

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/11**  
**Document Question 11**

## Key messages

- This assessment focusses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates approach.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read them and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

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

## General comments

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

Weaker responses to part **(a)** were often rushed. Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify similarity and difference. Weaker responses often attempted to only identify one comparison, either similarity or difference, whichever was the more obvious. Many did not attempt to consider the other half of the question. Another feature of weaker responses was to include large sections of contextual knowledge. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences. The consequence of these approaches was that the vast majority of candidates achieved Level 2 marks for their answers to **(a)**.

For part **(b)** questions, many candidates concentrated on analysing the four sources without any evaluation. The consequence of this was that the vast majority of candidates achieved Level 3 for their answers to **(b)**. In order to achieve the higher Levels of the mark scheme candidates need to include specific evaluation. To provide specific evaluation rather than generic comments candidates need to use their own contextual knowledge to decide on the accuracy of either the content or the provenance of the chosen source. A helpful starting position when doing so is to decide how unreliable a source might be. Weaker candidates often assert that a source is essentially reliable. It is often better if they start from the opposite end of evaluative spectrum.

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

**Comments on specific questions**

***Section A, the European Option: The War with Austria 1859***

- 1 (a) To what extent do Sources A and B provide evidence that Napoleon's views on Italy had changed greatly between 1856 and 1858?**

Most candidates identified the main difference in Napoleon's views: Source A said that in 1856 Napoleon saw the future of Italy would involve Austria whereas two years later he was reported as wanting Austria expelled from Italy. There were other differences which were rarely spotted. These include support for an Italian confederation in Source A as opposed to support for a Kingdom of Northern Italy in Source B. A very few candidates identified the similarities needed to ensure Level 3 marks. The best responses identified that both sources showed Napoleon expecting major change in Italy and that change would violence of some kind to bring about.

- 1 (b) 'The motive for both France and Piedmont for going to war against Austria in 1859 was to drive Austria out of Italy.' How far do Sources A to D support the view that Austria was the biggest obstacle to change in Italy?**

Most candidates found enough evidence in the sources to both challenge and support the thesis. They identified Source A as a clear challenge, Napoleon seeing Austria as part of the new Italy. Source B was clear in supporting the thesis, Napoleon agreeing to go to war against Austria in order to expel it from Italy. There was one detail of Source B which confused some candidates; they thought that Prince Napoleon, intended husband of Victor Emmanuel's daughter, was Napoleon himself instead of his son. Source C caused some confusion with candidates dismissing the source because the extract does not actually mention Austria, highlighting the importance of sound contextual knowledge. Talk of war between Napoleon and Cavour in 1858 can only be about the forthcoming war with Austria. Where contextual knowledge was less secure candidates could have used Source B to show who the intended enemy was going to be. Contextual knowledge was also useful when analysing Source D. Piedmont wants war, but to expand in northern Italy. Such expansion could only be at the expense of Austria, which occupied much of northern Italy. Some candidates, however, drew a distinction between Piedmontese expansion and war with Austria, which weakened their analysis.

Very few candidates reached Level 4 for accurate evaluation. Attempts at evaluation were usually generic, examples of which include asserting that the source is primary or, in the case of Source D, written by an Englishman and therefore reliable or unreliable. Accurate evaluation must be detailed and specific. The best responses assessed the sources using contextual knowledge. The best-known contextual event in preparations for the war with Austria was the secret meeting of Napoleon and Cavour at Plombieres in July 1858. This meeting was held to agree on how to bring about war with Austria. This meeting could be used to evaluate Source B in particular, suggesting that the source is a reliable one.

***Section B, the American Option: The Missouri Compromise 1820***

- 2 (a) To what extent do Sources C and D agree about President Monroe's attitude towards the Missouri Compromise?**

Many candidates identified a valid similarity or difference between the sources. Some correctly identified both, thus reaching Level 3. Many noted that Source C is a Southern source and is concerned that the President might veto the Missouri Compromise (this was because doing so would undermine the Compromise and thus prevent Missouri from becoming a slave state). Source D shows that the President was very close to vetoing the Compromise. This is one similarity, which many candidates understood and explained. The main difference, which many candidates identified, was that Source C showed Monroe thinking of vetoing the bill while Source D shows the President accepting it. A minority misinterpreted Source D because they thought that 'it' in the third line applied to the Compromise, when in fact it applied to the veto.

- 2 (b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the Missouri Compromise was in fact a victory for the North?**

Most candidates were able to explain how some sources supported the thesis and some challenged it, thus reaching Level 3. Analysis of Sources A and B was usually more assured than their

consideration of Sources C and D. Weaker responses argued that Source A was neutral as it did not express a view, whereas stronger responses understood that the Compromise itself could be used both to support and challenge the assertion. There were contrasting responses to Source B as well. Source B sees the Compromise, the death knell of the Union, as a victory for neither side and therefore challenges the assertion. The majority of candidates understood and explained this analysis. A minority equated the Union with the North, however, making the correct assessment of the source but basing their judgement on unsafe foundations. Most correctly identified Source C as a Southern source but tended to dismiss it because it was written before the Missouri Compromise became law. Source D, a more reflective look back to the Compromise, was rarely analysed at length.

Very few candidates attempted to evaluate the sources and those who did, did so in very general terms, which is not enough to ensure a Level 4 mark. The best attempts at evaluation came from those who focused on Source B. They did know who Jefferson was and so could comment on his pessimistic view of the Compromise. Some argued Source B was reliable because it is written by one of the Founders, one of the great men of US history. Others were more critical, arguing he was an old man who admitted he knew little of current events. Candidates found Sources C and D much harder to evaluate. Comments on Source C usually went no further than explaining it was a primary source written before the Compromise became law and thus of limited use. Too many asserted that Source D was reliable simply because it was written many years later. Evaluation needs to be as specific as possible. Candidates should use a combination of source content, provenance and contextual knowledge to decide how reliable a source can be.

### ***Section C, International Option: The Soviet Union and the League of Nations***

#### **3 (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of communist attitudes towards participation in the League of Nations.**

Many candidates found it easier to identify differences than similarities. Source A shows the leading communist of the time being extremely critical of the League of Nations, as a result of which the USSR refuses to join it. Source B, from a marginal communist source, shows the USSR being prepared to join the League. There was also a clear difference between the two sources, Source A coming from the leading Soviet communist, Source B from an American communist magazine, presumably with a limited circulation. Those who read the sources carefully were also able to identify similarities: in terms of content, both were critical of the League, which they saw as imperialist and up to no good; in terms of province, both were written at times with the USSR felt under threat.

#### **3 (b) ‘The Soviet Union did not believe that the League of Nations could encourage peace and security.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Most candidates successfully identified that Source A supported the assertion, as Stalin is arguing that the League was a camouflage for the aggressive ambitions of the imperialist Western states. The other source supporting the assertion was Source D, which asserted that ‘the League couldn’t act as an instrument of peace’. Most candidates were able to find evidence to challenge the assertion in both Sources B and, to a lesser extent Source C. Source B argues that the League could encourage peace now that Germany and Japan had left and the USSR was in the process of joining. Source C is more ambivalent. It believes that the League could be a force for peace thereafter. However, it also argues that the League has not been a peace-keeper in the past. Most candidates reached Level 3 marks by successfully identifying these points.

The source which most candidates were able to provide specific evaluation for was Source D. They often used its provenance to argue that the USSR was bound to criticise the organisation which had recently expelled it for invading Finland, a state which was definitely small in comparison to the USSR. Thus, Pravda’s comment about small states is shown to be hypocritical and the source itself unreliable. Stronger responses were also able to evaluate Sources A and C using contextual knowledge of international relations in 1927 and 1934 respectively. Most candidates struggled to assess the reliability of Source B. Those who attempted to do so emphasised the American origin of the source, assuming that it was bound to be anti-Soviet. Perhaps more important was that the article came from a communist magazine. In the 1930s, a time of weakness for the US economy, communist ideas attracted more support than they did in the Cold War era. Therefore, the fact that it is [mildly] critical of the Soviet leadership makes it more reliable.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/12**  
**Document Question 12**

## Key messages

- This assessment focusses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates approach.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read them and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

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

## General comments

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

Weaker responses to part **(a)** were often rushed. Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. This was less of an issue with regard to **(b)** questions. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify similarity and difference. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

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

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section 2**, Source B which is a public speech from Lincoln regarding the Missouri Compromise. In analysing whether the passing of the compromise showed Southern dominance it is clear from reading the source and from using contextual knowledge of the motivations of Lincoln, that he was keen to emphasise that both sides made compromises. However, many candidates used the sentence 'Threats of breaking up the union were made' to suggest that there was Southern dominance, but this is not what Lincoln wants to convey overall. Thus, candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making judgements.

To achieve higher evaluation marks it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example was in **Section C** where two sources from F.D. Roosevelt were provided to consider his views on international peace-keeping. Some candidates were able to comment on the different purposes of these sources as well as just pointing out the obvious time difference. Others also successfully used contextual knowledge to place the sources in their context. When using these ideas it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date and saying it is unreliable.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section A, the European Option: The Problems facing German Nationalists before 1850**

##### **1 (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of attitudes towards liberal ideas.**

The two extracts came from very different sources: Metternich and Johann Wirth (a Prussian radical). Metternich's proposals in Source A show that he had a negative attitude towards liberalism and its 'rebellious ideas' whilst Source B talked about the 'people's sovereignty' positive way. Source A shows that Metternich intended to repress the freedom of the press whilst Source B was focused on freedom and liberation. Source A says that Germany should consist of sovereign states whereas Source B wants to work towards a federated and republican Europe. Most candidates correctly identified the similarity between the two sources was that both expressed a desire to maintain peace and order; some candidates also recognised that both were evidence of an oppression of liberal values by showing the intention of Metternich and the later evidence of Wirth. Weaker responses often struggled to define the term 'liberal ideas' and this led to comparisons which were not valid. Candidates who had a clear appreciation of the concept identified several relevant similarities and differences.

##### **1 (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that Austria was the principal obstacle to German Unification before 1850?**

The source which provided the clearest support for the assertion was Source A from Metternich himself, his vision of what the German federation should look like clearly shows that he was against the idea of unification. At face value this source suggests that Austria is the principal obstacle to unification and can be supported by relevant contextual knowledge of Metternich and the impact of the Carlsbad Decrees. A significant number of candidates struggled to interpret the source accurately which caused their responses to the other sources to also be quite muddled. Weaker responses often contained a large section of contextual knowledge about Metternich and his actions without making a clear attempt to link the ideas to the source and question. The remainder of the sources could generally be used to argue against the assertion as they exposed some of the other obstacles to unification i.e. the reluctance of aristocratic families to work together or take on the crown (Sources B and D) and the lack of economic unity (Source C). Many candidates also used contextual knowledge to argue that there were elements of Austrian influence in these sources, for example, the fact that Austria opposed the formation of the Zollverein and thus undermined economic unity. This worked most successfully when candidates could make a clear link between their knowledge and the source. The most successful evaluation was often of Source D where candidates were able to point out the purpose of Frederick William's reply to the Frankfurt Parliament and use it to question his real motives. It is important that candidates attempting evaluation ensure that it is based on specific context and provenance in order to achieve to Level 4.

#### **Section B, the American Option: Henry Clay and the Missouri Compromise, 1820**

##### **2 (a) To what extent do Sources A and C agree about the role of Henry Clay in achieving Congressional approval for the Missouri Compromise?**

Some candidates had some difficulty in answering this question, most commonly as a result of confusion about the exact loyalties of Henry Clay. It was necessary to recognise the role of Clay as the great compromiser in order to recognise why he may disagree with Thomas Hart Benton. Candidates that had a secure knowledge of the period were able to show how Source A plays down Clay's role in agreeing the Compromise whilst Source C says that Clay was the undisputed author of the final element of the Compromise. In addition, candidates were able to recognise the difference in emphasis between the sources where Source A focused on the 36°30' line whilst Source C considered the Missouri Compromise in its entirety. Both sources agreed that it was a commonly held view that Clay was the author of the compromise and in turn both Sources state the claim was

undeserved. The provenance of both sources was central to being able to explain the similarities and differences. Candidates who recognised that during the unsettled 1850s both men had reasons for portraying the creation of the 1820 Compromise in a particular way were able to highlight why there were differences. Candidates who displayed an understanding of the workings of the government of the United States were also make points about the different emphasis put on the House of Representatives and the Senate.

