www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 9489/12
Document Question

Key messages

- This assessment focusses on source comprehension, analysis, and evaluation. As such, this should be central to candidates' approach.
- When reading sources, candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- The document paper requires candidates to have an understanding of the contextual knowledge surrounding the questions. Without this, it is difficult for responses to properly analyse and evaluate the sources due to a lack of contextual understanding.
- Timekeeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.

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

General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question.

Stronger responses appreciate the need to support the points made with precise quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. In some weaker responses candidates attempted to include long sections of quotation by starting a sentence and then using ellipses to join with a later section. This was rarely a successful way of showing support from the source and often led to confusion or lack of clarity. Support should take the form of brief, precise, quotation or paraphrase.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed, and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered, it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question by concentrating on two sources and a particular issue. Candidates who completed **part (b)** first often found it difficult to refocus on **part (a)**.

Candidates sometimes made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The comparisons should also be focused on the question, e.g., in ***Section A*** comparisons should focus on 'the Whites' rather than other similarities and differences between the sources.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e., identifying similarities and differences.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. Some candidates were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. Thus, candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. There was some evidence that candidates did not have the required level of contextual understanding of the topics covered in this paper. This meant that they were often trying to analyse sources without understanding the context in which they were written or produced.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful. One example of where this could be achieved was in ***Section A***, Source A. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the 'Order for Red Terror' and actions of the Bolsheviks during the Civil War to comment on the purpose and context for this source. As such, when using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The Russian Revolution 1894–1921

(a) How far do Sources B and C agree about the Whites?

Many candidates made a good attempt at this question and were often able to identify similarities and differences in the sources. Most responses were able to show, with support, that both sources recognised the bad behaviour of the Whites during the conflict and the links between the White forces and a return to the Tsarist regime. Better responses were also able identify differences in how the sources saw the chances of White success. In the strongest responses the source comparisons were accompanied by clear contextual knowledge that was used to clarify or further explain the areas of comparison and contrast. The best responses began to use the nature and purpose of both sources in order to explain why the two sources showed similarities and differences.

(b) 'Bolshevik strength in the Civil War was dependent on their use of terror.' How far do the source support the statement?

This question was generally well attempted, and responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Some candidates were able to recognise both support and challenge in the sources and good responses used clear quotations or paraphrases to support their points. The better responses were then able to use their knowledge to contextualise the sources to explain them further and answer the question given. This was done best when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further. However, there were a significant proportion of candidates who struggled to properly access the sources because of a lack of contextual knowledge. Source D was a particular issue as many candidates could not identify this source with War Communism and industrialisation as a tactic used by the Bolsheviks. It is vital that candidates have the contextual knowledge for the sources they will be using in this paper. There was still some evidence of candidates using time to write long sections of contextual knowledge or rote provenance discussions. Neither of these approaches was successful when answering the question and were often not credit worthy beyond Level 1 in the mark scheme.

Section B, the American Option: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

There were no candidate scripts for this option.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

Section C, International Option: China and Japan, 1912–45

(a) To what extent do Sources A and C agree about the motives of the Communists for working with the Kuomintang?

This question required candidates to focus on evidence about the motives of the Communists in both source extracts. Some candidates confused this with trying to look at what the Communists did after joining with the nationalists, which was not strictly relevant. It should be remembered that **part (a)** questions have a specific focus which should be followed closely by candidates. Most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Better responses were able to use their knowledge of the period to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them. Some candidates struggled to really highlight the comparisons between the sources as they seemed to have little contextual knowledge of the period of the events of the early 1920s in China. The strongest responses began to use knowledge of the period to explain the differences between them using provenance, which went beyond rote evaluation.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that the Kuomintang shared the aims of the Communists?

