

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. Each source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- Responses are most effective when **part (a)** is answered first.
- Contextual knowledge helps to inform candidates' reading of the sources. In **part (a)** it can be used to explain the similarities and/or differences between the sources. In **part (b)** it can be used to help evaluate the sources.
- Commentaries about the reliability or 'bias' of the sources, which do not serve the needs of the question, are not relevant. For example, many answers to **part (a)** contained discussions of the relative reliability of the sources. This is not required.
- To be effective, comparisons need to be linked by a common criterion such as a point of detail or an inference which can be made from both sources. It is not enough to point out word matches between the sources, such as both sources contain the word 'pikes'.
- Relevant source details should support the comparison. The use of ellipses weakens support as it raises questions about how well the source material is understood.

## General comments

Most responses demonstrated comprehension of the sources and effective analysis. Candidates were aware that **part (a)** requires identification and support of similarities and differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Most responses provided relevant quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain the support/challenge argument. Short quotations are adequate.

It is important to read the sources carefully and to work out their arguments. On occasion, candidates missed nuances in sources or misrepresented the arguments. This resulted in comparisons or support/challenge arguments which were not valid. The best responses involved careful planning where candidates have given themselves time to read and think about the sources before starting their answer.

Some responses demonstrated knowledge of the topic, but it was not always deployed to best effect. In **part (a)**, it is necessary to consider the sources in context to work out why they are similar or different. Using contextual knowledge to explain the point of view of a source is only creditable if a comparison of viewpoints is relevant, included and the difference/similarity is explained.

In **part (b)**, the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless it is linked to the question. Many responses contained lengthy sections of background information or generalised commentary on the bias and reliability of sources. In **part (b)**, candidates might ask themselves if their knowledge supports or challenges the claims made in a source as a way of assessing the weight of the source as evidence. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific audience or to achieve a specific outcome, candidates should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. It is important to remember that each question and set of sources work differently. Generalised comments about a source being a political speech and therefore biased, or a cartoon being created to entertain the audience is not effective, or question-specific, evaluation.

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

It will always be possible to make a balanced argument for **part (b)** to support and challenge the statement in the question. However, candidates should not expect the number of sources on each side to be the same or expect that at least one source will be nuanced. These expectations sometimes led to missed opportunities for valid source use.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Section A: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750 – 1850***

##### **Question 1**

- (a) **Read Sources B and C. Compare and contrast these sources as evidence about events in Haslingden in April 1826.**

Many responses identified and supported similarities and differences. The most frequently discussed similarity was that the aim of the rioters was to break machinery. This was supported with effective use of detail. For example, it was pointed out that in Source B, the rioters '*set off to the loom breaking*' and in Source C the '*power looms of three mills*' were destroyed. Another frequently seen comparison was that there were troops in the Haslingden area and, although the rioters were aware of their presence, they were still determined to destroy the machines. Many responses also identified a valid difference, quite often about whether there was violence between the soldiers and the rioters. In Source B the rioters were not willing to engage with the soldiers and threw their pikes (for breaking machines rather than attacking soldiers) over the hedge to show they were not aggressive. However, in Source C the rioters attacked the troops with a '*volley of stones*'. It was also possible to identify and support a difference about the behaviour of the troops towards the rioters. Many responses demonstrated contextual knowledge. This was sometimes quite general, often in the form of an introduction to the industrial revolution. Where contextual knowledge was used most effectively, responses understood the development of the textile industry and the plight of the handloom weavers. Some responses used this knowledge well to explain the similarity between the sources. However, general comments on reliability were more frequently seen than explanation.

- (b) **How far do these sources show that working-class protest was a reaction against mechanisation?**

Most candidates gave a two-sided response and there was evidence of effective source use and contextual understanding. Most identified Source A accurately as a challenge source, explaining the informers claim that the Luddites had political aims and were a revolutionary organisation. A few stronger responses saw through this argument and used knowledge of the Luddite movement to show why it was false. Some attempted to use Source A to support the prompt but these arguments were often based on knowledge of the Luddites rather than the source. Source B supported the prompt, the desperation of the rioters reflecting their loss of employment in the face of mechanisation. Some attempted to make a separate argument about starvation as the main cause of working-class protest from Source B. However, this was a circular argument – the workers were starving because they had lost their jobs to new machinery. Source C supported the prompt and illustrated the violence of the workers against the machines. Most argued that Source D challenged the prompt, referring to high taxes and social injustice which angered the working-class. However, it contained references to mechanisation and a few candidates noted these. '*Rick burning and mobbing*' referred to the Swing Riots which occurred in rural areas after the introduction of threshing machines. Therefore, Source D could be used on both sides of the argument. Although many responses demonstrated knowledge, only a few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger.

**Section B: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920 – 41**

**Question 2**

- (a) **Read Source B and Source D. To what extent do these two sources agree about the government's management of the stock market crisis of 1929?**

A considerable number of responses answered **part (b)** first and, as a result, found it difficult to focus on the issue of how the government managed the stock market crisis in **part (a)**. **Part (b)** was about the causes of the Wall Street Crash, and many continued this focus into their **part (a)** answer. The most frequently explained similarity was that both sources mentioned Hoover's attempts to ease the situation by introducing public works schemes and encouraging the government to make cuts. The role of Treasury Secretary Mellon offered a similarity as the sources showed he was potentially influential in addressing the crisis. However, Mellon could also be the focus of a difference. Some argued he was shown in Source B to favour *'inactivity'*, therefore not using his power to act, whereas in Source D he was portrayed as only having *'limited power'*. The attitude of Congress, and whether Hoover showed leadership in dealing with the crisis, could also be compared for difference. However, to be valid comparisons needed to be like for like. Many responses added a paragraph of contextual knowledge, or a discussion of reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question. Explaining the differences between the sources required knowledge of what Hoover had, or had not, done in response to the Crash rather than a generalisation about his memoirs being *'biased'*.

- (b) **'Speculation on the stock market caused the Wall Street Crash of 1929.' How far do these sources support this view?**

Many responses made effective use of the sources and contained a balanced answer. However, some lost focus on the question and confused causes with consequences. Source A was well-understood and used for support. Many argued the Federal Reserve removed the plate from the speculator to save him from himself and prevent more speculation. Stronger responses often commented on this somewhat misleading message as the Federal Reserve could be accused of causing the problem of speculation by encouraging low interest rates. Source B was used most effectively as a challenge and responses noted the *'lack of effective regulation'* as the main cause of the Crash. Source C was nuanced. In support, many referred to the source's claim that *'Americans rushed wildly into their stock markets'*. However, the source blamed *'foreign pressure'* for encouraging the banks to *'cut interest rates and lend more money'* and this was a challenge argument. Source D blamed the banks and bankers for their *'dishonesty'* and *'willingness to lend money to anyone'* and so challenged the prompt. Hoover's reference to his attempt to prevent speculation was labelled by some as a support argument. However, this attempt was made in the aftermath of the Crash and therefore not directly relevant to its causes. Some candidates used their knowledge to explain what caused the Crash, although this was often at the expense of the sources. While some answers considered provenance and commented on source reliability, it was common to see generic evaluation in weaker responses. For example, Source D was from Hoover therefore *'biased'*, Source C was from a member of the Federal Reserve so unlikely to be truthful.

**Section C: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s**

**Question 3**

- (a) **Read Source A and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the role of the United States in maintaining peace.**

To make effective comparisons it was necessary to focus on the phrase *'role of the US in maintaining peace'*. Most answers supported at least one valid similarity, often that both sources agreed that the United States was to become more involved in world affairs. Relevant source use to support this included that Source A mentioned the *'increased participation'* of the US in world affairs and Source C commented on the new *'worldwide responsibility'* which the US had taken on. It was also possible to argue that the role of the US was potentially *'very great'*, but care was needed when quoting from Source A as it also argued that if the US did not act against aggressors, its role would be *'small'*. The second element of Chamberlain's argument in Source A could be used to argue a difference in outlook about the role of the US. Source C referred to their increased involvement as *'a magnificent thing'* while Source A had a more cautious tone. The straightforward difference, that Source A credited Kellogg for increasing the role of the US in maintaining peace,

but that Source C credited Briand, was observed in a handful of responses. Differences could be explained by contextual knowledge. Austen Chamberlain was involved in promoting the League of Nations and dismayed by the failure of the US to join. However, the author of Source C was delighted by recent developments, which could be explained using knowledge about the relative insecurity of France.

**(b) 'The Kellogg–Briand Pact would prevent a future war.' How far do the sources support this view?**

Most responses developed a balanced argument and many recognised that it was possible to use some sources on both sides of the argument. Source A offered some support for the prompt as it argued that the American people were keen to outlaw war. However, Chamberlain's concern about the approach taken by the US to nations which broke the Pact could be used as a challenge. Source B represented the strongest challenge argument and was explained well in many answers. European powers insisted on the right to self-defence, and this meant they could still justify war if they chose to. Although the professor who wrote Source B stated that Kellogg's intentions '*were of the best*', this did not weaken the overall argument of the source and could not be used as a challenge. Source C was used as a challenge, citing evidence such as the threat to peace posed by the Bolsheviks and the need to avoid the '*illusion that war can be eliminated by pacifist ideals*' to support the argument. Source D was nuanced as Kellogg commended the way statesmen worked to ensure peace but also admitted reluctantly that many people were 'predicting war.' Less effective responses sometimes resulted from misreading sources and creating a one-sided response. A small minority of responses attempted to use their contextual understanding to evaluate the sources but generalised comments on reliability were more frequent.





# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9489/12**  
**Document Question 12**

## Key messages

- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. Each source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- Responses are most effective when **part (a)** is answered first.
- Contextual knowledge helps to inform candidates' reading of the sources. In **part (a)** it can be used to explain the similarities and/or differences between the sources. In **part (b)** it can be used to help evaluate the sources.
- Commentaries about the reliability or 'bias' of the sources, which do not serve the needs of the question, are not relevant. For example, many answers to **part (a)** contained discussions of the relative reliability of the sources. This is not required.
- To be effective, comparisons need to be linked by a common criterion such as a point of detail or an inference which can be made from both sources.
- Relevant source details should support the comparison. The use of ellipses weakens support as it raises questions about how well the source material is understood.

## General comments

Many responses demonstrated understanding that the **part (a)** question requires the identification and explanation of similarities and differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or view in the question. Most responses used source content and provided selected quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain whether the sources supported or challenged the view in question. Some responses did not provide precise evidence and used ellipses to show selections from whole sentences. This did not provide enough evidence to support an assertion.

In each of the **(a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons based on evidence about the methods used by the Chartists. **Question 1(a)**, comparing and contrasting sources as evidence about Huey Long in **Question 2(a)** and comparing and contrasting evidence about Soviet foreign policy in **Question 3(a)**. To be valid, comparisons must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and related to the question. Some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable or wrote about the provenance. Some responses contained lengthy introductions which are not necessary.