**2 (b) 'The passage of the Missouri Compromise in 1820 highlighted the dominance of the South over US politics.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

The source that caused the most confusion amongst candidates was Source B, from a public speech by Lincoln. Candidates sometimes seemed confused to encounter Lincoln in a period before the main conflicts of the Civil War and struggled to interpret what he was saying. Like Clay in Source A, Lincoln is attempting to show a sense of compromise and working together in this source (no doubt as a way of highlighting the importance of his real focus throughout his career: the Union). The phrase which shows this clearly is his assertion that 'both sides yielded something'. Therefore, although he might suggest issues from both sides the overall message of this source rejects Southern dominance. Candidates who were able to interpret this successfully and support this with the message of compromise and legal working in Source A were, in turn, able to recognise the opposite opinions in Sources C and D. Source C claims Southern dominance and sees it as a positive thanks to the clear purpose of Thomas Hart Benton writing in the troubled year of 1854 for an audience longing to see the final victory of the South. In contrast, Source D laments the Southern dominance which meant that the Compromise could pass even whilst it 'was strongly opposed by the majority of Northern people'. Candidates who were most successful at evaluation were able to look at the sources from Clay and Benton; and place them in their context to comment on nature, origin and purpose.

**Section C, International Option: The Origins of the United Nations**

**3 (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of F. D. Roosevelt's opinions about international peacekeeping organisations.**

The two sources in question were both extracts from President Roosevelt taken 12 years apart and the strongest responses were able to use the respective years to interpret each source. In Source A Roosevelt is very clear that he is against American participation in the League of Nations whereas in Source B he is enthusiastic about the outcomes of the Dumbarton Oaks conference. In 1932 Roosevelt sees the League as a place to discuss 'European national difficulties' whereas in 1944 he emphasises the role of different countries and the focus on 'the maintenance of international peace'. In Source A he states the League has not 'developed along the course contemplated by its founder' whereas in Source B he believes that the 'task of planning the great design of security and peace has been well begun'. Some candidates struggled to recognise that the main similarity was that Roosevelt shows an underlying enthusiasm for international peacekeeping organisations in both sources, but those that did emphasised the difference between the theoretical and the practical. Weaker responses could have been improved by placing greater focus on comparing and contrasting the sources rather than explaining which one was more reliable.

**3 (b) 'The same thing with a different name.' How far do Sources A to D support this comparison between the League of Nations and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a United Nations Organisation?**

The key source for this question was Source C which offered arguments that both supported and challenged the statement. It is clear from the British magazine that some did think that the United Nations was 'the same thing with a different name', indeed that is where the quote appears. However, the source then goes on to argue against this notion. Candidates who recognised the support offered by this source were then able to use the other sources, especially B and D to challenge the statement by pointing out clear ways in which it was presumed the United Nations would be different. Some candidates struggled to use Source A as it concentrates on an earlier period but most were able to cross reference its content with Source B to show the difference of opinion about the organisations from Roosevelt and link them together to challenge the statement. Source D was generally well interpreted and candidates were able to use images such as the gun to describe differences between the League of Nations and the United Nations. Less successful responses often concentrated on small similarities to try and use Source D to support the statement but this was not valid. The most successful attempts at evaluation were often made when referring to

the two sources from Roosevelt. Stronger responses drew on their knowledge of the different purpose Roosevelt had in each instance to suggest that each source could be limited in how honest it was about the real differences between the organisations.

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9389/13 Document Question 13</p>
---

## Key messages

- This assessment focusses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates approach.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read them and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

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

## General comments

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

Weaker responses to part **(a)** were often rushed. Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. This was less of an issue with regard to **(b)** questions. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify similarity and difference. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

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

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section 3**, Source C which is an article from an American newspaper regarding the San Francisco conference. In analysing where the idea of a veto had originated the paper says '*At the time of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference last summer, it was believed that the veto originated with Russia and was opposed by the USA and Britain.*' and then goes on to say the idea had actually come from the US delegation. However, many candidates used part of the first sentence to suggest that it came from the USSR when it is clear that the whole source suggests otherwise. Candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissect sections of it when making judgements.



To achieve higher evaluation marks it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example was in **Section A** where Source D came from a British writer A.S. Bicknell. Some candidates suggested this made the source particularly reliable because it was British; this was not taken as a valid comment. The British government and press had a particular interest in the region and in the activities of Garibaldi; in addition the author had travelled with Garibaldi meaning he was much more likely to know about him than Mazzini. When using these ideas it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the authorship and saying it is reliable or unreliable.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section A, the European Option: Mazzini and Garibaldi**

##### **1 (a) Compare and contrast the views on Garibaldi in Sources C and D.**

The two extracts came from quite different sources and, as such, many candidates successfully identified differences. Source C says that Garibaldi provided great generalship whereas Source D says that his contribution has been exaggerated. Source C says that Garibaldi was a brave and inspiring leader whereas Source D says that Garibaldi only succeeded in Sicily because of the peasant revolt. Source C says his skills were important to victory in both Sicily and Naples whereas Source D says they were only useful to minor struggles in South America. Many candidates were also able to use appropriate contextual knowledge to support and further explain these differences. The main similarity between the two sources was that they both recognised that the military skills of Garibaldi had been praised by many people. It should be noted that the question focused on Garibaldi even though both sources also talked about Mazzini. In this question it was not valid to compare the actions and views of Mazzini because he was not named in the question. Weaker responses struggled to make valid comparisons in this question because they were distracted by sections of the text which were about Mazzini or the relationship between him and Garibaldi. The strongest responses considered the impact that the provenance of each source might have had upon its view of Garibaldi.

##### **1 (b) ‘Mazzini played a vital role in bringing about Italian unification.’ How far do Sources C and D support this view?**

The source which was crucial to a balanced answer is Source C. The other three sources broadly challenge the assertion that Mazzini played a vital role in bringing about Italian unification by pointing out his various weaknesses and character defects. Source C argues that ‘Mazzini...succeeded in making all the tyrants of Europe tremble on their thrones.’ placing him at the centre of the movement. It is worth noting that Bicknell is a strong supporter of Garibaldi so his praise of Mazzini is worth taking notice of, although by 1868 after unification is settled maybe he is more open to looking favourably on all those who worked for the cause. Source A clearly states that Mazzini was not up to the task and many candidates were able to begin to comment on the impact that the relationship between Cavour and Mazzini might have on how much weight we can give this opinion. Many candidates also showed that they were able to select sections of Source B and Source D which suggested that Mazzini’s role lacked importance. Some candidates were led astray by Source D and Bicknell’s British nationality. It is not valid to say that Britain was any more neutral than any other state in this struggle; in fact British interest was largely against Austria and so sometimes tacitly in favour of unification. The much more important point to make about the origin of Source D is that Bicknell had travelled with Garibaldi up through southern Italy and so was much more likely to know about this than the activities of Mazzini in the North. It is therefore questionable how far we can trust his judgement of Mazzini’s work being exaggerated.

#### **Section B, the American Option: The Fugitive Slave Act: The Case of Joshua Glover**

##### **2 (a) To what extent do Sources A and C agree about the arrest of Joshua Glover?**

Most candidates explained that the two sources differed over whether a warrant had been issued for the arrest; showing that Source A states that Glover’s owner had a warrant for Glover’s arrest whereas Source C says that there was no warrant for the arrest; instead he ‘captured’ him. Another difference can be shown when Source A says that only necessary force was used in the arrest, whereas Source C states that Glover resisted and force was used leaving the jail ‘covered with dirt and blood’. There were also similarities in the sources such as the mention of law officers being used in the arrest and both saying that the incident led to Glover being put in jail. Stronger responses were

also able to explain the differences by considering the provenance of each source. Source A had a particular purpose and was written with a legal framework possibly constructing a narrative that would be used later whereas Source C was written by the owner of a local abolitionist newspaper who may have wanted to over-emphasise the violence involved in the incident.

**2 (b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that implementing the Fugitive Slave Act worked well?**

Some responses demonstrated that there was confusion about what 'worked well' meant in the context of the question. Some candidates argued that violence meant it was working well but this is not really a valid interpretation of the sources or the time period. The Fugitive Slave Act was passed as a law which was supposed to end the violence of bounty hunting and disagreement between the North and South, thus violence is not evidence of it 'working well'. Source A is the only source that provided evidence that suggests that the act is working well and candidates were able to suggest reasons why the purpose of the source may lead us to question its reliability. The other three sources broadly suggest ways in which the act was failing by leading to increased violence, particularly focused on in Source B, and in Source D which include vigilante style reactions from the abolitionist community. Many candidates were able to point out that all of these sources have a distinctly abolitionist tone and so their painting of the incident may not be entirely reliable. Sources C and D also offer views from after the Civil War when the Fugitive Slave Act was largely condemned as a mistake so their bold accusations of violence are maybe not surprising but might be questioned using evidence of the actual actions taken as a result of the act. Contextual knowledge of the arguments surrounding the Fugitive Slave Act was often put to good use in the best responses.

**Section C, International Option: The Origins of the United Nations and Veto Rights**

**3 (a) Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence of the US government's attitude towards the granting of veto rights to the Big Five Powers.**

The sources in question were extracts from articles in American newspapers from near the beginning and end of the San Francisco conference. Most candidates coped well with looking for differences between the sources recognising that Source B says that the US government was against the veto, whereas Source C suggests that the idea of the veto originated with the US. Source B also has a much stronger anti-Soviet view and accuses the USSR of blackmailing the US with talk of the veto whereas Source C says that Stalin was surprised at the discussions. There was also a difference in the impact the US government thought the veto would have with Source B suggesting the US government thought the veto would prevent war, whereas Source C says the US government wanted to placate domestic isolationists and stop them being involved in foreign conflict. Many candidates identified it was clear in both sources that Roosevelt wanted the Big 3 to be involved in any organisation and so the US was willing to accept the veto for the sake of international unity.

**3 (b) How far does Sources A to D support the view that the Soviet Union was responsible for the divisions which appeared at the San Francisco Conference over the issue of veto rights for the Big Five Powers?**

Some candidates found this question challenging as all four sources were taken from American newspapers at different times in the same year. However, many candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to comment on the content of the sources. Source A stands out as it is taken from an article published after the Dumbarton Oaks conference six months before San Francisco. It does begin to suggest that the Soviet Union was causing tensions but its obvious weakness is that it does not relate directly to the framework of the question. Candidates who used thoughtful contextual knowledge were able to point this out and achieve marks in the top Levels. Source B and D also suggest to some extent that tensions were the fault of the Russians although B is much more forceful in its characterisation of Soviet actions. Source D also recognises that the US had an interest in the issue of veto rights being settled. Source C stands alone in making the US the clear culprit of tensions as the author of the veto. Some candidates were able to use knowledge of the discussions around San Francisco to point out the ongoing arguments between internationalists and isolationists in the US which it could be suggest Sources B and C highlight. Most candidates were able to pick out points showing support and challenge.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/21  
Outline Study 21

## Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they inter-reacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

**Part (a)** questions – These questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. The following is a clear example of relative significance from a response to **Question 10(a)**.

*In conclusion I feel the most significant reason why relations improved between France and Germany was because of France's willingness to cooperate with Germany, this is because if they were not willing to cooperate they would have never left the Ruhr. I feel this is more significant than staggering reparation payments and receiving loans because if France was not willing to take part in the Dawes Plan they would have not been able to stagger payments and provide loans to Germany as France wanted to make sure Germany was never going to be a threat to France again.*

Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of actors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

**Part (b)** questions – The most successful responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

**Comments on specific questions**

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

**Question 1 – France, 1789–1814**

**(a) Why did the Jacobins fail to retain power?**

Many excellent responses were able to refer to the radicalism of the Jacobins as alienating the majority of people in France, as seen in the Terror and the Cult of the Supreme Being. Other candidates could have improved their response by avoiding a narrative of Jacobin actions with no link to causation.

**(b) ‘The failings of the Directory explain Napoleon’s rise to power.’ How far do you agree?**

The more effective responses were able to analyse the failings of the Directory, failed coups and instability in the regions. This was then balanced with an analysis of the ways Napoleon exploited the situation, using his military reputation and the manoeuvrings of his brother. Most responses were based around description of the Directory’s action, alongside narrative accounts of Napoleon’s actions.

