discuss this view.

Responses demonstrated good relevant knowledge of examples such as the Camp David Accords, however several responses drifted from the conceptual focus of the question and instead discussed the causes of the Palestine crisis which was not the requirement.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/42 Depth Study</p>
--

Key messages

- The most successful responses tailored their knowledge to the specific demands of the question and ensured that the material they used related to the correct chronological timeframe specified.
- Effective responses avoided narrative and description of events and provided a balanced, clear, analysis of relevant issues that supported a directed argument and reached a judgement.
- Using the question to determine what criteria will be used to make judgements is good practice.

General comments

Most candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and should aim for balanced analysis. Stronger responses attempted to consistently compare the relative significance of different factors and attempted to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left overall judgements to the conclusion. The most effective responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the specific enquiry and were able to ensure that their answers directly addressed the wording of the question. In the case of **Question 1** and **Question 3** for example, this involved engaging with the conceptual focus of 'a nation of fascists' and an 'economic miracle' respectively. Good awareness of the chronology was also evident in the most effective responses and **Question 2** answers, for example, contained precise knowledge of the nature of Stalin's propaganda campaigns.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Assess the view that by 1941 Mussolini had failed to create a nation of fascists.

Responses which engaged directly with the conceptual focus of the question – the extent of popularity and loyalty for Mussolini's regime – were very effective, especially those which engaged with the issue of genuine support. Many agreed with the proposition and decided that what support Mussolini did gain was conditional and mostly related to vested interests. The continued need and use of repression through the OVRA and the heavy use of propaganda were often cited as examples, as was the marked lack of enthusiasm for war. Other responses considered the failure of Italians to fully engage with social policies such as the Battle of Births as evidence and considered that the popularity of the OND's activities did not constitute political support. Balance was achieved through providing examples of genuine support, sometimes tied to foreign policy success.

2 'Stalin's control of the Soviet Union in the years 1928 to 1941 was mainly the result of successful propaganda.' Discuss this view.

Most responses were able to show the interconnections between different factors of which propaganda and terror were the most notable. The most effective responses often had strong knowledge of the different forms which propaganda took, whilst others dealt with the stated factor in more general terms before moving onto their favoured alternative and focused largely on repression. Strong arguments were seen in some cases where candidates argued that propaganda played a vital role in covering up the various disastrous consequences of Stalin's policies and exploited the deeply nationalistic feelings of most of the Russian people. Thoughtful analysis of the traditional tolerance of authoritarian rule was also present in some of the stronger responses. A minority of weaker responses paid little attention to the dates presented in the question and wrote about how Stalin gained control of the Soviet Union.

3 'The success of the Nazi regime's economic policies in the years 1933 to 1939 amounted to a miracle.' Discuss this view.

Stronger responses engaged directly with the concept of an apparent economic miracle in Germany during these years and used their knowledge to assess its validity. Others tended to ignore the phrasing of the question, but did assess the extent of success of Hitler's economic policies. Those that did deal with the conceptual focus of the question, often tended to disagree with the argument. While acknowledging that the rapid decline in unemployment did appear to be miraculous, this was countered with discussions of the nature of the employment offered, the concept of 'invisible unemployment' and the extent to which deficit financing policies were novel and that Germany's economic recovery was underway prior to 1933 and was mirrored elsewhere. The extent to which the economy was geared towards rearmament, autarky and war was also used to argue that many German people's living standards failed to improve, with valid references to guns v butter being made. There was often detailed knowledge of Mefo Bills and the extent to which Germany reached autarky, although this was not always securely tied to the question. Weaker responses ignored the references to the Nazi regime, or the dates provided in the question and discussed the years before 1933. A minority of responses discussed foreign policy and did so without the necessary references to economics.

4 'The political dominance of the British Conservative Party in the years 1922 to 1939 was due to its leadership.' Analyse this view.

Responses to this question were effective, with some good knowledge of, particularly, Baldwin's role in guiding the Conservatives for most of this period. Alternatives focused on the decline of the Liberals, particularly as a result of the split between Asquith and Lloyd George's wings of the party and their subsequent struggles. Comparisons between Baldwin's 'safety-first' approach and the role of the establishment, including press barons, in undermining the fledgling Labour government of 1924 by highlighting its apparent revolutionary tendencies were made by some stronger responses. Others pointed to Macdonald's weakness and failure to break with economic orthodoxy from 1929 to explain Labour's failure.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 'Improvements in transport and communications were the greatest achievement of Eisenhower's domestic policy.' Discuss this view.

The most popular question in this section and generally answered with a degree of competence, as long as candidates paid heed to the term 'domestic' in the question.

