

HISTORY

Paper 9389/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

- To make the best use of the one hour available to them, candidates should spend approximately twenty minutes on the **(a)** question and thirty-five minutes on the **(b)** question, leaving five minutes to check their work.
- To achieve good marks, candidates should read questions and the four sources with great care. A greater focus on answering the question set should result in better responses. It is advisable to read each source at least twice. Once candidates have understood the sources, they should explain how far they help answer the question.
- To achieve higher marks, candidates need to evaluate the sources to decide their reliability in relation to the question being asked about them. In other words, they should question the information which the sources provide on first reading them. They should interrogate them in order to decide how reliable that information might be. How to question sources is explained in more detail below.
- Wherever possible, candidates need to incorporate their contextual knowledge of the subject. The most obvious way of doing so is to use it to help decide on the reliability of the four sources.
- In this examination session, most candidates coped reasonably well with the demands of the paper. No candidates answered questions from the other two Sections. Virtually all candidates attempted both questions. Few ran out of time. Most divided time between the two questions appropriately. An occasional error was to misread the **(a)** question and compare two sources, one of which was incorrect; thus Source B and C might be compared when the question asked for a comparison of A and B. As no valid comparison is being made, then only limited credit can be awarded. The other, more frequent weakness was to answer questions without carefully reading the sources first. In some cases, a more careful reading would have resulted in higher quality answers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Revolutions in Italy, 1848

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence of the reasons why many Italians wanted change in 1848.

The contrast is between the economic demands of the people of Naples in Source B about Naples, and the political demands of political leaders in Rome in Source C. In addition, Source C shows opposition to the Papacy which is missing in Source B. Finally, Source B is focused on the needs of the Two Sicilies, while Source C makes some reference to 'every state in Italy'. The similarity is that both seek political change of some kind.

Most answers showed an awareness of the basic contrast between the two, economic versus political, but few took their answers much further. Those who struggled to distinguish the main contrast would have improved their answers with greater knowledge of the various Italian states in 1848; often these answers saw Italy as a whole.

Question (b)

How far do these sources show that Italian nationalism was the reason for the revolutions in Italy in 1848?

This part of the question was usually better answered than the (a) question. Candidates were usually able to contrast the importance of nationalism in Source A and, to a lesser extent, in Source C, with the absence of nationalist motives in Source B and the divisions among the nationalists in Source D. Thus most answers reached a reasonable level. To achieve higher marks, some evaluation of the sources was required. The most straightforward sources to evaluate were Sources A and C, written by the Belgian Ambassador to Rome. He, presumably, would be required by the Belgian government to report as carefully and as accurately as possible. The 'moderate reformer' who wrote Source B takes a critical view of the revolutionaries of Naples whom he describes as 'crazy'. They were too extreme for his tastes. Thus his account is not so reliable.

Section B - American Option: The Compromise of 1850

Question (a)

To what extent do Sources B and C agree about the role of the South in the making of the 1850 Compromise?

This question shows the importance of the second part of these comparison questions. It asked about the role of the South in making the Compromise. It did not ask how far the Compromise benefited the South, which is the question some candidates appeared to address. The difference was that Source B argued that the South had an important role, while Source C did not. However, both agreed it had a role of some kind, as shown by Source C's mention of the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act.

Question (b)

How far do these sources support the assertion that the 1850 Compromise was favourable to the North?

Most candidates were able to show how the hypothesis was challenged by Sources B and C, with Source A being neutral. Evaluation of Sources B and C, Northern and Southern newspapers, was the most straightforward. When it came to Source D, some were misled by the French-sounding name of the author. Felix de Fontaine was a Northern journalist who became a leading reporter for the South once the Civil War began. Others were misled by the title of the book, as shown in responses such as 'Source D is reliable because it is from a book all about the history of American Abolitionism'. Deciding whether a book labelled a history of a subject can be trusted requires careful examination of its content, rather than making an assumption based on its title.

Section C - International Option: The League of Nations and the Italian Invasion of Abyssinia

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence about Britain's attitude towards the Italian invasion of Abyssinia.

The question is not a general comparison of the two sources. The focus has to be on Britain's attitude towards the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. In Source B, Britain is seen as supporting firm action by the League against Italy. In Source C, just three months later, Britain still supports 'decisive' action against Italy. However, in the second source, the British Prime Minister stresses the isolation of the UK's stance within the League, whereas Source B says that only France is against firm action. Most candidates who focused on the specific question made these contrasts.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A-D support the view that France was responsible for the League of Nations' failure to take effective action in response to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia?

Some candidates argued that all four sources identified France as responsible for the failure of the League of Nations to respond effectively to the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. This raises the general point that to reach higher levels of marks, candidates must always find evidence for and against the hypothesis. Documents are selected to provide such opportunities. Here the distinction was whether responsibility was France's alone or whether it was shared. Sources B and C argue that inaction was France's alone. However, these are British sources which are likely to shift the blame for the League's inaction to another state, in this case France. Source D is interesting - a French politician looking back at the crisis ten years' later. He accepts that France has some responsibility for the failure to stand up to Mussolini, which is a bit of a surprise in itself. However, he still maintains that 'we', by which he means the League, have the greater responsibility.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/12

Paper 12

General Comments and Key Messages

- To make the best use of the one hour available to them, candidates should spend approximately twenty minutes on the **(a)** question and thirty-five minutes on the **(b)** question, leaving five minutes to check their work.
- To achieve good marks, candidates should read questions and the four sources with great care. A greater focus on answering the question set should result in better responses. It is advisable to read each source at least twice. Once candidates have understood the sources, they should explain how far they help answer the question.
- To achieve higher marks, candidates need to evaluate the sources to decide their reliability in relation to the question being asked about them. In other words, they should question the information which the sources provide on first reading them. They should interrogate them in order to decide how reliable that information might be. How to question sources is explained in more detail below.
- Wherever possible, candidates need to incorporate their contextual knowledge of the subject. The most obvious way of doing so is to use it to help decide on the reliability of the four sources.
- In this examination session, most candidates coped reasonably well with the demands of the paper. No candidates answered questions from the other two Sections. Virtually all candidates attempted both questions. Few ran out of time. Most divided time between the two questions appropriately. An occasional error was to misread the **(a)** question and compare two sources, one of which was incorrect; thus Source B and C might be compared when the question asked for a comparison of A and B. As no valid comparison is being made, then only limited credit can be awarded. The other, more frequent weakness was to answer questions without carefully reading the sources first. In some cases, a more careful reading would have resulted in higher quality answers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Bismarck's attitude to Austria

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence of Bismarck's attitude to Austria.

