

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/11  
Document Question

## Key messages

This assessment focusses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates approach.

Candidates should ensure that they answer the specific questions about the sources. Neither question **(a)** nor question **(b)** will ask candidates to compare or to analyse the sources in general. When evaluating the sources, the arguments also need to be linked to the question being asked.

Candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. Individual sentences or part sentences, when taken alone, can convey different ideas to the overall message of the source.

Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.

Part **(b)** questions require candidates to use all four sources.

Candidates should quote the phrases of source content they are citing to convey their argument. Only writing the first and last word of a sentence within the source does not provide the evidence needed to fully support the point being made.

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities and differences and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger answers supported the points they make with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. Weaker answers to part **(a)** were often rushed. Candidates often made incorrect points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. Weaker answers often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Evaluation must be valid and relevant to answering the question in order for it to be credited.

A minority of candidates interpreted the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. Weaker answers were often unfinished, usually including long introductions which contributed little to the answer.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. Candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. Stronger answers included evaluation which used the nature, origin or purpose of the source and explained how this made it more or less useful. When evaluating the sources it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A, European Option*

1(a) To what extent do Sources A and B show that Cavour's views on Garibaldi changed?

Most candidates found identifying the differences in Cavour's views easier than identifying valid similarities. They explained how in Source A Cavour was critical of his fellow Italian while in Source B Cavour finds plenty to praise about Garibaldi's actions. The main similarity identified concerned Cavour's wish that Garibaldi was not involved in Naples, whether by conquering it [in Source A] or by leading a revolution [Source B]. A minority found a similarity in terms of a positive view of Garibaldi's character, Source A saying he has a generous character while Source B that he has great moral power. As the main message of Source A is to criticise Garibaldi, this comparison could not be credited.

**(b) 'The influence of foreign powers determined the fortunes of Italian nationalism.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Almost all candidates correctly interpreted 'determined' as affecting the fortunes of Italian nationalism by having some power over events in Italy. In Source A, Cavour sees Austria in terms of Garibaldi's ambitions, as passive rather than active. This means that Source A challenges the assertion. The fortunes of Italian nationalism are being determined by Italians. Most candidates correctly interpreted Source A in this way. Source B is also clear in its belief that Italians determined the fate of Italian nationalism and most candidates understood this. Source C argued the opposite case, maintaining that French bayonets were needed 'further north', presumably north of Naples. Stronger answers used their contextual knowledge and identified that this is a reference to the Papal States and to Venetia. Gaining control of either would need French support against the Pope and the Habsburg Emperor respectively. Most candidates understood the main point being made by Source C, although weaker answers did not refer to the specific reasons why French support was needed. Source D could be interpreted as either challenging or supporting the hypothesis. Candidates were split evenly in their view of the Source; as long as they provided supporting evidence from the source itself, this was acceptable. One word in the source caused problems in weaker answers. That word was 'Neapolitan', which some thought was a reference to France, which inevitably confused their analysis. Candidates who attempted to evaluate the sources did best in their evaluation of Source D. Evidence from the autobiography of Garibaldi needed to be treated with great caution when considering the influence of foreign powers. Contextual knowledge supports the events described by Garibaldi, if not the judgements he makes about the relative importance of the British warships. Some weaker answers did include attempts to evaluate the other sources, but this rarely went beyond generic points such as being primary or, as with Source C, written by a foreigner, a point most thought made the source more reliable.

**Section B, American Option**

**2(a) Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence about Davis's journey from Mississippi to Montgomery.**

Weaker answers concentrated wholly on the content of the speeches of Davis rather than incorporating them into an analysis of the journey he made, as the question required. A majority of answers identified differences. Stronger answers also identified similarities as their analysis considered the journey as well as the speeches. Both sources described crowds along the way, the numerous speeches Davis made and the brevity of those speeches. Candidates who explained the similarities of journey descriptions and differences of speeches were awarded Level 3. Very few answers provided valid evaluation. Weaker answers which attempted to evaluate Source B incorrectly identified the Source as coming from a Northern newspaper. Maryland was a border Southern state, even though it did join the Union forces in their war against the Confederacy.

**(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that Jefferson Davis had the qualities needed to be a war leader?**

Most responses took the approach that a war leader is the same as a military leader. Thus they asserted that Source A challenged the hypothesis, preferring to focus on Davis's initial 'off-putting' manners, rather than on the endearing and friendly qualities he later revealed, and on the fact that he was not a 'fire-eater'. His skill as a speech-maker was usually overlooked and the last sentence was often ignored. The last sentence asserts that Davis maintained that 'he is every way fitted' to lead the Confederacy – which was a state at war. Stronger answers took a wider approach and argued that a war leader is more than a military leader. Most candidates identified Source B as supporting the thesis because it portrayed him as both popular and determined to use force. Stronger answers were able to differentiate the two views found Source C, those of Davis and those of Northern newspapers, at least as reported by Davis. Most correctly saw Davis as disputing

the Northern newspapers' view that he was threatening devastation on the North and thus argued that he was not aggressive enough to be a war leader. In analysing Source D, many answers combined two assertions of his wife – that she 'thought his genius was military' and 'he did not know the arts of a politician' – to argue that Davis made a good military leader. That was valid if 'war leader' is defined narrowly. However, his lack of political skills meant that Davis would not be a good war leader in the broader sense of the term. Both approaches were credited so long as they were soundly based on relevant quotes from the source. Source D was often evaluated as being reliable and useful because it came from his wife and she must have known him well, though some did point out that her book was published thirty years later and thus might have exaggerated his positive qualities. Source C was dismissed as too partisan to be reliable. As mentioned in the section on part (a), evaluation of Source B was confused because most candidates took it to be a Northern source. Weaker answers also struggled with Source A because it was a Northern newspaper giving a favourable view of the leader of the Confederacy.

### **Section C, International Option**

#### **3(a) Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence of how far the British government remained committed to the Covenant of the League of Nations.**

Weaker answers compared the two sources in general or with regard to Britain and the Abyssinian crisis. The question required candidates to focus on the attitude of the British government towards the Covenant of the League of Nations, which gives a much more specific point of reference. Stronger answers noted that the question asked specifically about 'government' and made that the focus of their analysis. The main similarity is that both sources show the government as being committed to the Covenant. The main difference is that the government's commitment is greater in Source C than in Source B. Most candidates made these comparisons, even if their answers also contained a lot of marginal material. The strongest answers included evaluation of the two sources: Source B was a private letter to a government diplomat and thus likely to be an accurate view of the government's views while Source C was a public speech to the League of Nations itself and likely to be less than honest. The weakest answers showed evidence of not being secure in their knowledge of what the Covenant of the League of Nations was.

#### **(b) 'In 1935, British public opinion was in favour of supporting the League of Nations in taking strong action against Italy.' How far do Sources A-D support this view?**

This question required a focus on the British people, not the British government. Only one source is from a member of the British public and that is Source A, a source which needed careful analysis. The author says that some sections of the British press does not support action against Italy on behalf of Abyssinia 'because it would be inconvenient to us' – which is referring to the British people. The author, however, is critical of the British press, 'with a few honourable exceptions'. Thus, Source A supports the hypothesis. Many candidates missed this point. When evaluating Source A, weaker answers argued it was reliable because it was written by an academic. An academic source should not inevitably be seen as a reliable source. This type of assertion is not valid evaluation. The other source with links to the public is Source D, written by an MP, someone elected by and representing many thousands of people. Source D is a diary extract in which the MP writes, 'Why should Britain fight Italy over Abyssinia?' which is a challenge to the hypothesis. The final sentence of the extract praises Source C's speech to the League of Nations, which could be seen as supporting the hypothesis. Most candidates, however, focused on the earlier isolationists statement as being more representative of the MP's views. Few candidates used the author's status as an MP to help evaluate the argument and the source. Source D is probably closer to British public opinion than either Source B or Source C. These sources come from someone who is a government minister as well as an MP. Both sources refer to the British people. Both sources see the public's opinion as hardening against Italy, which means they support the assertion. Most candidates successfully analysed these sources in this way.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 9389/12</b> <b>Document Question</b></p>
--

## Key messages

This assessment focusses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates approach.

Candidates should ensure that they answer the specific questions about the sources. Neither question **(a)** nor question **(b)** will ask candidates to compare or to analyse the sources in general. When evaluating the sources, the arguments also need to be linked to the question being asked.

Candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. Individual sentences or part sentences, when taken alone, can convey different ideas to the overall message of the source.

Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.

Part **(b)** questions require candidates to use all four sources.

Candidates should quote the phrases of source content they are citing to convey their argument. Only writing the first and last word of a sentence within the source does not provide the evidence needed to fully support the point being made.

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities and differences and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger answers supported the points they make with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. Weaker answers to part **(a)** were often rushed. Candidates often made incorrect points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. Weaker answers often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Evaluation must be valid and relevant to answering the question in order for it to be credited.

A minority of candidates interpreted the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. Weaker answers were often unfinished, usually including long introductions which contributed little to the answer.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. Candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. Stronger answers included evaluation which used the nature, origin or purpose of the source and explained how this made it more or less useful. When evaluating the sources it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A, European Option*

#### **1(a) To what extent do Sources A and C agree on the impact of the Congress of Vienna on Italy?**

These two sources offered both similarities and differences in their views on the impact of the Congress of Vienna. Both were unhappy with the level of Austrian involvement in the North of Italy

after the Congress although better responses were able to point out that this is much more of a blanket response from Source A, who sees all Austrian involvement as malign; whereas Source B sees the particular influence of Metternich as problematic whilst not minding wider Austrian influence. Source B has a different focus for its unhappiness and many candidates were able to identify the difference shown by the way the author blames 'the Church, the aristocracy and those sovereign princes of Italy' for the problems he sees. Source B was particularly interesting here because although it was written by a Frenchman it offers a very pro-Italian point of view and one which particularly supports the people of Italy. This sometimes confused some candidates who should be careful not to make simplistic judgements about the origin of sources.