The most effective responses to **part (a)** explained how the sources were similar and different and considered why the similarities or differences existed using specific contextual knowledge. For instance, in **Question 1(a)** the similarities between the sources could be addressed with specific knowledge of the aims of the Chartist movement in particular, and the ideas of Lovett, Place, O'Connor or John Frost. Differences could be explained with knowledge of the chronology of the Chartist movement and its decline after the rejection of the 1842 petition. In **part (b)** the most effective responses assessed the sources' weight as evidence, considering, for example, if the sources were for a specific purpose or audience and how this might affect their standing. Less effective responses also attempted this, but the evaluation was often not linked to the question. These contained lengthy sections of background information or unfocused commentary on the bias and reliability of sources.

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

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Section A: European option: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850***

##### **Question 1**

- (a) **Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the methods used by the Chartists**

Most responses identified relevant similarities between the sources and supported these by effective use of source details and inferences. Most candidates selected the counterproductive elements of the debate from both sources. Fewer responses highlighted the similarity concerning the importance of education. Many responses identified valid differences with the sources, with most candidates identifying the difference in attitudes to moral force or physical force. Weaker responses found the sources difficult to interpret and used partial quotations from each source to attempt comparisons. Stronger responses used relevant details to explain the similarities and differences and some also used knowledge of the Chartist movement to explain both similarities and differences between the two sources.

- (b) **‘The Chartist movement had a good chance of success.’ How far do these sources support this view?**

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most responses. Source A was identified by most as a support source, with many candidates identifying that optimism was high the movement, showing the belief from many Chartists that they could achieve success. Some candidates also used this source to challenge the view, arguing these aims were very unlikely to be met. Source B was also used for both sides, with Lovett’s hopefulness identified as giving a chance for success. Some candidates also identified the obvious fractures in the movement evident in B. Sources C and D were identified as challenge sources, with the visual source mostly being interpreted as the charter being depicted as too substantial, and that Parliament would be unwilling and unable to meet the Chartists’ demands. Source D was very well interpreted by many candidates as a clear challenge by its fatalist tone. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. Less effective responses were more generic in their attempts at evaluation – often stating the sources were biased or unreliable.

#### ***Section B: American Option: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920 – 41***

##### **Question 2**

- (a) **Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Huey Long.**

The question focused on Huey Long and many responses successfully identified a number of relevant similarities and differences. Most responses used a range of detailed contextual knowledge about Huey Long and his activities to explain the similarities and differences with consideration of the nature, origin and purposes of the sources.

- (b) **‘The New Deal was opposed because it cost too much.’ How far do the sources support this view?**

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the view that the New Deal was opposed for financial reasons. The nuanced nature of Source A was recognised by many candidates who used the financial aspects to strongly support the view and recognised the depiction on communist ideas to challenge the statement. Source B was mostly used as a support source by many candidates, using the clear messaging that ‘that the government had spent ‘too

much of the public's money'. Some candidates also identified the political aspect and the comments about revolution to use this as a challenge to the view. Source C was also used well to challenge, with candidates identifying Long's opposition as evidence of personal ambition for the presidency himself. Candidates also used Source D to challenge the statement, although fewer responses identified the ideas about the New Deal as a means of protecting a privileged class, with most using the ideas about personal ambition again to solidify the arguments expressed from Source C.

**Section C: International Option: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s**

**Question 3**

**(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Soviet foreign policy**

This question required candidates to compare the sources as evidence of Soviet foreign policy and most responses were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources. The most successful responses used relevant details to explain the similarities and differences they identified. For example, they used specific knowledge of post-revolutionary foreign policy to identify the needs of the Soviet state to encourage trade and the ideological stances of 'Socialism in One Country' as opposed to theory of permanent revolution to explain the similarities and differences very clearly. Less effective responses attempted to match phrases between the two sources, for example 'promoting peace in the world' and 'maintaining peace' to attempt to match similarities. These were not valid in the most part as many of the selections were identifying US Foreign policy not Soviet policy which was the focus of the question. Some of these responses added a paragraph of contextual knowledge, or a discussion of the provenance and reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question.

**(b) To what extent do these sources agree that the policies of other nations towards the Soviet Union were based on economic considerations?**

Most responses engaged well with the sources to offer support and challenge for the statement. Strong responses made good use of the provenance of Source A to identify elements to support and challenge the view. Source B was used well by candidates both to support and challenge using Stalin's arguments about trade and his views on propaganda. Source C was mostly used to challenge by detailing its military considerations, but it was also possible to link these to economic considerations. Some candidates used their wider contextual knowledge of the period to do this very effectively. Source D was also used well, with the majority of candidates using Lloyd George's comments on the economy to good effect. Some candidates also used his comments on disarmament and peace to challenge the view. The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to assess whether the sources were stronger or weaker as evidence in response to the question. Weaker responses used more generic evaluation for many of the sources, with many stating that the sources were biased or unreliable without any links to the context or the question. Some weaker responses also described source content without making a clear link to the question.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9489/13**  
**Document Question 13**

## Key messages

- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. Each source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- Responses are most effective when **part (a)** is answered first.
- Contextual knowledge helps to inform candidates' reading of the sources. In **part (a)** it can be used to explain the similarities and/or differences between the sources. In **part (b)** it can be used to help evaluate the sources.
- Commentaries about the reliability or 'bias' of the sources, which do not serve the needs of the question, are not relevant. For example, many answers to **part (a)** contained discussions of the relative reliability of the sources. This is not required.
- To be effective, comparisons need to be linked by a common criterion such as a point of detail or an inference which can be made from both sources.
- Relevant source details should support the comparison. The use of ellipses weakens support as it raises questions about how well the source material is understood.

## General comments

Many responses demonstrated understanding that the **part (a)** question requires the identification and explanation of similarities and differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or view in the question. Most responses used source content and provided selected quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain whether the sources supported or challenged the view in question. Some responses did not provide precise evidence and used ellipses to show selections from whole sentences. This did not provide enough evidence to support an assertion.

In each of the **part (a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons based on evidence about the Peterloo Massacre for **Question 1(a)**, comparing and contrasting sources as evidence about the Tennessee Valley Authority in **Question 2(a)**, and comparing and contrasting evidence about the Åland Islands question in **Question 3(a)**. To be valid, the points of comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and relates to the question. Some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question, for example discussion of wider concerns of the League of Nations in **Question 3(a)**. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable or simply wrote about the provenance. Some responses contained lengthy introductions which are not necessary.

The most effective responses to **part (a)** explained how the sources were similar and different and considered why the similarities or differences existed using specific contextual knowledge. For instance, in **Question 1(a)** the similarities between the sources could be addressed with specific knowledge of popular calls for reform and in particular the Combination Acts and Corn Laws. Differences could be explained through examining the origin and purpose of the sources in context. In **part (b)** the most effective responses assessed the sources' weight as evidence. Less effective responses also attempted this, but the evaluation was often not linked to the question. These contained lengthy sections of background information or unfocused commentary on the bias and reliability of sources.



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

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Section A: European option: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850***

##### **Question 1**

##### **(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Peterloo massacre**

Most responses identified valid similarities between the sources, with most candidates identifying the actions of the cavalry and the size of the crowd. Most responses identified relevant differences between the sources; these included attitudes towards the events from different viewpoints either as a 'battle' or as a 'massacre', points of difference concerning whether both sides were armed, and the nature of the crowd. To make effective use of knowledge it was necessary to use relevant contextual details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources however many candidates attempted discussions of reliability of sources which is not required in **part (a)** questions. Explanations should use specific detail to explain the reasons for similarities and differences.

##### **(b) 'There was widespread support for working-class demands.' How far do these sources agree?**

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was good evidence of effective source use in most answers. It was possible, with careful use of the content of the sources, to find elements of support and challenge from every source. Some candidates did not fully interpret the provenance of Source A and this led to some confused use of this source. However, there was clear elements of challenge from MPs to be identified in the source. Source B could also be used for both sides of the argument with most candidates using it as a support source based on the number of violent outbreaks occurring. Source C also could have been used for either side. Most candidates used this source as a challenge source, focusing on the actions of the cavalry to show the establishment view, but some used their historical skills to determine the portrayal of each side by the artist, and used the origin and purpose of the source in context to support the view. Source D was most typically used as a challenge source. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger, while in weaker responses attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable.

#### ***Section B: American Option: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41***

##### **Question 2**

##### **(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Tennessee Valley Authority**

Most responses identified relevant similarities between the sources, including various benefits and changes. In most cases these similarities were supported with effective use of source details. Most responses also identified valid differences, most especially that Source B suggested measures were temporary whereas Source C suggested they were long term solutions. Many candidates identified the differences stated about compulsion and the motivations behind the creation of the TVA, however only a few more effective responses developed explanation of these similarities and differences.

##### **(b) To what extent do the sources support the view that President Hoover did little to try and solve the Depression?**

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Source A was used to challenge the view with candidates identifying well-described elements of the image to support their arguments. This source lent itself to

opportunities to use wider contextual knowledge of the cost of emergency measures and the Revenue Act to evaluate it and several more effective responses did so. Source B was typically used to identify challenge, with the author's assertions that the price that business had paid for the New Deal had been 'too high' and its dismissal of 'temporary' measures not securing the long-term future for any business and its employees. Source C's tone and content was used to support the view. Source D was a nuanced source, and some candidates used the content to support and challenge to good effect.

**Section C: International Option: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s**

**Question 3**

**(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Aaland Islands question**

Most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources. Similarities were best identified, with many candidates highlighting the difficulties of the process. Many candidates identified reaction to the settlement as a key difference where the message of Source A was that the solution had left the islanders unsatisfied and hoping for justice in future, whereas Source B expressed that it 'delights the Aalanders' that concessions on their autonomy had been achieved. However, some responses were not well-focused and were commentaries on the different arbitrations undertaken by the League of Nations, which was not the question. Only the most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period to explain the differences between the sources.