The contrast is between the aggressive stance of Source A, with Bismarck predicting war with Austria 'in the not too distant future' and the more pacific attitude of Source C, where Bismarck saying 'we had to avoid wounding Austria too severely'. The main similarity is that in both cases Bismarck accepts that Austria is a great power. Virtually all candidates understood these distinctions. Those who used contextual knowledge to comment on these sources gained good marks. The comment might focus on Bismarck being in or out of office, it might focus on Prussia's position relative to Austria. This information, if relevant and used effectively could raise answers to the highest level.

Question (b)

How far do these sources show that, during the period to 1866, Bismarck was more concerned with Prussian than with German interests?

Most candidates found three of the four sources relatively straightforward to analyse. In Sources A and C, Bismarck clearly put Prussia before Germany. In Source B, Bismarck put German interests on a par with

those of Prussia. Source D proved more challenging to analyse and mainly because the source makes no mention of Bismarck. The better candidates worked out that the historian was asserting that Germany required a new political order which Austria could not provide. This means that only Prussia could provide it. Led by Bismarck, Prussia would have to focus on German interests.

More candidates could have noticed the qualification to the question which limited answers to 'the period to 1866'. The restriction affects the answer. Had the date been 1871, the argument would have been quite different.

In terms of source evaluation, evaluation of Source C, Bismarck's memoirs, was sometimes unconvincing. Most argued that the extract was reliable because Bismarck was writing thirty years after the events he describes. We cannot be sure of that because the memoirs were published in 1899, not written. In addition, memoirs are notoriously unreliable, Bismarck's especially so.

Section B - American Option: Daniel Webster's Seventh of March Speech, 1850

Question (a)

To what extent do Sources B and C agree on the reaction of the North to Daniel Webster's Seventh of March speech?

Some candidates would have benefited from knowing that Massachusetts was a Northern state and a leading force for abolition. The provenance of Source A states that Webster is a US Senator for Massachusetts. That is what makes the Seventh of March speech, arguing with respect to the Fugitive Slave Act, in favour of the South, such a great surprise.

Source B expresses that surprise. It argues that the North, the Free States, will oppose the speech. Source C reports the reaction of a small number of citizens of Boston, in Massachusetts, who form part of the 'Cottonocracy'. Some candidates were misled by this latter term to assume that the eight hundred men must live in the South. These eight hundred praise the speech. The extracts are similar in that both are critical of the speech: Source B describes its key doctrine as 'shocking', while Source C describes the speech as 'notorious'. The provenance of the two sources could be used to highlight further similarities.

Question (b)

'A disaster for the abolitionists.' How far do these sources support this assertion about the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850?

In that it strengthened the ability of slave owners to recover their fugitive slaves from Northern states, the Fugitive Slave Act would appear to be a major setback for abolitionists. Most candidates could draw some clear distinctions between Sources B and D, which clearly support the hypothesis and Sources A and C, which do not.

When it came to evaluating the sources, most candidates were less convincing, perhaps because they did not realise that Daniel Webster was a Northern Senator and that the 'Cottonocracy' included men from the North, as well as the South. Some did point out the common provenance of Sources B, C and D, which were all abolitionist and thus bound to give a distorted view of the impact of the Fugitive Slave Act after its passage. More could have pointed out that the passage of the Act helped energise the abolitionist cause and thus was far from being a disaster; the success of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, published two years after the passage of the Act, is evidence of that.

Section C - International Option: The League of Nations and the Abyssinian Crisis

Question (a)

Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B about Britain's commitment to the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Source A, a British cartoon, provided some interesting interpretations. Some missed the provenance and wrote that the dog was in fact a British bulldog, from it was concluded that Britain was stronger than the League of Nations. Some lacked accurate contextual knowledge and thus assumed that the cartoon referred to the Hoare-Laval Pact of December 1935 when in fact it alludes to the anti-German Stresa Front signed three months before the cartoon was published.

Most candidates, however, once they had used the provenance correctly, were able to identify some clear similarities and differences between the two sources with regard to British support for the League of Nations.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A-D support the view that the League of Nations was never fully committed to taking effective measures in response to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia?

Most candidates were able to identify the sources which challenged or supported the hypothesis. Source B was against and Sources A, C and D in favour. Fewer candidates evaluated those sources, however. Contextual information could have been used more often to help the process of evaluation. Straightforward points such as the League of Nations being heavily dependent upon the leadership of Britain and France were overlooked by some. Also, some candidates confused the League of Nations with the United Nations, writing about the power of veto, for example. The Hoare-Laval Pact was of great relevance in evaluating Source B and yet it was mentioned less frequently here than it was in answering question (a). Haile Selassie's speech in Source C could quickly be evaluated by reference to the fact that it was delivered after the successful Italian invasion of Abyssinia. These source-based questions give candidates the opportunity to use contextual information and more successful candidates managed to do this.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/13

Paper 13

General Comments and Key Messages

- To make the best use of the one hour available to them, candidates should spend approximately twenty minutes on the **(a)** question and thirty-five minutes on the **(b)** question, leaving five minutes to check their work.
- To achieve good marks, candidates should read questions and the four sources with great care. A greater focus on answering the question set should result in better responses. It is advisable to read each source at least twice. Once candidates have understood the sources, they should explain how far they help answer the question.
- To achieve higher marks, candidates need to evaluate the sources to decide their reliability in relation to the question being asked about them. In other words, they should question the information which the sources provide on first reading them. They should interrogate them in order to decide how reliable that information might be. How to question sources is explained in more detail below.
- Wherever possible, candidates need to incorporate their contextual knowledge of the subject. The most obvious way of doing so is to use it to help decide on the reliability of the four sources.
- In this examination session, most candidates coped reasonably well with the demands of the paper. No candidates answered questions from the other two Sections. Virtually all candidates attempted both questions. Few ran out of time. Most divided time between the two questions appropriately. An occasional error was to misread the **(a)** question and compare two sources, one of which was incorrect; thus Source B and C might be compared when the question asked for a comparison of A and B. As no valid comparison is being made, then only limited credit can be awarded. The other, more frequent weakness was to answer questions without carefully reading the sources first. In some cases, a more careful reading would have resulted in higher quality answers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Bismarck and war with France

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources C and D as evidence of the growing power of Prussia.

The great similarity between the content of the two sources is the evidence of the growing military power of Prussian power which they provide. The clear contrast is between the essentially defensive use of that power in Source C and the more aggressive use detailed by Source D. These points are perhaps explained by the nature of the two sources: Source C is a public statement by the King of Prussia in 1870 while Source D is a secondary source written in the aftermath of the First World War and the humiliation of the Treaty of Versailles. Stronger responses made good use of the provenance of the two sources and related contextual information; more candidates could have adopted this approach.

Question (b)

How far do these sources show that France was to blame for war in 1870?