**(b) 'It was Austria that prevented Italian unity after 1815.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

The sources which showed the clearest support for the statement are A and B whilst Sources C and D suggested other reasons for the cause of Italian unity struggling after 1815. Most candidates were able to pick out the ideas supporting the statement although some struggled to interpret the message of Sources C and D who also mentioned Austria but did not consider it to be the main reason for a lack of unity. Stronger answers were careful to get a sense of the 'overall message' of the source rather than looking for decontextualized keywords and were able to see both support and challenge for the statement. The best answers were able to contextualise the sources and use this to begin to evaluate although this was not always directed at answering the question and so often struggled to add to the overall answer. Useful comments on provenance included the secret nature of Source B and the slightly one-sided viewpoint given by the author of Source D who having been involved in early attempts to oust the Austrians might have taken a particularly dim view of anyone who he saw as being involved in their failure.

**Section B, American Option**

**2(a) To what extent do Sources C and D agree on the impact of President Lincoln's inaugural address?**

Some candidates had some difficulty in attempting this question because they approached these two sources expecting to read about the huge importance of Lincoln's inaugural address. The main similarity between both of the sources is that they both see the speech as having a limited impact, if for different reasons. Source C sees it as accepting the secession moves of the South; Lincoln's threats are seen as a bluff; whereas Source D sees it as merely adding smoke to the fog surrounding the topic of war. This highlights the importance of careful reading of the sources rather than candidates assuming that they know what will be said about a person or event. The differences were somewhat more subtle but stronger answers successfully interpreted the sources to see that Source C is much more welcoming of the tone of the speech than Source D. It should not be presumed that a New York newspaper is necessarily pro-Republican or pro-Lincoln. As this source shows, there was a great deal of scepticism over what would happen as a result of the speech.

**(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Abraham Lincoln was responsible for the outbreak of civil war in 1861?**

This question was well answered by many candidates who were able to identify evidence from the sources of who was responsible for the outbreak of the Civil War and apply it to the situation at the time. However, there are still some candidates who when dealing with Lincoln struggle to look beyond simplistic ideas about his place in history. It is vital that any analysis of sources is based on what the sources say rather than prior knowledge/opinions about Lincoln. This is particularly important when using the words of Lincoln himself such as in Source B. Combined with Source C this source offers a clear challenge to the statement although for two different reasons. Source B is from a key public speech, in which Lincoln is likely to show himself as working for peace, not war. If he does have to order the use of force, the source says, it would be in defence of a Union which others are trying to destroy. Dismissing Lincoln's threats to use force as bluff, Source C describes Lincoln's inaugural address as 'a peace-keeping document'. On the other hand, Source D argues that whether the USA would experience war or peace depended on Lincoln and his response to the demands of a team of Southern politicians. Thus, Lincoln would be ultimately responsible for the start of war. Source A also sees Lincoln as responsible for causing the War. Asserting that the question of war or peace was in Lincoln's hands and hoping for peace, the author left a meeting with Lincoln depressed by his hard-line stance. Some candidates were able to use their contextual

knowledge of the situation in Kentucky to comment on the utility of Source A by suggesting that this was actually quite a balanced piece of reporting; whilst others used the purpose of some of the sources to make sensible comment on provenance. These comments were only credited if they were used to decide on source utility in relation to the question asked.

**Section C, International Option**

**3(a) Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence of the German people's opinions about, and expectations of, the League of Nations.**

These sources come from quite different places i.e. a British newspaper and a speech by Hitler. Most candidates identified that both sources agree that the League's failure to secure international disarmament was a fundamental reason for the German people's resentment towards it. Germany had complied with its obligations to disarm, but no other country had. This put Germany in a 'position of inferiority' (Source B) and 'completely at the mercy' of threats from other nations (Source D). Many candidates were able to draw out points about the failure of disarmament successfully although some struggled to clearly support the point from the sources. The main difference between the sources is shown when Source B suggests that the German people have always felt disappointed and humiliated by the League whereas Hitler claims that no other people could have been more supportive of the organisation. The strongest answers were able to use provenance to unpick the claims of Hitler and suggest reasons that he would want to portray Germany as supportive before announcing he was leaving the League.

**(b) 'Germany withdrew from the League of Nations because of its failure to secure international disarmament.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Many candidates displayed a lot of knowledge of Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations, but how this was applied to the sources and question that had been posed was a discriminator between the stronger and weaker answers. Sources A, B and D all included the clear suggestion that it was disarmament that had led to the withdrawal of Germany from the League of Nations. However, Source B also suggested that there was a more deep rooted feeling within the country that the problems with disarmament merely built on. It is important that candidates look for nuance in sources such as this rather than feeling the need to decide that all sources clearly support or challenge the statement. Source C offered a very different picture suggesting that the withdrawal was much more based on domestic problems in Germany. Some of the best answers used the provenance of this source to add weight to its argument as the US ambassador was reporting back to the government. Candidates also questioned how much weight could be given to Source D with Hitler making claims that it was recent developments with disarmament that had caused Germany to leave. Better answers used contextual knowledge to suggest that this did not tell the whole story of Hitler's views on the League of Nations. Using the source content closely, and beginning to apply provenance to test utility, many candidates were able to produce strong answers. These were often more successful than those that included long passages of own knowledge that were only tangentially related to the question.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/13  
Document Question

## Key messages

This assessment focusses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates approach.

Candidates should ensure that they answer the specific questions about the sources. Neither question **(a)** nor question **(b)** will ask candidates to compare or to analyse the sources in general. When evaluating the sources, the arguments also need to be linked to the question being asked.

Candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. Individual sentences or part sentences, when taken alone, can convey different ideas to the overall message of the source.

Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.

Part **(b)** questions require candidates to use all four sources.

Candidates should quote the phrases of source content they are citing to convey their argument. Only writing the first and last word of a sentence within the source does not provide the evidence needed to fully support the point being made.

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities and differences and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger answers supported the points they make with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. Weaker answers to part **(a)** were often rushed. Candidates often made incorrect points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. Weaker answers often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Evaluation must be valid and relevant to answering the question in order for it to be credited.

A minority of candidates interpreted the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. Weaker answers were often unfinished, usually including long introductions which contributed little to the answer.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. Candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. Stronger answers included evaluation which used the nature, origin or purpose of the source and explained how this made it more or less useful. When evaluating the sources it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A, European Option*

1(a) To what extent do Sources A and B differ about the reasons for Prussia's victory in the War of 1866?

Weaker answers struggled to deal with the more nuanced view of Source A which allowed for the skills of the Austrians as well as the superiority of the Prussians. Most candidates were able to identify that both sources highlighted the superiority of the Prussians forces and that both sources focussed on the skills of leadership on either side. Many candidates were also able to identify the main difference between the sources where Source A suggested that Austrian forces were almost the equal of the Prussian in terms of competence and bravery, implying that victory was hard won, whilst Source B believed the Austrian army to be inferior in many ways, e.g. leadership and weaponry, implying the outcome was never close. Stronger answers highlighted both the similarities and the differences of the two sources and then began to evaluate the sources using the provenance.

**(b) 'The War of 1866 was a complete disaster for Austria.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Most candidates recognised that Source B strongly supported the hypothesis showing evidence of humiliation from the author as well as stressing that 'Austria's place in Europe and the world' have been damaged forever. The other sources could be used to both support and oppose the statement depending on the definition of 'complete disaster' taken by the candidate. This sort of nuance is often important in questions and candidates should be encouraged to think about what might satisfy the term in the context of the period. In this way, both Source A and Source C supported the basic hypothesis that Austria had been defeated in the War but they also mitigated that defeat by commenting on the 'competency and bravery of the Austrians' (Source A) and the way in which Prussia was now responsible for the balance of power in Europe (Source C) – a task which had previously fallen to Austria often with difficult consequences. There are elements of Source D which candidates used to show 'complete disaster', such as the loss of territories in Italy but other candidates used their contextual knowledge to comment on the fact that Austria still held a lot of her territory and thus controlled an Empire even after defeat. Stronger answers compared the provenance of the sources when deciding how useful they were to answering the question. The nuanced tone of Source C was highlighted by some candidates as what they might expect from an official report but also a source which showed little reason for bending the truth. Source B was sometimes contrasted with this, although it should be noted that personal diaries such as this should not always be seen as unreliable just because of their emotional nature. They are, perhaps, more useful for showing the feelings of people at the time than actual consequences but this should be taken into consideration. The best responses included these ideas and clearly linked to both the sources and the question.

**Section B, American Option**

**2(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree about the election contest in New York state?**

Many candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the election of 1860 but there were some who struggled to make this relevant to the particular topic which the sources were interested in, i.e. the contest in the state of New York. Some candidates presumed that a New York newspaper (Source A) must be Republican supporting and so became confused about the focus of the extract on the Democrats likely victory. Better answers identified that both Sources clearly came from Democrat supporting newspapers and were able to look beyond basic provenance to compare the content of the sources. Candidates who were able to do this often highlighted both similarities and differences which focussed on levels and location of support for the two parties.