**(b) How far do the sources support the view that, in the early 1920s, the League of Nations inspired confidence?**

Most responses engaged with the sources to offer support and challenge to the view that the League of Nations inspired confidence. Source A was a clear challenge source with most candidates identifying the lack of confidence in the League of Nations offered in the source for failing to protect the principle of self-determination. On the other side, Source B was confidently used as a support source by many candidates, who identified the pride and satisfaction suggested in the source over arbitrations which could not have been settled by 'ordinary methods of diplomacy'. Source C was a nuanced source, and many responses used this both to support confidence in the League for promoting 'peace and confidence' and for 'settling many controversial questions'. Elements which undermined full confidence were also present in the source which enabled the most effective responses to identify nuance and use knowledge of Nansen and his work for the League to fully evaluate the source in context. Source D was also a challenge source and was generally well-used by candidates to indicate various failures by the League.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9489/21**  
**Outline Study 21**

## Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach by offering a supported account of two different perspectives and ensuring that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Candidates should note and act on any timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

## General comments

**Part (a)** questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. Weaker responses were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on generalised assertions which did not have appropriate factual support.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; or 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. These were characterised by factual inaccuracy and assertions based on inadequate support.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Modern Europe 1750 – 1921**

#### **Question 1: France 1774 – 1814**

**(a) Explain why Napoleon agreed to the Concordat of 1801.**

Most responses identified and explained at least one causal factor to show why Napoleon agreed to the Concordat of 1801. Candidates most frequently discussed the improvement of relations between the state and the Church, the influence the Church had on the French people, or Napoleon demonstrating that he would uphold the principles of the revolution. The more successful answers then linked the above factors to people's support for Napoleon providing stability, reducing opposition or ensuring the support of the Church. Weaker responses were often able to identify factors but lacked the factual support necessary for explanation.

**(b) 'The failings of Louis XVI led to the storming of the Bastille.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses demonstrated understanding of the demands of the question and good knowledge of the failings of Louis XVI and the reasons for, and events of, the French Revolution. Overall responses attempted to provide some balance. In support of the statement, candidates commonly discussed Louis's weak and indecisive leadership, his inability to solve France's financial problems, and the failing of the Estates General. Alternative perspectives often considered the role of bad harvests, grievances of the Third Estate, and the influence of Enlightenment thinkers. The most effective responses were able to use this background to make clear links to the storming of the Bastille which was the focus of the question. Such answers highlighted that it was a symbol of royal tyranny, or the need to get gunpowder as they were afraid of the troops surrounding Paris. Weaker responses equated the event to the French Revolution in general. Such answers were often generalised and, at times, descriptive.

**Question 2: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815 – 71**

**(a) Explain why Prussia went to war with Austria in 1866.**

The strongest responses were able to explain several causal factors for Prussia going to war with Austria. The most common explanation was that Bismarck wanted to unify Germany and saw defeating Austria as a way to achieve this. Other explanations considered the strength of the Prussian army giving Prussia confidence, or that Prussia was looking to gain revenge for the humiliation of Olmutz. Some good knowledge was also shown about the Holstein and Schleswig situation. Weaker responses showed a general contextual understanding and were able to identify at least one factor, but these did not have the specific support necessary to be credited as explanation.

**(b) How influential were liberal ideas in Germany by 1848?**

This question required candidates to consider not only the influence of liberal ideas by 1848, but to consider an alternative perspective such as the restrictions placed on the influence of liberal ideas. An alternative but equally valid alternative perspective was to consider ideas that were more influential, such as nationalism. Strong responses were able to achieve this balance, initially through considering liberal influence through the development of the middle-class, and amongst university candidates. This was often linked to the 1848 revolutions throughout Germany and the development of the Frankfurt Parliament. The most common alternative perspective seen was the crushing of liberal ideas through Metternich's Carlsbad Decrees. Weaker responses recognised that nationalist ideas were important at this time but were often unable to separate this from liberal ideas, considering both to be the same. Similarly, knowledge of the Zollverein was often evident, but in a descriptive form, and lacking focus on the question.

**Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894 – 1921**

**(a) Explain why there was opposition in Russia to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.**

Most responses were able to identify factors related to the losing of land and the payment of reparations. Other identifications included that it was seen as a humiliation of Russia, particularly after the sacrifice of many of her its soldiers during the war. Stronger responses were able to explain these identifications with specifics such as an idea of where the land was, why it was important, and why this caused opposition. Others explained that through signing the Treaty Russia lost their access to support from their former allies. Weaker responses were not sure as to what the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was and gave generalised answers that could be applied to any peace treaty. Others argued that the Treaty had been signed by either the Tsar or the Provisional Government.

**(b) 'The repression of opposition was the reason the Tsar maintained his power, 1894–1914.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses demonstrated knowledge and could assess factors on one side of the argument. When considering the role of oppression, candidates were able to demonstrate how use of the army and the Okhrana enabled the Tsar to remain in power, often linked to the suppression of uprisings such as Bloody Sunday. The role of the Fundamental Laws was also examined. When



providing balance, the impact of the October Manifesto through its division of the opposition by the provision of a Duma was argued well, as was the support of the Tsar by the Orthodox Church. The strongest responses explicitly explained how such factors allowed the Tsar to stay in control and also weighed up their relative importance. Overall, candidates appeared confident in answering this question although some weaker responses ignored the dates in the question and explained how or why the Tsar lost support during the First World War which was not relevant.

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

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

**(a) Explain why the Civil War began in April 1861.**

The strongest responses explained several factors such as the election of Lincoln, the secession of the Southern States or the attack on Fort Sumter, all of which immediately preceded the start of the Civil War. Weaker candidates identified or described factors but did not adequately link these to the start of the Civil War. Other responses were overly focused on slavery, missing the question's emphasis on immediate causes. These responses tended to describe previous disputes over slavery, often at length, but these were not made relevant to the question focus of April 1861.

**(b) 'The enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act was the main cause of increased sectional tensions in the 1850s.' How far do you agree?**

When discussing the role of the Fugitive Slave Act, strong responses were able to examine its impact on both the North and the South in terms of its introduction, and the repercussions that it had in its execution. When considering the alternative perspectives, these explored the impacts of the 1850 Compromise, the Dred Scot case and Bleeding Kansas. For example, the introduction of popular sovereignty was used to explain that it led to Bleeding Kansas and the increased violence associated with it. Weaker responses often described the events rather than adopting an analytical approach. Others went outside of the timeframe given in the question and explained the role of events such as the Missouri Compromise or the entry of Texas into the Union, or described the reasons why the North and South disagreed over slavery.

**Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 77**

**(a) Explain why there were different responses in the North to the Emancipation Proclamation.**

Most responses showed understanding of what the Emancipation Declaration was and were therefore able to identify at least one factor, but several were unable to provide multi-causal answers. The most common response was that many Northerners supported abolition, and therefore agreed with the freeing of slaves in the South. Stronger answers also recognised other reasons for supporting it such as that it was a strategy to weaken the Confederacy by disrupting its economy and war effort. The strongest responses were also aware that not everyone in the North supported it and were able to explain that some people, possibly in the border states, did not agree as they were anti abolition. Weaker responses lacked precise evidence or were unsure regards to the detail of the Proclamation and who it applied to.

**(b) 'Reconstruction policies were applied consistently throughout the period 1865 – 77.' How far do you agree?**

Strong responses considered the question thematically, whilst other equally effective responses took a chronological approach. When contending that there was consistency, arguments included that the future of the freed slaves was considered, or that there were attempts to find a genuine solution to reuniting the country. Alternative perspectives often focused on the issues created by Southern reluctance as shown by the Black Codes and the rise of the Ku Klux Klan. Weaker responses were often descriptive, providing a narrative of the different approaches taken to Reconstruction, rather than arguing whether these were consistent or not. Other responses lacked focus on Reconstruction altogether, instead describing the end of the Civil War and the reasons for the North's victory.

**Question 6: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920**

**(a) Explain why there was an economic panic in 1873.**

Stronger responses identified Jay Cooke's bankruptcy as a causal factor for the economic panic, and some linked it to the Vienna stock market crash. Others were able to very clearly link the panic to the change in use of silver as a standard and moving over to gold, however, not all were able to add on to this factor with other factors such as the railway prospects. Weaker responses were overly general and did not address the specifics of the question. Several had a vague idea that it was linked to the stock market, but often confused these issues with the stock market crash of 1929, even naming and dating it as the Wall Street Crash of 1929.

**(b) 'The 19th Amendment was the most significant reform of the Progressive era.' How far do you agree?**

Many responses provided balanced arguments by discussing the significance of not only the enfranchisement of women, but other reforms during the Progressive era. The strongest responses were able to clearly explain significance through the longevity of the campaign to achieve the vote, for example by the NAWSA movement. The impact of the Amendment was also considered through a discussion of later improvements to the lives of women through their participation in politics. Counter-arguments were approached in different ways – either through a comparison with other Progressive Amendments such as the 18th, or through other reforms as the Sherman antitrust act, Elkin's Act and the Hepburn Act, with supporting explanations of their significance. Either approach was equally valid. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive rather than analytical, and often displayed weakness in knowledge and understanding both of the 19th Amendment, and the period in general. For example, some candidates suggested that the 19th Amendment gave women and African American men the right to vote. Several weaker responses attempted to consider alternative perspectives but wrote about the significance of reforms outside of the timeframe of the question such as the Dawes Plan or the New Deal.

**Section C: International history, 1870 – 1945**

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

**(a) Explain why Japan was able to improve its international status by 1900.**

Strong responses were confident in explaining several reasons for Japan improving its international status by 1900. The most popular reasons explained were the modernisation carried out by the Meiji Restoration after 1868 with examples of industrialisation with western technology being adopted, military improvements, reformed education and a new constitution based on the German model. Also, the effectiveness of these reforms was explained, especially the military reforms, demonstrated by the successes in the First Sino-Japanese war in 1894 and the gains made in the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895. Weaker responses usually identified some of these reforms without expanding knowledge. In addition, some of these described irrelevant material on the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902 and the success in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904–5. This was outside of the timeframe given in the question and could not be credited.

**(b) How far do economic factors explain the Scramble for Africa?**

Strong responses were able to assess the varying economic factors concerning reasons for the Scramble such as the need for more raw materials and specific ones were often identified such as gold, diamonds, iron and rubber. Another reason concerned the search for new markets to sell European goods and the expansion of trade. Stronger responses were able to not only explain the economic benefits but were also able to link nations to specific countries, such as Belgium in the Congo or Britain in South Africa. Balanced arguments were often provided through a discussion of other factors such as the political factors relating to consolidate power and prestige for European countries such as Britain, France and Germany. In addition, spreading European culture and religion were seen as important factors and assessed. Lastly, advances in weaponry made conquest of African lands far easier than in the past and medical improvements such as quinine to combat malaria was a vital improvement for European explorers or missionaries. Weaker responses knew about resources and markets being needed, however there was an absence of specifics in their responses. Similarly, although other factors were sometimes cited, these were with limited supporting knowledge.

**Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s**

**(a) Explain why the Rome–Berlin Axis was formed in 1936.**

Most candidates were able to display some knowledge and understanding through the identification of at least one factor. A common response was to explain that following the breakup of the Stresa Front and the sanctions imposed following Italy's invasion of Abyssinia, Mussolini was keen to develop an alliance with Germany. Other responses were able to explain that the Axis enabled Hitler to achieve Anschluss following the failed attempt in 1934. There was an awareness that both countries shared mutual ideologies and had both been involved in the Spanish Civil War, but these responses were often underdeveloped, and the factor was stated rather than explained with reference to the Axis. Weaker responses discussed the involvement of Japan which was not the focus of the question, or lacked awareness of which countries were involved in the Rome-Berlin Axis.