Candidates were able to analyse the source content with some accuracy: Sources A and C supported the hypothesis, while Sources B and D did not. Source evaluation was more limited than it should have been. The outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war should have provided enough contextual information to help



assess the reliability of all four sources, especially when linked with the provenance of all four sources. The utterances of Bismarck, as in Source A, should always be questioned rigorously as he almost always had what might be called 'ulterior motives' in commenting as he did. Public statements from combatant governments just before the outbreak of war, which are provided by both Sources B and C, again will have objectives which undermine the accuracy of what is being claimed. Source D is almost counter-intuitive in that a German historian writing soon after the First World War provides an analysis of the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war which is surprisingly sympathetic to the French.

Section B - American Option: John Brown, 1859

Question (a)

To what extent do Sources C and D agree about Southern attitudes towards John Brown's raid?

Most answers focused on attitudes towards John Brown, rather than the raid on Harpers Ferry, which required a slightly different focus than an answer on John Brown alone. The question also shows the importance of reading the sources with great care. Some took Source C as straightforward evidence of Southern attitudes. Candidates who argued thus appeared to have overlooked the two words 'to us' in the second sentence of Source C, which show that it expresses Northern perceptions of Southern attitudes, which is quite different. Stronger responses picked up on this. By comparison, Source D, a Southern source, appeared more straightforward to candidates. It also focuses more on the raid than does Source C.

Question (b)

How far do these sources support the assertion that John Brown was insane?

Most candidates were able to show how the hypothesis was supported by Sources A and C and challenged by Sources B and D. Evaluating the sources was more of a challenge to some. Most identified all four sources as taken from contemporary newspapers. They struggled in going further in their evaluation. Source A was from 'bloody Kansas', in which John Brown had become heavily involved in 1856, as alluded to by the source. Sound contextual knowledge was invaluable to evaluating this source. Though not obviously from a Northern state, Source A was bound to be pro-Brown and thus to be discounted to a degree. The other three sources fitted into more predictable patterns. Sources B and D, which argue that Brown was not insane, were Southern sources and thus are unreliable. As Source C comments, Virginians would never agree that they had been frightened by a crazy man. Source C argues that the state of Virginia should give Brown the opportunity to have his conviction overturned on the grounds of insanity, even this was unlikely to happen. Thus the evaluated sources are evenly matched. Contextual knowledge was thus needed to decide which side of the argument was more convincing, and better candidates were able to make use of such knowledge.

Section C - International Option: The League of Nations and the Manchurian Crisis

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence about Britain's reaction to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria.

This question is not a general comparison of the two sources. The focus has to be on Britain's reaction to the invasion of Manchuria. The similarity between the two sources, one written, the other visual, is that both see Britain as responding to the invasion. In addition they are both British sources. (They both see the Japanese invasion as wrong in that it flouts the League of Nations but that is not the focus of the question.) The difference is that Source B argues that Britain should overlook the aggression and do a deal with Japan in order to help stop the spread of Communism whereas Source C, the cartoon, shows Britain ignoring Japan while it helps the League save face – presumably by the Lytton Commission. A further contrast is that one is written evidence from within British government circles while the other is from a mass newspaper outside politics. The cartoon is very critical of the government, the letter not at all critical.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A-D support the view that there was nothing the League of Nations could do in response to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria?

Candidates found initial analysis of the sources reasonably straightforward. The clearest sources on either side are Sources C and D. Source C clearly shows that the League could do nothing to stop Japan. On the other side of the argument Source D argues that the League should do something to stop Japan taking Manchuria. Source B sides with Source C in arguing there was little that the League – or any great power – could do to stop Japan taking Manchuria. If Britain, the leading imperial power, was not prepared to stop Japan, then who would? Source A also supports the assertion, arguing that Japan was too strong to bow down to impractical sanctions. Thus, surface analysis shows three sources for the assertion and one against. When it came to evaluating the sources, candidates were less confident in their responses. The source perhaps most straightforward to evaluate was Source D, for which sound contextual knowledge was essential. The important point about the date of the source, 1934, was that it was the year the USSR first joined the League of Nations. The speech made by Litvinov was probably the first speech ever made by a Soviet representative to the League. Thus it is safe to assume that Litvinov would build up the League. Japan and USSR both have interests in China and especially in the state of Manchuria (or Manchukuo). The USSR would want collective action by the League to keep Japan at bay for reasons of national self-interest. Source D has very little value except as a statement of Soviet interests. Sources B and C are British sources and Britain had had an ambivalent attitude towards the League from the start. Source A is from a Chinese source several months after the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, when any hopes of effective League action would have been diminishing rapidly. It is points such as these that candidates need to make when evaluating the sources and then reaching their final judgement about which set of evaluated sources is to be preferred.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/21

Paper 21

Key Messages

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

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. All of the questions on the paper were attempted by large numbers of candidates, and responses to each reflected the full range in terms of quality. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but many were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet less successful (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions. Many candidates clearly appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa).

Part (a) questions - candidates should be aware that these questions are about causation. Effective answers require detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Some candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. Weaker responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to drift into less relevant material and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they would have been improved by more detailed and specific points, backed up with appropriate factual support.

Part (b) questions – candidates should be aware that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses tended to be narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue or relevant arguments based on factual support which would have benefited from greater range and depth. Weaker responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they would have been improved by more factual and chronological accuracy, points based on better factual support and greater relevance (adhering to timeframes given in the question would have helped here in some cases).

Comment on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Modern Europe, 1789-1917

1 France, 1789-1804

(a) Why was Louis XVI executed in 1793?

Many candidates wrote generally about the causes of the French Revolution and, in particular, reasons for the growing dissatisfaction with Louis XVI's rule. As a result, most responses did not go beyond 1789 and were based on the inaccurate assumption that there was widespread support for the King's execution at that time. More effective responses focused on the key events of the post-1789 period, such as growing radicalism, the rise of the Jacobins and the significance of Louis XVI's flight to Varennes. This enabled a more focused explanation of why the king was executed in 1793, rather than earlier.

(b) How complete was Napoleon's power over France by 1804?

There were a number of impressive responses to this question. These were characterised by detailed and balanced assessment of Napoleon's control over France by 1804, leading to a focused judgement fully supported by appropriate and accurate factual evidence. Other responses were less balanced; there appeared to be a general assumption that Napoleon's power must have been complete once he adopted the title of Emperor, most candidates finding it difficult to identify any factors to challenge this assumption. Less successful responses would have been improved by greater factual knowledge or chronological accuracy. Some candidates wrote at length about issues relating to the period after 1804.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

(a) Why did changes in transport encourage the Industrial Revolution?

The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed analysis of the ways in which developments in transport (roads, rivers, canals and railways) stimulated economic growth, supported by examples from Britain and, in many cases, continental Europe. Other responses, however, tended to contain vague and generalised assertions regarding the advantages of railways, with limited focus on how railways encouraged the development of the Industrial Revolution. Greater range and depth would have helped such responses.

(b) Assess the effects of the Industrial Revolution on political systems by 1850.