**(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Abraham Lincoln's victory in the 1860 presidential election revealed the North to be more divided than united?**

Stronger answers successfully used their contextual knowledge to consider the date range of the sources provided as well as considering what division or unity might look like in this context. Many answers pointed out that both Source A and Source B were written either before or in the immediate aftermath of the election and, at face value, did show division within the North. However, better answers were able to go further, suggesting that both these sources seemed excited for a Democrat win and so perhaps were over-exaggerating the chances of their success. The second two sources (C and D) showed more clearly that the North was not divided through the results of the election which were heavily in favour of Lincoln. These two sources were produced as actual results were coming in and so could be seen as more reliable but they do only provide headline figures (Source D) and the detail for two states (Source C) so maybe should be used with some caution. The results in D are not entirely accurate, for example, and do not show the results from all states (of which



there were 33 at the time). The best answers were able to use all the sources with a degree of caution to come to a conclusion about the feelings of those in Northern states immediately before and after the election.

**Section C, International Option**

**3(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of Mussolini's attitude towards the League of Nations.**

Most candidates were able to identify the similarities and differences shown in Mussolini's attitude towards the League of Nations. In both sources Mussolini is dismissive of the League of Nations and signals his intention to leave. However, in Source A he feels unable to leave the League because of the possible actions of other states and the economic dangers; whereas in Source B he takes a much more belligerent stance threatening the 'armed hostility' of the Italian people should the League try to prevent him from taking over Abyssinia. The best responses were able to contextualise the two sources to explain the differences in tone seeing that the source from 1932 to the Grand Fascist Council had little reason to hide the economic weaknesses of Italy and was given before the growth of his own and Hitler's fascist power. Whereas by 1935 an interview in a newspaper would be designed to show the public his growing strength in a period when he had long been planning to leave the League.

**(b) 'Mussolini withdrew from the League of Nations because of its reaction to Italian involvement in Abyssinia.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Many candidates identified the sections of the sources which supported the idea that Mussolini withdrew from the League of Nations because of its reaction to Italian involvement in Abyssinia. In Sources B and C Mussolini clearly suggests that the actions of the League are bringing the moment of Italy's departure ever closer. Source A offers a challenge showing that Mussolini wanted to leave the League before the Abyssinian crisis and Source D, from Winston Churchill, suggests that internal problems in Italy are the main driver. Many candidates were able to successfully support and challenge the statement although some answers could have been improved by candidates reading the source holistically and considering the overall message that the source gives in relation to the question rather than picking out short de-contextualised statements. Stronger responses were able to contextualise and test the sources to see how useful they were when answering the question. For example, Source D whilst pointing out some issues that were happening inside Italy is clearly an anti-appeasement speech from a couple of years after the Abyssinia crisis. Churchill's purpose in this source is to point out the folly of the British government who negotiated with Mussolini rather than take more aggressive action. Thus, it should be considered to be prone to exaggeration.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/21**  
**Outline Study**

## Key messages

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 of the mark scheme it is necessary to give some indication of the significance of that factor to the event. At the very highest Level of the mark scheme it is necessary to make a comparative judgement about the relative importance of different factors.

In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.

Candidates could improve their responses by ensuring that they focus more on the question set and rather than providing a narrative of their body of knowledge on a given topic.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper, **Section A** questions being the most popular. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates could improve on sustaining 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 weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

**Part (a)** questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of actors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; some were too vague, were limited to generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

The most successful **Part (b)** responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. There is some evidence that candidates, faced with a very familiar topic, were not able to adapt their knowledge to the specific question asked in the paper. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the specific nature of the question set, 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; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by not considering timeframes given in the question).

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **Question 1: France, 1789–1814**



**(a) Why did the Terror come to an end in 1794?**

Virtually all candidates were able to explain, with varying degrees of depth and accuracy, why the Terror came to an end in 1794. Weaker responses provided a narrative of *what* the Terror did rather than *why* it ended, and so provided no link to causation.

**(b) 'The aims of the Revolution had been achieved by the end of 1791.' How far do you agree?**

A common feature of answers was to set up an obvious contrast; ways the aims of the Revolution had been achieved by 1791 versus ways the aims of the Revolution had not been achieved by 1791. There were some excellent responses seen from many candidates who took this approach, showing a good depth of knowledge and understanding of key developments such as the August decrees of 1789, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 1790 and the King's acceptance of the new Constitution, 1791, the lack of fiscal stability and the King's grudging acceptance of his role as a constitutional monarch. Less successful responses provided a narrative of events and often ignored the question's timeframe.

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

**(a) Why did the Agricultural Revolution lead to social and economic change?**

There were some good responses to this question with the focus of social and economic changes fully grasped. This involved the understanding of issues such as greater food production, rising population, improvements in transport and the role surplus capital from increased agricultural profits played in industrial investment. Moderate responses had a general tendency to describe aspects of the Agricultural Revolution. Many of these narrative accounts needed more factual detail and accuracy as they relied on vague, generalised and unsupported assertions.

**(b) How successful were conservative interests in hindering the progress of industrialisation? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Good responses were characterised by the clear identification of groups (such as the skilled workers from Britain 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.

**Question 3: The Origins of World War I, 1900–1914**

**(a) Why did France declare war on Germany in 1914?**

Some excellent responses were seen, providing explanations of how the humiliation France felt at her defeat in the Franco–Prussian war plus the loss of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, and the large indemnity it had to pay, created a desire for revenge against Germany. This was supported further by references to the Moroccan crises and invasion of Belgium as examples of German provocation and aggression which further fuelled the French public's anti-German feeling and support for war. There was a clear awareness of France's sense of commitment to its ally Russia, once Germany had declared war on Russia. Weaker responses could have been improved by avoiding lengthy descriptions of the alliances drawn up by Germany to isolate France.

**(b) Assess the reasons why events in the Balkans played such a significant role in bringing about the First World War.**

A number of candidates were able to provide a fully focused and balanced response, leading to well-reasoned judgements supported by appropriate factual evidence. Some less focused responses ignored the fact that the question was about 'events in the Balkans' and instead focused on the general causes of the First World War (e.g. militarism, the alliance system and imperial rivalry). This is a good example of the sort of question where candidates have a sound body of basic knowledge about the international situation prior to the outbreak of World War One, but have difficulty in using it in a question that does not specifically ask for the relative significance of one cause set against other causes of the war.

**Question 4: The Russian Revolution, c.1894–1917**

**(a) Why did Bolshevik ideas have increasing appeal to the Russian people during 1917?**

Candidates who grasped the question's focus of 'Bolshevik ideas' were able to deploy the ideas of Marx along with Lenin's 'April Theses' as a means to organise their response by explaining how they met the wishes of various groups in Russia, which resulted in their increased appeal. Less successful responses provided a narrative of why the Tsar had been unpopular and/or how the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917.

**(b) 'Too many people were hungry.' How far does this explain the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution?**

There were many excellent responses to this question. These were characterised by clear understanding and detailed analysis of a wide range of factors, both long- and short-term, which culminated in the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution. There was an analysis of the relative importance of these various causes, with particular reference to the significance of 'too many people were hungry'. This approach facilitated the development of fully focused and balanced arguments, leading to conclusions which explicitly addressed the requirements of the question. Other responses, while containing similar factual information, tended to be more narrative in style and would have benefitted from greater analytical depth. Less successful responses were characterised by vague or generalised assertions regarding poor working/living conditions, Russia's economic instability and the Tsar's personal failings.

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

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

**(a) Why, in 1848, did the USA sign the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo with Mexico?**

Successful responses were aware of the role that the growing division in the USA over the war with Mexico played in the signing of the treaty. The majority of responses, while making some relevant points, could have been improved by including more factual depth. Less successful responses described the terms of the treaty.

**(b) How far did the 1911 Chinese Revolution affect US policy towards China?**

Effective responses appreciated the need to analyse the ways the Revolution of 1911 either changed or did not change US foreign policy towards China. Weaker responses were largely narrative in approach, outlining, without focused analysis, various issues concerning the USA's involvement in, and relations with, China after the 1911 Revolution.

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

**(a) Why, in 1866–68, was the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution agreed?**

There were a number of high quality responses to this question. They were characterised by examination of the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment in context; for example, by demonstrating how the amendment was designed to counteract the implications of the Black Codes and to give stronger legal protections to ex-slaves than that contained in the 1866 Civil Rights Bill. Less well focused responses were characterised by vague, generalised and often inaccurate assertions, with Lincoln seen as the driving force throughout the stated timeframe.

**(b) Assess President Lincoln's record as a war leader.**

Some excellent responses to this question were seen, with candidates able, for example, to 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. This determination to restore the Union was seen as the defining characteristic of his leadership skills as a war leader, and did result in victory for USA forces over the CSA in 1865. This was balanced with valid references to Lincoln's lack of military experience and poor choice of military commanders in the opening years of the war. Less successful responses either provided a

narrative of Lincoln's actions or focused on why the North was not initially successful in the war without reference to Lincoln's role.

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

- (a) **Why, in the later nineteenth century, were the main industrial cities often governed by party bosses?**

Effective responses displayed good knowledge of the party bosses' manipulation of the voting system through bribery and the lack of checks on their actions by government. Less successful responses generally demonstrated only limited understanding of the activities of party bosses or the ways in which they achieved and maintained their power, often confusing party bosses with Industrial Tycoons, such as John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie.

- (b) **How appropriate is it to refer to the later nineteenth century as the 'Gilded Age'?**

Well focused responses were aware that the term 'Gilded Age' offered a critical contrast, an unequal society where a very rich few benefitted underpinned by corruption and poverty for the majority. Such responses demonstrated this contrast effectively and provided valid counter-arguments such as the growth of an educated and salaried middle class along with the gradual emergence of the Progressive movement, whilst noting that these were developments which favoured white Americans. Weaker responses wrote about the period as being a 'golden' age, with description of growth, progress, achievement and growing wealth in the US economy.

