www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 9489/12
Document Question

Key Messages

- This assessment focuses on source analysis, and evaluation. As such, this should be central to candidates' approach. Candidates should focus on how their historical knowledge of the period helps them to interpret the sources and use this knowledge to comment.
- 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.
- Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.
- Candidates must 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 candidates appreciated that they needed to support their points with precise quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. However, 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. Evidence from the sources should be a 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 evidence about 'opinions of members of the Estates-General' rather than other similarities and differences between the sources which may be apparent.

The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences in 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 sources' usefulness, the question should focus on making a developed comparison, i.e., identifying similarities and differences.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

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. Responses should also focus on contextualising the sources and applying historical knowledge. Too often, it appears that candidates do not know enough about the historical context to deal with the sources successfully. This paper requires more than just source comprehension. Candidates must be aware of and able to apply the historical context of the period as shown in the syllabus.

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 when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in ***Section C*, Source D**. Good responses used this source to comment on the purpose of MacArthur in this source which is written with knowledge but also with hindsight. They also used their knowledge of the context and of MacArthur to the source in relation to the question. 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: France, 1774–1814

(a) Compare these two sources as evidence about the opinions of members of the Estates-General on the rights of men.

This question focused on the opinions of members of the Estates-General about the rights of men and asked candidates to identify similarities and differences in the two sources. The best responses to this question used their historical knowledge of the events and ideas of 1789 to interpret ideas from the sources. They also focused on the opinions of the rights of men rather than other comparisons such as taxation or monarchy. As such, they were able to recognise similarities and differences in their opinions on freedom and the place of religion in society. Weaker responses struggled to make such clear points of comparison because they appeared to not know enough about the ideas of 1789. These responses often compared the sources without a focus on the Question, and this meant that they were sometimes confused by the ideas described in the sources and could not draw clear comparisons.

(b) How far do these sources agree that taxation was the main cause of discontent before the Revolution?

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. Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement e.g., in Source A which recognises the problems of taxation, but ultimately sees inequality as the biggest problem. The best responses were able to use their historical knowledge of the period to explain the context of these sources in 1789, and the discussions which were being held. Most candidates were able to recognise both support and challenge in the sources and strong responses used clear quotations or paraphrases to support their points. This was done best when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further. There were also a significant minority of responses which started to use the provenance of the sources to weigh up the evidence they gave. This meant that answers began to evaluate sources for use in the question. This was pleasing to see and relied on the knowledge and understanding of candidates. However, there were still a number of responses which struggled to contextualise the sources because they did appear to know enough about the arguments surrounding the events of 1789 and the complexities involved. It is vital that candidates have closely studied the syllabus and understand the period before attempting to answer these source questions.

Section B, the American Option: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

There were not enough entries for this option to write a report.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

Section C, International Option: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in these two sources about the Treaty of Portsmouth.

This question required candidates to focus on the Treaty of Portsmouth in both source extracts. Some candidates confused this with trying to look at Japanese domination – this was not credit worthy as it often overlapped with the focus of the second question. Therefore, it should be remembered that **part (a)** questions have a specific focus which should be followed 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, as mentioned in the General comments about Source D. The best responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between the sources using provenance which went beyond rote evaluation. Overall, this question was well attempted.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that, by 1905, Japan was determined to dominate East Asia?

Most responses engaged with the sources thoughtfully to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss different views of Japan in the period, and the best responses began to use their contextual knowledge to do this. 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. Source C was particularly well used as it enabled responses to discuss the wider context of Asian dominance in the period. The strongest 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.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 9489/22
Outline Study

Key messages

Candidates should make sure they are familiar with all aspect of the topics being studied. For example, the syllabus highlights, under the issue of success of the League in the 1920s the 'Role and impact of the Agencies' and yet some candidates struggled to find anything, positive or negative, to say in response to the question about the work of a range of agencies, from the Mandates Commission to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and wrote instead about the work of the Assembly and Council in the settlement of disputes.