**(b) To what extent was the Great Depression responsible for the rise of political extremism in Europe?**

Stronger answers were able to provide a balanced argument through an analysis of the effect of the Great Depression on specific countries such as Germany. These were able to link the economic problems being experienced to a lack of faith in the current government leading to the rise of extremist leaders such as Hitler. Some excellent responses were seen that also argued that even in previously stable countries such as Britain, the Great Depression caused instability, for example through the rise of the British Union of Fascists. An alternative and equally valid approach was to take a broader view and consider the impact of the Great Depression on creating extremist foreign policies in countries such as Italy. Alternative perspectives most usually analysed the role of the Treaty of Versailles in creating extremism in both Germany and Italy, and sometimes through the consideration of the successor states. Other views seen explained the role of war in creating a Communist state in Russia, and the fall of the monarchy leading to the Spanish Civil War. Weaker responses often provided lengthy descriptions of the causes of the Great Depression, and its impact on countries in Europe, but failed to link these to the rise in political extremism. Some responses also included arguments about ultranationalism in Japan, but these were outside the question focus.

**Question 9: China and Japan, 1912 – 45**

**(a) Explain why the First United Front was ended in 1927.**

Some good responses were seen that displayed understanding of the First United Front and were able to identify reasons for its ending such as the split in the KMT or the Shanghai Massacres using some contextual knowledge. Weaker responses wrote more generally about China during the 1920s to 1940s, often providing descriptions of Mao's actions such as the Long March. These responses did not focus explicitly on the question. Some of these responses lacked awareness that the focus was China and provided descriptions of events in Japan or the Scramble for Africa.

**(b) How far does the war against Japan explain why the Kuomintang was in a weak position by 1945?**

Several responses were able to provide an analytical response, at least on one side of the argument. Stronger responses did attempt to provide balance which was sometimes undeveloped. The strongest arguments were seen when considering the strength of the CCP in comparison to the weakness of the KMT, particularly with regard to the popularity of the CCP as a result of their propaganda, and Mao's success in winning support from the rural peasants. Some candidates were aware of the failure of the KMT's tactics compared to the guerilla warfare by the CCP, but these arguments often lacked specific support. Weaker responses adopted a narrative approach, or attempted analysis with comments that were not supported or were undeveloped.

# HISTORY

**Paper 9489/22**  
**Outline Study 22**

## Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach by offering a supported account of two different perspectives and ensuring that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Candidates should note and act on any timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

## General comments

**Part (a)** questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. Weaker responses were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on generalised assertions which did not have appropriate factual support.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways were a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; or 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. These were characterised by factual inaccuracy and assertions based on inadequate support.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Modern Europe 1750 –1921**

#### **Question 1: France 1774 –1814**

**(a) Explain why Louis XVI and his family fled Paris in June 1791.**

Strong responses were appropriately focused on the events of 1791 providing a clear outline of the situation that faced Louis in the summer of 1791 and the reasons for the course of action he decided to take. These included his reluctance to accept proposed changes to the Constitution, fears for his family's safety in the face of growing extremism and the possibility of help from overseas supporters. For example, *Firstly, Louis believed in Divine Right and hoped to restore his power with the help of Austria.... Secondly, growing antagonism towards him and increasingly radical political demands threatened his position ..... Thirdly, he saw growing violence as an*



*increasing threat to the safety of his family who lived as virtual prisoners....all these combined to influence Louis decision to flee.* Weaker responses often covered events in France from 1789 or spent time describing the Flight to Varennes and its aftermath without fully focusing on the question.

**(b) 'Napoleon was a dictator.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses discussed some of the successful domestic policies that were adopted by Napoleon and were able to provide a clear account of them, with stronger responses assessing the extent to which the application of these policies represented dictatorial methods. For example, *Napoleon crowned himself Emperor having previously made himself dictator for life and had absolute control over government. He appointed regional governors loyal to himself to carry out his orders and had a civil service trained in the Lycée system and totally loyal. He used propaganda and censorship to create a strong personal image and closed down publications that criticised him. However, he gave the people the right to vote and established a fair legal system in the Code Napoleon.* These responses showed good awareness of the alternative arguments surrounding this issue and were successful in countering the argument that Napoleon's methods were dictatorial by showing ways in which he maintained the principles of the early revolutionaries of liberty, equality and fraternity.

**Question 2: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815 – 71**

**(a) Explain why Bismarck wanted to be allied with Austria in the war against Denmark in 1864.**

Most responses showed an awareness of both the current situation of Prussia and the future ambitions of Bismarck. Many referred to the less satisfactory state of the Prussian military where army reforms were still in their early stages. Equally important were Bismarck's long-term ambition to unite Germany under Prussian leadership which would at some point necessitate confrontation with Austria, with the Schleswig Holstein situation providing a potential trigger for such a confrontation. Weaker responses only provided general assertions about this while stronger responses were able to give a fuller account of Bismarck's ambitions and how this issue fitted into them.

**(b) To what extent did the Carlsbad Decrees limit the development of nationalism in Germany in the period from 1819 to 1848?**

Candidates with a clear understanding of the Carlsbad Decrees were able to produce effective responses comparing the limitations imposed by the Decrees with the other factors which allowed for the continuing growth of nationalism – factors like cultural developments, industrialisation and the development of the Zollverein. The strongest responses recognised that over a period of thirty years the effectiveness of the decrees might decline. For example, *In conclusion the Carlsbad Decrees were largely successful. Especially in the period from 1819 to the 1830's However, by the 1840's it can be argued that the economic success of the Zollverein and the growth of cultural factors that influenced the pace of political debate, made Germans more aware of nationalism as a concept. By the time of Metternich's fall in 1848 the Carlsbad Decrees had been significantly weakened allowing nationalist sentiment to build leading to the 1848 revolution.* Weaker responses often focused on the origins of nationalism under the influence of Napoleon or sought to demonstrate how much they knew about the Frankfurt Parliament which was beyond the focus of this question.

**Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894 – 1921**

**(a) Explain why the Bolsheviks were able to establish one-party rule by 1921.**

Many responses did not identify the focus of this question which was about how, once they had taken control of Russia from the Provisional Government, the Bolsheviks were able to eliminate all potential opposition. Weaker responses wrote predominantly about 1917 and the ways in which the Bolsheviks were able to seize power from the Provisional Government. Stronger responses were well focused and offered explanations based on the role of the Red Army, the outcome of the Civil War, the use of War Communism and its eventual replacement by the NEP and the setting up of the Cheka. These responses produced detailed and well-balanced answers.

**(b) To what extent were Witte's economic reforms successful?**

Most responses demonstrated understanding of the economic situation in Russia. Stronger responses included details of reforms and assessed their success or failure. One or two particularly good responses compared short term achievements with the longer-term effects in Russia noting the ultimate collapse of the Russian economy under the pressure of World War One. For example, *To summarise, the economic reforms of Witte were able to establish a short-term success giving a fast growth of industries and creating some economic prosperity. However, it came at a cost to an already struggling working class and proved to be insufficient in the long run. The reforms were a temporary sedate to Russia's social and economic issues but were unable to resolve the fundamental issues which culminated in revolutions.* Less effective responses were phrased in general terms showing little real understanding of where and when the economic reforms of Sergei Witte occurred or what specific measures were involved. Assessment of success in these responses tended to be based on identifying continuing weaknesses in the Russian economy rather than being specifically focused on what Witte did.

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

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

**(a) Explain why people believed in a 'slave power' conspiracy during the 1850s.**

Most responses recognised that increasing difficulties stemmed from the Compromise of 1850, and a few had a clear understanding of the idea of 'slave power conspiracy'. Most were able to describe, in general terms, how slavery gradually worsened relations between the slave and free states and stronger responses offered specific issues of 'slave power' such as the balance of power in Congress, the Kansas Nebraska Act and the Fugitive Slave Act.

**(b) To what extent did the Republican victory in the 1860 election cause the Civil War?**

It was possible to answer this question by referring only to events between the election in November 1860 and the attack on Fort Sumter in April 1861 but there were few attempts to do this. Instead, most responses took a longer-term view, first establishing the events and action over the previous decade that increased tensions between North and South and made Civil War increasingly possible and then identifying shorter term, or trigger, events that led to the outbreak of war in 1861, for example, *The election of Lincoln in November 1860 certainly set in motion a train of events that led to Civil War. However, the causes of previous violence such as the attack of Harpers Ferry, Bleeding Kansas and the Boston Riots all foreshadowed the violence that eventually became a full-scale Civil War.* This was an effective approach for most candidates though weaker responses did not organise the information into a coherent argument.

**Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 77**

**(a) Explain why Reconstruction ended in 1877.**

There were few responses to this question, and these showed some understanding of what reconstruction meant in terms of applying the Reconstruction Amendments, but only a minority really engaged with the problems that led to its ending and very few mentioned the Compromise of 1877 or knew what it entailed.

**(b) 'The shortage of resources was the main reason the Civil War lasted for four years.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses provided general descriptions of the economic situation of the two sides with some attempt at comparisons but with little consideration how this affected the progress and outcome of the Civil War. A few stronger responses made reference to the Anaconda Plan which affected the South but not many discussed problems for the North.

**Question 6: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920**

**(a) Explain why Progressive presidents reformed the constitution in the years leading up to 1920.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

- (b) **'The most significant consequences of immigration in the period 1870–1920 were economic in nature.' How far do you agree?**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

### **Section C: International history, 1870 – 1945**

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

- (a) **Explain why Russia was unable to defeat Japan in the war of 1904–05.**

Most responses showed good understanding of the outcome of the Russo-Japanese War and some of the reasons for it. The strongest responses focused on Russia's lack of preparation, poor supply lines and leadership, together with their underestimation of the strength of Japanese forces. Less successful responses were mostly about the strength of Japanese forces and the role of the Anglo-Japanese alliance rather than had a clear focus on Russia.

- (b) **To what extent was colonial rivalry in Africa the cause of a decline in Anglo–German relations?**

Strong responses focused on the Scramble for Africa and the growing involvement of Germany from Bismarck's organisation of Berlin Conference to Kaiser Wilhelm's demand for a 'Place in the Sun'. They used these to show how increasing competition for African colonies was particularly harmful to Anglo-German relations. The strongest responses were able to identify other factors that led to increasing hostility like the improvement in Anglo-French relations and the development of the Anglo-German naval race. Some also cited colonial competition in other areas like China, as a relevant issue. Weaker responses turned the question around and discussed how a decline in Anglo-German relations led to colonial rivalry which was not the focus.