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

- (a) **Why did the New Deal face opposition from both left and right?**

Good responses were characterised by detailed explanation of a range of political and economic reasons why the New Deal faced opposition from both left and right. Thus, for many on the left, the New Deal legislation did not go far enough whilst the right argued that the federal government was deploying unconstitutional methods to enhance its own power and was undermining America's notions of individualism and free enterprise. There was awareness of some of the key figures in this opposition, Huey Long, Father Coughlin and Francis Townsend. More moderate responses could have been improved by avoiding generalised accounts of what the New Deal did.

- (b) **To what extent did the US economy recover in the 1930s?**

Some excellent responses were characterised by detailed analysis of the US economy throughout the whole period and a sound awareness of the different approaches adopted by Hoover and Roosevelt in their attempts to address the US economy's problems in the 1930s. Hoover's laissez-faire beliefs were contrasted with Roosevelt's interventionist strategies, arguing that, whilst the former worsened the economy, the latter had some effect on recovery, but it was the outbreak of war which brought a return to economic recovery in the USA. Less successful responses focused on a very limited timeframe and described the various aspects of the New Deal, asserting that Roosevelt succeeded in bringing about economic recovery by the end of the 1930s.

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

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

- (a) **Why did the USA declare war against Germany in 1917?**

Most candidates were able to demonstrate a range of factors to explain why the USA declared war against Germany in 1917. For example, the growing anti-German feeling amongst many in the USA due to German disregard for American protestations over Germany's resumption of its unrestricted submarine warfare campaign, compounded, finally, by German duplicity as revealed in the Zimmermann telegram. Other responses could have been improved by avoiding lengthy narrative accounts of the sinking of the 'Lusitania' in 1915.

- (b) **'The formation of the Triple Entente by 1907 made a major European war more, rather than less, likely.' How far do you agree?**

The most successful responses were focused explicitly on the requirements of the question throughout, with detailed analysis of how the development of the Triple Entente enhanced tensions between the main European powers, as well as how it kept peace (Britain's offer of support in 1911 to France over Morocco led to a German climbdown). This was then balanced by arguments outlining other factors which threatened international peace during the period (e.g. militarism/Kaiser Wilhelm II's policy of 'Weltpolitik'). Other responses were based on chronological narrative accounts of the events which led to the outbreak of World War I, less focused responses being confined to the period following the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.

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

**(a) Why was the War Guilt Clause included in the Treaty of Versailles?**

Many candidates were able to identify and explain several reasons why the War Guilt Clause was included in the Treaty of Versailles. Most candidates understood that the need to impose reparations was a determining factor behind the War Guilt Clause, as was France's wish to thoroughly weaken Germany to prevent her from ever being a threat again. Responses which were less successful wrote at length about the various terms of the Treaty.

**(b) 'Attempts to reduce international tension during the 1920s were largely ineffective.' How far do you agree?**

The best responses were characterised by a detailed understanding of the attempts made to reduce international tensions during the 1920s (e.g. the Washington Naval Conference, Genoa Conference, the Dawes Plan, the Locarno Treaties, Kellogg-Briand Pact) together with focused and balanced analysis of their short- and long-term implications for reducing tensions. 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. Less successful responses wrote at length about the Treaty of Versailles.

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

**(a) Why was Stalin willing to sign a non-aggression pact with Germany in 1939?**

Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge of why Stalin was willing to sign the agreement in 1939. Often, the responses were characterised by detailed analysis of his motives, such as his need to buy time so he could prepare Soviet forces for the likely German attack and his calculation that the non-aggression pact offered him more than any agreement with Britain and France. Less successful responses described the terms of the Pact and/or set out Hitler's aims in signing the non-aggression pact.

**(b) To what extent was Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War dependent on the support he received from the Spanish army?**

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 Spanish army support, balanced against the significance of other reasons for his success, such as support from Germany and Italy, and 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.

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

**(a) Why did the Long March lead to an increase in support for the Chinese Communist Party?**

Good responses grasped the role that propaganda deployed by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) about the Long March had in increasing their support. Such responses often appreciated that the way the CCP conducted themselves during the march (e.g. Eight Points for Attention) gave some substance to this propaganda, especially when compared with the actions of the KMT government. Responses which were less successful tended to provide narrative/descriptive accounts of the Long March.

- (b) **‘Japan’s motives for following an aggressive foreign policy during the 1930s were economic rather than political.’ How far do you agree?**

The most successful responses were based on detailed understanding and analysis of a wider range of economic and political factors, such as Japan’s post-war economic depression, the growing disillusionment with democracy in Japan, the increasingly militaristic outlook of Japan and China’s political disunity. These responses were characterised by the development of fully focused and balanced arguments, leading to well-reasoned judgements based on appropriately selected evidence. Less focused responses struggled to differentiate between the economic and political motives behind Japan’s foreign policy, adopting a largely narrative approach and, as a result, lacked analytical depth.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/22**  
**Outline Study**

## Key messages

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 of the mark scheme it is necessary to give some indication of the significance of that factor to the event. At the very highest Level of the mark scheme it is necessary to make a comparative judgement about the relative importance of different factors.

In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.

Candidates could improve their responses by ensuring that they focus more on the question set and rather than providing a narrative of their body of knowledge on a given topic.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper, **Section A** questions being the most popular. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates could improve on sustaining 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 weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

**Part (a)** questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of actors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; some were too vague, were limited to generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

The most successful **Part (b)** responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. There is some evidence that candidates, faced with a very familiar topic, were not able to adapt their knowledge to the specific question asked in the paper. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the specific nature of the question set, 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; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by not considering timeframes given in the question).

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **Question 1**





**(a) Why did the Directory survive for four years?**

There were many good responses to this question. Better responses showed a clear understanding of where the Directory fitted into the progression of regimes during and after the French Revolution and were able to identify a number of appropriate causes for the duration of the Directory's rule. Some weaker responses concentrated too much on what had gone before whilst others devoted too much attention to the role of Napoleon.

**(b) To what extent was lower-class unrest the driving force of the Revolution from 1789 to 1794?**

Stronger responses were clear in identifying who they saw as being the 'lower-class'. Many candidates wrote clearly about what happened between 1789 and 1794, some in considerable detail. Stronger responses included an assessment of which aspects of the revolution could be linked specifically to the 'lower-classes', with the best responses able to offer some comment on the relative importance of this group.

**Question 2**

**(a) Why did changes in agriculture encourage industrialisation?**

Weaker responses simply highlighted various changes that constituted the agricultural revolution without really addressing the issue of how these 'affected industrialisation'. The best responses, whilst being aware of the changes and noting them, focused on the effects these reforms produced in the population in terms of availability of food for growing populations in towns, release of workers from agricultural responsibilities and other factors.

**(b) Assess the impact of technological change in the iron and steel industries in bringing about industrialisation. Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Detailed knowledge of the iron and steel industry was relatively sparse, but good answers demonstrated how the application of increasing quantities of high-quality iron and steel led to big steps forward in both industry itself, with better machines, and in transport, which fed the rise of industrialisation. Weaker responses wrote in general terms about the Industrial Revolution, often concentrating on transport for some reason. There was little evidence of knowledge of relevant developments in countries other than Great Britain seen.

**Question 3**

**(a) Why did Germany consider its alliance with Austria as so important?**

Many answers demonstrated a good understanding of the development of relations between the two countries after the unification of Germany in 1870, commenting on the successive policies of Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II and the significance of the Austrian alliance in pursuing those policies. Weaker responses tended to be more descriptive or concentrated on just one aspect of the relationship, often the role of the alliance in the outbreak of the First World War.

**(b) 'Austria must take the blame for causing the First World War.' How far do you agree?**

There were some thoughtful and well-balanced responses to this question that scored highly. These supplied a careful assessment of Austria's role in the July crisis and balanced this against a consideration of the role of the other major powers involved directly in the rising conflict, without going through a list of every country involved. The best answers provided a reasoned judgement about the extent of Austria's responsibility compared with other countries. Less successful was the approach that, whilst paying some attention to the part played by Austria, wrote more generally about the causes of the First World War, describing the role of each country in turn. Such responses did not meet some of the essential requirements of the mark scheme and did not score highly.

#### Question 4

**(a) Why did the Provisional Government become so unpopular?**

This question was generally well done, with the best responses providing a very thorough explanation of the failures of the Provisional Government often going far beyond what was required in terms of detail. Such answers could have been further improved by making a comparative judgement which is required to reach the highest level of the mark scheme. Weaker responses sometimes got confused about the chronology of events in 1917 and a few wrote about the fall of the Tsarist regime and thus missed the focus of the question.

**(b) 'Political incompetence, rather than poor social and economic conditions, led to the 1905 Revolution.' How far do you agree?**

Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the weaknesses of the Tsarist Government in 1905 and were able to write in some detail about policies and events that led to the 1905 Revolution. In better responses there was a clear attempt to differentiate between those factors that were due to political incompetence and those that stemmed from economic and social conditions. The strongest responses reach a reasoned judgement usually based on suggesting that a more competent administration could have done more to alleviate the economic and social difficulties. Weaker answers struggled to differentiate between the different causes and tended to list them. A few responses also incorporated events and actions that were a result, not a cause, of the 1905 Revolution and thus strayed beyond the requirements of the question.