Better responses were characterised by a clear understanding of the term 'political systems', with appropriate reference to issues such as the Great Reform Act and Chartism in Britain and the 1848 Revolutions in continental Europe. Other responses provided more generalised outlines of the effects of the Industrial Revolution, focusing on social and economic, rather than political factors.

3 The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

(a) Why was the Triple Entente formed?

The most effective responses were based on a clear understanding of French, Russian and British motives for reaching the series of agreements which together formed the Triple Entente. Most candidates were able to explain why France sought these alliances, although they appeared less confident when considering the advantages which Russia and Britain sought from them. Some responses needed greater focus, tending towards narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* and *when* the Triple Entente was formed, rather than analysis of *why*. Some factual confusion characterised weaker answers, these candidates writing about the Triple Alliance rather than the Triple Entente.

(b) Which of Austria and Russia was the more responsible for tensions in the Balkans from c.1900 to 1914?

Most candidates were able to display sound knowledge and understanding of the role which Austria played in enhancing tension in the Balkans during the period leading up to World War I. There appeared to be less understanding of Russian interest and involvement in the region,

commonly restricted to the statement that Russia was an ally of Serbia. Such responses tended to lack balance. Some candidates did not cover the full period from 1900 to 1914, confining their answers to a narrative outline of events following the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

(a) Why did the Provisional Government face problems in ruling Russia?

The quality of responses to this question varied in terms of range, depth and chronological accuracy. Most candidates were able to outline at least some of the problems which confronted the Provisional Government, although their relative significance often needed to be analysed greater detail. For example, reference was commonly made to issues such as the Kornilov Affair and the July Days, but without explanation of the threats which they posed to the Provisional Government. Some candidates wrote exclusively about the role played by Lenin in the aftermath of the February Revolution in 1917, which, while relevant, provided only a very narrow focus on the requirements of the question. Weaker responses came from candidates who assumed that the Provisional Government had been established in the aftermath of Bloody Sunday in 1905.

(b) 'The Russian people supported Nicholas II between 1906 and 1914.' How far do you agree with this statement?

Some candidates were able to produce focused and balanced responses based on detailed analysis of a wide range of appropriate factual evidence, leading to well-argued judgements. Other responses would have benefited from more balance, most candidates arguing against the statement given in the question. Support for this view could be weak and assertive. For example, it was commonly assumed that Bloody Sunday and its immediate aftermath in 1905 provided proof of the Russian people's hatred of Nicholas II, while the fact that the Tsar was removed from power in 1917 was seen as further evidence of the same point. Candidates who possessed greater understanding of Russia's social, economic and political situation in the period from 1906 to 1914 were able to develop more impressive arguments.

Section B - American Option: The History of the USA, 1840-1941

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

(a) Why, in 1867, did the USA acquire Alaska from Russia?

Virtually all candidates were able to display detailed factual knowledge of 'Seward's folly', although some found it difficult to remain focused on the precise requirements of the specific question. Therefore, some descriptive accounts of the purchase and the subsequent effects of it were seen, with only limited (and often implicit) reference to Seward's motives. The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed explanation and understanding of a wide range of factors, together with a supported judgement regarding their relative significance.

(b) How consistent was US policy towards Central America and the Caribbean from 1900 to 1939?

The overall impression given by responses to this question was that candidates possessed sound knowledge, although better understanding would have improved some answers. Most candidates could make reference to relevant aspects, such as the Roosevelt Corollary, banana wars and the Good Neighbour Policy, but more needed to provide meaningful explanations or demonstrate their significance in terms of US policy. This, together with the confused chronology which was a characteristic some responses, largely prevented a number of candidates from developing focused arguments. Most responses concluded with the assertion that US policy was consistent throughout the period. On this last point, better support would have improved some answers.

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

(a) Why did President Lincoln introduce the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863?

Many candidates were able to identify and explain Lincoln's strategic motives for introducing the Emancipation Proclamation in his attempt to undermine the South's war effort and, thereby,

support the North's primary objective of restoring the Union. Some candidates confused the Proclamation with subsequent legislation. As a result, it was inaccurately claimed that Lincoln's aim was to end slavery throughout the Union on moral grounds.

(b) How severe were the limitations on civil liberties imposed by the federal government during the Civil War?

There were relatively few quality answers to this question. Many candidates referred to the suspension of *habeas corpus*, although often without explanation of the term or assessment of impact. Other civil liberty restrictions, such as press censorship and the deployment of military courts, seemed to be less well-known. There could have been more assessment regarding the severity of such restrictions, most candidates addressing the rather different issues of why Lincoln took these actions and whether he was justified in doing so. Some candidates misinterpreted the question, confusing civil liberties with civil rights; as a result, they wrote about the problems faced by slaves in the southern states or issues relating to the post-Civil War period.

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Why did many leading US corporations turn themselves into trusts in the late nineteenth century?

Most candidates were able to show some understanding of the economic benefits which could be gained from the formation of trusts, and could provide relevant examples to support their comments about monopolies and control of production. Some responses referred to horizontal and vertical integration, although these terms required better explanation. Legal and political factors leading to the creation of trusts were less well-known or understood.

(b) How far do you agree that the expansion of the railroad network was the main cause of the rapid growth of the American economy in the period from 1865 to 1914?

The most impressive responses were fully focused on the requirements of the question, a balanced assessment of relevant evidence leading to a well-supported judgement/conclusion. Other responses were confined to an outline of the advantages of railways, often in generalised terms, with little attempt to explain or analyse their impact on the American economy. More candidates could have appreciated the need to identify other factors which might be seen as responsible for the rapid growth of the US economy. Greater focus and depth would have improved such responses.

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

(a) Why, in 1937, did President Roosevelt embark upon his 'court packing plan'?

There was much variation in the quality of responses to this question. Some candidates were able to explain, often with appropriate examples, the implications of the Supreme Court's opposition to Roosevelt's New Deal policies. Other responses simply provided details of Roosevelt's plans to gain greater control over the appointment of Supreme Court judges, but lacked explanation or analysis of his motives. Some candidates drifted off the key issue by explaining the reasons why Roosevelt's court packing plan failed. Weaker responses appeared to be the result of inadequate factual knowledge; some candidates did not appreciate that the plan related to the Supreme Court.

(b) How far did the New Deal encourage economic growth?

Most candidates were able to display sound knowledge of the New Deal and the strategies which were adopted in an attempt to address the economic and social problems caused by the Great Depression. Generally, responses focused on the aims of the New Deal rather than its impact, concluding that it clearly was intended to encourage economic growth. The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed analysis of the effects of the New Deal, the most common argument being that it actually made little difference and that it was the outbreak of war which brought a return to economic growth in the USA.

Section C - International Option: International Relations, 1871-1945

9 International Relations, 1871-1918

(a) Why was the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1894 agreed?