Many candidates were able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question. Most of these used evidence from the sources to clearly support their argument. Better answers used clear and precise contextual knowledge to clarify the evidence from the sources and further explain some of the details. The best answers used their knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question. Once again, some responses seemed to struggle with contextual knowledge, e.g., not knowing about the context of the Sun-Joffe agreement in Source B, which made it difficult for them to build a really strong argument about the question. Whilst source analysis and evaluation are the focus for this paper, it is also important that candidates can place sources into the relevant context. Only then can they begin to show how the nature, origin and purpose of the sources can be used to build a strong and supported argument in relation to the question.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 9489/22
Outline Study

Key messages

Candidates should always read the question carefully to make sure the requirements have been fully understood; this often leads to a failure to focus fully on the relevant time period. For example, a question on the growth of German Nationalism between 1815 and 1850 should not cover developments beyond that time, such as the Prussian conflict with Denmark or Austria that happened in the 1860s. Similarly, the calling of the assembly of Notables or the Estates General is not relevant to a question on why Necker resigned in 1781.

In **part (a)** questions it is important to recognise the difference between describing actions, events or intentions that affected something and explaining exactly why these things happened or what effect they had on the outcome.

In **part (b)** questions it is important to recognise that there are different ways of assessing the factors that contributed to a particular outcome. If the question involves a quote, then candidates need to show how the argument in the quote might be supported but also how it might be challenged. The best responses should also be able to make a judgement about which argument is stronger and explain that judgement.

General comments

Whilst the entry was small, there was a good range of responses, with the best demonstrating good understanding and strong analytical skills. Weaker responses did not generally get beyond a fairly basic description of what was going on around the period that was the focus of the questions. In addition, weaker responses were often purely descriptive, and sometimes, that description was not particularly well linked to the question that was actually under consideration.

Comments on specific questions

Section A (this was the more popular section of the paper.)

Question 1

(a) Explain why Necker resigned in 1781.

This was a question that seemed to confuse almost all candidates and saw some of the poorest performances on the paper. Indeed, several candidates who did **Question 1** did not even attempt this part of the question. Those who did generally failed to get beyond the lower levels of the mark scheme. The basic problem was that almost no-one really knew why Necker resigned in 1781, and so even the better responses only wrote in general terms about failure to manage finances, the unfairness of the tax system, etc. and unpopularity with the nobility at court. However, these responses failed to relate these as to why he resigned in 1781. Weaker responses also wrote about the calling of the Council of Notables and the Estates General or the poor harvests that came later in the 1780s, which were not relevant to the question. There was only one well-constructed response that concluded:

Overall, although all these factors boil down to Necker's publishing of France's finances, it can be argued that it was the negative reaction of the royal circle that mainly caused him to resign in 1781. This is because Louis XVI was very impressionable and hence because his other ministers did not such as Necker he adopted the same mindset that ultimately led Necker to resign.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) How firmly did Napoleon establish his control over France as First Consul, 1799–1804?

Most candidates were able to provide a narrative account of some of Napoleon's measures that were designed to secure his control over France. However, they were generally less successful in being able to show where weaknesses still existed in this control, so most of the responses lacked any substantial degree of balance. Weaker candidates tended to just agree with the statement and then provide a more or less, detailed description of the measures that showed this was the case. Many candidates demonstrated limited chronological awareness of the reforms Napoleon made that fell within the specified period of the first Consulate. Overall performance on this question was generally weak.

Question 2

(a) Explain why Chartism emerged in 1838.

Occasionally some responses provided substantial detail of the six demands of the Great Charter but provided little evidence of why it was developed and circulated in the late 1830s. For example, writing about what the Chartists did and who was involved without managing to explain why they were involved or what they were actually trying to achieve. Establishing the link between what happened and why it happened is critical in developing effective responses, and few responses did this with this question.

(b) 'Industrialisation did not benefit the lower classes.' How valid is this view?

Weaker responses often simply listed some of the things that made life difficult and ended with a simple statement such as:

Industrialisation affected the lower classes more negatively than positively especially after the introduction of machinery left them unemployed even though there were some positive factors such as they were employed to build canals and roads and rail it was short-lived and temporary. The skilled lower class did not have such a difficult time with the unemployment the unskilled did.

A few better responses differentiated between working and living conditions and were also able to demonstrate how, over time, some things did begin to improve, especially with the government taking an increasing interest in living and working conditions. A few candidates failed to recognise the timeframe of the essay and went on to the reforms of the 1860s and 1870s in areas such as education, etc. Better responses provided a balanced viewpoint of the positive and negative effects of industrialisation and supported this with specific examples. Overall judgements tended to be restricted to simple assertions with little direct linking to any evidence that may have been presented earlier in the response.