Candidates sometimes confuse description and explanation. All **part (a)** questions begin with the word 'explain' which means give reasons why. Candidates should try to give at least one reason to explain whatever action or event is the focus of the question. Some candidates spend much time and effort describing an event in great detail without getting to the central issue of WHY it happened.

Candidates should practice different types of question on the topics they are studying. This will help choose the right approach if faced with an unfamiliar focus for a popular topic.

General comments

With a small entry it is difficult to make general comments. There was a good range of responses reflecting the different abilities of candidates which suggests that the questions discriminated well between the stronger and weaker candidates. Some sections of the paper produced stronger responses than others, but this may reflect different sizes of cohorts for each section. Most candidates showed a reasonable understanding of the topics they had studied, but some struggled with the specific requirements of the essays on those topics.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750-1921

The majority of candidates did questions from this section.

Question 1

(a) Explain why railways developed after 1820.

Most candidates had some idea about key factors in the development of railways, but weaker responses failed to take note of the key date in the question. A few weaker candidates concentrated on the development of the steam engine in the eighteenth century rather than writing about steam locomotives and the growth of railways after 1820. Stronger responses offered a range of factors including increased demand, growth of towns and markets, improved technology. A few candidates were also able to link these to demonstrate a complex web of factors. However, some otherwise detailed responses failed to make this final step.

(b) To what extent did capitalism cause the Industrial Revolution.

Most candidates were able to provide some explanation of a range of factors that contributed to the Industrial Revolution, but weaker candidates struggled to separate 'Capitalism' from their more general explanation. A few weaker candidates misinterpreted the question and wrote mainly about

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

the agricultural revolution. Stronger responses identified and explained a range of factors with the more perceptive differentiating those which represented the influence of capitalism from other factors.

Question 2

(a) Explain why the development of German nationalism was limited in the period before 1848.

All candidates were able to offer an explanation for this failure, the most common one being the repressive measures adopted by Metternich and imposed on the German Confederation.

The best responses also gave details, to varying levels, of other factors like the reluctance of Princes to give up their individual power, cultural and religious differences, and the restriction of liberalism to middle class intellectuals, with little interest in nationalist ideas from the largely agricultural peasant population. However, few candidates were able to round this off with an overarching summary:

Overall, each of these factors is closely linked. While it is possible that Metternich's measures were effective in limiting liberal ideas, they were not completely so, as seen in continued gatherings like the Hambach festival, where nationalists came together to celebrate their common art and literature. Differences like religion and local loyalties were, in some ways, a greater issue in preventing any meaningful growth of nationalism.

(b) 'Prussia's economic strength was the reason for its victory in the Franco–Prussian War.' How far do you agree?

Most candidates were able to describe key features of Prussian economic progress in the mid-19th century, but weaker candidates struggled to relate this to victory in the war against France. Stronger candidates were able to explain that heavy industries contributed to the development of better armaments whilst the building of railways was utilised to move troops rapidly to the key points on the border. Strong responses then went on to identify other factors that affected the outcome of the war including the development of the Prussian army and the diplomacy of Bismarck. However, some of these restricted their suggestions to Prussian advantages and failed to consider the weakness of the French. The strongest candidates considered all aspects of the victory in balanced and detailed responses with some even identifying links and differentiating between critical and supporting causes to reach a reasoned overall judgement.

Question 3

(a) Explain why the Russian Orthodox Church was important in maintaining the Tsar's rule.

Most candidates recognised that the support given by the Church to the Tsar's claim to rule by Divine Right was important to his control.

A salient reason for the Church's importance is that it gave Nicholas II legitimacy. He was deeply religious and believed that he was chosen by God to rule, and the Church conveyed this to the people. Most of the people were deeply religious peasants who were heavily influenced by the Church's teachings.

Stronger responses linked this to the role of the Church in the education of the majority of Russians and/or to the importance of the Church in the lives of the majority of Russians who were simple peasants. A few responses tried to introduce other factors that helped the Tsar maintain control like weakness of the opposition or use of the secret police, but these were not relevant to the question and so did not enhance the response.