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

#### Question 5

**(a) Why did the USA sign the Washington naval treaties?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**(b) How beneficial to the USA was the acquisition of Alaska in 1867?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

#### Question 6

**(a) Why was Radical Reconstruction introduced?**

The strongest answers focussed on the conflict between the Radical Republicans in Congress and President Johnson over the extent of civil rights for the freed slaves and the treatment of the South in general. Many answers wrote more generally about the legislation that followed the ending of the Civil War, recognising that there was conflict over which path to follow but without focussing on the specific issue of 'Radical Reconstruction'. Weaker answers often wrote about Lincoln's plans and some got very confused about who proposed what solutions.

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

There were some very thoughtful responses to this question exploring the subtleties of continuity and change throughout the period of the Civil War. Generally the idea of change was centred on the Emancipation Proclamation which effectively gave new purpose to the Northern forces in seeking to defeat the South. Continuity was provided by the idea that the aim of the North was always to re-integrate the South into the Union and that any changes in specific policies, like the increased prominence of the issue of slavery, did not change this underlying objective. The best responses saw the adoption of changes as a means to achieve the continuities. Weaker answers were often able to identify significant policies of the North towards the South during the Civil War, but did not contain analysis.

#### Question 7

**(a) Why was the Prohibition Amendment to the constitution passed in 1919?**



There were too few responses to provide comment.

- (b) **How important to the industrialisation of the USA in the later nineteenth century were the contributions of ‘robber barons’?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

#### Question 8

- (a) **Why was there a Great Crash in October 1929?**

Most candidates were able to identify several factors that contributed to the Great Crash of 1929. The difference between the stronger and weaker responses was the extent to which the significance of the factors was explained; for example, identifying ‘buying on the margin’ as a possible cause of problems provides part of the answer but explaining what it was and why it contributed to the Crash would take a response to a higher level. Weaker responses described what happened in October 1929 and included comment on what happened after the Crash as well as trying to identify causes but this gained no additional credit as it was outside the remit of the question.

- (b) **How far do you agree that Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal undermined the traditional values of the USA?**

Weaker responses were insecure in their knowledge of the New Deal and did not consider whether it had any significant implications for the ‘traditional values’ of the USA. The best responses worked from a consideration of what these traditional values might be and then examined the New Deal policies to try to establish which legislation might be considered to have been ‘undermining’ and which represented some sort of continuity. For example, Roosevelt’s clash with the Supreme Court could be argued to be symptomatic of a break with tradition but equally, measured against the whole, the number of actions that were judged unconstitutional was very few and so might be judged as not challenging traditional values

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

#### Question 9

- (a) **Why did Germany develop the Schlieffen Plan?**

The purpose of the Schlieffen Plan was quite specific and many candidates recognised this and provided a detailed explanation of exactly what the objective of the Plan was and why the German High Command thought it was necessary, scored well. Weaker responses were often still able to provide a reasonably detailed account of what the plan involved without fully connecting this with the intentions behind it other than the quick defeat of France. Some weaker responses got involved in describing how it led to the First World War and the involvement of Britain rather than why the Germans developed it.

- (b) **To what extent was the ‘Scramble for Africa’ caused by the development of nationalism in Europe?**

Most of the candidates who tackled this question were able to offer some reasons for the ‘Scramble for Africa’ and why it happened in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Stronger responses often began by considering the factor identified in the question and the role that played, before going on to identify and explain other factors like economic benefits, improved communications, medical advances etc. The best responses were able to differentiate between those factors that drove the ‘Scramble’ and those that merely facilitated it.

#### Question 10

- (a) **Why, in 1932–33, did the World Disarmament Conference take place?**

There were relatively few responses to this question and on the whole they offered only fairly general assertions about the desire not to repeat the horrors of the First World War. Some better answers did cover in some detail the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, including the

disarmament of Germany, that put the issue of disarmament in the public domain. Few candidates were able to offer any suggestions as to why it took until 1932 to organise this conference.

- (b) **'The problems which confronted the 'successor states' during the 1930s were caused by economic rather than political factors.' How far do you agree?**

The weakest responses struggled to offer a reasonable definition of who the successor states were. Better responses were able to identify the origins of the problems in the way in which these states were established, often with quite arbitrary borders, following the Versailles Settlement and link this to the way in which these problems were compounded by the Great Depression and the rise of extremist politics in the 1930's.

#### Question 11

- (a) **Why, by 1936, did many Spanish generals believe that military dictatorship was the only solution to Spain's problems?**

Some candidates coped effectively with this question identifying the causes of the increasing polarisation and disorder within Spanish politics from the beginning of the Republic to the outbreak of the Civil War. Weaker responses confused different groups and leaders and their intentions and this led, in some cases, to confused and ineffective responses which had identified significant details but not necessarily constructed an effective account around them.

- (b) **To what extent was Mussolini's foreign policy based on fear of Italy being isolated and vulnerable?**

Many candidates displayed a sound knowledge of the key features of Mussolini's foreign policy from 1923 to 1939 and many were aware that it is often divided by historians in two distinct phases around the year 1934. The best responses were able to use their knowledge to consider whether the policy was based on fear of isolation, and often saw the change in emphasis as a continuity of an underlying purpose linked either to a basic insecurity or to a longer-term objective that went beyond fear of isolation and was more concerned with making Italy powerful and feared by others.

#### Question 12

- (a) **Why did Japan attempt to increase its power and influence in eastern Asia in the period from 1931 to 1941?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

- (b) **'By 1935, the Kuomintang had achieved complete control over China.' How far do you agree?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/23**  
**Outline Study**

## Key messages

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 of the mark scheme it is necessary to give some indication of the significance of that factor to the event. At the very highest Level of the mark scheme it is necessary to make a comparative judgement about the relative importance of different factors.

In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.

Candidates could improve their responses by ensuring that they focus more on the question set and rather than providing a narrative of their body of knowledge on a given topic.

## General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper, **Section A** questions being the most popular. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates could improve on sustaining 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 weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

**Part (a)** questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of actors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; some were too vague, were limited to generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

The most successful **Part (b)** responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. There is some evidence that candidates, faced with a very familiar topic, were not able to adapt their knowledge to the specific question asked in the paper. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the specific nature of the question set, 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; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by not considering timeframes given in the question).

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **Question 1**



**(a) Why did Napoleon face so little opposition to his rule in France?**

Most candidates were able to identify several factors that helped Napoleon maintain his power and the main discriminator was how well this knowledge was used. The best responses provided a clear and concise explanation of the role of several factors, like the Code Napoleon, adoption of some of the key ideas of the Revolution and use of censorship and rewards to maintain support. Few responses went further than this in reaching a comparative judgement about the significance of different factors.

**(b) 'The Directory successfully restored order to France.' How far do you agree?**

Candidates who were able to identify success and failures of the Directory were able to produce solid response to this question. The best responses discriminated effectively between short term success and longer-term failures, for example using the army to quell potential revolts but failing to build a solid support base for this new form of government. Weaker answers wrote extensively about what went before but showed only limited understanding of the work of the Directory, whilst others focused too much on the role of Napoleon.

**Question 2**

**(a) Why did governments start to regulate industry?**

Insufficient responses for meaningful comment.

**(b) Assess the impact of the Industrial Revolution on the higher/upper classes. Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Insufficient responses for meaningful comment.

**Question 3**

**(a) Why was there an arms race in the years before 1914?**

The strongest responses provided a solid overview of a range of policies of the major European powers and the developments and plans they put in place in the years before 1914. Weaker answers often interpreted 'arms race' as simply meaning the Anglo-German Naval Race and wrote only about this. Even if well done this was an incomplete answer as it did not consider a range of factors, and was thus limited in the maximum marks it could achieve.

**(b) 'It was the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia that was the critical factor in bringing about the outbreak of war.' How far do you agree?**

Weaker answers contained a list of causes of the First World War, often paying scant attention to the issue of Austrian responsibility. Better responses often began with a consideration of actions by Austria that had long- or short-term consequences in terms of causing the war. For example, consideration of the whole situation in the Balkans provided useful background to Austrian actions in July 1914. Successful responses took this approach and then compared Austrian responsibility with that of other key players without necessarily going through a list of why every country joined in the war.

**Question 4**

**(a) Why did the Duma achieve little before 1914?**

Most candidates were able to identify the Tsar's attitude as a basic problem, but this was sometimes a general assertion with little evidence to support it. Weaker answers produced little else in the way of reasons though they were often able to describe the work of the different Dumas, with varying degrees of detail, to show why their achievements were limited. Some responses also strayed beyond the focus of the question and wrote about events in 1917. Stronger responses identified and explained a number of other factors that influenced the effectiveness of the Dumas like lack of experience, division between different groups etc.

**(b) How far was Kerensky responsible for the collapse of the Provisional Government?**

Many candidates produced well-constructed answers. These tended to follow a clear pattern of identifying Kerensky's mistakes/failures and setting these against a number of alternatives that caused the fall of the Provisional Government. These might include something as simple as the fact that it was never intended to be a permanent government, but most went well beyond this to look at the broader issues and problems facing the Provisional Government including the rise and influence of Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Good answers were often able to link these to Kerensky's problems and assess relative importance. Weaker answers included generic information about the Provisional Government and did not address the focus of the question.

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

**Question 5**

**(a) Why did the USA gain special rights over Cuba after 1898?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**(b) Assess the impact of America's involvement in the First World War on its relations with Europe in the 1920s.**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**Question 6**

**(a) Why did the North remain politically divided during the Civil War?**

There were some good responses to this question which looked in some detail at the various divisions that existed and the groups that opposed the War and used these to provide a clear explanation of the persistence of divisions throughout the War. Some candidates, however, had a poor grasp of basic details and simply wrote about Lincoln and the problems he faced. Weaker responses compared divisions in the North with the South which did not address this question.