Most responses had a good focus on 'domestic policy' and, when addressing the stated factor, largely relied on Eisenhower's Interstate Highways Act and its various consequences for the economy and society. A smaller number of responses were able to incorporate the St Lawrence Seaway into their arguments. Some use was made of Eisenhower's economic policies, although examples of social policies such as health and education were more common. The same could be said for African American civil rights, with references to the 1957 Civil Rights Act, often without a great deal of supporting information, and Eisenhower's support for the Little Rock Nine. Some responses referred to McCarthyism, with varying degrees of relevance to the question and others drifted into commentary on the Cold War, which lacked relevance.

6 'The oil crises were the most important reason for economic deterioration in the 1970s.' Assess this view.

Responses to this question were generally very confident with the material. Some of the most convincing analysis posited the view that the Oil Crisis only served to worsen and to accelerate problems already in existence before 1973. Reasons for this economic decline included the impact of Bretton Woods, the rise of foreign competition – most notably from Germany and Japan, the impact of high government spending in the 1960s on Johnson's Great Society programme and on the Vietnam War. The strongest responses also debated the efficacy of Nixon's policies.

7 Evaluate the impact of the Rainbow Coalition on US politics in the years 1984 to 1992.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

8 Assess the consequences of the Cuban Missile Crisis for relations between the US and USSR.

Most responses provided good analysis of the consequences of the Cuban Missile Crisis by focusing on the steps taken during the 1960s to avoid a similar situation. Balance was achieved by discussing ongoing tensions, for example over Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the continued stockpiling of nuclear weapons. The most focused responses dealt largely with the 1960s, although it was valid to discuss later events.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 ‘The fall of the Berlin Wall resulted in the collapse of communist rule in Eastern Europe and the USSR.’ Analyse this view.

The strongest responses focused on the collapse of communist rule in both Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. A small number of responses provided cogent analysis of the situation in the USSR but chose not to mention Eastern Europe at all and therefore did not meet the conceptual demands of the question. Valid analysis in some particularly thoughtful responses saw the fall of the wall as little more than symbolic and argued that the rot had already set in, providing examples such as Poland to support this view. Equally reasonable was the argument that events in Berlin in November 1989 served to massively accelerate the collapse by pointing to examples like Romania and Bulgaria. In relation to the USSR, the high cost of the arms race and the war in Afghanistan, failings of the command economy and the impact of Gorbachev’s attempts to salvage the situation were all included and used to argue that the fall of the Berlin Wall was incidental to a process which was well under way already.

10 Assess the extent to which discontent with the Kuomintang resulted in the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949.

Responses were well-informed as to the reasons for the unpopularity of the Kuomintang, commonly referencing Chiang’s corruption and the ill-treatment of the populace by his troops, as well as the implications of US support, and its reduction. On the other side, Mao’s policies towards the peasantry, military tactics and Soviet support were among the most common examples provided. The strongest responses were clear in their judgement and, whilst accepting that there were various competing factors at play, set out their line of reasoning from the outset, maintaining their analysis throughout which was a very effective approach.

11 ‘Mass support for nationalist movements was the main reason African nations gained their independence after 1950.’ Discuss this view.

Responses were often stronger on the counterarguments than the stated factor in this question. A range of valid alternatives were introduced, which included the skills of named individual leaders, the emerging anticolonial feelings after World War Two, the economic situation facing the colonial powers in this period and the use of violence by groups such as the Mau Mau. Some responses also made effective comments about the role of the media, including the written and broadcast word.

12 Evaluate the impact of Yasser Arafat’s leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organisation up to 1979.

Most responses had good understanding of Arafat’s role, whilst others relied more on the background to his leadership. Most common examples included his speech to the United Nations and the issue of recognition. There was also good detail on the violence of groups such as Black September and Arafat’s response. Weaker responses were less confident about the analytical aspect of the question and only the most effective responses provided convincing analysis of his actual impact, particularly on the wider context of the Middle East at this time.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/43 Depth Study</p>
--

Key messages

- The most successful responses tailored their knowledge to the specific demands of the question and ensured that the material they used related to the correct chronological timeframe specified.
- Effective responses avoided narrative and description of events and provided a balanced, clear, analysis of relevant issues that supported a directed argument and reached a judgement.
- Using the question to determine what criteria will be used to make judgements is good practice.

General comments

Most candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and should aim for balanced analysis. Stronger responses attempted to consistently compare the relative significance of different factors and attempted to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left overall judgements to the conclusion. The most effective responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the specific enquiry and were able to ensure that their answers directly addressed the wording of the question. Less effective responses were more generalised, often giving the stated factor cursory attention before moving onto alternative explanations – for example **Question 2**, where several responses did not explore the security of the Soviet Union as a motivation for the Great Terror. Others did not consider the full question demand – for example in **Question 1**, some responses discussed the success and failure of individual policies without specifically relating them to the idea of improving the Italian economy.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Assess the extent to which Mussolini's policies improved the Italian economy.