(b) To what extent was Bolshevik success in the Russian Civil War caused by War Communism?

Most candidates clearly understood the factors that contributed to the Bolsheviks' success in the Russian Civil War. The strongest responses wrote in detail about what War Communism meant for different population sectors. They contrasted this to the weaknesses of the Whites and other advantages that the communist forces had, like compact lines of communication and outstanding

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

leadership in the person of Leon Trotsky. The best responses produced balanced overall judgements.

Overall, there were various reasons for success. War Communism certainly played an important part in keeping the armies fed and establishing nationalised industries which supplied vital war materials. However, the Reds were far more united than the Whites and their clear aims and Trotsky's leadership were paramount in achieving victory. Thus, it can be concluded that while War Communism was a vital part of the Bolsheviks success various other factors made it possible.

Some candidates did consider the more negative aspects of War Communism, but concluded these were outweighed by other factors. Weaker responses lacked detail and depth but generally still managed to achieve some degree of balance.

Section B: The History of the USA, 1820-1941

Only three candidates answered questions from this section, so a meaningful comment is difficult.

Question 4

(a) Explain why many people were worried by Lincoln's victory in the 1860 presidential election.

Candidates did recognise that slavery was a central issue in the worries about the election result, but all tended to write in terms of Lincoln being strongly against slavery and intent on abolishing it '….*Lincoln heavily opposed slavery and was greatly inclined to use any means to abolish it*.' This was not Lincoln's position at the time of his election although he was morally opposed to slavery, he was not initially intent on its abolition. Little else was offered in terms of worries about his election.

(b) To what extent were disagreements over slavery before 1850 caused by the migration of people westwards?

There was some confusion about this question. One candidate argued that westward migration was about Europeans moving westward to America and '…*southern Europeans bringing the idea of slavery with them*.' the resulting analysis offered little in the way of relevant detail beyond a few vague, general assertions.

Another candidate wrote largely about what happened in the 1850s and, beyond mention of the Louisiana purchase and Mexican cession causing the problem, there was no mention of the Missouri Compromise or subsequent issues by any of the candidates.

Question 5

(a) Explain why life was difficult for civilians in the South during the Civil War.

There was some recognition of issues relating to the suspension of habeas corpus and the effect of occupying forces, '…*food shortages prevailed, water shortages, disease and above all a great loss of life.*' but the points made tended to be generalised, and there was no consideration of the effect on the slave population.

(b) How far was Johnson to blame for the failure of Presidential Reconstruction?

Candidates demonstrated little significant understanding of the idea of 'Presidential Reconstruction' and wrote generally and positively about the Reconstruction Amendments '…*he did try to let America flourish after the war by promoting the three new Amendments so heavily*.' though Johnson largely opposed these. The other factor mentioned tended to be about the Ku Klux Klan. However, there was often little clear significant relevance in the responses to this question.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 6

(a) Explain why government policies had a negative effect on the 1920s economy.

(b) 'Opposition to the New Deal was based on the claim that its measures were not ambitious enough to resolve Americas problems.' How far do you agree?

There were no responses to this question to make meaningful comment possible.

Section C: International History, 1870-1945

Question 7

(a) Explain why the Corfu incident was difficult for the League of Nations to deal with.

Candidates were generally aware of the details of the Corfu incident, and some provided quite detailed descriptions of the events leading up to the Italian occupation of the island. However, some candidates did not go beyond this description. Stronger responses gave an outline of the incident and then proceeded to consider how the League dealt with it and the extent to which it exposed the weaknesses of the League. Factors included lack of enforcement measures and self-interest of the leading members, to demonstrate why the incident proved to be a difficult one for the League to deal with, e.g.

Italy was one of the leading members of the League and the other leaders Britain and France did not feel they could take more severe measures against Italy because they needed their support in other issues.

(b) How successful was the work of the agencies and commissions of the League of Nations during the 1920s?