**(b) How consistent were the policies of Reconstruction in the period from 1865 to 1877?**

The best responses showed a clear grasp of the difference between the principles of Reconstruction as embodied in key legislation, and the practice of Reconstruction as experienced by the various communities of the South between 1865 and 1877. Weaker responses often wrote about the struggles between Congress and President over the nature of reconstruction immediately after the Civil War. Such responses showed little awareness of the continuation of reconstruction through the presidency of Grant and provided no explanation for the ending of reconstruction in 1877.

**Question 7**

**(a) Why was a federal income tax introduced in 1913?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**(b) 'Economic benefits, social problems.' How accurately does this summarise the main consequences of mass immigration in the later nineteenth century?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**Question 8**

**(a) Why were the 1920s a time of political stability?**

Most candidates were able to identify and explain at least one relevant factor, usually based on the economic prosperity of the period, and better responses identified and explained several other factors, including republican domination of the presidency and international peace. The strongest responses then considered their relative importance.

**(b) 'More improvised than planned.' How valid is this judgement on the New Deal?**

Many candidates simply wrote a description of the New Deal with differing amounts of detail. Stronger responses made relevant comments about what was planned and what was improvised in the New Deal and the best responses reached a judgement on this, though not always sufficiently supported about whether it was 'more improvised than planned'.

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

**Question 9**

**(a) Why did Bismarck establish the Dreikaiserbund in 1873?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**(b) How far did Kaiser Wilhelm II maintain Bismarck's foreign policies?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

**Question 10**

**(a) Why did the USA move back towards a policy of isolationism after the First World War?**

Most answers to this question demonstrated a good level of understanding of the position of the US in the aftermath of the First World War. Stronger responses identified several factors beginning with the deep divisions in the USA over involvement in the war in the first place and going on to rejection of the Treaty of Versailles by Congress and the political climate in the country in the 1920's.

**(b) How consistent was the French government's attitude towards Germany in the period from 1919 to 1933?**

The best answers showed a good understanding of the period were able to successfully negotiate to the issue of consistent or inconsistent. The Treaty of Versailles was often a starting point and was explained in some detail by almost all candidates. Good responses were able to identify ways in which the French attitude towards the Germans at Versailles was reflected in its policies throughout the next 14 years. The best answers were also able to demonstrate ways in which the French attitude changed and commented on how short or long term such changes in attitude were.

**Question 11**

**(a) Why, in September 1938, was the Munich Conference held?**

Most candidates were aware of some reasons for the Munich Conference and were able to give details of the issue of the Sudetenland. Better responses gave some insight into the intentions and expectations of the main participants in the Conference. A few weaker answers focused more on the outcome of the conference rather than the reasons for holding it.

**(b) 'Britain adopted appeasement as a response to the shortcomings of the Treaty of Versailles.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates made a good attempt explaining the two alternative positions i.e. that the problems of Versailles were the main reason for appeasement, or that other factors were significant and cumulatively outweighed the importance of Versailles, though achieving a balanced response proved difficult for some. Weaker answers described the events of the 1930's.

**Question 12**

**(a) Why, in the period from 1926 to 1928, was the Kuomintang able to reduce the power of the warlords?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.



- (b) **To what extent were the aims of the Kuomintang similar to those of the May the Fourth Movement?**

There were too few responses to provide comment.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- Stronger answers were concise and focused on the extract.
- Writing about the context is only valid if it helps to explain the historian's interpretation.
- The best responses demonstrated how they used the extract to infer the historian's interpretation.
- The interpretation will be valid for the extract as a whole. The best answers treat the extract as a whole, rather than working through it paragraph by paragraph.

## General comments

Before starting to write an answer, candidates are encouraged to take time to read through the extract, identify the main points of the interpretation and plan how these can best be illustrated by evidence selected from the extract. In order to achieve this, candidates need to be concise and be focused on the significant points of the extract without writing at length about less central aspects.

When dealing with the nature of the interpretation, the strongest responses understood that it will be applicable to the extract as a whole. They were not distracted by elements of the extract that appear to contradict the interpretation, but explained how these elements are being used by the historian to make specific points. They appreciated the nature of the claims being made by the historian, considered the importance of distinctions and qualifications that the historian makes in her/his argument, and reached sound conclusions about the interpretation based on what the extract says. They carefully selected the elements from the extract which best helped to illustrate and explain the interpretation.

Weaker answers often adopted a paragraph by paragraph approach to the extract, and often argued that the extract showed that the historian had multiple, often contradictory, interpretations. Taking phrases and details in isolation may give an entirely wrong impression about the interpretation presented by the extract when taken as a whole. This approach makes it very hard for candidates to determine the relative significance of different points in the historian's argument, leading to an answer that often contains logical inconsistencies. Such inconsistencies can undermine the coherence of the answer and therefore demonstrate only a limited understanding of the interpretation.

Better responses focused on the historian, rather than on repeating the extract. With the question asking what can be learnt about the interpretation and approach of the historian from the extract, it is important that candidates infer the interpretation and then use details of the extract to explain how their inferences can be supported.

## Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that whilst white women did indeed help to undermine the stability of the Empire (i.e. through their educational work); this was not in the manner that has traditionally been argued. The best answers recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Weaker responses saw the extract as being about gender and empire, but did not accurately explain how. Weaker answers paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Empire with no reference to the extract.

**Section B: The Holocaust**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that by late 1941, Hitler had taken a decision to radicalise policy against the Jews, but that functionaries like Himmler were left to decide exactly how this would be carried out. The best answers recognised both the aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many candidates tried to argue that the interpretation was functionalist, but a significant obstacle to this was the fact that the extract included no contingent factors, most notably the war itself. Others saw it as structuralist, but there was nothing on a 'weak Fuhrer' and competing functionaries to base this on. The strongest responses took the approach of seeing the interpretation as intentionalist, putting Hitler at the centre of the decision to radicalise, and initiating the intensification of policy, although seeing it as a synthesis of intentionalist and structuralist elements also was acceptable. Weaker answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

**Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the Truman Doctrine was misconceived, and that Truman/the United States can therefore be blamed for worsening Cold War tensions. The best answers recognised both the aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The overall approach in the extract was revisionist, yet many less successful responses were deflected from this conclusion by their reading of the first paragraph, which stated that the United States had the right to resist the spread of Communism. This was a good example of where the paragraph-by-paragraph approach could prove misleading, since the historian's overall point was not that *any action* against the Communists would be wrong, but that the *particular action* chosen by the United States was wrong. By not detecting this distinction, many candidates struggled to reconcile what they saw as the traditional approach of the first part of the extract with the obvious criticism of the United States in the second. This produced some conclusions that the interpretation was post-revisionist in nature, but this was not persuasive. The Weaker answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- Stronger answers were concise and focused on the extract.
- Writing about the context is only valid if it helps to explain the historian's interpretation.
- The best responses demonstrated how they used the extract to infer the historian's interpretation.
- The interpretation will be valid for the extract as a whole. The best answers treat the extract as a whole, rather than working through it paragraph by paragraph.

## General comments

Before starting to write an answer, candidates are encouraged to take time to read through the extract, identify the main points of the interpretation and plan how these can best be illustrated by evidence selected from the extract. In order to achieve this, candidates need to be concise and be focused on the significant points of the extract without writing at length about less central aspects.

When dealing with the nature of the interpretation, the strongest responses understood that it will be applicable to the extract as a whole. They were not distracted by elements of the extract that appear to contradict the interpretation, but explained how these elements are being used by the historian to make specific points. They appreciated the nature of the claims being made by the historian, considered the importance of distinctions and qualifications that the historian makes in her/his argument, and reached sound conclusions about the interpretation based on what the extract says. They carefully selected the elements from the extract which best helped to illustrate and explain the interpretation.

Weaker answers often adopted a paragraph by paragraph approach to the extract, and often argued that the extract showed that the historian had multiple, often contradictory, interpretations. Taking phrases and details in isolation may give an entirely wrong impression about the interpretation presented by the extract when taken as a whole. This approach makes it very hard for candidates to determine the relative significance of different points in the historian's argument, leading to an answer that often contains logical inconsistencies. Such inconsistencies can undermine the coherence of the answer and therefore demonstrate only a limited understanding of the interpretation.

Better responses focused on the historian, rather than on repeating the extract. With the question asking what can be learnt about the interpretation and approach of the historian from the extract, it is important that candidates infer the interpretation and then use details of the extract to explain how their inferences can be supported.

## Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the major motive for the expansion of empire was trade, and that this remained the case even with the Scramble for Africa. The best answers recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. They saw that a focus on trade went along with a preference for informal empire, and that the fact that only a small proportion of trade was ever with Africa is not an argument in itself against the importance of the hope of more trade as a motivation. Less successful responses wrote generally about economic interpretations of empire without explaining the specific arguments of the extract. Weaker answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Empire with no reference to the extract.

**Section B: The Holocaust**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the Holocaust emerged from the failure of war in Russia, with Himmler improvising the Final Solution using elements of the 'lightning victory' plan. The best answers recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. They understood the argument that the Final Solution that Himmler engineered was a response to circumstances, and that this marked the interpretation out as having a strong functionalist element. The extract did not deny the importance of Hitler, so it was certainly also possible to argue for a synthesis, but it was crucial to see the centrality of circumstance in the interpretation. Weaker answers often saw that war was important, but did not see that this historian was focusing on the failure of Barbarossa as stimulating changes to Jewish policy. Weaker answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

**Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the Soviet Union was following an expansionist policy, which the United States had no choice but to resist, and that this explains the introduction of the Containment policy. The best answers recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian's approach was traditional in character, but answers that argued for a post-post-revisionist approach were also acceptable. There was plenty of loaded language throughout the extract which could be used to support the interpretation. The best answers made clear the 'Soviet action – US reaction' structure of the argument, which served both to blame the Soviets and exonerate the United States. Weaker answers tended to spot only the blame placed on the Soviet Union or the exoneration of the United States. Other weaker answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

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

## **Key messages**

- Stronger answers were concise and focused on the extract.
- Writing about the context is only valid if it helps to explain the historian's interpretation.
- The best responses demonstrated how they used the extract to infer the historian's interpretation.
- The interpretation will be valid for the extract as a whole. The best answers treat the extract as a whole, rather than working through it paragraph by paragraph.