#### **Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s**

- (a) **Explain why the remilitarisation of the Rhineland was not resisted.**

Most responses showed good understanding of the issues that were involved in this question. These included the economic problems caused by the Great Depression and domestic issues in both France and Great Britain. Many responses discussed the general feeling that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh, and the negative effects of the Great War on public opinion about potential armed conflict especially in view of other international issues at the time. For example, *Both Britain and France, at the time, were not prepared for war as their economies were facing the effects of the Great Depression. In addition, public opinion in both countries was opposed to war because of the losses they had suffered in the First World War and many also believed that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh and this was just a correction which allowed Germany back into 'its own back yard'.*

- (b) **'The invasion of Poland in September 1939 was not expected to lead to a wider European conflict.' How valid is this view?**

Strong responses provided a balanced analysis of whether full-scale war was likely to result from Germany's actions, acknowledging how events such as the Munich Agreement and Nazi–Soviet Pact gave Hitler confidence, and then considering this against the increasing preparations being made, for example: *Previous experience of appeasement and the removal of the Soviet Union from possibly joining Britain and France, meant that Hitler believed that they would not act when he invaded Poland, so a wider European war was not likely. However, the western powers increasing preparations for war shows that they had realised appeasement was not working and were preparing to go to war to stop further expansion by Germany.* Less successful responses usually described events that led to war.

**Question 9: China and Japan, 1912 – 45**

- (a) Explain why Japanese military leaders thought war with the USA was inevitable by 1941.**

Strong responses recognised that the key to Japan's attitude was their ambitions and policies for the creation of a zone of influence in East Asia and were able to explain these ambitions. These responses were able to suggest ways in which Japanese actions led to increasingly hostile responses from the US, and, vice versa, how in the late 1930's increased tensions made conflict between the two increasingly likely, leading to the Japanese decision to take pre-emptive action. Weaker responses tended to focus on US–Japanese issues from the 1920's rather than the immediate causes of conflict.

- (b) How important was Chinese Communist Party support in the success of the Northern Expedition?**

Strong responses recognised that central to this issue was the formation of the First United Front between the KMT and the CCP. These responses were able to provide clear explanation of how co-operation with the CCP allowed the KMT to develop a large and well-trained army with technical support from the Soviet Union, which was able to challenge the power of the warlords whose forces were poorly led and paid very little. For example: *The formation of the First United Front provided an opportunity to build support. This was based on Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles, nationalism, democracy and livelihood, which appealed to supporters of both parties. The agreement also brought support from the Soviet Union which was anxious to improve international links and provided both training and equipment. This meant that CCP support helped create a well-trained and competent force with popular support against which the warlord armies stood little chance of success.* Strong responses understood the contribution of each of these factors and were able to provide effective explanations of the significance of the CCP. Less effective responses wrote about Mao Tse-Tung and his role in the Long March which was not the focus of the question.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9489/23**  
**Outline Study 23**

## Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach by offering a supported account of two different perspectives and ensuring that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Candidates should note and act on any timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

## General comments

**Part (a)** questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. Weaker responses were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on generalised assertions which did not have appropriate factual support.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways were a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; or 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. These were characterised by factual inaccuracy and assertions based on inadequate support.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Modern Europe 1750 –1921**

#### **Question 1: France 1774 –1814**

\*\*Cambridge reviewed the language used and, although the French title is well known, concluded that a question using a French phrase without a translation could be challenging for candidates. To ensure that candidates' performance and outcomes were not negatively affected Cambridge introduced a mitigation for this question part. Research showed that candidates score very similar marks on part (a) questions, so examiners were first asked to mark question 1(a), the question using the title in French, according to the mark scheme. Examiners were then asked to look at the mark that the candidate scored on their other part (a) question. If the mark on question 1(a) was the higher of the two-part (a) marks, no further action was taken. However, if the mark on the other part (a) question was higher, then examiners changed the mark on question 1(a) to be the same as

the mark on their other part (a) question.\*\*

- (a) **Explain why Necker's 'Le Compte Rendu au Roi' was criticised when published in 1781.**

Stronger responses did know something about the detail of 'Le Compte Rendu au Roi' and were able to provide an accurate focus on the reaction to the report from various groups. Weaker responses were less familiar with the report and wrote generally about the financial problems facing France before the revolution which did not provide the specific detail that the question required.

- (b) **'Hunger caused the Great Fear of 1789 to happen.' How far do you agree?**

Stronger responses were able to successfully focus on the issues that led to growing discontent and violent outbreaks in the countryside in the autumn of 1789. The strongest responses set this against the uncertainty caused by events in Paris at the same time and particularly on the ineffectiveness of Louis in controlling the development of the revolutionary impetus and thereby produced a balanced analysis. Weaker candidates confused the 'Great Fear' with the 'Reign of Terror' and therefore wrote accounts, sometimes quite detailed, of events between 1789 and 1793 that were not relevant to this question.

### Question 2: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815 – 71

- (a) **Explain why the Carlsbad Decrees threatened the development of German nationalism.**

Most responses had a solid understanding of events in Germany following the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the Congress of Vienna. Their responses showed an awareness of the movement, led Metternich, to suppress the nationalist ideas that had been encouraged by the French Revolution, for example: *Nationalism was becoming dangerous and radical in the eyes of government, especially the candidate organisations or Burschenschaften and when candidate assassinated a Russian diplomat, Kotzebue, this provided the excuse to pass the Carlsbad decrees which stifled the further development of nationalism in Germany.* Many candidates were able to provide detailed examples of how the Carlsbad Decrees worked in suppressing the development of nationalistic ideas amongst the most politically active groups in German society and reinforced the level of control that local authorities were able to exercise over the population in general. The strongest responses were able to explain why Austrian domination, which was established by these decrees, threatened nationalism as it was not in Austrian interests to promote it.

- (b) **'The dispute over the new Danish King's rights over Schleswig-Holstein caused the war of 1864.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses were able to establish some valid reasons for the Prussian and Austrian decision to go to war over the intentions of the new Danish king, though few specifically mentioned the Salic Law which was at the root of the problem. Stronger responses were able to present a clear alternative explanation based on the ambitions of Prussia and especially on the actions and intentions of Bismarck, for example: *The Danish king's actions certainly angered many Germans who considered both states should be part of the German Confederation but it was Bismarck who used this to manoeuvre Austria into a position where they could not refuse to take part in a war against Denmark. By doing so he created a situation that he would be able to take advantage of in the future, so his intentions were a more important factor in the war.* Few candidates mentioned the previous war or the impact of broader international issues, with many concentrating heavily on the significance of relations between Prussia and Austria at this critical time in the development of German nationalism. In doing this several went beyond 1864 and therefore outside the parameters of this question

### Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894 – 1921

- (a) **Explain why the Tsarist regime had become unpopular by 1905.**

The strongest responses concentrated on the failings of Nicholas II whilst less effective ones concentrated heavily on the specific events of 1905 rather than explaining how the Tsar's growing unpopularity led up to these events. The latter tended to view the events of Bloody Sunday as being the trigger for the Tsar's unpopularity, for example: *There were growing social and political*

*problems and the early failings in the Russo Japanese war angered people even more but it was Boody Sunday that was the spark that lit the fire of the 1905 revolution.* Stronger responses were able to incorporate details such as the effects of rapid industrialisation, policies like Russification, and natural disasters such as harvest failures, into a more generic explanation of why the tsar was so widely unpopular. These provided high levels of detail that were very effective.

**(b) 'By 1921 Bolshevik rule over Russia was firmly established.' How far do you agree?**

There were effective responses showing a clear understanding of the events of 1918–21 and the methods used by the Bolsheviks to establish firm control over the majority of Russia. Strong responses were aware of the Kronstadt rebellion, the issues surrounding War Communism and the equally controversial New Economic Policy and were able to provide balanced arguments while less effective responses were not as successful identifying these challenges. Some weaker responses explained in detail how the Bolsheviks were able to take power in November 1917, but this was not the focus of the question.

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

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

**(a) Explain why Confederate forces attacked Fort Sumter.**

Many candidates were aware of, and offered some explanation for, the significance of Fort Sumter as one of several Union controlled forts that stood in Confederate territory, for example: *When the USA split into the Union and the Confederacy the confederates wanted to take control of all areas in the south held by northern forces. Fort Sumter was a strongpoint on Charleston harbour that was well inside southern territory and southerners were afraid its forces could be used against them, so they wanted the soldiers out.* Stronger responses were able to explain its symbolic value as a Union enclave in the middle of Confederate territory. Clear answers stuck to the basic issues of position, resupplying and the demand for a surrender, and produced effective results. Less effective responses explored some of the wider reasons for the outbreak of the Civil War, which were not part of this question.

**(b) How significant was the issue of 'Bleeding Kansas' in bringing about the Civil War?**

Most candidates were able to describe, often in considerable detail, the events that constituted the episode known as 'Bleeding Kansas'. Most candidates understood its implications for the spread of slavery and were able to characterise this as a 'mini' civil war based on clashes over the implementation and interpretation of the Compromise of 1850. Stronger responses saw what happened in Kansas and Nebraska as a consequence of this but were also able to identify other factors that increased the possibility of civil war. These included the collapse of the Whig party and the rise of the Republicans as well and the effect of the short-term factors like the election of 1860 and the divisions of the Democrats. Many candidates produced effective responses by taking this wide-ranging approach, for example: *Bleeding Kansas was like a rehearsal for the Civil War – some of the reasons for the future conflict underpinned the conflict in Kansas and the failure to sort out the basic issues caused a steady increase in tension leading to the secession of the South.*

**Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 77**

**(a) Explain why Radical Republicans opposed Johnson's Presidential Reconstruction policies.**

Most candidates were aware that much of the conflict was centred around the Reconstruction Amendments. Stronger responses were able to identify the mismatch between the intentions of the amendments and the reality of their application. However, some responses did not provide a fully effective analysis because they were not clear on what Johnson's policies were. This was sometimes implicit in responses with a focus on the Radical Republicans and their actions and intentions, but this approach often avoided saying exactly what it was of Johnson's policies that they objected to.

**(b) 'Living conditions in the South were hard throughout the Civil War.' How far do you agree?**

Many responses wrote a general commentary on conditions in the South whilst others included



conditions in the North. Stronger responses distinguished between different groups, identifying slaves as the ones who suffered most, but few responses got beyond a general description including the effect of the Anaconda plan, for example: *In the south the trade in cotton was an important factor in the working of the economy the Anaconda Plan was a Union naval blockade around the coastline of the Confederate States. This meant that the confederacy had trade cut off with Britain meaning they would be deprived of money and supplies led to many harsh living conditions in the South throughout the war.*

**Question 6: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920**

- (a) **Explain why the Granger Movement was formed.**

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comment.

- (b) **'Constitutional change was the most significant achievement of the Progressive Movement.' How far do you agree?**

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comment.