Most candidates clearly appreciated that both France and Russia felt isolated and insecure, not least because they saw the rise of Germany as a significant threat, especially following the emergence of the Triple Alliance. The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed analysis of both countries' motives for reaching agreement, for example Russia's concerns following Kaiser Wilhelm's decision not to renew the Reinsurance Treaty. Less successful responses lacked such depth, simply stating that both France and Russia feared Germany. Weaker responses appeared to stem from inadequate factual knowledge and understanding; for example, several candidates assumed that the Franco-Russian Alliance was an agreement between Spain and Russia.

(b) How far do you agree that Japan had become a Great Power by 1914?

Most candidates were able to write in some detail about Japan's rapid industrialisation, modernisation and military development prior to 1914. Many were able to describe Japan's successes in wars against China and Russia. Fewer were able to use this information to develop an argument and reach a judgement in line with the requirements of the question. The most impressive responses were based on a genuine attempt to provide a definition of the term 'Great Power', followed by an assessment regarding whether Japan met such criteria by 1914. Less successful answers tended to lack balance, based on the assumption that Japan's economic and military growth guaranteed it 'Great Power' status by 1914.

10 International Relations, 1919-1933

(a) Why did the Locarno Treaties of 1925 offer new hope for lasting peace in Europe?

The best responses were characterised by a detailed understanding of the agreements which were reached at Locarno, together with balanced assessments of their significance in terms of relations between European nations, particularly France and Germany. Other responses displayed a lack of in depth knowledge of the Locarno Treaties, as reflected in general and unexplained assertions regarding border agreements and better relations between French and German politicians. Some candidates wrote about other issues, such as the Washington Naval Conference or the Dawes Plan, with no explicit reference to the Locarno Treaties.

(b) How justified were German criticisms of the Treaty of Versailles?

Most responses were fully focused on the requirements of the question. Candidates generally displayed sound knowledge of the Treaty of Versailles' terms and the reasons behind German resentment of them. Most were able to provide a balanced assessment, leading to a supported judgement. There were relatively few weak responses; these were characterised by limited or inaccurate factual content, leading to vague and generalised assertions. A small number of candidates wrote, often in considerable detail, about Hitler's objections to the Treaty and the actions he took in defiance of it; this was usually at the expense of issues of more immediate relevance to the question.

11 International Relations, 1933-1939

(a) Why did Mussolini adopt a more aggressive foreign policy after 1934?

Most candidates focused on Mussolini's aim to restore Italy to its former greatness, to make it 'great, respected and feared'. While this is clearly a valid argument, it frequently led to a lack of focus on the requirements of the set question. For example, the Fiume and Corfu incidents were commonly seen as evidence of Mussolini's more aggressive foreign policy, missing the point that these took place during the 1920s. The most impressive responses were characterised by clear understanding of the reasons for Mussolini's diplomatic approach to foreign policy in the period from 1923 to 1934, together with a detailed explanation of the factors which led him to abandon this approach after 1934.

(b) To what extent was Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War due to the support he received from Germany and Italy?

Most candidates were able to show sound knowledge of the Spanish Civil War and some understanding of the factors which ultimately led to Franco's victory. The best responses were characterised by detailed analysis of the advantages which Franco gained as a result of military support from Germany and Italy, balanced against the significance of other reasons for his success, such as Nationalist unity compared with the ill-disciplined and disjointed Republican forces. A minority of candidates drifted away from the question, writing an outline of the causes and/or the course of the Spanish Civil War or, in some cases, answering the rather different question of why Germany and Italy decided to support Franco. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of factual content, and by unsupported assertions.

12 China and Japan, 1919-1945

(a) Why was the Kuomintang successful in the period from 1925 to 1928?

Most candidates argued that the KMT's success was founded on the widespread appeal of Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles. While this is clearly true, it misses the point that, by the time of Sun's death in 1925, the KMT had made little progress. The most impressive responses were based on a clear understanding of the significance of events between 1925 and 1928, in particular Chiang Kai-shek's Northern March and the reasons behind its success in gaining control over much of China. Some candidates were able to write in considerable detail about the importance of Chiang's own military training, the significance of Soviet military support, the disorganisation of the Warlord armies and the KMT's close liaison with the CCP. Other responses lacked such range and depth.

(b) 'In terms of their political beliefs, Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek had little in common.' How far do you agree with this statement?

The most impressive responses were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, commonly based around the two men's views regarding the Three Principles. It was widely argued that, while both were strong believers in Chinese nationalism, Chiang Kai-shek rejected Sun Yat-sen's belief in democracy and social reform. Most candidates, however, concentrated on differences in the two men's backgrounds and personalities, with limited reference to how these impacted on their political beliefs. Weaker responses were based on unsupported or inaccurate assertions. For example, several candidates argued that, unlike Chiang Kai-shek, Sun Yat-sen was a communist.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/22

Paper 22

Key Messages

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

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. All of the questions in Sections A and C were attempted by large numbers of candidates (Section B was less commonly addressed, most candidates answering questions 7 and 8). Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but many were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet less successful (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions. Many candidates clearly appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa).

Part (a) questions - candidates should be aware that these questions are about causation. Effective answers require detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Some candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. Weaker responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to drift into less relevant material and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they would have been improved by more detailed and specific points, backed up with appropriate factual support.

Part (b) questions – candidates should be aware that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses tended to be narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue or relevant arguments based on factual support which would have benefited from greater range and depth. Weaker responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they would have been improved by more factual and chronological accuracy, points based on better factual support and greater relevance (adhering to timeframes given in the question would have helped here in some cases).

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – European Option: Modern Europe, 1789-1917

1 France, 1789-1804

(a) Why were there economic problems in France from 1789 to 1795?

Virtually all candidates were able to outline the economic problems facing France in 1789, together with an explanation, in varying levels of depth and accuracy, of the reasons behind them. Relatively few were able to go beyond these long-term factors to explain why France continued to experience economic problems throughout the period from 1789 to 1795. Therefore, a number of responses lacked specific focus on the timeframe established in the question.

(b) Did the Jacobins do more to defend or endanger the Revolution in France?

Some candidates were able to develop focused, balanced and well-supported arguments based on detailed factual knowledge and understanding. Other responses were restricted to narrative accounts of the 'reign of terror', inevitably leading to the conclusion that the Jacobins endangered the revolution by going against the basic principles which it represented. Some candidates would have benefited from a greater understanding of who the Jacobins were or what they actually did.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

(a) Why did conservative interests try to hinder the development of the Industrial Revolution?

Better responses to this question were characterised by the clear identification of groups (such as the skilled workers who turned to Luddism) which felt threatened by on-going industrialisation. Some candidates' responses would have been improved by a fuller understanding of the phrase 'conservative interests'. These candidates wrote, often in considerable detail, in general terms about the effects of industrialisation, with only implicit relevance to the requirements of the question.