Question 3

(a) Explain why King Frederick William IV of Prussia refused the imperial crown in 1849.

Most candidates were aware of at least some of the reasons why Frederick William IV rejected the imperial crow citing his belief in divine right and the authority of the princes and his view of the legitimacy of the Frankfurt Parliament. Reference to his description of it as; 'a crown of mud and sticks' was frequently used to support the explanation. Most candidates displayed and made effective use of relevant knowledge and the strongest responses were able to explain clearly how each of the factors led to the rejection. However, these responses had more limited success in linking the factors together to provide an overarching judgement.

(b) To what extent was the development of German nationalism in the period 1815–50 caused by economic factors?

Candidates showed a sound understanding of the forces at work in Germany that led to the rise of nationalism in this period. There was some good explanation of economic factors, particularly the importance of the Zollverein, but also including the economic hardships of the 1840s and their effects on the wider population. There was also a good understanding of other factors such as the impact of the changes Napoleon had imposed on the German states and of the Enlightenment that came with this. Weaker reponses focused on description and tended to be limited in the scope of

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

their suggestions, or their responses lacked balance, focusing almost exclusively on economic issues with little offered in the way of alternatives. An example of good response which did all of these things and produced a clear overarching judgement was as follows:

In conclusion I strongly believe it was a complex combination of economic factors, the increase in appreciation of German culture and art and the increased educational level of the population, that led to a rise in German nationalism between 1815 and 1850. If it was not for the economic factors such as the Zollverein, the benefits of a united Germany would not have becomes so obvious. However, it was the advances in the education that gave people the ability to recognise these advantages and they would not have been so aware of the common features of German culture. So, it was the combination of factors that was important in bringing about the growth of German nationalism.

Section B

There were no candidates who attempted questions from this section

Section C

Question 7 very few candidates attempted this question so detailed comment is not possible

(a) Explain why people in Britain supported overseas expansion in the late nineteenth century.

There was an awareness of the reasons why overseas expansion became so popular in the late nineteenth century. Candidates were able to describe at least some of the reasons why the British were interested in continuing expansion, often related specifically to the Scramble for Africa so on the whole responses were reasonably effective.

(b) 'The United States went to war with Spain in 1898 in support of the independence movement in Cuba.' How far do you agree with this statement?

All candidates produced a reasonable response to this question. They showed awareness of a range of factors though all tended to concentrate much more heavily on factors stemming from within the United States of America rather than the issue of independence for Cuba and the fact that the Cubans had already been fighting a civil war to gain independence from Spain, with some help from US supporters, did not seem to figure significantly in any of the responses

Question 8

(a) Explain why Poland, as a successor state, faced political and economic problems in the 1920s.

Candidates generally understood what the term 'successor state' meant and most were able to explain at least one or two of the problems that resulted from the re-creation of Poland from territory that had previously been absorbed into the three former empires of Russia, Austro-Hungary and Germany. As shown in this example:

The creation of Poland as sovereign state did not take into account the complex ethnic and linguistic issues of the region, for example portions of Prussia with a largely German population were included in Poland especially the Polish corridor that gave Poland access to the sea. This was an obvious source of conflict as demonstrated by German attempts to reclaim the 'Polish Corridor' later on.

Stronger responses showed an understanding of the economic issues and explained these, but their responses tended to lack any overall linking or judgment about relative importance of the different factors. Weaker responses often just described general problems of the successor states with little specific reference to Poland.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) 'During the 1920s the work of the League's agencies was more successful than its peacekeeping work.' How far do you agree?

There were some responses which showed a clear understanding of the operations of, the different Agencies of the League. However, the peacekeeping functions of the League were often dealt with more briefly leaving an overall lack of balance in some scripts. Stronger responses produced some sound assessment of the success and/or failures of both the agencies and the peacekeeping organs of the League and some produced sound overall judgements such as the following:

To conclude it is clearly evident from the examples given that both the League's agencies and its peacekeeping work enjoyed considerable success. But the Leagues abilities to influence peacekeeping operations were significantly undermined when it came to bigger countries. Hence it can be said that the Agencies were indeed more successful than the peacekeeping operations in the 1920s.