**Section C: International history, 1870 – 1945**

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

- (a) **Explain why political considerations led to European interest in gaining territories in Africa after 1870.**

Strong responses demonstrated an awareness of the meaning of political considerations and focused their analysis appropriately. This included identifying political advantages to be gained by focusing public opinion on overseas gains and successes and diverting interest away from domestic issues. Some also mentioned the political reasons for Bismark's conversion to a more expansionist policy as seen in the calling of the Berlin Conference and the importance of the Kaisers demands for 'a place in the sun', for example: *Many countries like Germany wanted to have a large overseas empire like Great Britain but it was impossible to expand within the boundaries of Europe so Africa became a target for their ambitions.* Less effective responses provided general discussion of all the factors that encouraged late 19<sup>th</sup> century imperialism, with little or no distinction between political and other factors.

- (b) **To what extent were the economic difficulties of the 1890s a cause of the change in US attitudes towards overseas expansion?**

There were very good responses to this question. Most candidates were able to offer a range of factors that contributed to the US development of a more expansionist and proactive foreign policy in the late 1890's. Strong responses were able to distinguish clearly between economic and other factors in order to produce a balanced consideration of relative importance. Candidates generally showed a good understanding of the working of the US economy and the effect of the Panic of 1893, which, together with the closing of the frontier, pushed American industrialists to looking further afield for resources and markets. Strong responses also recognised that other circumstances like the Cuban fight for independence, the influence of the yellow press and the election of expansionist president McKinley, also played a big part in the changing attitudes in the US towards acquiring colonies.

**Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s**

- (a) **Explain why Germany became involved in the Spanish Civil War.**

Most candidates were able to offer a reason for German involvement based on the desire to test new weaponry and battle tactics in preparation for a more general conflict, for example: *Germany became involved due to a number of factors including Hitler's resolve to support the growth of fascism in Europe and to isolate France and destroy democracy in Spain. However, his most important motive was his long-term goal of rearmament and rebuilding German forces for a future war.* Stronger responses were able to provide more specific detail of these different objectives and were also aware of a range of secondary factors including supporting the spread of fascist ideas



and strengthening the alliance with Italy. Also gaining access to vital resources that Spain could provide in return for the help they received. Weaker responses were largely focused on the military aspect of the support and provided little information on other factors.

- (b) **‘The League was not to blame for the failure to prevent Italy’s conquest of Abyssinia.’ How far do you agree?**

The most effective responses were focused on the mismatch between the theory and the practical reality of the operation of the League. In theory when the Emperor Haile Selassie appealed to the League for assistance against the invading Italian troops, the League should at least have imposed sanctions on Italy and possibly intervened militarily. In this sense the League was responsible for not stopping Italy and this was the basis of successful arguments supporting the hypothesis. Against this was usually set the argument that the League could only act in accordance with the intentions of its leading members which, by 1935 was Britain and France. The role of these two countries was the basis of most arguments against the culpability of the League. Most responses produced some balance with differentiation on the basis of detail, for example: *In conclusion the League’s weakness did restrict its ability to help Abyssinia, but it was entirely to blame as they were unable to do more due to the alignment of Britain and France which prevented more decisive action by the League. Mussolini’s aggression and ambition also made it difficult to prevent his action against Abyssinia.*

**Question 9: China and Japan, 1912 – 45**

- (a) **Explain why Chiang Kai-shek’s Extermination Campaigns failed to destroy the Communist Party.**

Many responses focused primarily on Mao Tse-Tung and the Long March and whilst these do represent the final means of survival for the Chinese Communist Party, they do not explain the failure of previous campaigns by Chiang Kai-shek. Stronger responses recognised that Chiang had already failed in that his previous campaigns had not achieved any significant success. These had been aimed at the centres of communist power, with traditional campaigns against the major population centres, rather than the source of their power, the scattered peasant population. Stronger responses also took into consideration the growing aggression from Japan, culminating in the invasion of Manchuria, which was a major distraction for Chiang.

- (b) **To what extent was the Kwantung Army’s invasion of Manchuria a result of the weakness of democracy in Japan?**

Strong responses considered why the action in Manchuria might be caused by the failure of democratic government, establishing exactly how little control they had by 1932. Weaker responses focussed on how democracy had failed in Japan whilst more effective responses looked for other factors that supported the Kwantung army’s move. These included the effects of the Great Depression the rise of right-wing militarist societies and the significant role of the emperor in Japanese society. This approach produced some very effective results, for example: *Several factors led to the Kwantung army’s invasion of Manchuria. These included fear of continued western expansion in the far east and the seriously bad effects on the economy caused by the global economic crisis. However, the main reason was the weakness of the democratic government in Japan. In the face of these problems people lost faith in democracy and turned instead to ultra-nationalist groups eventually plunging Japan into further expansionist action like the second Sino-Japanese War.*

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9489/31**  
**Interpretations Question 31**

## Key messages

- Candidates should read the extract carefully. Spend time thinking about the extract and working out what it all means. Highlight those sections of the extract that seem most important in revealing the historian's views. Make notes so as not to forget something that could be useful in a response.
- The most effective responses view the extract as a whole. They understand that the historian's interpretation will apply to the extract as a whole and will be consistent with all the arguments contained within the extract. They recognise that not all aspects of the extract will be equally important, and they focus on those aspects that most clearly signal the historian's interpretation. They select those aspects of the extract which most effectively illustrate and explain the interpretation and use these to construct the answer.
- Working through the extract, paragraph by paragraph, summarising what it says results in the inclusion of material that is not central to the interpretation, and a concentration on what the extract says rather than on what it means. Answers should be about the historian's ideas, opinions and interpretation, and what the extract says should only be used as a means of explaining and illustrating these.

## General comments

The most effective responses built their answer around the illustration of blame, explicitly linking selected sections of the extract to it. Less effective responses relied too much on summarising what the extract said but would usually in the introduction and conclusion make mention of the issue of blame. The effect of this is that very few answers failed to engage at all with the historian's interpretation. Even when weaker responses made false inferences from what the extract says, there was usually a clear process discernible in the answer of trying to show how the extract supports what the interpretation was claimed to be.

Many responses used historiographical 'labels' (revisionist, intentionalist etc.) to identify the historian's approach. This is not a requirement of the examination, but it can be helpful in demonstrating understanding of what is contained in the extract. If done incorrectly, it can also be indicative of misunderstanding, so having a firm grasp of what labels mean is important. Several responses did not exemplify this and jumped to conclusions on the basis of limited and insufficient evidence. For example, on the Holocaust any mention of Nazis other than Hitler was taken to mean that the approach was structuralist, or any reference to the war was taken to indicate functionalism. Similarly on the Cold War, any discussion of ideology was taken to mean post-post revisionism. Engaging with the extract as a whole to get an overall impression of the interpretation was a more effective approach than trying to make it 'fit' a label.

## Comments on specific questions

### ***Section A: The origins of the First World War***

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames France and Russia for the war because (i) from 1912 they planned for war, and (ii) in the July Crisis they took active steps to bring war about. The most effective responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most of the other responses detected some or all of this but undermined the answer by perceiving something else as also being part of the main interpretation – often Serbia. This country does come in for some criticism from the historian, but clearly not as a main message. Less effective responses saw more general factors – militarism, imperialism, the Alliance System – as being blamed, using what the extract said about France and Russia as evidence of this, even though the argument was not about these factors. Weaker responses paraphrased points in the extract with little elaboration or development.

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

The main argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames **(i)** the American government for not having assisted the Jews enough, and **(ii)** the American people for being unsympathetic and self-interested in their attitudes to the Jews. The strongest responses were able to identify these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them effectively using material from the extract. The extract concerned 'bystanders', a branch of Holocaust historiography that candidates seemed well aware of, with the label used often in answers. However, several responses made exaggerated and often false claims about the nature of the blame attributed by the historian. It cannot be accurate that the Americans were to blame for 'the Holocaust', though this was often claimed, and occasionally argued as if the Americans were co-conspirators of the Nazis. Responses that were based on working through the extract paragraph by paragraph were often distracted by apparently contradictory sections of the text – for example, was Roosevelt sympathetic or not? In viewing the extract as a whole, it was clear that his sympathy was in short supply, and that he was unprepared to make the effort needed, but several responses seized upon details that suggested otherwise and concluded wrongly that on balance he was exonerated. Because this was not an extract that dealt directly with Holocaust causation, a few responses did not locate the blame and did little more than summarise what the extract said. The weakest responses wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

### **Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War**

The argument presented by the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Truman **(i)** for being unwilling to negotiate in good faith at Potsdam, and **(ii)** for his impatience with the way the conference proceeded. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The extract was about Truman at Potsdam, so answers had to be properly contextualised. Answers that saw Truman as being criticised, for example because of his inexperience or his personality, but which failed to put this in context, were regarded as showing only partial understanding. Less effective responses saw the Russians as being also to blame, or even being totally to blame. In an extract that focused so definitely on Truman, this meant taking the occasional sub-messages on the Russians as being part of the main interpretation. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins of the Cold War with no reference to the extract at all.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9489/32**  
**Interpretations Question 32**

## Key messages

- Candidates should read the extract carefully. Spend time thinking about the extract and working out what it all means. Highlight those sections of the extract that seem most important in revealing the historian's views. Make notes so as not to forget something that could be useful in a response.
- The most effective responses view the extract as a whole. They understand that the historian's interpretation will apply to the extract as a whole and will be consistent with all the arguments contained within the extract. They recognise that not all aspects of the extract will be equally important, and they focus on those aspects that most clearly signal the historian's interpretation. They select those aspects of the extract which most effectively illustrate and explain the interpretation and use these to construct the answer.
- Working through the extract, paragraph by paragraph, summarising what it says results in the inclusion of material that is not central to the interpretation, and a concentration on what the extract says rather than on what it means. Answers should be about the historian's ideas, opinions and interpretation, and what the extract says should only be used as a means of explaining and illustrating these.

## General comments

The most effective responses built their answer around the illustration of blame, explicitly linking selected sections of the extract to it. Less effective responses relied too much on summarising what the extract said but would usually in the introduction and conclusion make mention of the issue of blame. The effect of this is that very few answers failed to engage at all with the historian's interpretation. Even when weaker responses made false inferences from what the extract says, there was usually a clear process discernible in the answer of trying to show how the extract supports what the interpretation was claimed to be.

Many responses used historiographical 'labels' (revisionist, intentionalist etc.) to identify the historian's approach. This is not a requirement of the examination, but it can be helpful in demonstrating understanding of what is contained in the extract. If done incorrectly, it can also be indicative of misunderstanding, so having a firm grasp of what labels mean is important. Several responses did not exemplify this and jumped to conclusions on the basis of limited and insufficient evidence. For example, on the Holocaust any mention of Nazis other than Hitler was taken to mean that the approach was structuralist, or any reference to the war was taken to indicate functionalism. Similarly on the Cold War, any discussion of ideology was taken to mean post-post revisionism. Engaging with the extract as a whole to get an overall impression of the interpretation was a more effective approach than trying to make it 'fit' a label.