(b) How far did the Industrial Revolution benefit the lower classes by 1850?

The majority of candidates focused on the poor working and living conditions which resulted from industrialisation and urbanisation. Those who attempted to provide more balanced responses tended to overstate the impact of early factory legislation and political reform, or wrote about improvements which took place after 1850. Some candidates drifted away from the requirements of the question by outlining benefits which the middle classes gained as a result of the Industrial Revolution. Weaker responses were characterised by vague and generalised assertions, unsupported by appropriate factual evidence.

3 The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

(a) Why was there a Naval Race between Britain and Germany before World War I?

Most candidates were able to display sound knowledge of the naval rivalry between Britain and Germany in the period leading up to World War I. Kaiser Wilhelm II's adoption of a more aggressive foreign policy and his desire for a strong navy to support it were widely understood. In general, British motives could have been better analysed, many responses simply stating, without explanation, that the development of the German navy posed a threat to Britain. Some candidates adopted a narrative/descriptive approach, outlining the various developments which took place in the German and British navies with only implicit reference to the requirements of the set question. A small number of candidates wrote generally about deteriorating relations between Britain and Germany during the period, rather than focusing on the Naval Race specifically.

(b) 'The assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand was the most important cause of World War I.' How far do you agree with this claim?

This question was generally well answered. Many candidates were able to provide a fully-focused and balanced response, most commonly based on the argument that, while the assassination could be seen as the immediate cause of the outbreak of war, it should not be considered as the most important cause. Evidence was then provided to explain the longer-term causal factors, allowing the assassination to be analysed in its full historical context. Less successful responses were characterised by a narrative/descriptive approach – an outline of events in Sarajevo, followed by a list of other factors which led to World War I, with little or no analysis regarding their relative significance. Weaker responses, of which there were relatively few, suffered from factual inaccuracy, chronological confusion and/or the presence of too many unsupported assertions.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

(a) Why did Stolypin face problems in carrying out his reforms?

Most candidates were able to outline the nature of Stolypin's reforms and methods of implementation, many making reference to his combination of reforming measures and harsh repression. Factors which hindered the introduction and impact of his reforms also featured in responses but appeared to be less well known and understood, many relying solely on the generalised/undeveloped assertion that peasants were opposed to them. The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed analysis of a wide range of factors which inhibited what Stolypin was attempting to achieve.

(b) How serious a threat to Nicholas II was the 1905 Revolution?

There were a number of high-quality responses to this question. These were characterised by detailed analysis of the situation facing Nicholas II following the 1905 Revolution, using evidence from the 1905-17 period to support clear, focused and reasoned conclusions. Less impressive responses were based on unbalanced and generalised arguments; while many candidates suggested that the 1905 Revolution was clearly not a threat to Nicholas II because he survived it, others claimed that it obviously was a threat because it led to revolutions in 1917. Narrative accounts of the events of Bloody Sunday and its immediate aftermath, with no explicit reference to the requirements of the question, were seen.

Section B - American Option: The History of the USA, 1840-1941

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

(a) Why, in 1898, did the USA acquire the Philippines?

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

(b) How consistent was US policy towards Japan in the period from 1901 to 1922?

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

(a) Why did four slave states join the North in fighting the Civil War?

There were relatively few responses to this question. Most candidates were able to identify the four states and some general factors to explain their decision not to secede from the Union, most commonly focusing on their geographical location and economic ties with the North. Generally, candidates would have benefited from a greater depth of knowledge in order to analyse the decision of each state individually.

(b) How far did the aims of the North change during the course of the Civil War?

There were relatively few responses to this question. Most were narrative/descriptive accounts of the war itself with limited (and, at best, implicit) reference to the set question. More candidates could have appreciated the significance of the Emancipation Proclamation or the strategic motives

which lay behind it. The majority of responses argued that the aims of the North, primarily the restoration of the Union, remained constant throughout the Civil War.

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Why, in the late nineteenth century, did the US economy experience frequent crises and panics?

Some responses were in the form of narrative/descriptive accounts, often in considerable detail, of the various crises which occurred during the period, most notably those of 1873 and 1893. Generally, candidates struggled to find explanations for the frequency of such events.

(b) How serious was the crisis facing American farmers in the late nineteenth century?

Most candidates were able to explain at least some of the reasons why American farmers were facing a crisis in late nineteenth century, although this was often in the form of generalised comments regarding over-production and falling prices. Assessment regarding the severity of the crisis was seen but could have been attempted by more candidates.

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

(a) Account for President Hoover's response to the Great Crash.

Most candidates were able to describe Hoover's response to the Great Crash, although more responses needed to provide the contextual analysis required in order to develop a fully-focused argument. The most common approach involved criticism of Hoover for not doing enough to alleviate the social and economic problems brought about by the Great Depression. The most impressive responses were based on greater understanding of the situation confronting Hoover, together with appreciation of the fact that he was prepared to use unorthodox methods in response to the crisis.

(b) How different were the First and Second New Deals?

Virtually all candidates were able to display sound knowledge of the New Deals. The most impressive responses were characterised by clear and supported understanding of both the differences and similarities between the First and Second New Deals, leading to conclusions which were fully-focused on the requirements of the question. The majority of responses tended to concentrate on the differences and, as a result, lacked some balance. The most common argument was that the First New Deal was designed to address the immediate problems caused by the Great Depression, while the Second introduced more radical reform with longer-term aims and implications.

Section C – International Option: International Relations, 1871-1945

9 International Relations, 1871-1918

(a) Why was Russia defeated in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5?

The highest quality responses to this question were based on detailed understanding and analysis of a wide range of factors (military, strategic and diplomatic) whose inter-reaction led to a Japanese victory which few had anticipated. Other answers tended to concentrate on only one reason for Russia's defeat, usually the fact that its military equipment was outdated and no match for the modern Japanese army and navy. A number of responses would have been improved by a greater range and depth.

(b) How successful was Bismarck's foreign policy from 1871 to 1890?

Most candidates displayed sound knowledge of Bismarck's foreign policy and, in particular, his series of alliances with neighbouring countries. Generally, there could have been more focus on the issue of 'how successful' Bismarck's foreign policy actually was – this was usually in the form of concluding assertions. The most impressive responses were based on an appreciation of the fact that it was necessary to establish criteria by which success or failure might be judged. In most cases, this was achieved by outlining Bismarck's aims and objectives, followed by an assessment

of the extent to which these had been achieved by 1890. Weaker responses came from candidates who possessed only limited knowledge and understanding of Bismarck's foreign policy, a common issue being confusion between Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II.

10 International Relations, 1919-1933

(a) Why was Bolshevik Russia not invited to the Paris Peace Conference?