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

**(a) Why were canals important to the Industrial Revolution?**

Some very good responses were able to place canals and their relevance for transportation against a range of factors, such as the ability to transport goods in bulk, and the stimulus this provided to industrial production. Some responses showed confusion in stating that the water flowed fast in canals and so provided the power to operate factory machinery.

**(b) To what extent did the Industrial Revolution have different causes in different countries?**

Effective responses had a clear understanding of the question focus with appropriate references to the ‘laissez-faire’ approach of the British government, the more government directed stance in France and the role of the Zollverein in the German states. Other responses provided more generalised outlines of similarities and differences in the chosen countries.

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

**(a) Why did the alliance system affect international stability?**

Good responses provided explanations of the system’s part in increasing tension and creating the idea of different sides in any potential future dispute. These were supported by references to the Moroccan crises as examples of raising tension, by bringing in allies of the participant. Candidates could have improved their responses by focusing on the timeframe 1900–1914 and avoiding a description of the various alliances drawn up from The Three Emperors’ League onwards.

**(b) ‘The principal troublemaker in the period from 1900-1914’. Explain which country you think most deserves this title.**

Most candidates concentrated on Germany and provided focused analysis of her actions throughout the period 1900–1914, and this was, at times, set against the actions of the other Great Powers. Stronger responses reflected on ‘troublemaker’ and whether this equated with ‘most responsible for causing World War One’. Further improvement could have come from using the whole time period in order to develop a fuller assessment.

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

**(a) Why was Trotsky's role in the October 1917 Revolution important?**

In many responses candidates displayed sound knowledge of Trotsky's role in October 1917, such as his support of Lenin, relations with the Petrograd Soviet, and explained his importance in the Revolution of October 1917. Less well focused responses had difficulty with the chronology of events and wrote at length about his role in the Russian Civil War.

**(b) 'The 1905 Revolution failed'. How far do you agree with this view?**

The majority of candidates remained fully-focused on the requirements of the question. Many responses argued in support of the view that the 1905 Revolution had little impact, based on the evidence that, having made concessions in the October Manifesto, the Tsar rapidly reneged on them through the Fundamental Laws. Less well focused responses provided a narrative of Bloody Sunday or the Revolution of February 1917.

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

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

**(a) Why did the concept of Manifest Destiny gain such influence in the 1840s and 1850s?**

Most candidates were able to demonstrate a range of factors to explain why Manifest Destiny was influential in the mid-19th Century. The most effective responses showed detailed explanation, supported by the selection of appropriate and accurate factual evidence. Other responses showed some confusion about the requirements of the question and described Manifest Destiny.

**(b) 'American entry into the First World War meant the end of American isolationism'. How far do you agree?**

Effective responses had a clear understanding of the question with sound knowledge displayed on how American entry in 1917 created engagement with the wider world and how this also continued after the war. This was then balanced by an assessment of how American isolationism either ended before 1917, such as Roosevelt's Corollary leading to an increasing role in the political affairs of Latin America, or continued with isolationism after 1917-18, not joining the League of Nations. Less well focused responses wrote at length about how America came to enter the war in 1917, or were unsure of the idea of isolationism.

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

**(a) Why did it take the North three years to turn its superiority of resources over the South into a military victory?**

Most candidates were able to identify a number of factors to explain why Northern forces were largely unsuccessful in the early stages of the Civil War, despite the North's clear advantage in terms of resources. Relevant references were made to better Southern generalship in the first half of the war, fighting a defensive war, the scale of what the North had to achieve in order to win. Other responses lost the question's focus and described why the North eventually won rather than why it took so long to achieve victory.

**(b) How valid is the assertion that 'all plans for Reconstruction, whether Presidential or Congressional, were far too ambitious'?**

Good responses were able to highlight the South's lack of support for Northern aims, pointing to sharecropping, and the existence of the Ku Klux Klan and the introduction of the Black Codes. This was balanced against the achievements of the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments and the Freedman's Bureau, showing that reconstruction was not too ambitious. Weaker responses had a lack of understanding of Radical Reconstruction as against that of Presidential Reconstruction, or did not grasp the meaning of 'too ambitious'.

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

- (a) **Why were farming associations, such as the Granger movement, established in the late nineteenth century?**

Responses which were effective explained the role of unfair practices of railway companies, levels of farm debt and silver currency in the creation of the farming associations. Other responses could have been improved by avoiding narrative accounts of what the farming associations did.

- (b) **How deserved were the widespread criticisms of party bosses in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries?**

Effective responses displayed good knowledge of the party bosses' manipulation of the voting system through bribery and the consequent tarnishing of public life. Some responses balanced this with a discussion of how far providing jobs and shelter to immigrants could be seen as positive acts by the bosses in an age when there was no social security. Less focused responses confused party bosses with Industrial Tycoons and Presidents.

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

- (a) **Why, in 1935, was the second New Deal introduced?**

Most candidates were able to provide explanations of why the first New Deal was limited in its achievements and that Franklin Roosevelt had to act and do more. There were relevant references to the role of the Supreme Court in limiting the first New Deal, the growing pressure from critics on the left and the forthcoming election of 1936, all prompting Franklin Roosevelt to act and produce the second New Deal. Weaker responses could have been by keeping a clearer focus on the question and avoiding descriptions of the various aspects of the second New Deal.

- (b) **'The saviour of American democracy'. How far do you agree that Franklin Roosevelt deserves this title?**

The best responses realised that the question's focus was political rather than economic. This meant assessment was made of how far increasing federal government regulation undermined not only states' rights but also the spirit of American free enterprise, seen as a building block of American democracy. This was balanced against the fact that the size of the task Franklin Roosevelt faced called for innovative responses and that he was democratically elected on three occasions in this period by the American people. Weaker responses were typically narrative accounts of the economic measures undertaken by Franklin Roosevelt's administrations.

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

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

- (a) **Why was Japan stronger in 1918 than it had been in 1914?**

Good responses focused on the question's timeframe 1914–1918 and provided appropriate explanations for Japan's increased strength, such as territorial gains due to the First World War and the exploitation of economic opportunities as Europe concentrated on the war. Other candidates could have improved their response by keeping to the timeframe in the question and so avoid descriptive accounts of events pre-1914, sometimes all the way back to Commodore Perry.

- (b) **To what extent had Bismarck achieved his foreign policy aims by 1890?**

Effective responses explicitly stated Bismarck's aims as a yardstick with which to measure success, isolating France and avoiding conflict, and showed clear knowledge of Bismarck's alliances. Less good responses could have been improved by focusing on the end date of 1890, rather than providing narrative accounts of events after 1890 up to the outbreak of war in 1914.

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

**(a) Why did the Dawes Plan of 1924 help to improve relations between France and Germany?**

Most responses displayed sound knowledge of the Plan and its positive consequences for Franco-German relations, such as France's willingness to cooperate, the removal of troops from the Ruhr, and the Locarno treaties. Other responses could have been improved by focusing on results rather than descriptive accounts of why the Plan was created.

**(b) 'Criticism of the Paris peace settlement of 1919 was undeserved.' How far do you agree?**

Many candidates were able to identify appropriate evidence in support of the statement, Germany's harsh terms in the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, her role in causing war in 1914, the near impossibility of satisfying the conflicting aims of the victors. This was balanced, often, by reference to the high reparations demanded of Germany, the reduction in German armed forces to below a defensive capability and the abandonment of the 14 points as the basis for treating a defeated Germany. Weaker responses produced a narrative account of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

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

**(a) Why, by 1934, was Mussolini widely respected by European politicians?**

Good responses kept to the focus of 'by 1934' and could refer to Mussolini's actions regarding the Locarno Treaties, his support of Britain over Mosul and his thwarting of Hitler's ambitions in Austria in 1934. Other candidates could have improved their answers by keeping to the timeframe rather than writing at length about events post-1934, such as the invasion of Abyssinia and the Rome-Berlin Axis.

**(b) 'In September 1939, Hitler had every reason to believe that Britain would do nothing to defend Poland'. How far do you agree?**

Most answers could argue some reasons to agree with the statement, such as the feeling in Britain that the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were too harsh; Hitler was only taking land that was linked to Germany and the belief that after the Sudetenland Hitler's territorial demands had been met. All adding, in Hitler's eyes, to the credibility problem Britain faced after years of appeasement. Responses could have been improved through presenting a balanced assessment, by looking at how Britain viewed the annexation of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, Britain's introduction of conscription in May 1939, and Britain's guarantees to Poland.

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

**(a) Why did support for Chinese nationalism increase after 1918?**

There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

**(b) How far was Emperor Hirohito responsible for Japan becoming a military dictatorship in the 1930s?**

There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/22  
Outline Study 22

## Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they inter-reacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

**Part (a)** questions – These questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. The following is a clear example of relative significance from a response to **Question 1(a)**.

*In conclusion, the Napoleonic Code was primarily a means of unifying France with a single comprehensive legal system to tackle severe regional legal differences that greatly hindered administration. In doing this Napoleon was also able to satisfy some revolutionary ideals by incorporating changes made since 1789, for example equality before the law and land ownership. A further consequence was that it also helped to consolidate his own power becoming a useful tool for his propaganda and political agenda.*

Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of actors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

**Part (b)** questions – The most successful responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).



**Comments on specific questions**

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

**Question 1 – France, 1789–1814**

**(a) Why was the Code Napoleon introduced?**

Good responses came from those who knew that it was just the codification of the laws to create a single legal system for the whole of France. Some candidates seemed to think that the Code Napoleon meant all of Napoleon's reforms and answered accordingly. It is not clear why a significant number of candidates felt they needed to include educational, economic and other reforms but it led to significant weakening of some otherwise very competent answers. Good candidates were able to explain several factors and the best responses were able to justify some sort of prioritisation of these factors.

**(b) Assess the reasons why France was no longer a constitutional monarchy by 1793.**

There were some good responses that set the failings of the king against the rise of republicanism and the effect of increasing international conflict to produce a reasoned account and, in better answers, an effective judgement on relative importance of different factors. Some candidates did not understand the significance of 'constitutional' monarchy – that it was effectively the first constitutional experiment following the outbreak of the revolution. A lot of essays included extensive accounts of the failure of the Ancien Regime. Equally, some did not understand that the constitutional monarchy ended when it was abolished by the National Convention on 21st September 1792 and that therefore the king's execution, in January 1793, is not a reason for its termination. Nor were the harsh measures adopted by the Jacobin relevant to the question.

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

**(a) Why did industrialisation start later in Germany than in Britain?**

Almost all candidates wrote confidently about the industrial revolution and the biggest failing was not actually answering the question set; the lowest marks generally went to those who wrote about why Britain's development was earlier than Germany's rather than the other way round. Many candidates were aware of several factors and wrote about them. For example, many candidates were able to point out that Germany remained divided after the Napoleonic Wars and that the founding of the Zollverein in 1834 began a process of change. This produced a sound level 2 response. To get to a higher level, better candidates explained that this slowed German development **because** of internal customs duties inhibiting trade and **because** the proliferation of boundaries prevented the development of trans-national railways. Other factors, like war, individual enterprise, investment and entrepreneurship, were also considered, but not all of these needed to be included for a high level response

**(b) 'Overall industrialisation was a benefit to the lower classes.' To what extent do you agree with this view? Refer to any two countries in your answer.**

There were some very competent answers to this question from candidates who were able to outline both the benefits of, and the problems caused by, the Industrial Revolution for the lower classes. Topics commonly included were working conditions and the Factory Acts, health and hygiene, overcrowding, the effects of the transport revolution on food and opportunities and political developments. Many candidates found it difficult to provide examples from countries other than Britain but better candidates found comparisons to make and the coverage did not have to be equal between the countries chosen. Some candidates wrote about the middle and upper classes as well, despite the fact that the focus of the question was on the lower classes. Less successful answers also lacked any concept of chronological development in the changes. Top marks went to those who used a clear understanding of chronology to make judgements like '*things were bad at first but gradually got better*'. It is not enough just to state this at the end, it needs to be demonstrated in a summary of arguments from earlier in the essay which is easier if the whole essay sits within a proper chronological framework.

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

**(a) Why did Great Britain become involved in the Naval Race after 1900?**

Generally, the issues were well understood and many candidates wrote confidently about the causes of this competition between Britain and Germany. Weaker answers were able to provide a reasonable list of suggestions about the causes of disagreement; stronger ones were able to explain how each of these factors influenced relations, and the best responses were able to make judgements about their relative importance.