This is a reasonable judgment, but it lacks 'precisely selected evidence' that 'develops and supports' this conclusion. Weaker responses tended to be limited to simple description of different achievements of the League in both areas and little acknowledgement of failure or attempt to make any comparative assessment.

Question 9

(a) Explain why the World Disarmament Conference ended in failure.

Candidates had some reasonable knowledge of the reason for the failure of this conference. Some candidates concentrated basically on the increased aggression of the early 1930s using the specific examples of Japan in Manchuria. This provided a sound explanation for those who linked it to the issue of disarmament and its effect on the wider credibility of the League. Stronger responses provided more context to the links between disarmament and the Treaty of Versailles or the growing causes of international instability that was prevalent in the early 1930s, including the rise of Hitler and the growing discontent around the world caused by the Great Depression.

(b) To what extent was the outbreak of war in 1939 a result of Hitler's long-term plans?

Whilst some responses did not tend to use the terms functionalist and intentionalist to explain the different views of Hitler's intentions and actions; the better responses provided clear explanations of what these two views involved. Weaker responses tended to describe the steps to war, sometimes arguing that appeasement was significant but failing to address the specific question of Hitler's responsibility. Weaker responses also tended to focus on the later 1930s without fully engaging with the idea of 'long term plans'

Sometimes responses did produce clear explanations:

One crucial factor that is sometimes overlooked is the Great Depression that swept the world in the 1930s. It had two main effects that made war more likely. Firstly, it aided Hitlers' rise to power as he was able to exploit the hardship that the depression caused for many Germans. Secondly it weakened the democracies considerably and undermined their willingness to oppose German Aggression.

This is a good point, but the response lacks complete analysis by not supplying the detailed evidence needed to support this argument. Lack of depth was a common weakness in responses to this question.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 9489/32
Interpretations Question

Key messages

- It is essential to spend sufficient time at the start of the examination on a careful and detailed reading of the extract. Before beginning to write, candidates need to be familiar with everything the extract says.
- Although the question asks candidates to make inferences about the historian's interpretation and approach, most of the answer should consist of an explanation, using relevant parts of the extract, of how those inferences have been made.
- The historian's interpretation will be consistent with all aspects of the extract and must be inferred from the extract taken as a whole, not just from parts of it.

General comments

The overall quality of work was sound, with almost all candidates demonstrating an awareness of how to go about appropriately answering the question. All answers were focused on the extract. Although some diverted too much into descriptions of the historical context. However, this was never to the extent of undermining analysis of the historian's interpretation. A more common shortcoming was for part of the answer to be effectively focused on explaining the interpretation, but with other aspects of the extract being merely summarised. This failure to integrate these aspects satisfactorily into the explanation would often signify an incomplete understanding of the historian's main interpretation. However, the most important point to emerge from this examination was the vital importance of candidates understanding the meaning of the historiographical 'labels' that they use in their answers. It should be stressed that it is not a requirement of the examination that these labels must be used. Identifying and explaining the interpretation is possible without using them. But if they are misused, as they often are, it indicates of a lack of understanding. Another important and related issue is insisting on a 'label' when the extract contains evidence to refute or question it. A good example of this was the Cold War extract, where some responses referred to a lack of information or sources on the workings of Stalin's government. Yet many candidates still saw the extract as being 'post-Cold War' or 'post-post-revisionist', both of which would be based on the opening up of the Soviet archives after 1991. This all underlines the central message that the historian's interpretation will cover all aspects of the extract. Ignoring or missing something in the extract may undermine the whole answer.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1: The Origins of the First World War