Most candidates focused on the fact that, following revolution in 1917, Russia had a communist government. Other European countries, fearing the spread of communism and actively supporting counter-revolutionaries in the Russian Civil War, saw Bolshevik Russia as an enemy which had no right to attend the Paris Peace Conference. Valid though this argument is, the most impressive responses were able to provide greater range and depth, in particular recognising that the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk meant that Russia no longer qualified as one of the allied nations which provided delegates to the Conference.

(b) 'The Locarno Treaties of 1925 achieved nothing.' How far do you agree with this statement?

The quality of responses to this question varied. The most impressive were characterised by detailed knowledge and understanding of the agreements which emerged from the Locarno meetings, together with focused and balanced analysis of their short and long-term implications for relations between European countries. Other responses were based on narrative/descriptive accounts of the agreements, to varying levels of detail and accuracy, with few attempts to analyse their significance. Weaker responses were assertive in nature and lacking in factual knowledge. A minority of candidates confused the Locarno Treaties with other attempts to improve international relations, most commonly the Dawes Plan.

11 International Relations, 1933-1939

(a) Why did Hitler and Stalin sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939?

Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge of the agreements reached between Germany and the USSR in 1939, many going into considerable detail regarding the preliminary negotiations which had taken place between Ribbentrop and Molotov. That the Pact came as a shock to other European countries was also clearly understood. Some responses would have been improved by a greater understanding of the reasons why both countries had signed the Pact, the majority of responses simply stating that it was designed to enable Germany and the USSR to gain territory at the expense of Poland. The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed analysis of the two leaders' motives, based on clear understanding of the fact that neither expected the agreements to be honoured.

(b) 'Hitler did not want war.' How far do you agree with this statement?

This question was generally well answered. The need to define the word 'war' was widely appreciated, many candidates arguing that there could be little doubt that Hitler did want a war against Poland and, subsequently, Russia, but that it was less certain whether he desired, and was preparing for, a major war against Britain and France. The most impressive responses were characterised by focused, balanced and well-supported arguments, often referring to the debate between historians regarding Hitler's long term foreign policy aims and ambitions. Weaker responses, of which there were relatively few, were based on narrative/descriptive accounts of Hitler's foreign policy, in varying degrees of chronological accuracy, with little focus on the requirements of the set question.

12 China and Japan, 1919-1945

(a) Why did Japan complete the takeover of Manchuria in 1931-32?

Most candidates were able to identify some reasons for Japan's aggression in Manchuria, most commonly its need to seek out new sources of raw materials and wider markets for its industrial output. The most impressive responses were based on detailed understanding and analysis of a wider range of causal factors, such as Japan's post-war economic depression and China's political disunity and weaknesses in the aftermath of widespread floods. Relatively few candidates seemed

aware of the fact that the takeover of Manchuria was initiated by the military in defiance of the wishes of Japan's democratically elected government

- (b) **'Chiang Kai-shek's decision to end the collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party was an error of judgement.' How far do you agree?**

Some candidates adopted a narrative/descriptive approach, outlining *how* Chiang Kai-shek ended collaboration between the KMT and the CCP, rather than addressing the issue of *why*. The most impressive responses were more focused on the precise needs of the question, providing a balanced assessment of Chiang's motives, followed by a reasoned judgement. A common argument was that Chiang's decision seemed logical at the time; he had exploited the CCP's popularity in order to gain power and, once that had been achieved, severed it because he had no intention of carrying out the CCP's proposed land reforms. It was only in the longer-term, as a result of the CCP's unexpected survival under Mao, that the decision seemed flawed.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/23

Paper 23

Key Messages

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

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. All of the questions on the paper were attempted, the most popular being 3 and 4 from section A, 6 and 7 from Section B and 10 and 11 in Section C. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but many were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet less successful (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions. Many candidates clearly appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa).

Part (a) questions - candidates should be aware that these questions are about causation. Effective answers require detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Some candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. Weaker responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to drift into less relevant material and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they would have been improved by more detailed and specific points, backed up with appropriate factual support.

Part (b) questions – candidates should be aware that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses tended to be narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue or relevant arguments based on factual support which would have benefited from greater range and depth. Weaker responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they would have been improved by more factual and chronological accuracy, points based on better factual support and greater relevance (adhering to timeframes given in the question would have helped here in some cases).

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Modern Europe, 1789-1917

1 France, 1789-1804

(a) Why did the Directory face problems in France from 1795 to 1799?

There were relatively few responses to this question. Some contained generalised statements regarding political and economic instability, but needed to back this up with specific supporting evidence. Weaker responses were characterised by confusion regarding what the Directory actually was, why it was established and the problems with which it was confronted.

(b) How far do you agree that war was the most important cause of the instability of French governments from 1789 to 1795?

There were relatively few responses to this question. While some candidates were able to develop focused and balanced arguments, others adopted a narrative/descriptive account of the various wars in which France was involved during the period, with only implicit reference to the requirements of the question. Other factors which led to political instability in France could have been more often considered.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

(a) Why did mechanisation affect the lower classes?

Although there were some impressive responses to this question, some would have benefited from greater range and depth. A broader interpretation of 'mechanisation' would have also improved responses, including a consideration of issues other than the introduction of factory machinery. A small number of candidates wrote exclusively about how, why and by whom specific machines (usually textile, but also steam engines) were invented, but they needed to include reference to how they impacted on the lower classes. Most responses were focused on the requirements of the question, but required more specific arguments and more extensive factual support.

(b) How far did industrialisation result in changing patterns of trade in this period?

The most impressive responses were based on a clear understanding of the demands of the question, together with the selection of appropriate factual material to support focused arguments. Other candidates appeared to miss or misunderstand the phrase 'patterns of trade' and wrote in more generalised terms about the impact of industrialisation.

3 The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

(a) Why did Britain go to war with Germany in 1914?

The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed understanding of a wide range of relevant factors, demonstrating how relations between Britain and Germany had deteriorated throughout the period. It was commonly argued that, while the German invasion of Belgium was the immediate reason for Britain's declaration of war, growing animosity between the two countries had made war increasingly likely and, indeed, expected. Other responses lacked such range and depth, tending to focus almost exclusively on one particular cause. Weaker responses were entirely based on a narrative account of the events which followed the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.

(b) Assess the reasons why tensions in the Balkans were a concern to major European countries from 1900 to 1914?

While most candidates were able to provide largely accurate narrative accounts of the development of tension in the Balkans between 1900 and 1914, more could have deployed their knowledge in an explicitly relevant manner. Austria-Hungary's concerns were widely understood, but, generally, there was less understanding of Russian interests in the Balkans (usually restricted to Russia's

'friendship' with Serbia). Britain and France could have been mentioned much more, while reference to Germany often lacked focus, with assertions made about the 'blank cheque'.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

(a) Why was there widespread disorder in Russia in 1905?