## **General comments**

Before starting to write an answer, candidates are encouraged to take time to read through the extract, identify the main points of the interpretation and plan how these can best be illustrated by evidence selected from the extract. In order to achieve this, candidates need to be concise and be focused on the significant points of the extract without writing at length about less central aspects.

When dealing with the nature of the interpretation, the strongest responses understood that it will be applicable to the extract as a whole. They were not distracted by elements of the extract that appear to contradict the interpretation, but explained how these elements are being used by the historian to make specific points. They appreciated the nature of the claims being made by the historian, considered the importance of distinctions and qualifications that the historian makes in her/his argument, and reached sound conclusions about the interpretation based on what the extract says. They carefully selected the elements from the extract which best helped to illustrate and explain the interpretation.

Weaker answers often adopted a paragraph by paragraph approach to the extract, and often argued that the extract showed that the historian had multiple, often contradictory, interpretations. Taking phrases and details in isolation may give an entirely wrong impression about the interpretation presented by the extract when taken as a whole. This approach makes it very hard for candidates to determine the relative significance of different points in the historian's argument, leading to an answer that often contains logical inconsistencies. Such inconsistencies can undermine the coherence of the answer and therefore demonstrate only a limited understanding of the interpretation.

Better responses focused on the historian, rather than on repeating the extract. With the question asking what can be learnt about the interpretation and approach of the historian from the extract, it is important that candidates infer the interpretation and then use details of the extract to explain how their inferences can be supported.

## **Comments on specific questions**

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that imperial policy was determined at the metropole by government ministers, and that their sole concern in taking part in the 'Scramble for Africa' was maintaining the security of routes to the East. The best answers recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Weaker answers focused on less central aspects of the extract, such as the lack of enthusiasm in Britain for acquiring a formal empire in Africa. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Empire with no reference to the extract.

**Section B: The Holocaust**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that in pre-war Germany, Jewish women were better able than Jewish men to understand and respond to increasing persecution, but that gender in the end made no difference to their ultimate fate. The best answers recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. By looking at different aspects of the lives of Jews, the historian illustrated how women could perceive what was happening more clearly than men. Moderate responses could not detect this comparative dimension to the interpretation, and described the differences between men and women, with no comment on their significance. As noted in previous Examiner Reports, when extracts have dealt with the Jewish experience of the Holocaust, weaker responses are often characterised by attempts to apply a causation label to the interpretation. This indicated a lack of understanding. Another feature of weaker answers was to claim that the interpretation showed that the Allies were to blame for the Holocaust for failing to receive more refugees, which was not stated within the extract. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

**Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that in the immediate post-war period the United States was willing to accept Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, but that in following Atlantic Charter principles, they unwittingly provoked Soviet hostility. The best answers recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many candidates understood aspects of the interpretation, but struggled to explain the nuances of the argument. In particular there was a tendency to place too much blame on the United States, usually for their failure to communicate effectively. In fact, the historian was fairly sympathetic, stressing that there was no intention from the United States to cause problems. Their weakness was their naivety in assuming that the Soviets shared the same security interests. They could have done more to reach a compromise, but they were simply unprepared. This was hardly a classic revisionist interpretation, and many of the more successful answers saw it more as post-revisionist, arguing that nobody was really to blame, and that hostility was the result of misunderstanding. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

## HISTORY

---

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

### Key messages

- It is important that candidates focus on the specific nature of the question set.
- The strongest responses develop a clear case from the outset.
- It is important to ensure that there is relevant and accurate detail provided to support the points made. Assertive responses can only be awarded marks in the lower Levels.
- For questions that ask, 'how far?' or 'to what extent?', the strongest responses justify their perspective.

### General comments

Stronger responses included not only a range of factual information, but also a good quality of thought and analysis. The information deployed showed a depth of understanding and was both accurate and relevant, supporting valid ideas. These responses, often showing evidence of careful planning, started with a clear answer and demonstrated an awareness of the 'other side' of the debate.

Less successful responses often gave the views of historians on a given subject, but not the candidates' own view. These responses also did not clearly address what the question was asking. The weakest answers listed, using bullet points in some cases, the cases for and against a hypothesis without giving an answer to the question. This was particularly prevalent in responses for **Depth Study 3**. Weaker conclusions were often limited to a single sentence at the end, suggesting that one side might be stronger than the other, but without any reasons for this view being given.

### Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 'Lenin abandoned all his communist ideals in order to retain power.' How far do you agree?**

The best answers invariably contained two elements, the first being a clear picture of what communist ideals (and not policies) might consist of, and the second keeping the focus firmly on the retention of power. Many stressed that the NEP was only intended as a purely temporary measure and that many key aspects of a communist state continued and were further developed in the period to 1924. There were a large number of very descriptive answers with a lot of detail on War Communism, the NEP and the use of terror, but they often did not relate this information the actual question.

#### **2 To what extent was Mussolini himself responsible for the rise of fascism in Italy?**

This question produced a large number of responses which focused primarily on the rise of Mussolini to power and had limited coverage of fascism. The best responses kept the focus firmly on fascism and did not just confine the answer to the period 1919 to 1922, but carried on after



Mussolini's arrival into power looking at the implications of Acerbo and one-party rule (which Mussolini was actually pushed into by the party). Good responses were aware of the appeal of fascism was strong with a range of elites, such as the Church hierarchy and the major manufacturers and mentioned that a key factor in the rise of the ideology came from Mussolini's switch from socialism to an anti-socialist policy.

**3 How far was Stalin's rise to power in Russia dependent on his skilful planning?**

The better answers dealt well with the aspect of how much was good planning and how much was just sheer opportunism and luck. Many made a very good case 'for' Stalin's planning, looking at his use of his position as General Secretary and other bureaucratic roles he obtained, his posing as Lenin's true heir at the funeral, the suppression of the Testament, his ability to isolate Trotsky and the careful switching of sides to eliminate opponents. There was very good identification of other factors which played a part, such as the underestimation of Stalin by other leading Bolsheviks, Lenin's incapacity and his failure to carefully think through the whole issue of the succession. Weaker responses tended to either give a simple narrative of events between 1924 and 1929, or just lay out a case for and against the role of planning without coming to any conclusion.

**4 'Brilliant propaganda and effective indoctrination.' How far do these factors explain Hitler's domination of Germany after 1933?**

The responses kept a focus firmly on the period after 1933 and did not go into a lot of detail on his rise to power. Most responses simply agreed with the hypothesis and then added a little on the use of terror as a balance. The tendency was to just maintain that all the propaganda was effective and that indoctrination was also important, without really explaining how and why. The best responses looked not only at his political methods, such as the technically legitimate nature of his arrival into power, the elimination of other parties, combining the presidency and the chancellorship and the support of the army/civil service/judiciary, but also at the foreign policy successes and the reduction of unemployment. The weakest responses did not notice that the question said 'after' 1933 and only dealt with 1933.

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

**5 How far do you agree that, by 1960, the Civil Rights Movement had achieved little?**

Most responses were very descriptive and had a focus on events after 1960. There was an awareness that some aspects of the Movement were potentially important, such as the key rulings of the Warren Court and Eisenhower's use of federal troops, as well as cases such as Rosa Parks, but weaker responses were characterised by a reluctance to suggest whether they were achievements or not.

**6 How far did President Johnson's domestic policies help to unite the American people?**

While there were some reasonably accurate descriptions of Johnson's various 'Great Society' programmes, there were no responses which considered their impact on the American people.

**7 How far did President Reagan achieve the goal of 'a growing economy that provides equal opportunities for all Americans', as he declared in his first inaugural address?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**8 'It aimed to further US economic interests rather than contain the USSR.' How valid is this assessment of American foreign policy in the late 1940s?**

Good responses showed knowledge of the containment and rollback policies of the United States. Weaker responses did not show an awareness of what US economic interests were, and thus did not address the argument within the question.

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

**9 How real was the threat of nuclear war in the period from 1950 to 1975?**

The better responses carefully considered the term ‘real’ within their answers. Weaker responses were limited to a narrative of the Cold War in the period (often straying back to 1945 or on into the 1980s) and did not answer the question. Candidates demonstrated a good level of knowledge of the Missile Crisis, but often no comment as to whether this was a ‘real’ threat or not. Some wrote in depth about ‘MAD’, but again did not comment on whether this raised or lessened the threat of war itself. Such responses could have been improved by a discussion of the genuine fear that many felt about the possibility of an attack or indeed one brought about by accident.

**10 ‘The US Senate’s failure to ratify SALT II resulted from the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.’ How far do you agree?**

Better responses went back to Helsinki and went into some detail about the role of the Soviet Union in the developing world. There was also good discussion about the growing awareness of the cynicism with which many of the Accords were treated in the Soviet Union as well. The United States was recovering from Vietnam and no longer feeling the need for détente. Weaker responses tended to focus primarily on Afghanistan and spend too much time on Reagan and events well after the failure to ratify.