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

Question 2: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that although by July 1941 Hitler had decided on the extermination of Soviet Jewry (i.e. there was prior intent), it remained unclear how this was to be extended to the murder of all European Jews. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. It was important to note that the historian argued that Barbarossa involved preparations for a 'racial war', and indeed led to the killing of Soviet Jews, but that a second decision in July 1941 was made to extend the killing to all European Jews. It was how to bring about this much wider goal that remained uncertain. Weaker responses missed the detail in this argument and saw the Holocaust as simply emerging from the confusions and uncertainties of war. This would then be labelled as a functionalist interpretation, even though the historian was not arguing that the Holocaust evolved as an ad hoc response to circumstances. Rather it was willed into existence, and only the means of bringing it about remained uncertain. A better approach was to view the extract as containing

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

pointers to Hitler's intent to bring about genocide; indeed, it even included a reference to Hitler's 1939 'prophecy' speech, a key piece of evidence for intentionalists. However, if some candidates were misled into an over-simple assumption that an extract detailing events of the war must inevitably be functionalist, this was understandable. Far greater inaccuracy occurred in the use of the term 'structuralism'. Many candidates, after seeing references to Himmler, Heydrich, and Goebbels, claimed that the historian argues that the nature of the Nazi state caused the Holocaust. Awareness that a structuralist perspective would include the notion of Hitler as a 'weak' dictator allowing competing organs of the state to drive policy through of continuous escalation was often absent. Such awareness would have precluded any structuralist conclusions about this extract since it contained no such argument. Though marked out as misunderstanding the interpretation, at least perceived that the extract contained one, and tried to support it. The weakest answers of all, of which there few, simply paraphrased points in the extract, and never satisfactorily managed to focus the answer on the historian.

Question 3: The Origins and Development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that although, because of the complexity of the post-war situation, both sides were implicated in causing the Cold War, Stalin still bore the greater share of responsibility. The best responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. These responses also could also reconcile the two aspects and avoid jumping to conclusions that would bring either of the aspects into question. In contrast, many candidates took the arguments for Soviet responsibility included in the first and last paragraphs, and claimed that the historian blamed Stalin (or the Soviet Union) for the Cold War. Often this was labelled post-post-revisionist, or post-Cold War. However, this was to ignore the content of the second paragraph, which stated 'neither side can bear sole responsibility for the onset of the Cold War'. It also ignored the very strong hints that the historian was writing before the opening of Soviet archives from 1991 onwards. A much more sustainable idea was that the interpretation was post-revisionist (i.e., blaming both sides), but simply blamed Stalin more than the USA. When extracts contain apparently contradictory aspects, candidates often found it difficult to reconcile them in a single consistent interpretation. Most responses did not totally ignore the content of the second paragraph; but just tended to see what it said as post-revisionist, and the rest of the extract as post-post-revisionist, thus failing to view the extract as a whole. Some weaker responses seemed to think that explaining the historian's interpretation should involve adding contextual illustration to points in the extract. For example, given the reference to Kennan at the end of the first paragraph, they would then write in some detail about the Long Telegram and its influences on Truman and the development of containment. This adds nothing to the quality of the answer, since the focus was to write about the historian's interpretation, not the events of the Cold War. Writing about the context only makes sense if it helps explain arguments put forward by the historian. The weakest responses of all simply paraphrased points in the extract, and never satisfactorily managed to focus the answer on the historian.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 9489/42
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question posed is crucial in accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- The strongest answers are consistently analytical and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging.
- The strongest answers demonstrate a good chronological understanding and only employ material which is relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternatives explanations for events.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before starting to respond is strongly advised.

General comments

The best responses were fully analytical in approach and contained clearly defined arguments. These were well supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge to reach a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 3**, where high-quality answers examined the economic challenges facing Germany from 1929 onwards and developed an argument about their contribution to the growth of Nazi support, before goin examining alternative explanations. This allowed the construction of a balanced judgement, based on precise and relevant factual knowledge. Weaker responses tended to just describe the events of the period and offered no real opinion or tended to focus either on economics or other factors without offering balance.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 1**, where some responses demonstrated limited knowledge about the nature and threat of communism in Italy before 1922. Therefore, making it difficult to create a fully balanced response as the stated factor in the question was sometimes hastily dealt with before candidates moved onto other factors that they felt more comfortable with.