## Comments on specific questions

### ***Section A: The origins of the First World War***

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames genocide on (i) the contribution of the elites in validating it to the masses, and (ii) on the willingness of German society as a whole to stand aside. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most responses did not attempt to attach a 'label' to this extract, as there was nothing in it to suggest a functionalist or structuralist explanation, and no mention of Hitler to encourage candidates to perceive intentionalism. Several responses found it difficult to locate the



interpretation, perhaps because Nazi anti-Semitism was a given, yet was not seen by the historian as the decisive factor for most people. Rather than seeing Germans as 'willing executioners', this historian aimed at explaining how genocide could occur within a German society that was not initially genocidal towards the Jews, but was nonetheless willing to turn a blind eye, or uncritically follow the lead of its elite. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract with little elaboration.

**Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames the United States/Truman for **(i)** its misplaced attitudes/assumptions about the rest of the world, and **(ii)** its ineffective/flawed policies towards the USSR. The most effective responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most responses understood that the historian's approach was revisionist, but many were misled into thinking of it as a standard 'dollar imperialism' extract, taking what it said about Marxist historians as being the historian's own view. Though there was an economic dimension to the historian's argument, it was not made central to the interpretation. Some responses thought that the approach was post-revisionist, blaming either both the USA and the USSR, or more rarely neither, seeing the Cold War as being the result of mutual misunderstanding. The weakest responses wrote about the origins of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9489/33**  
**Interpretations Question 33**

## **Key messages**

- Candidates should read the extract carefully. Spend time thinking about the extract and working out what it all means. Highlight those sections of the extract that seem most important in revealing the historian's views. Make notes so as not to forget something that could be useful in a response.
- The most effective responses view the extract as a whole. They understand that the historian's interpretation will apply to the extract as a whole and will be consistent with all the arguments contained within the extract. They recognise that not all aspects of the extract will be equally important, and they focus on those aspects that most clearly signal the historian's interpretation. They select those aspects of the extract which most effectively illustrate and explain the interpretation and use these to construct the answer.
- Working through the extract, paragraph by paragraph, summarising what it says results in the inclusion of material that is not central to the interpretation, and a concentration on what the extract says rather than on what it means. Answers should be about the historian's ideas, opinions and interpretation, and what the extract says should only be used as a means of explaining and illustrating these.

## **General comments**

The most effective responses built their answer around the illustration of blame, explicitly linking selected sections of the extract to it. Less effective responses relied too much on summarising what the extract said but would usually in the introduction and conclusion make mention of the issue of blame. The effect of this is that very few answers failed to engage at all with the historian's interpretation. Even when weaker responses made false inferences from what the extract says, there was usually a clear process discernible in the answer of trying to show how the extract supports what the interpretation was claimed to be.

Many responses used historiographical 'labels' (revisionist, intentionalist etc.) to identify the historian's approach. This is not a requirement of the examination, but it can be helpful in demonstrating understanding of what is contained in the extract. If done incorrectly, it can also be indicative of misunderstanding, so having a firm grasp of what labels mean is important. Several responses did not exemplify this and jumped to conclusions on the basis of limited and insufficient evidence. For example, on the Holocaust any mention of Nazis other than Hitler was taken to mean that the approach was structuralist, or any reference to the war was taken to indicate functionalism. Similarly on the Cold War, any discussion of ideology was taken to mean post-post revisionism. Engaging with the extract as a whole to get an overall impression of the interpretation was a more effective approach than trying to make it 'fit' a label.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Section A: The origins of the First World War***

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

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

The historian's main argument is that s/he blames the circumstances of war for the development of the Holocaust by arguing (i) that before the invasion of the Soviet Union there was no plan for genocide, and (ii) that even after the invasion measures against the Jews were improvised, ad hoc developments. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. A good number of responses spotted and supported the first element of the interpretation well, but did not fully grasp the rest of the argument, often thinking that the extract argued that the start of

Barbarossa signalled the start of the Final Solution. The reference to the invasion as the 'turning point' was the cause of this misunderstanding, although the subsequent statement that what should happen to deported Jews 'was (still) anything but clear' provided further clarification. The extract also gave rise to flawed inferences about the historian's approach. Despite the approach being functionalist, many candidates claimed it was structuralist, often on the basis that Hitler was pressurised by the Gauleiters to change policy (thus Hitler was claimed to be a 'weak' Fuhrer, even though he ignored this pressure). Alternatively, subordinates were claimed to be 'working towards the Fuhrer' which produced 'cumulative radicalisation', purely on the basis that Heydrich and Himmler were mentioned as being involved in the making and implementation of Jewish policy. The responses that did this seemed to be fitting the extract to a label rather than, as the strongest responses did, analysing what the historian was actually arguing. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

### ***Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War***

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Truman **(i)** for abandoning Roosevelt's search for improved relations (i.e. his UN policy), and **(ii)** for moving towards a break with the Soviet Union. The strongest responses were able to clearly recognise these elements and illustrated them effectively using material from the extract. As the first paragraph set the scene for the main interpretation, several candidates who approached the extract paragraph by paragraph claimed that Roosevelt was being blamed, for example by trying to force a free market economy on the world. Viewing the extract as a whole, as the best responses did, it would have been clear that any inferences blaming Roosevelt would be sub-messages only. The other common misunderstanding was to assume that the extract was approving of the United States' policy towards the Soviet Union, and that the approach was therefore orthodox. Reaching this conclusion depended on seizing on individual phrases or sentences – for example, 'Truman was concerned with preserving democracy in Western Europe' – and overlooking most of what the extract actually said. The weakest responses wrote about the origins of the Cold War with no reference to the extract and little elaboration.

# HISTORY

Paper 9489/41  
Depth Study 41

## Key messages

- The most effective responses tailored knowledge to the specific demands of the question.
- A balanced response that considers an alternative argument is important for success.
- Good chronological knowledge is important when questions specify a particular time period.

## General comments

There was clear understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, incorporating introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis. Strong responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays and attempted to produce a consistent line of reasoning. Others made their judgements in the conclusion. The extent of supporting detail is important, and the more successful responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the chosen question and were able to ensure that their response directly addressed the wording of that question. Less effective responses tended to offer more generic responses.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 ‘Mussolini’s foreign policy was largely unsuccessful.’ Discuss.**

Most responses set out criteria which they would use to judge the degree of success achieved by Mussolini in his foreign policy. The strongest analysis measured overall achievements against the aims outlined from the outset, while a balanced approach was adopted in the majority of responses. Many of these made judgements which pointed to the success of Mussolini’s foreign policy adventures in relation to domestic propaganda, and then reasoned that these policies ultimately failed due to the disastrous involvement in World War Two. The most effective responses also showed precise and accurate knowledge of examples from both the 1920s and 1930s. The most common examples included Corfu, Abyssinia and the Spanish Civil War. Some weaker responses found it more difficult to locate the correct focus and provided irrelevant examples such as economic policies of autarky or the Battle of the Lira.

#### **2 Analyse the impact of Stalin’s propaganda and personality cult on the Russian people from 1929.**

There was evidence of good knowledge of the methods used by Stalin to spread propaganda and effective discussions of what the personality cult entailed, with strong examples offering evaluation of its success. Good examples included the impact of propaganda in the education system, sometimes incorporating Komsomol, and the impact of the Stakhanovite Movement. Weaker responses tended to describe propaganda in vague terms, with many references made to the use of television for comfort. Some also discussed the impact of other policies, such as terror or industrial and agricultural policies, without linking them to propaganda in any way.

#### **3 ‘Hitler’s consolidation of power was achieved by gaining the support of the traditional German elites.’ Assess this view.**

The strongest responses were able to identify what was meant by elites and to explain their role in helping Hitler’s consolidation of power. Examples provided included landowners, industrialists, the church and the higher echelons of the armed forces. The Concordat with the Catholic Church and the reduction in influence of the SA through the Night of the Long Knives were provided to explain the latter two. Less successful



approaches saw descriptions of why these groups supported Hitler or how they helped him gain power and these also found it difficult to define elites. Most responses were confident on alternatives, with the stronger ones understanding that the main period of consolidation was in 1933–34 and referred to examples such as the Reichstag Fire, Enabling Act and the death of Hindenburg. Many responses covered the Night of the Long Knives as a counterargument rather than as an example to support the proposition made in the question. More general discussions such as those of terror and propaganda were valid, although less sharply focused. Some responses widened the lens too far and included examples such as policies towards the young and racial minorities which did not address the terms of the question. The least successful responses did not discuss consolidation of power and instead explored how Hitler gained power by January 1933.

**4 Assess how influential pacifism was on British popular opinion in the period 1934–39.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**Section B: The USA, 1944–92**

**5 Assess the importance of economic prosperity in the development of a distinct youth culture during the late 1940s and 1950s.**

Responses were able to offer some links between economic prosperity and the development of a distinct youth culture. Few responses offered discussion of alternative explanations and lacked balance as a result. Weaker responses also incorporated material which applied more specifically to the 1960s rather than the period specified in the question.

**6 ‘Kennedy’s domestic policies failed to deliver on his promises.’ Discuss this view.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**7 Assess the social impact of federal economic policies in the 1980s.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**8 ‘The importance of the Nixon Doctrine in changing US foreign policy has been exaggerated.’ Evaluate this claim.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**Section C: International history, 1945–92**

**9 ‘The resolution of the Cuban Crisis did little to improve US–Soviet relations in the 1960s.’ Assess this view.**

Strong responses recognised that the resolution of the Missile Crisis led to improvements and provided examples such as the Hotline between the White House and Kremlin. There was also good knowledge provided on attempts at arms limitations during this period. Balanced responses relied on the continuation of the arms race and on events in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Some weaker responses focussed on Cuba itself and often drifted into unnecessary discussion of causes of the crisis. Others were unable to maintain the correct chronological focus and added material relevant to the 1970s.

**10 Evaluate the factors that influenced Sino-Soviet relations in the period 1945–69.**

There was evidence of good knowledge of the changing nature of the relationship between the two states and the strongest responses clearly set out what caused those changes and making clear judgements about their relative significance. Effective responses also provided examples of positive relations from 1945, the reasons for decline and the eventual Sino-Soviet split. A few weaker responses were unable to place sufficient focus on the reasons for the various developments, tending towards narrative at times.

**11 Assess the extent to which the economic challenges of the newly independent African nations were a legacy of colonial rule.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**12 ‘The First Gulf War was a consequence of the Iran-Iraq War.’ Analyse this view.**

Responses were usually able to explain why they agreed with the statement, with knowledge of Iraq's economic problems and, in some cases, of the internal challenges that Saddam faced at this time. The most effective responses provided balance through a discussion of Kuwait's role in worsening the situation in Iraq through the production of oil and through Saddam's miscalculations.