**(b) ‘The alliance system played only a minor role in causing the First World War.’ How far do you agree?**

There was a tendency for answers to become a basic description of the factors leading to the outbreak of conflict. Typically, description of the alliance system was followed by an outline of factors that led to war like imperialism, nationalism, militarism, etc. Such responses scored no better than moderately. Better responses took a more integrated approach, starting with the causes of World War One and considering how the existence of the alliance system linked to each cause or even how it linked different causes to create a situation where war was unavoidable. For example, most candidates knew about Germany’s blank cheque but simply said that it encouraged Austria without providing a proper context in which the blank cheque was offered/used. Linking it to the alliance system, to previous issues in the Balkans and to the complex nationalist issues of the region produced a complex analysis and could lead to reasoned judgments in good examples. Less successful candidates often wrote lengthy descriptions of the alliances from 1870 onwards and added a bit about ‘other factors’. Candidates would do well on questions of this type to learn to distinguish between the conditional and contingent factors – the factors that created a situation in which an event was possible and those which actually triggered it.

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

**(a) Why was the Provisional Government overthrown?**

Most candidates were able to provide a reasonable list of factors that aided the decline and fall of the Provisional Government and many were able to develop this into an explanation of how different factors affected the situation in Russia in 1917. Candidates were generally able to explain how issues of legitimacy, failure to meet the needs of the people and the return and propaganda of Lenin helped to weaken the Provisional Government, but often slipped at the final step, the role of Trotsky in the planning and execution of the October Revolution. Those who did include this produced the best answers.

**(b) ‘A weak regime with few supporters’ Discuss this view of the Tsar’s government in 1914.**

Generally, candidates showed a sound grasp of the developments in Russian Government from 1905 to 1918 and many were able to use relevant detail to good effect in answering this question. Responses tended to support one side or the other – ‘a weak regime with an incompetent leader who progressively alienated increasing sections of the population’, or ‘a regime with considerable potential in terms of economic growth and military improvement that retained considerable support amongst key groups and institutions and was only challenged by a badly organised extremist minority’. Many produced a balanced response but with the detail on the argument they did not support being less well developed, so arguments tended to become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Nevertheless, alternatives were offered and that is the sign of a higher level response. A few candidates misunderstood the question and wrote either partially or wholly about what happened to the Tsar’s government after 1914.

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

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

**(a) Why did President Taft introduce the policy known as ‘dollar diplomacy’?**

On the whole, responses recognised the significance of commercial interests but did not get far beyond the basic level of description. Candidates tended to be diverted by the idea of US military intervention as a central part of dollar diplomacy, though there is only one example of this policy leading to direct involvement of US troops and it was not an integral part of Taft’s plan.

**(b) How successful was US policy towards Japan in the 1920’s and 30’s?**

Most responses displayed some knowledge of US-Japanese relations during this period but few produced detailed or balanced answers to the question asked and on the whole description prevailed.

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

**(a) Why was the Emancipation Proclamation so important to the course of the Civil War?**

The best answers showed familiarity with the concept of a turning point in History and were confidently able to demonstrate why this was one. The essence of this is to demonstrate what was different after the point, compared to before. In this case, key differences involved motivation of Union forces, the effect on the black population and the impact on potential foreign intervention. Good answers were able to deal with all of these, demonstrating how the Proclamation made a significant change in each key area which cumulatively gave the North a clear advantage. Weaker responses tended to write more generally about Northern advantages like overall numbers, industrial advantage, etc., but of course these were not changed by the Proclamation and thus were not directly relevant to the question.

**(b) ‘By 1877 freedom from slavery had brought few benefits to the ex-slaves.’ How far do you agree?**

The essence of good responses here was the differentiation between theoretical and practical benefits and between short-term and long-term effects. Most candidates were familiar, in outline at least, with the principal changes brought about by the Reconstruction Amendments and were able to explain why in the succeeding decades the ex-slaves made little apparent progress in taking advantage of those rights. The best answers provided explained points on both aspects of the question. Weaker answers were often clearer on the negative side - Black codes, KKK, etc., but struggled with positives, other than the Freedman Bureau and they did not seem to be able to provide much information about this. Good responses dealt with both equally effectively.

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

**(a) Why did many technological innovations occur in the late nineteenth century?**

Knowledge of specific innovations was not necessary though it did sometimes help; for example, in explaining the growth in inventions of electrical equipment to make full use of the growth in electricity generation. Whereas weak responses simply claimed that immigration was important (a valid point) better ones explained why it was important in terms of the motivation that led these people to seek a better life in America in the first place. Some less successful candidates, who knew about some innovations, explained the effects of the innovations rather than the cause and thus achieved only the lowest level of marks.

**(b) On the evidence of his domestic policies, how far does President Wilson deserve to be called a Progressive?**

Many candidates were familiar with the four key ‘progressive’ amendments passed during Wilson’s term in office, whilst on the whole being aware of the limited nature of Wilson’s involvement with their development. They were able to provide a good balance between the clearly progressive changes that he made in the areas of commerce and trade, and also of his failings in the areas of civil liberties and African American rights.

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

**(a) Why did it take so long for the US economy to recover from the Great Crash?**

Most candidates were aware of Hoover's failings and some good answers then went on to point out that Roosevelt did not have instant success just because he introduced a series of emergency measures. The best answers took these into account in judging that the problem was greater than the shortcomings of individual policies but was because the depression that followed the Great Crash was so bad that no-one knew how to cope with it.

**(b) 'Political critics of the New Deal were ineffective because of Roosevelt's popularity.' How far do you agree?**

Many weaker answers were limited to a description of the key features of the New Deal. Some did not get far beyond this simple description. Better responses considered the issue of popularity and set this against the aims/failures of his political opponents like Coughlin, Townsend and Long – only better responses tended to consider both left- and right-wing opposition. The best responses also looked at success as being different from popularity and produces well balanced and analytical answers.

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

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

**(a) Why did the USA's involvement in world affairs increase in the period from 1871 to 1918?**

Most candidates were able to identify significant factors that produced a steady increase in US involvement in world affairs during this period. Most began well into the period with the economic crisis of the 1890's building on this with a consideration of the role of the Spanish America War, the growth of European imperialism and increasing concerns this created in respect of the Monroe Doctrine, and the presidencies of McKinley and Roosevelt. This focus was at the basis of most responses but the degree of detail and understanding differentiated good from weaker answers. Better responses included the First World War and US involvement with good knowledge of the reasons for US intervention. The best responses also looked backwards to the changes in the US following the end of the Civil War that also affected attitudes to overseas trade and investment.

**(b) 'Throughout the period from 1871 to 1914, Germany's foreign policy was based on the need for security.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates showed good knowledge of German foreign policy throughout this period. At a basic level most were able to differentiate between the cautious, security based policies of Bismarck and the more aggressive and less defensive stance adopted by Willhelm II after the dismissal of Bismarck. This formed the basis of many sound alternative interpretations. The more perceptive responses were able to identify alternative trends in the policies of Willhelm, recognising that though more aggressive, there was still a significant security consideration behind even the most extreme of his actions. Weaker responses tended to be basic narratives describing the treaties of alliance devised by Bismarck to strengthen German security and the crises involving Willhelm. Such arguments had little to do with security.

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

**(a) Why was the Genoa Conference of 1922 unsuccessful?**

Weaker answers focused on the Versailles settlement with little demonstrated knowledge of the Genoa Conference. Many knew that the Conference was organised by the British in order to improve relations between Germany and France, but for some the response was a simple descriptive account of this. Better answers explained why this core conflict caused a breakdown in the conference and the best extended their analysis to comment on the effect of the failure of the US to attend, or the failure to solve the problem of Russian financial issues, or comment on the impact to the Rapallo Pact between Germany and the USSR.

**(b) 'Throughout the period 1919–1933 the USSR remained isolated and distrusted' How far do you agree?**

Almost all candidates were able to identify some actions and events that demonstrated each side of the argument. For some this amounted to simple, but reasonably detailed description; in better responses it included explanation of how/why specific issues led to failure. There was also, sometimes, recognition that inclusion in agreements like the trade treaties that were signed between USSR and Britain did not necessarily signify trust, because at the core of the distrust was fear of Communism. Some weaker answers failed to recognise the significance of the end date and wrote about Nazi-Soviet relations. Most candidates wrote about only about relations with Europe, which often produced high level answers, but a few more perceptive ones recognised that the USSR also pursued foreign policy aims in Asia and were involved with the KMT/CCCP struggle against the warlords in China.

#### Question 11 – International Relations, 1933–1939

- (a) **Why did Hitler's actions in Czechoslovakia in 1939 lead to a change in British policy towards Germany?**

The biggest differentiator in responses to this question lay in the way the issue of appeasement was dealt with. Some candidates wrote a lengthy account of the reasons for appeasement, beginning with dissatisfaction with the Treaty of Versailles and going through all the aggressive actions of Nazi Germany through the 1930s and how Britain responded to these. Whilst it is necessary to know what British policy was in order to explain how it changed, this sort of approach gained little credit because most of the detail was irrelevant to the question. Responses that began with a brief overview of the Munich Agreement and explained how Hitler's actions not only breached the specific terms of the agreement but also produced a change in expectations in the British government, scored well. Recognition of the threat to Poland was sometimes used to add a further dimension to the explanation, but consideration of the invasion of Poland went far beyond the parameters of the question.

- (b) **'Mussolini's adoption of a more aggressive foreign policy after 1934 resulted from his admiration for Hitler.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates were able to offer some explanation for the change in policy by Mussolini after 1934 and better answers were even able to present an argument that in essence the policy had not changed, but that the circumstances had, in that the effects of the Great Depression were undermining Mussolini's popularity at home, whilst events abroad like the failure of the League to take action against Japan in Manchuria, opened Mussolini's eyes to the possibility of embarking on a more aggressive policy to attain his long term objectives. The more demanding part of the question was the issue of Hitler's influence. This was sometimes just an account of what Hitler was doing at this time but better answers were able to establish links between Hitler's actions and changes in policy like leaving the League of Nations (*'Hitler's actions showed the League was weak and so Mussolini was able to ignore it when he invaded Abyssinia'*). Less successful responses did not deal with the idea of 'admiration'.

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

- (a) **Why was Sun Yat Sen prepared to work in collaboration with the Chinese Communist Party?**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

- (b) **'The Japanese people had little understanding of, or respect for, parliamentary democracy' How far does this explain why Japan became a military dictatorship in the 1930's?**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/23  
Outline Study 23

## Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they inter-reacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

**Part (a)** questions – These questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. The following is a clear example of relative significance from a response to **Question 3(a)**:

*The alliance system proved to be the most significant factor, had it not existed Germany may not have felt obligated to help Austria against the might of Russia, whereas she had already supported her ally Austria in the Bosnian crisis in 1908 and felt obliged to do so again. Less significant was Germany's own interest in the region where she was building the Berlin to Bagdad railway and depended on Austria maintaining stability in the region, which brings us back to the importance of the Alliance – by supporting Austria, Germany was also protecting her own interests.*

Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of actors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

**Part (b)** questions – The most successful responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

**Comments on Specific Questions**

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

**Question 1 – France, 1789–1814**

**(a) Why did the aims of the French revolutionaries change in the period from 1789 to 1793?**

Most candidates were able to outline some of the key changes in the aims of the revolutionaries from the basic overhaul of perceived weaknesses of the Ancien Regime to the demand for the establishment of a republic. Better answers were able to effectively establish the contextual circumstances that led to these changes; factors including Louis's failure to support moderate changes and his flight to Varennes linked with suspicion of overseas plots and continued hardship, leading to a rise in extreme republicanism were the basis for effective explanations. Weaker responses were limited to a description what happened between 1789 and 1793.

**(b) 'Napoleon remained in power because he was not a revolutionary.' How far do you agree?**

A common feature of answers was to set up an obvious contrast between the two alternatives; Napoleon as the embodiment of revolutionary principles versus Napoleon as the antithesis of revolution. Some took this route successfully, demonstrating how Napoleon integrated aspects of the revolutionary changes into his administration, then showing how much of Napoleon's style of government went against the principles of the Revolution. An interesting alternative was to argue that it was not about the revolution at all, but about Napoleon's popularity and personal appeal so that he could incorporate both revolutionary and non-revolutionary principles into his regime and win support from all sides. Less successful responses simply provided a description of how Napoleon governed France.