Although the focus was often on economic policies, it was valid to include the impact of Mussolini's foreign policy and there were comments made about Spain and Abyssinia which included relevance. The strongest responses were firmly focused on the precise demands of the question and made clear judgements about the impact of policies on the overall economy, rather than simply branding each one as a 'success' or 'failure' on its own terms. This particularly applied to examples such as the drive for self-sufficiency and the Corporate State.

2 'Stalin's concern for the security of the Soviet Union was the main cause of the Great Terror.' Assess this view.

Stronger responses thought carefully about what 'the security of the Soviet Union' might refer to and several of the strongest considered the impact of the rise of Nazism in Germany, its appeasement by Britain and France and the growing Japanese presence in the Far East. Most responses, however, interpreted 'security of the Soviet Union' as internal and used it to discuss Stalin's paranoia and megalomania which were valid examples of counterarguments, but not fully appreciating the focus of the question. Many candidates offered a logical response by arguing that Stalin's concern for the security of the Soviet Union could not have been important given the purges of the military, choosing to ignore the fact that not all of Stalin's policies were driven by logic. The most effective responses were able to demonstrate the inter-play between external threats and Stalin's domestic policy, for instance by exploring how the growing threat from Germany demanding increased discipline, greater efforts towards industrialisation and the necessity to cover up some of the disastrous consequences of Stalin's economics. Most responses evidenced strong knowledge of

Kirov, Ryutin and the purging of the Old Bolsheviks, and some offered effective arguments about the extent to which the NKVD contributed. However, most responses remained firmly rooted in explanations which were dominated by Stalin.

3 'The Nazi regime was popular mainly due to its economic success.' Evaluate this view.

The crucial area of consideration was Nazi popularity and stronger responses recognised this, discussing, for example, how job creation through public works schemes proved very popular. Valid counterarguments included successful foreign policy which fed into German nationalism, the effects of the propaganda machine, the benefits of social policies and the persecution of minority groups which satisfied the traditional hatreds of many. Weaker responses tended to misunderstand the focus and discussed whether the Nazis were popular or not, or the extent to which Nazi economic policies were actually successful, neither of which was the focus of the question.

4 Discuss the view that women's roles and status changed significantly in Britain in the period 1919–39.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 Analyse the reasons why fear of communism was so widespread in the US in the late 1940s and 1950s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

6 'Rising prices were the biggest challenge to the US economy in the 1960s and 1970s.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

7 'Much less radical than it appeared.' Evaluate this view of Reagan's economic policy.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

8 Assess the motives for US attempts at nuclear arms limitation in the period 1963–79.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 'US fear of communism was the main cause of the Cuban Crisis.' Discuss this view.

There was a good deal of agreement with the proposition, often rooted in the context of the events of the 1940s and 50s, including the loss of China, Korea and McCarthyism, while some responses went further back to reference the Monroe Doctrine. Containment was commonly cited as an important influence. Knowledge on the Bay of Pigs and Operation Mongoose was often strong. Candidates usually were able to explore significance for American domestic security of the placing of nuclear missiles in their 'backyard.' The strongest responses often considered US economic interests in the area and how Castro had interfered with them, although most other responses did not address this aspect. Kennedy's need to prove himself, particularly following the Bay of Pigs also featured in some responses and this was a valid explanation. Alternative explanations focused on the role of Khrushchev and Castro. Many pointed out that Khrushchev was aiming to bolster his position and test the inexperienced US president's resolve, as well as gaining parity given the presence of UN missiles in Turkey. Castro was often presented in a favourable light – having been pushed into the arms of the Soviets by American aggression. The most effective responses made a clear case from the outset and committed to this argument using a consistent line of reasoning.

10 'The USA benefited more than the People's Republic of China from improved Sino-US relations in the 1970s and 1980s.' Evaluate this view.

The strongest responses were very clear in identifying their criteria for what constituted a benefit, while weaker responses often changed their argument as to who were beneficiaries midway through the answer. Geopolitically, there were genuine benefits for both, with references to Taiwan and Chinese admission to the

United Nations being commonly cited. Leverage for changing relations with the Soviet Union was highlighted as a benefit for the US, as was Vietnam, although it was common to overstate what China was willing and able to achieve here. Responses found it more challenging to discuss economic developments in depth, although there was valid commentary which argued that US short term gains were outweighed more in the longer term by China, which was able to move beyond the Great Leap Forward and Cultural Revolution years.

11 Analyse the challenges facing agricultural development in the newly independent African nations.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 Assess the extent to which the aims of the revolutionaries in Iran were achieved by 1981.

Most responses focused on aims such as removing the Shah and US influence and imposing an Islamic state, with the strongest acknowledging that these two goals were not necessarily shared by all revolutionaries. There was good knowledge showed in many responses about why the Shah was so unpopular, but only a few provided effective discussions on the interaction between the political and economic demands on one hand and religious influence on the other and how the latter came to dominate.