# HISTORY

---

Paper 9489/42  
Depth Study 42

## Key messages

- The most effective responses tailored knowledge to the specific demands of the question.
- A balanced response that considers an alternative argument is important for success.
- Good chronological knowledge is important when questions specify a particular time period.

## General comments

There was clear understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, incorporating introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis. Strong responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays and attempted to produce a consistent line of reasoning. Others made their judgements in the conclusion. The extent of supporting detail is important, and the more successful responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the chosen question and were able to ensure that their response directly addressed the wording of that question. Less effective responses tended to offer more generic responses.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 Assess how far Italy's post-war social and economic problems led to Mussolini's rise to power.**

The strongest responses often looked at the nature and extent of the various problems first before contrasting them with alternatives. The impact of the war and the subsequent disappointment of the peace treaties, economic problems and the growth and threat of socialism all featured regularly and were often linked to the failure of Italy's liberal governments to act effectively. The role of the various elite groups in society and Mussolini's own strengths were then used to strengthen the argument further. The best analysis saw how these factors could be inter-linked – for instance the support of the elites for Fascism was partly due to the fear of left-wing revolution. There was often good range and depth of supporting material.

#### **2 Evaluate the impact of Stalin's policies towards non-Russian nationalities**

Effective responses linked Stalin's approach to the Tsar's Russification policies by way of the Leninist period, with reference made to Stalin's role as Commissar for Nationalities. There was often focus on education and the suppression of local languages and customs. Responses generally judged the impact to be negative and introduced examples of 'ethnic cleansing' such as the treatment of the Volga Germans in support. Some responses linked non-Russian nationalities to wider policies – the impact of Collectivisation on the Ukrainians being the most common example. Weaker responses asserted that social and economic policies affected non-Russians in the same way that they affected Russians without much elaboration or support.

#### **3 Analyse the extent to which Nazi policies towards women and children achieved their aims.**

The strongest responses tended to make clear what they considered the 'aims' to be and then made balanced judgements supported by a range of examples. In many cases, knowledge was stronger than analysis, with assertions of success of policies towards the youth or of the impact on Germany's birth rate without specific supporting detail of the impact. Responses tended to suggest that education policies achieved the subjugation of children before making references to groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates as a counterargument. References to the compulsory nature of the Hitler Youth rarely made the inference that this suggested significant failures to attend. In weaker responses some claims about women's role in the

workplace were not accurate – women were not banned from working as some responses suggested – although there were some good references to the growing necessity for women to bolster the workforce in late 1930s.

**4 Assess the extent to which a North-South divide existed in British society in the years 1919–39.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**Section B: The USA, 1944–92**

**5 ‘The response of federal institutions to demands for greater civil rights in the 1950s was limited.’ Discuss this view.**

What differentiated effective responses from less effective ones were a clear focus on what federal institutions consist of and of what their role is. Focus tended to be on the Supreme Court, although some weaker responses incorrectly asserted that this body ‘made’ laws. Effective comment was also made on the executive and on Eisenhower’s actions. There was little attention paid to Congress and one perceptive response recognised that the FBI under Hoover could be included in this question.

**6 Assess the effectiveness of Nixon’s domestic policies.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**7 Evaluate the reasons why gender equality was a divisive issue in the 1980s**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**8 Assess the reasons for changing relations between the US and China in the period 1950 – 79.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**Section C: International history, 1945–92**

**9 ‘Khrushchev’s main aim after the Cuban Revolution was to protect Cuba from the United States.’ Evaluate this view.**

The strongest responses grasped that the focus was on Khrushchev and his intentions relating to Cuba, rather than other policies such as peaceful coexistence. Balance was found through comparing his desire to protect Cuba from an aggressive US – the result of the attempted Bay of Pigs invasion and Operation Mongoose, to his attempts to spread communism in Latin America, place nuclear weapons close to the US or remove those currently in Turkey. Weaker responses provided long narrative sections including detail about the Cuban Revolution which was not necessary for the question set.

**10 Evaluate the role of international intervention in the Dutch failure to re-establish control in Indonesia.**

The few responses to this question were unsure of what was meant by international intervention and there were few references to the roles of foreign actors such as the British, Americans or the United Nations. Responses generally lacked depth of discussion or detail.

**11 Analyse why the People’s Republic of China became increasingly involved with Africa during the Cold War.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**12 Assess the significance of international involvement in the creation of the state of Israel in 1948.**

The question required knowledge of the reasons for the creation of the state of Israel and stronger responses were able to integrate examples such as the attitudes and actions of the British, including long-term factors going back to the Balfour Declaration, the role of the Americans in supporting Zionism in the aftermath of the Second World War and ultimately the United Nations’ decision to partition Palestine. Most responses included some or all of these examples and were able to provide some balance by offering alternatives such as Jewish resistance to British rule.



# HISTORY

Paper 9489/43  
Depth Study 43

## Key messages

- The most effective responses tailored knowledge to the specific demands of the question.
- A balanced response that considers an alternative argument is important for success.
- Good chronological knowledge is important when questions specify a particular time period.

## General comments

There was clear understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, incorporating introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis. Strong responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays and attempted to produce a consistent line of reasoning. Others made their judgements in the conclusion. The extent of supporting detail is important, and the more successful responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the chosen question and were able to ensure that their response directly addressed the wording of that question. Less effective responses tended to offer more generic responses.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 Assess how far the Corporate State achieved Mussolini's aims.**

It was important for candidates to decide what they understood to be Mussolini's aims in order to reach judgements about the impact of the Corporate State. Some responses were able to demonstrate sound knowledge of its creation and structure, whilst less effective responses were unsure about what it was. One interpretation was that the Corporate State failed to help to revitalise the economy and to make Italy great once more. Alternatively, some argued that it was essentially a propaganda exercise to celebrate the benefits of fascism and, on those terms, was a success. Other responses argued that as a way of calming industrial strife following the events of the *Biennio Rosso*, and by weakening the unions and pacifying the interests of capitalists the Corporate State was therefore successful.

#### **2 Assess how far Stalin's rise to power was due to his role and position within the Communist Party.**

Most responses explained the importance of the position of General Secretary, and the strongest were able to indicate how other roles, such as Commissar for Nationalities, also helped. Stalin's ability to control the bureaucracy, place supporters in key positions and control the content of meeting were widely cited. Good knowledge was also shown on the impact of the Lenin Enrolment, largely made up of young working-class members to whom Stalin appealed. Alternative arguments included Stalin's political skill and cunning in order to make the most of these positions and the weakness and failures of his rivals, notably Trotsky. There was also a good deal of discussion of Lenin's culpability in failing to ensure an orderly succession. The best responses were able to show how these factors interlinked and developed a consistent line of reasoning by indicating which factors were most significant and continuing this analysis consistently throughout the essay.

#### **3 Evaluate the extent to which Nazi industrial and agricultural policies were successful.**

Many responses did not address these policies directly and produced a response which related to the extent of success of the German economy more generally. This approach resulted in examples such as deficit financing which were not relevant to the terms of the question. There was some good knowledge of

agricultural policies, most commonly the Reich Entailed Law, but the depth of supporting material was sometimes limited. Few responses placed little emphasis on the policies towards, and relationship with, big businesses such as IG Farben or of the impact of Nazi policies on the *Mittelstand*.

**4 Evaluate the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Liberal Party in Britain in the period 1919–39.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**Section B: The USA, 1944–92**

**5 ‘Consumerism had limited impact on US economic growth in the late 1940s and 1950s.’ Discuss this view.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**6 ‘Johnson’s domestic reforms were highly successful.’ Assess this claim.**

Responses were able to identify and explain a range of policies constituting Johnson’s Great Society to discuss. Examples provided typically included Medicare, civil rights, poverty, education and environmentalism and in stronger responses there was an attempt to provide balanced analysis of the impact of these policies. The more effective responses provided good levels of supporting detail while less successful responses were more general.

**7 Evaluate the role of Reagan’s personality in his electoral successes.**

Responses showed good levels of detail when addressing this question. Most identified Reagan’s charisma and his ability to emerge unscathed from issues such as the Iran/Contra Affair. Many mentioned his apparent sunny optimism as an appealing factor for many Americans. His attitude towards social liberalism was cited as a reason to attract support, as was his adherence to states’ rights and continuation of Nixon’s Southern Strategy. Alternative explanations were put forward to achieve balance, with the failings of Carter and Mondale regularly put forward. There was also emphasis placed on the rise of the Religious Right and on neo-Conservatism in response to the social changes of the previous two decades.

**8 Assess the reasons for the creation of the Marshall Plan.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**Section C: International history, 1945–92**

**9 ‘The Prague Spring brought an end to peaceful co-existence.’ Discuss this view in relation to the period 1968–80.**

Most responses were able to provide good detail on the Prague Spring itself and made valid comment on what impact it had on US-Soviet relations. Some questioned the extent to which peaceful co-existence was relevant after the Berlin Crisis and Cuba, before discussing Soviet actions in Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev Doctrine. Balanced analysis was achieved by exploring American responses and the acceptance that the Soviets were acting within their sphere of influence and that relations were not badly affected as a result. Alternatively, there was valid emphasis placed on détente in the 1970s and examples such as SALT and Helsinki Accords to explain that positive relationships developed despite the events of 1968. Some of the best analysis saw consideration given to the role of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1980 and that Reagan’s victory similarly brought an end to peaceful co-existence, whilst a few also made reference to Carter’s responses before the 1980 election.

**10 ‘Military failure was the main reason why the US withdrew from Vietnam.’ Analyse this view.**

Responses addressed the stated factor well and were able to provide examples of military failure and the reasons for it, with appropriate focus on the tactics of the Viet Cong. References were made to Operation Rolling Thunder, Search and Destroy missions and their negative consequences. A range of alternative explanations were also provided and most common among them was US public opinion as a result of media reporting. Generally, responses had a very good range and depth of examples. Balanced analysis was commonplace, but some responses could have been more effective if the candidates had committed to a

consistent line of reasoning by highlighting which reason they felt was the most important from the outset and then showing why it played a more important role than alternative explanations.

**11 Evaluate the extent to which superpower rivalry affected UN involvement in the Congo.**

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

**12 Evaluate the importance of the Camp David accords (1978) in stabilising the Middle East.**

Responses had good knowledge of the accords themselves and were able to argue that they only really affected Egypt and Israel and therefore did little to stabilise the rest of the Middle East. There was some effective discussion of the reaction of the Arab World to Sadat's concessions and the subsequent expulsion of Egypt from the Arab League and Sadat's assassination as evidence of the accords' failure. Balanced analysis was usually achieved by a recognition of what was agreed at Camp David. Weaker responses had less detailed knowledge and sought to explain the different ways in which instability continued to plague the region by providing examples of conflict. This approach did provide some analysis to answer the question, although were not fully focused on its actual terms.