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

**(a) Why did industrialisation lead to challenges to political structures?**

Most responses managed to identify some ways in which political structures were challenged. The main areas of focus were the rise of the middle classes – factory owners and entrepreneurs who expected an increased say in the political direction of the state – and the changes in the situation of the working class. Good answers went beyond the simple change brought about by the development of Trade Unions to link this to changes in working practices and the increased need for education, which in turn led to political activism amongst the working classes.

**(b) 'Overseas trade was the most important factor in encouraging industrialisation.' How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries in your answer.**

Some candidates struggled with the concept of 'overseas trade' and there were limited responses that provided effective analysis of a country other than Great Britain. Better responses focussed on the importance of the early stages of industrialisation – growth of factories, development of the steam engine and spread of railways, suggesting that these precursors were needed before overseas trade became important, and there were some good comparisons here between Britain and Germany. There was also some thoughtful comparison between Britain, with its extensive overseas empire which encouraged overseas trade, and Germany, which did not have this advantageous situation.

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

**(a) Why did Germany support Austria against Serbia in 1914?**

Many candidates were able to provide a basic explanation about the importance of the alliance between the two countries, though weaker answers related the history of the Austro-German Alliance from the 1870's to 1914. Better answers also explained the Balkan situation and the effect of Russian support for Serbia, often linking this to the Bosnian crisis of 1908.

**(b) 'The Tsar was responsible.' Assess this view of the outbreak of the First World War.**

For many candidates, an explanation of the link to Serbia and an overview of the alliance system provided a reason for settling blame on the Tsar/Russia, whilst the role of Germany, plus other factors, like the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, supplied the counter argument. However, these answers tended to lack the depth required of the higher levels of the mark scheme. Additional explanation of elements like Austrian ambitions in the Balkans and the whole issue of mobilisation and military plans was a feature of better answers, but few candidates were able to explain clearly the progression of events and often blamed the Tsar on the grounds that France had to 'declare war in support of Russia'. This argument failed to acknowledge that the Schlieffen plan required a primary attack on France and thus it was actually Germany who declared war on France, having decided it had to act in response to Russian mobilisation.

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

**(a) Why were Stolypin's reforms opposed?**

Many candidates were able to offer some sort of explanation for the resistance to Stolypin's innovations. This included resistance from some, but not all, peasants owing to his land reforms, this being the base argument for most responses. Better answers included opponents of Stolypin's methods (Stolypin necktie) and the unreceptiveness of the Tsar himself.

**(b) To what extent were Lenin's ideas the principal reason for the success of the Bolsheviks?**

A few weaker answers confused the fall of the Provisional Government with the collapse of the Tsarist regime and scored few marks. Lenin's role and the weaknesses of the Provisional government were most often the two alternatives offered in response to this question, and where candidates had developed explanations of the significance of both, there was the basis of a sound argument, demonstrating how Lenin's theories (Peace, Bread and Land) highlighted the failings of the Government. Explanations of the events of the summer of 1917 were often seen as a factor distinct from the simple failure of the Provisional Government, but the role of Lenin during this period was often misunderstood or ignored. The best answers added the role of Trotsky as an alternative to that of Lenin in providing the positive push for the October Revolution, and the best responses compared the relative importance of the theoretical impetus of Lenin's ideology with the practical effects of Trotsky's organisational skills, sometimes even making a valid judgement of relative importance based on this.



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

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

**(a) Why did the USA expand its naval forces in the 1890's and early 1900's?**

Many of the arguments presented were based on the idea of the development of a more imperialist outlook under the leadership of McKinley and Roosevelt. This was explained as being a result of European imperialist expansion in Africa and the Far East, leading to concerns about their possible intervention in South America (Monroe Doctrine), the effect of the Spanish American War and the consequences of the closing of the Frontier in 1890. Many candidates were also aware of the book by Mahan on 'The Influence of Sea Power on History' which had a significant effect on popular opinion and on the press. Such specific knowledge was often used to good effect.

**(b) How successful were the 'Indian Wars' of the late nineteenth century?**

Many candidates struggled with this question. Often candidates just wrote about the expansion west, the benefits to settlers, the discovery of gold and other mineral resources and the elimination of the Indian 'threat' and concluded that it was a great success. Few candidates got beyond this to consider any negative aspects of the conflict, most particularly the consideration of the effects of the war from the Native American point of view.

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

**(a) Why did Congress oppose President Lincoln's plans for Reconstruction in 1863–64?**

Candidates usually knew something about Reconstruction plans and were even able to identify some of the conflicting ideas in the intentions of Lincoln and of the Radical Republicans who controlled Congress. These candidates often produced sound responses outlining the growing conflict between the two over issues like Lincoln's 10 per cent proposal in December 1863 and the Wade Davis Bill devised by Congress in July 1864. Weaker responses did not focus on the specific time frame of the question and often wrote about 'Presidential Reconstruction' and 'Congressional Reconstruction' in a much more general context extending beyond the assassination of Lincoln.

**(b) 'The North won the War because Grant was prepared to attack the people of the South as well as its armies.' How far do you agree?**

Less successful answers presented a general response to the generic question of why the North won the war. Whilst such answers might have some merit in presenting an 'alternative' interpretation of the reasons for the North's victory, there was rarely an adequate consideration of the role of Grant other than to outline the victories for which he was responsible, but with little consideration of the issue of attacking civilian populations. Better answers made use of events such as the 'March to the Sea' and the burning of Atlanta, events which were part of Grant's strategy, to support the hypothesis posed by the question which provided a more balanced analysis.

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

**(a) Why did railroads grow so rapidly in the late nineteenth century?**

There were too few answers for meaningful comment to be possible.

**(b) How far do you agree that the passage of four constitutional amendments between 1913 and 1920 shows the power of the Progressive movement?**

There were too few answers for meaningful comment to be possible.

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

- (a) **Why did many left-wing liberals oppose New Deal policies introduced by an apparently liberal president?**

Most candidates were familiar with the individual leaders of the group referred to in the question and were able to describe their resistance to the measures enacted by Roosevelt in his New Deal legislation. Answers tended to focus on these leaders, specifically Huey Long, Father Coughlin and Francis Townsend. Weaker answers tended to just describe the different measures that each of these sought to implement but better answers were able to explain why these represented a position that signified a broader dissatisfaction with the, as they saw it, relatively limited extent of Roosevelt's reforms.

- (b) **'We have won against the most dangerous of our foes – we have conquered fear' (Franklin Roosevelt, 1936). How justified was Roosevelt in this belief about the progress of the New Deal?**

Less successful answers gave long descriptions of the New Deal, including lengthy descriptions of the Alphabet Agencies. Such responses paid little attention to the issues of 'conquering fear'. Such answers also often failed to recognise that the quote from Roosevelt was from 1936 and thus was firstly, probably part of an election campaign speech and secondly, was only talking about the First New Deal. Candidates who failed to spot this often wasted time on detail of actions from Roosevelt's second term. The best answers combined consideration of how successful the early actions of Roosevelt had been, with a consideration of whether this had changed the outlook of America in general.

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

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

- (a) **Why, by 1907, had Britain, France and Russia come together in a series of friendly agreements?**

The most frequently successful approach to this question was to deal with each countries' insecurities and needs separately, with better answers able to show how this led to a commonality of interest that encouraged the formation of a loose association of agreements between the three countries, that became known as the Triple Entente. So French desire for 'Revanche', British growing worries over German imperialism and naval expansion and Russian concerns over German support of Austria in the Balkans, were all mentioned as contributory factors, combined with a settlement of Anglo-French conflicts of interest in Africa and a reduction of British concerns about Russian interference in India and the Far East following their loss in the Japanese War. These were all seen as potential contributors to the improvement in relationships that produced the mutually beneficial agreements.

- (b) **'Japan's victory in the war of 1904–05 was the result of Russia's military weaknesses.' How far do you agree?**

The basic argument of most responses was that it was either Russian weaknesses or Japanese strengths that led to the unexpected outcome. Russian weaknesses were characterised as stemming from long lines of communication, outdated equipment and ineffectiveness of leadership, whilst Japanese success was demonstrated as coming from the transformation of Japan, following the Meiji restoration, from a feudal medieval society into a modernised industrial nation with an efficient army and a well-equipped and modern navy. However, the technicalities of moving the Baltic Fleet to the Far East often confused the analysis of weaker answers, especially in regard to the possible role of Britain in the Russian defeat, following the Doggar Bank Incident and the closing of the Suez Canal to the Russian fleet.

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

**(a) Why did the Wall Street Crash lead to a deterioration in international relations?**

Less successful answers often described what happened and/or why it happened, but did not address the impact of The Crash on international relations. Better answers recognised the ‘domino effect’ of the sudden recall of American loans from Europe and the consequences for both Europe’s relations with the USA and relations between the nations of Europe. The rise of Nazism and the development of Appeasement were used as good examples of the effect of the Crash on international affairs and some effective answers were able to take their analysis beyond Europe, including the effects on the Japanese economy and the impetus that gave to militarism and expansionist intentions, beginning with the Muckden Incident and the occupation of Manchuria in 1931. Candidates who broadened their analysis to this extent generally produced very good responses.

**(b) To what extent did the USA avoid involvement in international affairs from 1919 to 1929?**

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to identify elements of US policy that sustained its ‘isolationist’ stance as distinct from actions that suggested an intention to maintain at least some level of interest in, and involvement with the international community. Failure to ratify the Versailles settlement and join the League of Nations are obvious starting points and most candidates set this against US involvement in the Dawes and Young Plan. Better answers went beyond these basic details and the best responses often concluded that the deciding impetus to US policy was economic self-interest. This was used in the best answers to provide an adjudication between the two alternative positions.

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

**(a) Why did the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939 astonish and alarm the rest of Europe?**

Weaker responses were restricted to a descriptive account, sometimes very detailed, of the terms and effects of the Pact, but paid little attention to the ‘astonish and alarm’ part of the question. Better candidates based their ‘astonishment’ on the known antithesis between Communism and Fascism, citing Hitler’s treatment of Communists in Germany and, more often, the fact that the two ideologies had very recently been involved in direct conflict in the Spanish Civil War in which the two countries had supported opposing sides. The best answers also dealt with ‘alarm’ by considering the position of, and possible consequences for, Poland, to whom the western allies had made a firm commitment following the occupation of the remainder of Czech state earlier in 1939.

**(b) ‘The outbreak of Civil War in Spain in 1936 was the result of Spain’s economic weaknesses.’ How far do you agree?**

Less successful answers struggled to include all the relevant elements involved here. The first problem was that some candidates clearly did not fully understand the economic situation in Spain following the Wall Street Crash or the already divisive nature of the organisation of Spain’s rural economy. The regional divisions of Spain and the flip-flopping between governments of the right and left in the early 1930s, also needed to be part of the explanation. There were some good responses that gave equal consideration to economic and political issues and were able to demonstrate that the economic issues simply fed the existing political divisions, which to some extent were also dependent on underlying social conflict.

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

**(a) Why was the USA concerned by the emergence of Japan as a major Asian power by 1918?**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**(b) To what extent was the unpopularity of the Kuomintang during the 1930’s due to its failure to respond effectively to Japanese aggression?**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- It is important to spend sufficient time on reading and thinking about the extract before beginning to write the answer. Thinking about the extract should include making notes of phrases and sentences that seem particularly significant in pointing towards the historian's interpretation, so that the answer can be properly planned and structured.
- The best answers demonstrate an understanding that the historian's main interpretation (from now on referred to as the 'Big Message') will encompass the extract as a whole, and that they should therefore view the extract as a whole.
- It is important candidates focus on what the question is asking them to do. It asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. It does not ask what the extract says. Answers that are limited to repetition or paraphrasing of the extract cannot be rewarded highly.

## General comments

Most answers were clearly focused on the extract (i.e. rather than on writing about the context), and concise. Length of answer is not an indicator of success; indeed, excessive length is almost always evidence of lack of planning and the inclusion of large amounts of redundant material. Another improvement has been that relatively few answers included unhelpful attempts to evaluate the historian's reliability. The strongest responses recognised the need to show understanding of the overall meaning of the extracts, rather than just the detail within them. The most successful answers had an overall grasp of the material. They were able to identify the Big Message and discuss it. Less successful answers often identified more than one Big Message which showed a lack of understanding of the requirement of the paper.