Having an answer that looks at both sides of the question and is balanced is very important. **Question 9** highlighted this very well and higher quality responses considered not only the policies followed by Gorbachev, but also looked at other significant factors too. Weaker responses tended to overlook, or at best pay limited attention to, the role of Reagan in ending the Cold War.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1

'The fear of communism was the main reason for the rise of Mussolini by 1922.' Discuss this view.

Most candidates who answered this question demonstrated a sound understanding of many reasons for Mussolini's rise by 1922, although detailed understanding of the nature and extent of the fear of communism was inconsistent.

Better answers understood the reasons for the fear of communism, including events in Russia and the difficult economic circumstances experienced in Italy after the First World War. There was a clear grasp of

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

the events of the Biennio Rosso and the growing electoral strength of the PSI. It was rare that candidates sought to distinguish socialism and communism in the Italian context, and this is an area that centres might consider paying further attention to. Those responses which were clear about the scale of support for left-wing ideas in both urban and rural Italy were more successful, as were those that clearly explained the elements of Italian society that were most fearful and became supporters of fascism, such as the landowners, business owners, the church, and the royal family. The extent to which Mussolini exploited these fears, which provided him with an enemy and a legitimate (at least in the eyes of his supports) target for violence, was also an aspect of strong responses. However, some candidates were uncertain about many of these arguments, and this weakened their responses somewhat.

There was an expectation that a full analysis would contain alternative explanations for Mussolini's rise and all responses to this question did this, in varying degrees of detail. There was attention paid to the dissatisfaction felt by many in Italy with liberal rule and the *trasformismo* system of politics which had held sway. Some responses efficiently dealt with the issue of the war and Italy's disappointments in the post-war treaties alongside the economic problems afflicting the country in these years. Other factors that could have been explored were the personal appeal of Mussolini and the promise of national revival and unity offered by fascism. The best answers were supported by precise supporting material, lifting their arguments above general assertions. In terms of analysis, it is often a characteristic of the strongest responses that links and connections between different factors were made explicit and formed an integral part of the final judgement. This question certainly allowed for this as, for example, Mussolini's popularity in part derived from the actions of his followers in tackling the communist threat directly.

Question 2

Analyse the reasons why Stalin had gained control of the Communist Party by 1928.

This was a popular question and responses were uniformly able to identify and explain a range of factors leading to Stalin's accession to power. Therefore, the requirement for balance was consistently met by candidates. A common approach was to compare and contrast Stalin's personal skills and his ability to take advantage of his various roles and responsibilities within the party with the failures and weaknesses of his chief rivals, most notably Trotsky.

Candidates demonstrated good understanding of the importance of Stalin's positions as General Secretary and explained the significance of his ability to create a power base through the Lenin Enrolment and that Stalin's political cunning was crucial in allowing him to fully exploit the opportunities afforded to him by his administrative control of the party. Better responses were able to link this appreciation of Stalin's success to the failures of rivals in their underestimation of him and the power that his positions gave him, with references to 'Comrade Card Index' and the 'Grey Blur' appearing in some. Stalin's ability to use the period of mourning and funeral of Lenin to his advantage were also well understood. There was also a good grasp of Stalin's policy shifts and use of support for the NEP and Socialism in One County to gain support and to outwit his rivals.

Balanced against this were the failures of rivals such as Trotsky and there were good explanations of the reasons for his personal unpopularity with some in the party. Stalin's character, aloofness and intellectual arrogance, which did not play well with the new influx of proletariat members and an unwillingness to be drawn into political infighting, all hampered him and were well understood. Relevant references to other leading figures such as Bukharin, Zinoviev and Kamenev were also made and were rewarded appropriately.

Question 3

'The main reason for the growth of Nazi support between 1929 and 1932 was the growing economic crisis in Germany.' Assess this view.

This was another popular question, and the candidates who attempted it were generally very knowledgeable about a range of factors leading to the increase in support for Hitler and the Nazi party in these years. Most responses were able to maintain a tight focus on the years in question. However, there was material in some which drifted beyond 1932 and included reference to events of the following year and which was not credited.

