



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9489/31

Paper 3 Interpretations Question

May/June 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **5** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p data-bbox="316 248 799 282">The Origins of the First World War</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 655 349">Interpretation/Approach</p> <p data-bbox="316 383 1278 450">The Key Question to be addressed is ‘Who (or what) was to blame for the First World War?’</p> <p data-bbox="316 483 1310 853">The main interpretation is <u>that if you want to explain why the war occurred when and how it did, then you have to focus on individual responsibility. Other factors can only explain why war was possible in 1914, not why it actually happened.</u> Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. The historian believes that a general explanation of the causation of the First World War encompassing a wide range of different factors can be advanced but would ultimately be lost in the sheer size of the question. Broad social and economic developments can explain the likelihood of war, but not its actual occurrence, which would be a matter of individual responsibility. This is an interpretation about the difficulty of providing satisfactory explanations for complex events.</p> <p data-bbox="316 887 1294 1189"><u>Glossary:</u> Early post First World War interpretations tended to blame Germany, but quickly a reaction against this occurred, with a variety of interpretations blaming other nations. This may be termed revisionism. The turning point in the historiography was Fischer’s work of the early 1960s which went back to blaming Germany – sometimes known as anti-revisionism. Since then, there has been a vast variety of interpretations, looking at the importance of culture, individuals, contingent factors etc, with no clear consensus, though most historians would still place a significant burden of responsibility on Germany.</p>	40

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>The Holocaust</p> <p>Interpretation/Approach</p> <p>The Key Question to be addressed is ‘Why did the Holocaust occur?’</p> <p>The main interpretation is <u>that there was no original intention to exterminate the Jews, but that under the circumstances of war Hitler took the decision as a means of implicating the entire German people in the crime</u> (the idea of ‘implicating’ is essential – not just uniting the German people in the war effort). Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. The historian’s argument is that once it became apparent that the war would not be over quickly, Hitler took the opportunity to mobilise the German nation by authorising genocide. This clearly cannot be seen as intentionalist, since it argues that the decision for genocide was brought about by a particular set of circumstances. The only label that can work effectively at L5/L6 is therefore functionalism. Arguments for a synthesis which explain the functionalism of one/both elements of the main interpretation will be L4. Opting for intentionalism or structuralism alone would be ignoring too much and could not be better than L3.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> Candidates may use some/all of the following terms: <i>Intentionalism</i> – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start. <i>Structuralism</i> - interpretations which argue that it was the nature of the Nazi state that produced genocide. There was no coherent plan but the chaotic competition for Hitler’s approval between different elements of the leadership produced a situation in which genocide could occur. <i>Functionalism</i> sees the Holocaust as an unplanned, ad hoc response to wartime developments in Eastern Europe, when Germany conquered areas with large Jewish populations. Candidates may also refer to <i>synthesis</i> interpretations, i.e., interpretations which show characteristics of more than one of the above. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.</p>	40

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p data-bbox="316 248 963 282">The Origins and Development of the Cold War</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 655 349">Interpretation/Approach</p> <p data-bbox="316 383 1278 450">The Key Question to be addressed is ‘Who (or what) was to blame for the Cold War?’</p> <p data-bbox="316 483 1310 987">The main interpretation is <u>that American policy deliberately risked the breakdown of relations with the Soviets, but that Stalin’s reaction, whilst understandable, was an over-reaction.</u> Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. There is an element of blame that is placed on both sides, though the interpretation makes it clear that the Americans initiated the process. By implication, this puts a greater share of blame on them. However, this is not a typical revisionist interpretation that would exonerate Stalin. Rather it would be more plausible to see this as a post-revisionist who allocates some blame to both sides. This is the only label that will be able to reach L6, though the answer must address more to blame/less to blame. A revisionist argument, based on the first element of the interpretation, would be acceptable at L5. Arguing that both sides were to blame (i.e. post-revisionist), but missing the comparative dimension, would be L4. Seeing Stalin as taking most blame, or being only to blame, will be misunderstanding and be worth L3 at best.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1021 1310 1155">There will be many answers that argue both sides were to blame (i.e., post-revisionist) but lack proper support from the extract OR reach unsupportable conclusions based on inevitability, mutual misunderstanding, nobody to blame etc. These will be L3 if they show some use of the extract.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1189 1310 1615"><u>Glossary:</u> <i>Traditional/Orthodox</i> interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after the Second World War. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin’s expansionism for the Cold War. <i>Revisionist</i> historians challenged this view and shifted more of the focus onto the United States, generally through an economic approach which stressed the alleged aim of the US to establish its economic dominance over Europe. <i>Post-revisionists</i> moved towards a more balanced view in which elements of blame were attached to both sides. Since the opening of the Soviet archives post-1990 there has been a shift to attributing prime responsibility to Stalin – a <i>post-post-revisionist</i> stance which often seems very close to the traditional view, but which often places great importance on ideology. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.</p>	40