Using historiographical 'labels' ('structuralist', 'revisionist' etc.) remains an important issue. There are obvious advantages in being able to use such labels where they are relevant, and it can certainly be argued that knowledge of them and what they mean should be part of a candidate's course of study. However, there are plenty of occasions where they are not relevant; for example, to attach a label that applies to Holocaust causation (e.g. 'intentionalist') when the extract is not about Holocaust causation. It will always be possible to identify and explain the Big Message without using a label; that is, labelling is not a requirement.

## Comments on Specific Questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that awareness of Empire was at the heart of British popular culture, and acted as a powerful unifying force in British society. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation, and illustrated them using material from the extract. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about Imperialism with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Jewish women were better able than men to deal with the privations of the Holocaust because of the socialisation they had been through. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation, and illustrated them using material from the extract. A full understanding of the interpretation required not just explanation of how socialisation had equipped women with coping mechanisms, but also illustration of why men were less able to cope. Here the case study of hunger used by the historian made it clear that men felt more vulnerable than women to Nazi power. In dealing with the responses of victims, the historian was not addressing issues of Holocaust causation. Thus, those candidates who stayed focused on what the extract actually said, rather than what they might have expected it to say, were able to answer more successfully. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

### **Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–50**

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that, whilst the USA certainly failed to make the most of the diplomatic opportunities open to them, this does not mean they were to blame for the Cold War. The most successful candidates were able to read the first paragraph and see how the historian first addressed the revisionist view and then rejected it. This was fundamental in perceiving that the Big Message could not possibly be blaming the USA, despite the undoubted criticisms of the USA that the extract thereafter contained. Weaker responses were often not able to make such fine a distinction. They saw the criticisms, and assumed this meant that the USA was being blamed. As long as such answers recognised that the main basis of criticism was on failing to make the most of its opportunities (i.e. a central aspect of the Big Message), then they were regarded as demonstrating sound understanding. The main focus of the extract was on the USA, and there was certainly more material putting the USA in a poor light than there was on the USSR. Nonetheless, there was some material which could plausibly be used against the USSR and this, along with the criticisms of the USA, led many candidates to decide that the interpretation was post-revisionist in blaming both. Some candidates wrote comments along the lines of 'This is a revisionist extract with post-revisionist leanings', but it is not possible for the extract to be both – if it has the characteristics of both schools of thought it must be post-revisionist. This underlines the Key Message that it is important to develop a sense of the extract as a whole. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- It is important to spend sufficient time on reading and thinking about the extract before beginning to write the answer. Thinking about the extract should include making notes of phrases and sentences that seem particularly significant in pointing towards the historian's interpretation, so that the answer can be properly planned and structured.
- The best answers demonstrate an understanding that the historian's main interpretation (from now on referred to as the 'Big Message') will encompass the extract as a whole, and that they should therefore view the extract as a whole.
- It is important candidates focus on what the question is asking them to do. It asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. It does not ask what the extract says. Answers that are limited to repetition or paraphrasing of the extract cannot be rewarded highly.

## General comments

Most answers were clearly focused on the extract (i.e. rather than on writing about the context), and concise. Length of answer is not an indicator of success; indeed, excessive length is almost always evidence of lack of planning and the inclusion of large amounts of redundant material. Another improvement has been that relatively few answers included unhelpful attempts to evaluate the historian's reliability. The strongest responses recognised the need to show understanding of the overall meaning of the extracts, rather than just the detail within them. The most successful answers had an overall grasp of the material. They were able to identify the Big Message and discuss it. Less successful answers often identified more than one Big Message which showed a lack of understanding of the requirement of the paper.

Using historiographical 'labels' ('structuralist', 'revisionist' etc.) remains an important issue. There are obvious advantages in being able to use such labels where they are relevant, and it can certainly be argued that knowledge of them and what they mean should be part of a candidate's course of study. However, there are plenty of occasions where they are not relevant; for example, to attach a label that applies to Holocaust causation (e.g. 'intentionalist') when the extract is not about Holocaust causation. It will always be possible to identify and explain the Big Message without using a label; that is, labelling is not a requirement.

## Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the Empire in Africa was established by 'the man on the spot', and that this process involved the use, or at least the threat, of force. The most successful candidates recognised both these elements of the interpretation, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. More modest answers recognised one of these central elements, generally 'the man on the spot', whilst missing the other, but nonetheless offered appropriate support from the extract. The historian used Lugard as an example of a typical 'man on the spot', but some saw what the historian said about Lugard himself as being the Big Message, whereas it could only be a sub-message. Some candidates weakened otherwise sensible answers by attempting to find evidence within the extract of a wide range of schools of thought. Taking short phrases and claiming that these were characteristic of a school of thought often resulted in responses that included assertions about the extract that could not be supported. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the

extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about Imperialism with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that there was no prepared plan to exterminate the Jews, and that the Holocaust came about because of competition within the Nazi power structure which led to constant escalation of measures against the Jews. The most successful candidates recognised these elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. This was, however, an extract that contained a number of important sub-messages – for example, that there was no explicit 'Hitler order' for the extermination – and many candidates took these to be the Big Message. This was perhaps most obviously the case with Himmler and Heydrich, seen as central by many answers, despite the extract stating that any 'purely personalised interpretation would prevent full understanding'. Despite the extract having a clear structuralist approach, many argued other approaches, most often intentionalist, by seizing upon individual references that clearly could not apply to a Big Message of the extract taken as a whole: for intentionalism this would generally be 'it must be conceded that (Hitler) was the ideological and political author of the Final Solution'. Some weaker responses claimed the approach to be structuralist, but were not able to support the assertion with evidence from the extract. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

### ***Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–50***

The central argument of the historian is that the leadership of the Soviet Union aimed to take advantage of the post-war situation to dominate Europe, and in so doing brought about the Cold War. Strong responses identified that the extract was focused on Soviet culpability and often used labels of traditional/orthodox or post-post revisionist. Such labels were accepted as indicating a sound understanding. The most successful answers also argued that the interpretation could not be revisionist or post-revisionist (i.e. how it makes no move to blame the USA or exonerate the USSR) and in doing so demonstrated a complete understanding of the Big Message. Some less successful candidates, who read in the first paragraph about concessions made by the West at Tehran and Yalta as having the effect of encouraging Soviet expansionism, argued that this was blaming the West for the Cold War – an argument which went beyond a justifiable conclusion. Others argued that what the historian said about how the Soviets viewed the West – as fearing that American capitalism would seek to maintain or expand its interests throughout the world – as being a statement of what was in fact happening. On these kinds of misreadings some candidates reached conclusions that the extract was revisionist or post-revisionist. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 9389/33</b> <b>Interpretations Question</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- It is important to spend sufficient time on reading and thinking about the extract before beginning to write the answer. Thinking about the extract should include making notes of phrases and sentences that seem particularly significant in pointing towards the historian's interpretation, so that the answer can be properly planned and structured.
- The best answers demonstrate an understanding that the historian's main interpretation (from now on referred to as the 'Big Message') will encompass the extract as a whole, and that they should therefore view the extract as a whole.
- It is important candidates focus on what the question is asking them to do. It asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. It does not ask what the extract says. Answers that are limited to repetition or paraphrasing of the extract cannot be rewarded highly.

## General comments

Most answers were clearly focused on the extract (i.e. rather than on writing about the context), and concise. Length of answer is not an indicator of success; indeed, excessive length is almost always evidence of lack of planning and the inclusion of large amounts of redundant material. Another improvement has been that relatively few answers included unhelpful attempts to evaluate the historian's reliability. The strongest responses recognised the need to show understanding of the overall meaning of the extracts, rather than just the detail within them. The most successful answers had an overall grasp of the material. They were able to identify the Big Message and discuss it. Less successful answers often identified more than one Big Message which showed a lack of understanding of the requirement of the paper.

Using historiographical 'labels' ('structuralist', 'revisionist' etc.) remains an important issue. There are obvious advantages in being able to use such labels where they are relevant, and it can certainly be argued that knowledge of them and what they mean should be part of a candidate's course of study. However, there are plenty of occasions where they are not relevant; for example, to attach a label that applies to Holocaust causation (e.g. 'intentionalist') when the extract is not about Holocaust causation. It will always be possible to identify and explain the Big Message without using a label; that is, labelling is not a requirement.

## Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the Empire was less central to British life than has often been claimed, and that those who assert the opposite lack the necessary evidence to support their case. The most successful candidates recognised these elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. The historian stated that while evidence of the Empire was present in British everyday life, this does not necessarily mean that the Empire was important to British people. Weaker responses lost focus on the arguments in the extract, and simply wrote about British imperialism in general terms.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the Holocaust could not have occurred without the prior conditioning of the Germans through Nazi propaganda and pre-war persecution of the Jews,



but that although this explains how the Holocaust could happen, it does not explain how the Holocaust did happen (i.e. that the social conditioning was a necessary but not sufficient cause). The extract states that 'only under the conditions of the war' could the Holocaust proceed, providing the 'necessary' aspect. The most successful candidates recognised these elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. However, many candidates thought that factors other than indoctrination were the necessary precondition mentioned in the extract. For example, some said anti-Semitism was essential, or alternatively, the complicity of the German people, not seeing that both of these were dependent on the Nazis' propaganda and policies. Candidates often compared the extract with what they took to be Goldhagen's views on German anti-Semitism: some, but by no means all, recognised that the extract conflicted with Goldhagen. There were also frequent attempts to attach causation labels to the interpretation/approach, with many answers rejecting intentionalism on the grounds that the extract denied the existence of any master plan, though few spotted the steer towards contingent factors offered by the reference to the war. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories: first, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract, but answers falling into the latter of these two categories were very rare.

***Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941-50***

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the Cold War was the consequence of the misunderstandings and misinterpretations of both sides' actions. This was almost self-evidently a post-revisionist interpretation, and the historian developed the argument by giving examples of misunderstandings caused both by ideology, and by 'readings of recent history'. The most successful candidates recognised these two elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract, keeping a consistent focus on the misunderstandings. Other candidates could see the post-revisionist nature of the approach, but lost sight of misunderstandings. Typically, such answers seized on the mention of ideology and assumed that the historian meant simply a clash between capitalism and communism, or were based just on examples taken from the extract which seemed to blame each side in turn, rather than seeing the overall shape of the historian's argument. A significant minority detected that the extract said rather more about the USA than about the USSR, and took this as an indication that the historian was placing greater blame on the USA. This sometimes led to the unsupportable conclusion that the historian's approach was revisionist. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract, but answers falling into the latter of these two categories were very rare.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/41**  
**Depth Study**

## **Key Messages**

- Candidates should ensure that they focus on the specific nature of the question set, rather than writing about the topic in general.
- It is important that candidates support their arguments relevant factual information.
- Answers where the objective of each paragraph is made absolutely clear and it relates back to the overall judgement often scored more highly.

## **General Comments**

Candidates demonstrated a greater awareness that responses needed to demonstrate real depth of knowledge and a high degree of understanding in order to get in to the higher levels. The best answers dealt effectively with the specific terms of the question set, such as ‘how far’ or ‘to what extent’. When asked to ‘assess’ or ‘evaluate’ or ‘analyse’, good answers provided thoughtful discussion of a variety of relevant factors, supported with evidence, and, most importantly, came to a reasoned judgment. If asked to ‘analyse’ the reasons ‘why’, successful answers not only gave an indication of the reasons for something happening, but a judgement on their relative importance and commented on why they are important.

Weaker answers often featured a long introduction, ‘setting the scene’ of the topic, which often had limited relevance to the question set, and did not set out the argument to be discussed in the rest of the essay. Often essays of this nature ended with a brief ‘conclusion’ which was not always very well related to preceding evidence. For example, an essay on the responsibility for ending the Cold War might contain a large number of facts which suggest that Reagan played the largest role, yet the conclusion might well go, ‘Thus we can see that Gorbachev was responsible for bringing the Cold War to an end.’ Candidates should not be afraid to come to a judgement, as long as the judgement is fully supported. In some cases answers included comprehensive coverage of both ‘sides’ of a question, yet failed to reach the top levels as they often ended saying ‘there is a good case either way.’, and not indicating which they feel might be the stronger case and why, or commenting in any way on why they feel there might be a ‘good’ case.