There was generally a sound understanding of the extent of the economic challenges facing Germany from 1929 and the apparent inability of Weimar governments to deal successfully with them. Well-informed candidates could use this knowledge to explain how hostility to the democratic system grew because of its perceived impotence and that support for the political extremes, including the NSDAP, grew accordingly. The

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

best responses were also able to demonstrate understanding of how Hitler exploited the situation to his advantage and was able to offer scapegoats for Germany's problems and a promise of national revival. In terms of Germany's economic situation in these years, it is worth noting that many candidates' belief that the county was suffering from inflation in these years is erroneous.

The ability to connect the political consequences of the Depression in Germany with alternative factors was characteristic of the best responses. Hitler's personal appeal and propaganda were effectively linked to the crisis through promises of 'work and bread' and foreign policy objectives such as over-turning the Treaty of Versailles. It was also possible to combine the economic situation, growth of support for communism and increased popularity of Hitler amongst those who feared this development most, with some references made to how Hitler's propaganda campaign was heavily financed by German industrialists. Responses where a clear effort was made to show the connections between different factors, rather than treating them in isolation, are often highly rewarded through AO2 marks.

Question 4

'Child evacuation was the most important civilian preparation for war made by the British government by September 1939.' Evaluate this view.

There were few or no responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate.

Section B: American option, The USA, 1944–92

There were few or no responses to **Questions 5–8** to make a general comment appropriate.

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

Question 9

Evaluate the role played by Gorbachev in ending the Cold War.

This was a popular choice and an accessible question. Candidates were usually well-informed about Gorbachev's policies, although the extent to which candidates were able or willing to offer alternative explanations, such as the role of Reagan was more variable.

Concerning Gorbachev, there was a consensus that he recognised that the Soviet Union's economic problems required action and that cuts in defence spending and an end to the war in Afghanistan were consequences of this. There was also a good deal of discussion of Gorbachev's replacement of the Brezhnev Doctrine with the Sinatra Doctrine and how this led to the ending of Soviet control of the Eastern Bloc countries. Good detail about events in countries such as Poland or the Baltic States was seen. Candidates are well-versed in Gorbachev's twin domestic policies of Glasnost and Perestroika, particularly the former, and understand that they failed. However candidates were not always able to securely explain how the unintended consequences of these policies helped to bring about the end of the Cold War and this is an area that centres might wish to focus on in their preparations for future examinations. The best analysis also explicitly recognised that Gorbachev's aim was to reform communism in order to preserve it, although some candidates developed arguments which seemed to argue otherwise.

The role of Reagan, with the increase in military spending and the Star Wars programme, which placed an intolerable economic burden on the Soviets and led to Gorbachev's desire to cut arms spending, alongside his enthusiasm for negotiations, was also well worth exploring. However, not all candidates did so in great depth.

Question 10

In the Korean War, the United States used the United Nations only to promote its own interests.' Evaluate this view.

Some candidates were able to successfully focus their knowledge on the requirements of the question, although others were not totally clear on what was expected and spent a good deal of their answers in descriptions of the causes and course of the war, without properly examining American motivations for involvement.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

Those that did tackle the question effectively were able to address the issues in a properly balanced manner by discussing the role of the UN, the failure of the Soviets to veto action due to their boycott over China and how involvement in the war was supported by most members that the UN forces were multi-national. The USA's involvement was to promote peace and collective security. The counterarguments sometimes revolved around the control that the Americans had over those forces, although it was rare that candidates could quantify the extent of that American dominance. There was often discussion of the use of the UN to further American interests in the area, and reference to the Domino Theory and that the US believed that the invasion of South Korea was part of a monolithic plot.

Question 11

Assess why the governments of newly independent African nations faced so many social challenges.

There were few or no responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate.

Question 12

Assess the impact of the role of the impact of the Iran-Iraq War on the stability of the Middle East.

There were relatively few responses to this question. Among those that did, there was often a desire to discuss the causes and events of the conflict, which was unnecessary, before discussing the main focus, which was its consequences. There was a sound understanding of the costs, both human and financial, to both sides in the war and some grasp of the subsequent polarisation of the Arab world, although this point could have been made more explicitly. Nevertheless, there was a clear link between the war and Saddam's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. Centres could also look more closely at the consequences for Turkey, which was not considered by candidates answering this question.

© 2022