**11 To what extent was the Great Leap Forward responsible for the famine suffered by China in the period from 1959 to 1961?**

The best responses were able to balance factors such as the targets and bad weather with other factors such as the infamous backyard furnaces and the lack of sensible scientific knowledge and ‘sparrowcide’. A willingness to address the word ‘extent’ together with accurate in-depth knowledge led to good responses.

**12 To what extent were Arab states justified in blaming Anglo–French imperialism for the outbreak of the Suez War?**

Many responses to this question did not include a judgement on the extent to which it was just Anglo-French imperialism which led to the war. The weakest responses were descriptive answers that followed the format of agreeing and disagreeing with the question and ignored the ‘extent’ and ‘justified’ parts of the question.

***Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991***

**13 Assess the reasons why the attitudes of colonial authorities towards the devolution of political power in Africa varied so much after 1945.**

The best responses considered two or three different colonial powers, usually the British and French, but Belgium and Portugal could appear as well, and covered their dealings with their colonies in all parts of Africa. Weaker responses confined their focus on a single country, usually Britain, and had limited depth.

**14 Analyse the reasons why there were so many military coups in post-independence Africa.**



Some excellent responses were seen which looked at a variety of examples in different countries and really tried to analyse the various reasons why coups occurred. Weaker responses tended to suggest some generalised theories without any examples or factual support.

**15 Assess the impact of independence on African literature.**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**16 How successful was the OAU in conflict resolution in Africa in the period to 1991?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

***Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–1990s***

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

## HISTORY

---

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

### Key messages

- It is important that candidates focus on the specific nature of the question set.
- The strongest responses develop a clear case from the outset.
- It is important to ensure that there is relevant and accurate detail provided to support the points made. Assertive responses can only be awarded marks in the lower Levels.
- For questions that ask, 'how far?' or 'to what extent?', the strongest responses justify their perspective.

### General comments

Stronger responses included not only a range of factual information, but also a good quality of thought and analysis. The information deployed showed a depth of understanding and was both accurate and relevant, supporting valid ideas. These responses, often showing evidence of careful planning, started with a clear answer and demonstrated an awareness of the 'other side' of the debate.

Less successful responses often gave the views of historians on a given subject, but not the candidates' own view. These responses also did not clearly address what the question was asking. The weakest answers listed, using bullet points in some cases, the cases for and against a hypothesis without giving an answer to the question. This was particularly prevalent in responses for **Depth Study 3**. Weaker conclusions were often limited to a single sentence at the end, suggesting that one side might be stronger than the other, but without any reasons for this view being given.

### Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 To what extent had the New Economic Policy solved Russia's economic problems by 1924?**

The best responses assessed the nature and extent of Russia's economic problems after the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917, rather than adopting the approach that War Communism failed and therefore the NEP was bound to be better. Many good responses emphasised the essentially temporary nature of the NEP while at the same time stressing the growth of economic inequality with the NEPmen and kulaks. Some responses included detail on the 'scissors' crisis, but few were able to explain why it was relevant in any way.

#### **2 How far do you agree that Mussolini achieved little of significance after 1924?**

The best responses kept focus firmly on the 'after 1924' part of the question while at the same time thinking carefully about what might be seen of significance in his tenure of power. Some argued successfully that staying in power and achieving a degree of political, social and economic stability was a significant achievement in the late 1920s and 30s, while at the same time achieving some

success in his foreign policy. Weaker responses were limited to describing the various ‘battles’ with little or no comment on whether they could be seen as significant or otherwise.

### **3 How far did Stalin’s social policies benefit women?**

Many responses were limited to describing Stalin’s economic policies and suggested that they might have some consequences for women. Better responses looked at the changes in attitude towards women that started under Lenin, and how they changed under Stalin, mainly for the worse. Some responses considered Stalin’s other social and economic policies and how they might have affected women, but the focus was too often on just collectivisation and industrialisation.

### **4 Hitler’s control over Germany was based largely on popular support.’ How far do you agree?**

Few answers included analysis of the nature and extent of popular support for Hitler and his regime and the focus tended to be on a mix of terror and propaganda explaining why he was supported. The better responses analysed his electoral successes, the popularity of his successful foreign policy (to 1940 at least) and the arrival of full employment as factors which also helped the degree of support attained. In weaker responses there was often a great deal of description of the White Rose/Edelweiss Pirates opposition, without really explaining why this was relevant.

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

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

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

### **9 Compare and contrast the strategies used by Presidents Johnson and Nixon in their handling of the Vietnam War.**

Stronger responses kept their focus firmly on the strategies adopted by the two presidents and avoided a discussion of either the causes of American involvement or getting into too much detail of the tactics. Weaker responses adopted a rather list-like approach, describing in some detail what each president did, but avoided any attempt to compare and contrast, or just ended with a comment that they ‘were different’.

### **10 To what extent was the rise of neo-conservatism in the USA responsible for the onset of the ‘Second Cold War’?**

This question tended to produce quite a large number of lists. The first describing why the Soviet Union could be seen as responsible and the second why it was the fault of the United States. Few adopted an analytical approach and really tried to deal with the issue of ‘extent’, and there was also limited knowledge about actually what ‘neo-conservatism’ was. Stronger responses argued that there were faults on both sides, as well as other factors such as the influence of Margaret Thatcher. These answers also assessed the ‘extent’ part of the question.

### **11 ‘His achievements far outweighed his mistakes.’ How far do you agree with this assessment of Mao Zedong?**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

### **12 Analyse the causes of the Gulf War (1990–91).**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

#### ***Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991***



There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

***Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–1990s***

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

## HISTORY

---

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

### Key messages

- It is important that candidates focus on the specific nature of the question set.
- The strongest responses develop a clear case from the outset.
- It is important to ensure that there is relevant and accurate detail provided to support the points made. Assertive responses can only be awarded marks in the lower Levels.
- For questions that ask, 'how far?' or 'to what extent?', the strongest responses justify their perspective.

### General comments

Stronger responses included not only a range of factual information, but also a good quality of thought and analysis. The information deployed showed a depth of understanding and was both accurate and relevant, supporting valid ideas. These responses, often showing evidence of careful planning, started with a clear answer and demonstrated an awareness of the 'other side' of the debate.

Less successful responses often gave the views of historians on a given subject, but not the candidates' own view. These responses also did not clearly address what the question was asking. The weakest answers listed, using bullet points in some cases, the cases for and against a hypothesis without giving an answer to the question. This was particularly prevalent in responses for **Depth Study 3**. Weaker conclusions were often limited to a single sentence at the end, suggesting that one side might be stronger than the other, but without any reasons for this view being given.

### Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 'The Reds had the better military leadership.' To what extent does this explain the outcome of the Civil War in Russia?**

Stronger responses included good in-depth knowledge of the leadership of the Reds, particularly Trotsky's strategy and tactics, as well as a sound grasp of the failings of the various White leaders. They also were able to balance the military leadership of both sides against a range of other factors, ranging from Lenin's decision-making ability and the effectiveness of War Communism to the geographical advantages that the Bolsheviks possessed. Weaker responses tended to list the factors which led to the Red victory, with limited or no analysis and little knowledge of actual leadership on either side.

#### **2 'Propaganda is more important than repression in explaining Mussolini's long tenure of power in Italy.' How far do you agree?**

Weaker responses tended to write either about Mussolini's rise to power or were limited to listing what he did when in power. Many responses included a lot of detail on the various 'Battles' with no

attempt to link this to the question. These responses could have been included by keeping the focus firmly on why and how he was able stay in power. The best responses analysed how Mussolini balanced his own skills, his use of propaganda and repression, against the failings of actual or potential opponents and the degree of support he gained from the various elites in Italy.

**3 'The main reason for the purges was to remove Stalin's rivals for power.' How far do you agree?**

There were some excellent responses which kept their focus firmly on the reasons for the purges and did not get too involved in the process and results. Candidates also demonstrated an awareness of current thinking and the various ideas emerging from since 1990 from various Russian historians. There tended to be a lot of material on removing rivals, but less on the Yezhovshchina and the idea of keeping the population under control. There were some excellent arguments on how the purges were used to control the economy and the military.

**4 How successful were the Nazis in imposing their ideas on the German people?**

Differentiating clearly between ideas and policies was a feature of the strongest responses. There tended to be a great deal of description of what the Nazis actually did, with a large emphasis on their anti-Semitic policies. Weaker responses could have been improved by including more analysis on the degree of success.

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

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

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

**9 'An example of the containment policy in action.' How valid is this assessment of American involvement in the Korean War?**

There were some very good responses to this question, with some impressive 'containment v rollback' arguments. These responses effectively challenged the assessment within the question and produce a developed argument. Weaker responses provided lists of facts supporting the two arguments, but did not include an answer to the question or analysis of it.

**10 To what extent was Gorbachev's decision to end the Brezhnev Doctrine responsible for the collapse of the Soviet Union?**

Many candidates kept their answers firmly on the collapse of the Soviet Union and did not stray into the debate on the ending of the Cold War. There tended to be a good grasp of why the Soviet Union fell and what Gorbachev's role was in it, as well as all the many other factors involved. There was often very good detail seen on both the Brezhnev Doctrine and the longer-term issues affecting the Soviet economy.

**11 Analyse Mao Zedong's motives for establishing the Hundred Flowers Campaign.**

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

**12 'The Suez War was the result of Western fears that Egypt was coming under communist influence.' How far do you agree?**

Few responses were seen, but they tended to be of high quality. Stronger answers included careful analysis and focus on the question set, they made a clear case from the outset and then developed it well supporting the argument with relevant detailed knowledge. Evidence used included the motives for involvement by the British, French and Israelis were well known.



***Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991***

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.

***Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–1990s***

There were too few responses to make any general comment appropriate.