## **Comments on specific Questions**

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

#### **1 ‘Lenin succeeded in establishing a Bolshevik regime by 1924 because he was prepared to kill his opponents.’ How far do you agree?**

Candidates who kept a firm focus on the ‘how far?’ part of the question throughout their responses did well. Some really good answers suggested that it was the sheer ruthlessness of Lenin, of which killing opponents was just a part, that was the most important factor, with critical decisions such as Brest-Litovsk and the closing of the Constituent Assembly being examples of this. Others argued that it was a mix of the legacy of the Tsarist and Provisional Government regimes, coupled with the incompetence of the Whites that was the key reason behind Bolshevik success. There were some responses which placed too much focus on the Bolshevik victory in the Civil War or on War Communism and the NEP, but there was little of relevance in most of these. Successful responses included a range of factors and discussed which were the most important in establishing the regime, and then considered why they felt they were the most important.

#### **2 How fascist was Italy under Mussolini?**

The better responses gave a clear definition of what they felt ‘fascism’ meant in this context. A firm definition of fascism (not easy in the case of Mussolini) was always a good start, as then a case both for and against could be developed. There were a large number of very different successful approaches.

Some did start with a definition and then developed a response from there. Others started by looking at his various policies and actions and commenting on whether they did, or did not fit in to a model of fascism. Some argued that there was actually very little ‘theory’ behind what he did, it was just an attempt to stay in power as well as increase his power. The willingness to argue and debate was often very successful. The less successful candidates tended to just write descriptions of what he did, the various ‘battles’ and dealings with the Pope for example.

### **3 How successful were Stalin’s economic policies?**

A common feature of good answers was to start with a reflection on the implications of ‘success’ in this context, considering whether what might be seen as a success from the point of view of the USSR, or Stalin’s personal power base, might not be seen as so successful from the point of view of the ordinary Russian citizen. Stronger responses supported this analysis with relevant statistics, demonstrating a good depth of knowledge and understanding. Weaker responses tended to either debate the ‘success’ part quite well, but lack any real evidence to back it up, or just include lots of facts about collectivisation or Magnitogorsk and fail to comment on whether the policies were a success or not from anyone’s point of view. The majority responses suggested that while the industrialisation policy was a success in terms of modernising Russia’s industry, it came at a horrendous human cost, while the collectivization policy was an unmitigated disaster from every perspective.

### **4 ‘The main reason for Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor was the popularity of Nazi ideas.’ How far do you agree?**

Many candidates demonstrated a good command of the relevant detail and included evidence of good knowledge and understanding. What really differentiated the best responses from the weaker responses was the candidates’ ability to keep a focus on the ‘main’ reason for his appointment as Chancellor and gave careful consideration as to why the chosen reason was the principal one, and not others. Less successful responses did suggest a range of relevant factors, but were very reluctant to give any indication of which they felt was the most important and why.

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

### **5 How accurate is the description of the US economy of the 1950s as a ‘consumer economy’?**

The best responses really focused on the ‘how accurate’ part of the question, and avoided the tendency to give a generalised description of the US economy in the 1950s. Candidates who demonstrated that they thought specifically about what a ‘consumer economy’ meant also tended to do well, arguing about the extent to which the growth of the economy was driven by consumer spending, or whether it was driven by other factors, such as increased government spending on defence and highways for example, or the lack of foreign competition from war-torn Europe, which boosted exports hugely. There tended to be rather a lot of description dealing with the growth of TV and the use of credit cards, without linking such detail to the question asked.

### **6 How influential was the counter-culture movement of the 1960s?**

Weaker responses to this question were often generalised descriptions of the changes in popular music or on the hippies/yippies. The most successful responses clearly defined what the counter-culture movement was and discussed its influence, if any. Some of the better responses argued that it was a brief flowering of independent thought and unorthodox behaviour by the young, which disappeared by the 1970s, suppressed by Nixon and the ‘silent majority’. Others argued that it did lead to greater tolerance and acceptance of non-conformist ideas in what had been a very conformist society. Some less successful answers focused solely on the Civil Rights Movement. Many good responses really tried hard to reflect on the nature and extent of the influence, both in the short and longer term.

### **7 Analyse the reasons why the Republican Party won all the presidential elections of the 1980s.**

Some very good responses were seen to this question. While some produced good outline answers which lacked much detail, particularly on specific elections, there were plenty of responses which showed both analytical skill and real depth of knowledge. The best responses tended to debate the extent to which the successes were due to the skills of Reagan and his policies, or whether it was Democratic failings or a reaction against the problems of the 1970s. Some argued that the rise of the Religious Right was very important, but without really explaining why. There was usually a good

analytical focus in most responses, and it was the level of accurate supporting detail which differentiated the competent from the excellent.

**8 'The USA followed a policy of détente because of the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.' How far do you agree?**

The most successful responses avoided going in to huge detail about the Cuban crisis itself and kept the focus firmly on the reasons for détente and commenting on the impact that the Cuban crisis had on official thinking. Many responses included good coverage of US policy in the 1970s and did not just comment on the aftermath of the crisis with its 'hotlines'. The better responses considered not only the implications of MAD, but also other factors such as the Vietnam War, government spending and the ideas of Kissinger and Nixon. The best responses dealt firmly and clearly with the 'how far?' part of the question without getting distracted by the Cuban crisis itself.

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

**9 How far should the outcome of the Korean War be seen as a victory for the USA?**

Better responses included reflection on precisely what a 'victory' might entail in this context. There were some interesting debates on whether the final re-establishment of the dividing line between the two nations could be considered a victory, in the light of the early defeats and the huge losses of life on all sides. Some considered the wider implications as well, suggesting that it was a victory for the United Nations, where the USA was playing a leading part, in upholding the rights of a sovereign state when invaded by a hostile power. Some very good answers dealt effectively with the 'how far' part of the question and really came to a firm judgement on it. Less good responses tended to adopt a very narrative approach towards the war, often with a lot of focus on the causes, ending with a statement such as 'In conclusion we can see that it was a victory for the United States', without giving any indication why they had come to this conclusion.

**10 To what extent was the Soviet Union responsible for the 'Second Cold War'?**

Many candidates produced competent responses in that they set out the case 'for' and 'against' the Soviet Union being responsible for the Second Cold War, often in considerable detail, but were very reluctant to make any comment on the extent of their responsibility. Sometimes an answer was implicit in the amount of information given for one side or the other, but without a clear answer with supporting reasons high marks cannot be attained. Analysis is just as important as information and accurate information alone will not gain high reward without being utilised to support an argument. The best responses often argued that there were faults on both sides, but then really tried hard to explain why one side or the other should take most responsibility.

**11 'The crisis of communism in China during the 1980s was caused by the development of "market socialism".' How far do you agree?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**12 How far was Britain responsible for the outbreak of the Suez War in 1956?**

Few responses were seen. They tended to focus very much on the background to the conflict and a history of Britain's role in the Middle East from the end of World War One. Good responses assessed the various factors which led up to the war, with the majority seeing either Nasser or the Israelis as being the more responsible.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/42**  
**Depth Study**

## **Key Messages**

- Candidates should ensure that they focus on the specific nature of the question set, rather than writing about the topic in general.
- It is important that candidates support their arguments relevant factual information.
- Answers where the objective of each paragraph is made absolutely clear and it relates back to the overall judgement often scored more highly.

## **General Comments**

Candidates demonstrated a greater awareness that responses needed to demonstrate real depth of knowledge and a high degree of understanding in order to get in to the higher levels. The best answers dealt effectively with the specific terms of the question set, such as 'how far' or 'to what extent'. When asked to 'assess' or 'evaluate' or 'analyse', good answers provided thoughtful discussion of a variety of relevant factors, supported with evidence, and, most importantly, came to a reasoned judgment. If asked to 'analyse' the reasons 'why', successful answers not only gave an indication of the reasons for something happening, but a judgement on their relative importance and commented on why they are important.

Weaker answers often featured a long introduction, 'setting the scene' of the topic, which often had limited relevance to the question set, and did not set out the argument to be discussed in the rest of the essay. Often essays of this nature ended with a brief 'conclusion' which was not always very well related to preceding evidence. For example, an essay on the responsibility for ending the Cold War might contain a large number of facts which suggest that Reagan played the largest role, yet the conclusion might well go, 'Thus we can see that Gorbachev was responsible for bringing the Cold War to an end.' Candidates should not be afraid to come to a judgement, as long as the judgement is fully supported. In some cases answers included comprehensive coverage of both 'sides' of a question, yet failed to reach the top levels as they often ended saying 'there is a good case either way.', and not indicating which they feel might be the stronger case and why, or commenting in any way on why they feel there might be a 'good' case.

## **Comments on specific questions**

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

#### **1 'The introduction of War Communism was the main reason for the Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War.' How far do you agree?**

This question was successfully answered by a majority of candidates. The best answers looked in some detail at War Communism itself and what it did to assist the final victory, while at the same time commenting on the possible damage it did to the Bolshevik cause. This was then compared to the various other factors which led to Bolshevik victory, ranging from the problems facing the Whites to the geographical advantages which the Reds had. Moderate responses tended to identify the various factors which led to victory, but were very reluctant to comment in any way on which were the most important and why, leaving it to the examiner to make up their own mind. The best responses invariably started with a firm judgement and then went on to develop a case as to which was the most important factor, and why, and commenting on the reasons why the other factors were less important to the final outcome.

#### **2 'Few opposed him.' To what extent was this the main reason for Mussolini becoming dictator of Italy?**

Good responses kept the focus firmly on the 'dictator' part of the question rather than focussing on a range of reasons why Mussolini got in to power in 1922. Less successful responses primarily dealt with

the reasons why the King gave Mussolini office in 1922 and did not address the years immediately after 1922 when the dictatorship was established. There was a lot of background provided on the pre-War state of Italian politics and some comments on the 'mutilated victory'. There was usually evidence of a competent grasp of the failings of the Liberal governments in the immediate post-war years, although knowledge of the electoral system and its implications was very limited in some responses. The best responses used the events before 1922 as a starting point, and then placed the emphasis of their answer on his consolidation of power post 1922 with good detail on Acerbo, Aventine and the various methods used to deal with potential opposition from the elites.

**3 Assess the reasons why Stalin was able to accumulate so much power.**

Candidates did less well on this question compared to others in this section. A feature of many less successful candidates was to focus their answer on Stalin's *rise to power* during the period from 1924 to 1929 rather than his accumulation of power throughout his leadership, with a significant number of responses started with the phrase 'Stalin rose to power because...'. The more successful responses invariably included ample detail on the post-1930 period. The best responses looked in some detail at the legacy of Lenin (and also the Tsars) when it came to authoritarian government, and then looking at the basis that Stalin had laid for himself in the late 1920s, analysed how he was then able to build on that to create such considerable power by the late 1930s. Keeping the focus on the 'so much' part of the question was a feature of all good responses. Providing a narrative of events from the death of Lenin to 1929 did not score highly. Good answers focused in depth on the Purges and their implications and then contrasted them with other factors, such as his control over education and the media as a means of accumulating power.

**4 'A weak dictator'. Assess this view of Hitler.**

Successful candidates paused and reflected on what the criteria for a 'weak dictator' might be in their introductions and set the criteria out clearly for the rest of their response. Less successful responses often went straight to a discussion of features of Hitler's time in power and then struggled to link this with the focus of the question set. Examples of this include discussing the debate on the Holocaust or an examination of Nazi economic policy such as the Schacht v Goering or the 'guns v. butter' debates, without linking this to the idea of 'weak dictator'. Generalised narrative often led to low level responses. Some argued successfully that in certain areas, such as in foreign and military policy, he had a virtually free hand, but in others he had to be much more careful in how he utilised his authority.

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

**5 'By 1960, the USA had become a mainly suburban society.' How far do you agree?**

Good responses reflected carefully on what the criteria for a 'mainly suburban society' might be before starting to write their answers. Strong responses also identified a clear case both 'for' and 'against' and developed both arguments with carefully selected evidence. It was clear in many of the responses seen that candidates knew many of the factors 'for' the argument, with the number of mass produced houses being built, the flight of the middle classes out of the cities, and then the case 'against' with the fact that roughly one third of the population were suburban dwellers, but then avoided any conclusion on the 'mainly' part of the question. There were a number of responses where it was thought that this was a question about the 'consumer society' and wrote in depth about that. Little was relevant in these answers.

**6 Analyse the reasons why, in 1971, President Nixon ended the gold-dollar standard established in 1945.**

Candidates demonstrated a good awareness of the various reasons, both economic and political, as to why President Nixon ended the gold-dollar standard. The best answers included analysis of which was the most important and why. Another feature of the strongest responses was the ability of many candidates not only to explain what the standard itself was and what it did, but also to give very concise reasons why Nixon chose to end it. While there could be good identification of the reasons, it was the very best responses which commented in a sophisticated analysis of the reasoning behind the decision. Some argued that it was primarily political in motivation, with fewer suggesting primarily economic reasoning.