There were many highly impressive responses to this question. These were characterised by clear understanding and detailed explanation of a wide range of factors, both long and short-term, which culminated in the widespread disorder of 1905. Most candidates were able to demonstrate at least some understanding of the reasons behind the growing dissatisfaction of various groups within Russian society. Less successful responses were based on a narrative/descriptive account of the events of Bloody Sunday, with little or no reference to the reasons why they occurred or to their wider impact.

(b) How important was Lenin in the Bolsheviks' seizure of power in October 1917?

This question was generally well-answered. Most candidates were able to produce a balanced response, contrasting the significant role played by Lenin with other factors, such as the weaknesses of the Provisional Government, which facilitated Bolshevik success in 1917. As a result, most responses were fully-focused on the requirements of the question. Less impressive responses were largely based on outline narrative/descriptive accounts of Lenin's actions in 1917, and would have benefited from more consideration of other factors which enabled the Bolsheviks to gain power. Weaker responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by unsupported assertions, factual inaccuracy and chronological confusion.

Section B - American Option: The History of the USA, 1840-1941

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

(a) Why did US naval power grow in this period?

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

(b) How far was the US responsible for the outbreak of war with Spain in 1898?

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

(a) Why did the Reconstruction policies of President Johnson provoke hostility in the US Congress?

There were relatively few responses to this question. While many candidates were able to make reference to relevant issues such as the black codes and reconstruction, President Johnson's policies were rarely known or understood in sufficient detail.

(b) 'The Thirteenth Amendment was the greatest of the constitutional amendments passed between 1865 and 1870.' How far do you agree with this statement?

There were relatively few responses to this question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the aims, terms and impact of the Thirteenth Amendment. Knowledge of subsequent constitutional amendments prior to 1870 was less evident. As a result, most responses lacked balance, the common conclusion in support of the hypothesis remaining an assertion in the absence of comparison between the relative significance of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Why did the prohibition movement gain support between 1900 and 1920?

There were relatively few responses to this question. Most were general in nature. Some candidates were able to display knowledge of various pressure groups which were formed to support the prohibition movement, and many referred to the Eighteenth Amendment. Generally, however, more understanding of the reasons behind the movement's appeal would have helped candidates.

(b) How powerful were the party bosses who governed many US cities in the late nineteenth century?

There were relatively few responses to this question. Most candidates were able to provide appropriate examples of party bosses and describe the kinds of authority which they exerted over the cities they controlled. The best responses were characterised by a genuine attempt to contrast the power which party bosses held against the limitations which were imposed on it. Some responses did not go beyond narrative/descriptive accounts, and lacked explicit reference to the 'how powerful' element of the question. Weaker responses were based on confused and largely inaccurate interpretations of the term 'party bosses'.

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

(a) Why did many left-wing liberals oppose the New Deal?

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

(b) How far was the First New Deal undermined by the judgements of the US Supreme Court?

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

Section C - International Option: International Relations, 1871-1945

9 International Relations, 1871-1918

(a) Why did the USA move away from its traditional policy of non-intervention overseas between 1871 and 1900?

The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed knowledge and understanding of how a variety of factors (political, economic, diplomatic and strategic) conspired to encourage the USA to effectively abandon its strict isolationist policy during the late nineteenth century. Other responses, while fully-focused on the requirements of the question, tended to adopt a mono-causal approach, the most common argument being that the policy change was a result of victory in the war against Spain. Weaker responses, of which there were relatively few, explained *how* the change of policy occurred rather than *why*, a narrative/descriptive approach which did not address the actual question.

(b) To what extent was Austria-Hungary responsible for the outbreak of the First World War?

Most candidates were able to display sound knowledge and understanding of the causes of World War I, though some found it difficult to remain focused on the specific demands of the actual question. The best responses contained balanced arguments, contrasting Austria-Hungary's culpability against that of other countries, leading to reasoned and well-supported conclusions. Other responses were based on chronological narrative accounts of the events which led to the outbreak of World War I, the least impressive being confined to the period following the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.

10 International Relations, 1919-1933

(a) Why did relations between France and Germany remain poor during the period from 1919 to 1933?

The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed knowledge and understanding of a wide range of issues which, despite the appearance of improved relations following the Locarno Treaties, continued to cause tension between France and Germany throughout the period. Less successful responses tended to be rather more vague and generalised, primarily focusing on French resentment of Germany after World War I and fear that France might again become the target of German aggression. These responses lacked the depth and range required to achieve higher marks.

(b) How far do you agree that the Paris peace settlement of 1919-20 was a 'bad peace'?

Most candidates displayed sound knowledge and understanding of the agreements reached during the Paris Peace Conference and were able to provide appropriate evidence, often in considerable detail, to justify the claim that the 1919-20 settlement was a 'bad peace'. Some were able to provide a supported counter-argument but other responses lacked balance, a common conclusion being that it was clearly a 'bad peace' because it did not prevent (or could be seen as responsible for) the outbreak of World War II. The most impressive responses were characterised by greater empathy with the problems which confronted delegates at the Conference.

11 International Relations, 1933-1939

(a) What were the causes of Spain's political instability in the period from 1933 to 1936?

Although not widely attempted, there were some very impressive responses to this question. These were characterised by explanation of a wide range of factors supported by appropriate and, at times, very detailed factual evidence. Other responses lacked such depth, largely relying on generalised statements regarding social, geographical and political divisions within Spain. Weaker responses often appeared to stem from confusion regarding the timeframe, many candidates assuming incorrectly that this was a question about the Spanish Civil War and writing narrative accounts of it.

(b) To what extent had Hitler achieved his foreign policy aims by the end of 1938?

The best responses came from candidates who fully appreciated that it was essential to identify what Hitler's foreign policy aims actually were. This provided criteria by which the extent of Hitler's achievements could be measured. Less successful responses provided narrative/descriptive accounts of Hitler's foreign policy actions, followed by a concluding summary of his achievements. As a result, they lacked explicit focus on the extent to which these achievements matched his aims.

12 China and Japan, 1919-1945

(a) Why did Japan's move towards democracy come to an end in the early 1930s?

Most candidates were able to identify some causal factors; more range and depth would have improved some of these responses, as would more specific evidence to explain the growing dissatisfaction with democratic government in Japan. In general, it appeared that this topic could have been better known and understood.

(b) Should the Long March be seen as a victory or a defeat for the Chinese Communist Party?

There were a number of very impressive responses to this question. These were characterised by detailed knowledge and understanding both of the reasons why the Long March took place and of its long-term impact on China in general and the CCP in particular. This facilitated balanced assessment of the evidence, leading to reasoned and supported judgement clearly focused on the demands of the question. Weaker responses tended to provide narrative/descriptive accounts of the Long March; consideration of whether the Long March should be seen as a victory or a defeat for the CCP was often assertive or, at best, implicit only, in such responses.