**7 How tolerant of social minorities were the American people in the 1980s?**

Many of the candidates who answered this question concentrated on the 1960s and 70s rather than addressing the specific date range of this question, the 1980s. Weaker responses which asserted that Reagan had been very generous towards social minorities could have been improved by making it very clear who were the 'social minorities' and giving examples of relevant policies and the benefits which arose from them. The better responses covered a full range of social minorities in their answers, often including African-Americans, Native Americans, homosexuals/lesbians, and then looked at both attitudes and formal legislative decisions made during this decade to give some idea of the degree of tolerance accorded to them. The best responses kept the focus firmly on the 'American people', as opposed to the government, and really reflected on how genuinely tolerant society had become.

**8 Assess the reasons why, after the Second World War, the USA abandoned its isolationist traditions.**

Some less successful answers became too focused on the pre-war isolationist debate, and did not include sufficient analysis of post 1945 events. Better responses identified a good range of reasons and also attempted to 'assess' those reasons, commenting on which were the most important and why. Some candidates also provided an assessment of how views could change, depending on factors such as differing presidential attitudes, Cold War issues and the state of the economy. Keeping the focus firmly on the post- 1945 period and making a clear attempt to prioritise and comment on the various reasons invariably led to more successful responses.

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

**9 To what extent was the move towards détente in the 1970s caused by fear of nuclear war?**

The best responses kept the focus of their argument on the reasons for the move towards détente by both major powers. Some weaker responses included detailed descriptions of the Cuban missile crisis which it was felt engendered the fear, or of the various negotiations and Treaties which took place between the two Cold 'Warriors' rather than addressing the issue of détente. The better responses not only looked at a range of the many different factors which led to détente, but took care to make it clear which they felt were the most important and why. There were some strong identifications of the major factors, often more comprehensive on US policy than the USSR. Some responses could have been improved by ensuring that there was an assessment of the 'extent' part of the question.

**10 'Gorbachev's reforms were responsible for the collapse of the Soviet Union.' How far do you agree?**

Many candidates provided a comprehensive discussion of a range of factors that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. The best responses provided a judgement that addressed the 'how far' part of the question with an analysis of the relative importance of the factors. Less successful answers often identified many of the reasons for the collapse ending with a brief 'conclusion' which said 'In conclusion we can see the Gorbachev's reforms were responsible to some extent for the collapse', with no indication of why this conclusion had been reached. Some responses set out two arguments, one saying it was Gorbachev's responsibility, and the other saying it was all Reagan's work, but often this approach was not linked back to the question. Weaker responses could have been improved by having a greater focus on including a judgement that was supported by relevant evidence.

**11 'A total disaster for the people of China'. How far do you agree with this judgement on Mao Zedong's economic policies?**

Good responses considered what a 'disaster' might be for 'the people of China' in their introductions. Some responses had a primary focus on Mao's reasons for the various policies which he introduced, but did not include any assessment on their results and how they would have impacted on the people of China. Many weak responses did not address the question and gave reasons why Mao won the Civil War which were irrelevant. Most candidates argued that the policies were a disaster, with only a few suggesting that, given the horrendous problems facing China in 1949, at least some progress had been made by the 1960s towards feeding the people and ending decades of political turmoil and war.

**12 How consistent was the USA's attitude towards Saddam Hussein in the period from 1980 to 1991?**

Candidates answering this question demonstrated a good grasp of the topic. The majority made a clear distinction between aims and actions, arguing usually that while the aims (following quite narrow US interests) were usually the same, the actions were inconsistent overall. There was much sophisticated analysis coupled with real in-depth knowledge being effectively utilised. Weaker responses did not address the issue of consistency and tended to offer just a narrative of events.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/43**  
**Depth Study**

## **Key Messages**

- Candidates should ensure that they focus on the specific nature of the question set, rather than writing about the topic in general.
- It is important that candidates support their arguments relevant factual information.
- Answers where the objective of each paragraph is made absolutely clear and it relates back to the overall judgement often scored more highly.

## **General Comments**

Candidates demonstrated a greater awareness that responses needed to demonstrate real depth of knowledge and a high degree of understanding in order to get in to the higher levels. The best answers dealt effectively with the specific terms of the question set, such as 'how far' or 'to what extent'. When asked to 'assess' or 'evaluate' or 'analyse', good answers provided thoughtful discussion of a variety of relevant factors, supported with evidence, and, most importantly, came to a reasoned judgment. If asked to 'analyse' the reasons 'why', successful answers not only gave an indication of the reasons for something happening, but a judgement on their relative importance and commented on why they are important.

Weaker answers often featured a long introduction, 'setting the scene' of the topic, which often had limited relevance to the question set, and did not set out the argument to be discussed in the rest of the essay. Often essays of this nature ended with a brief 'conclusion' which was not always very well related to preceding evidence. For example, an essay on the responsibility for ending the Cold War might contain a large number of facts which suggest that Reagan played the largest role, yet the conclusion might well go, 'Thus we can see that Gorbachev was responsible for bringing the Cold War to an end.' Candidates should not be afraid to come to a judgement, as long as the judgement is fully supported. In some cases answers included comprehensive coverage of both 'sides' of a question, yet failed to reach the top levels as they often ended saying 'there is a good case either way.', and not indicating which they feel might be the stronger case and why, or commenting in any way on why they feel there might be a 'good' case.

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

### **1 To what extent did Lenin change the way in which Russia was governed in the period from 1918 to 1924?**

The better responses kept their focus firmly on the 'governed' part of the question. There were some very good comparisons between the system that was established by 1924 and the previous regimes. Some commented on the contrast with the 'liberalism' of the Provisional Government and the authoritarianism of the Tsars, and suggested that in many ways Lenin was just a 'Red Tsar'. Some suggested that in taking decisions like Brest-Litovsk and Kronstadt, little had actually changed, one man was still exercising autocratic power. There was some good assessments of the structure of the new regime, looking both at the role of the party and institutions like Sovnarkom, sometimes suggesting that the intention was to bring about radical change in government, but never quite succeeding. The weaker responses tended to be highly descriptive, often just focusing on War Communism and the NEP, without explaining why they had any relevance.

### **2 How far was the incompetence of the Liberal governments in Italy responsible for Mussolini's rise to power?**

This question was well answered by the majority of candidates who selected it. The better responses really tried to tackle the 'how far?' part of the question and not just write a description of the factors which enabled Mussolini to attain power. The best responses demonstrated a good understanding of what the Liberal governments did do, or did badly. They invariably started with a clear judgement, and

then went on to develop it. Less successful answers often provided a narrative of the period between 1918 and 1922, with limited comment, where no picture emerged of which of the points raised played the most important role in the events leading up to the invitation to become Prime Minister in 1922.

**3 'Industrialisation benefitted both the Soviet state and the Soviet people.' How far do you agree?**

There were some very good responses to this question, which not only had real depth of knowledge on industrialisation under Stalin, but also differentiated carefully between the state and the people. Some also added a third possible beneficiary, Stalin himself, which was very perceptive. Those who demonstrated evidence that they had really reflected on what a 'benefit' might be in this context did exceptionally well. Some weaker responses discussed the collectivisation process at length, but this was often not directly relevant to the question set. A feature of weaker responses was to describe the whole process from the background to the NEP through the various plans and then end with a very brief conclusion 'that it benefitted the state and not the people very much.' The strongest responses made a judgement, explaining their reasons for coming to that judgement, and developing their case in depth through the use of carefully selected supporting evidence, demonstrating a really good grasp of the topic.

**4 Nazi economic policy failed.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the situation the Nazis inherited in 1933 and also the various policies adopted by Schacht and Goering. In stronger responses there was often considerable depth of knowledge shown, with lots of details about unemployment figures, armament production and the impact on real wages. Better answers reflected carefully on what a 'failure' might be in this context. Some very good responses considered the techniques utilised to get unemployment down and suggested that they could have had damaging long term implications, while at the same time pointing out the many flaws in both the aspirations of the autarky programme as well as the way in which they were administered.

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

**5 Assess the reasons why, against all expectations, Truman won the 1948 presidential election.**

There was usually good knowledge of this topic demonstrated, with awareness of both Truman's strengths and skills as well as the failings of his opponents. A fair amount was known about Dewey, but little mention was made of others such as Thurmond and Wallace. While there was often good depth of knowledge, there was a reluctance to 'assess' the reasons in weaker responses. Candidates who responded with analysis and comment on which were the most important factors leading to Truman's victory, and why he finally won were more successful. Answers which ended with unsubstantiated conclusions such as, 'There were a lot of reasons why Truman won', did not score high marks.

**6 How revolutionary were young people in the 1960s?**

There were some very detailed descriptions of what some American youth got up to in the 1960s, with the hippie movement and Woodstock getting a lot of coverage. Some responses focused almost entirely on the Civil Rights Movement and others looked in depth on the protests against the Vietnam War, but never really linked these narratives to the question about how 'revolutionary' American youth actually was. The best responses demonstrated reflection on the implications of 'revolutionary' in the context of the 1960s, with most suggesting that on the whole there was little that was genuinely 'revolutionary' about it. Young people were mainly reacting against the conformity of the 50s and the decision making of an out-of-touch elite, suggesting in one case that 'they soon shaved off their beards and bought their Brooks Brothers suits'.

**7 'Inconsistent and ineffective'. How valid is this comment about Reaganomics?**

This was a moderately well answered question. Some good responses showed analytical skills, commenting effectively on both the consistency and effectiveness of Reagan's economic policies (with often some very perceptive ideas on who and what was affected). Less successful responses had quite detailed knowledge of the various policies, but were reluctant to utilise that knowledge in actually answering that question.

**8 How far did President Kennedy depart from the Cold War policies of President Eisenhower?**

Less successful responses often got too involved in the detail of the Cuban missiles crisis and did not focus on the specific nature of the question. There was often sound knowledge seen about Kennedy's approach to the Cold War, but less was known about Eisenhower's. The best examined the work of Eisenhower and Dulles in the 50s and then contrasted it with Kennedy's, both before and after the Missile Crisis. Candidates who provided a judgement to the 'how far' aspect of the question were more successful.

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

**9 'The USA lost the Vietnam War because of its own mistakes.' How far do you agree?**

There was usually a good depth of knowledge seen, with the better candidates taking care to identify what they felt were the principal reasons for the American defeat and explaining why they were important to the outcome. Less successful responses often lacked balance and focused only on either the various American failings or on 'other factors' such as the guerrilla techniques used by their opponents and the degree of support they got from China and the USSR. Weaker responses could have made better use of their knowledge by taking a more balanced approach to the analysis and then ensuring they explained why they had come to their conclusion more fully.

**10 To what extent was the collapse of the Soviet Union caused by pressure imposed upon it by the USA?**

The best responses not only demonstrated a good depth of knowledge, but also dealt cogently with the 'extent' part of the questions. Most of the good answers argued that Reagan's pressure (with a bit of help from Thatcher) was merely a final straw, and that long term economic issues, coupled with consistent failure to deal with Eastern European/other nationalities issues, were the real problem. Some argued that responsibility lay more with Gorbachev's approach and policies, but the consensus was that, due to the nature of its structure, it was inevitable that the Soviet Union would collapse. The stronger responses clearly separated this topic from the 'End of the Cold War' topic and kept their focus firmly on why the Soviet Union collapsed.

**11 'Deng Xiaoping's priority was to modernise China's economy.' How far do you agree?**

Good responses to this question kept a focus on what Deng's priorities were. Less successful responses gave a lot of detail on the failings of the previous regime which, while they gave a picture of the problems he faced, had little connection to the question set. The better responses usually argued that while economic recovery and progress was obviously important, ensuring that the party remained firmly in control at all levels was very much the principal priority.

**12 'Fear of militant Islam was the main reason why Saddam Hussein invaded Iran in 1980.' How far do you agree?**

Candidates who argued their case, supported by a real depth of knowledge, did well in answering this question. The majority felt that while this fear was a factor, there were other more important ones in Saddam Hussein's mind, with aggressiveness and acquisitiveness being the major ones. These answers avoided just descriptions of motives and focused on the 'sustained judgment' required for the highest levels.