Some candidates showed awareness of the various organisations that operated under the general umbrella of the League of Nations from the early 1920s and were able to provide details of their work and of the success and failures. They demonstrated this, for example, by reference to the work of the ILO, the mandates commission, and the refugee's commission. A few, however, were not able to distinguish between these and the League's major organs and so wrote, often in detail, about the peace keeping operations in places like the Aaland Islands the Silesian Coalfields, the Greco/Bulgarian border. This was not the focus of the question and gained them little credit.

Question 8

(a) Explain why the French did not resist German remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936.

There were some strong responses to this question, identifying a range of factors that contributed to French inaction. Most candidates were able to cite the continuing effects of the Great Depression which limited French ability to wage any sort of direct action against Germany. This was often linked with the issue of the British position:

The French were not strong enough to act alone and Britain was not prepared to support them. They still had their own economic problems and there was also a feeling that the Treaty of Versailles had been unfair and that this was really a matter of the Germans moving back into their 'own back yard'.

Most candidates managed to explain at least one reason for French inaction and stronger responses covered several, though few clearly established the links between the different factors.

(b) How far was Britain's appeasement policy towards Germany caused by fear of another war?

Some weaker responses to this question tended to describe the actions taken by Britain in response to Germany's aggressive moves rather than explaining why Britain chose to act as they did. However, stronger responses often reached a clear conclusion:

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

The most important reason of the policy of appeasement, however, was the fear of war. All the other reasons had stemmed from this fear without which Britain would have no reason to follow a policy of appeasement towards Hitler's Germany. This fear stopped Britain taking action against it when it went against the Treaty of Versailles.

Such a comment shows that the question has been understood. However, unless there is detailed explanation, rather than description, of each aspect of this conclusion the response will not score highly.

Question 9

(a) Explain why Japan became involved in the Second world War in 1941.

There were few responses to this question, but candidates did manage to identify some reasons for Japan's actions. Principal amongst these were the deteriorating relationship between Japan and the US as a long-term issue as well as a result of sanctions impose by the US in support of China. Strong responses also referred to Japan's expansionist ambitions in southeast Asia.

Japan also wanted to increase its sphere of influence in the Pacific region and was challenged by America. All this combined with Japan's own jingoism and over-confidence led to their attack of Pearl Harbour

This response shows some basic understanding but needed to be developed with more detailed explanation to be an effective argument. Few responses made the connection to the opportunities offered by the war in Europe.

(b) To what extent was the decline in support for the Koumintang caused by the war against Japan?

Candidates who attempted this question showed a sound understanding of what happened in China in the 1930s and were able to produce a balanced account of the decline in support for the KMT. After recognising that, from 1931, there was an escalating issue with Japan culminating in the outbreak of full-scale war in 1937, stronger candidates were able to demonstrate why Chiang's own inaction lost support for both himself and the KMT in general, culminating in the Xi'an incident, and were then able to set that against other factors:

Even without this Chiang's popularity had been going downhill for some time. His obsession with eliminating the communists and atrocities committed to try and do this had lost him left-wing support. He failed to carry out promised social reforms …… at the same time Mao's escape to Yan'an undermined Chiang's credibility as a military leader and turned Mao into a national hero amongst the peasants.

This sort of argument sets up an alternative, but the quality of the answer will depend on the inclusion of relevant detail to support the assertions in this summary. This is what differentiates between a basic and a good response.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 9489/32
Interpretations Questions

Key messages

- The question asks what you can learn about the historian's interpretation from the extract. It does not ask what the extract says. The only reason for writing about what the extract says is to help illustrate or explain the interpretation.
- Almost always, the interpretation focuses on the issue of who or what was to blame, (i.e. for causing the First World War/the Holocaust/the Cold War). The answer should identify what the historian thinks about this issue, then explain how this can be inferred from what the extract says. (The only exception to this focus on blame is when a Holocaust extract deals with victims' experiences.)
- Although the question asks candidates to deal with a single extract, part of analysing the historian's approach will involve placing the extract within the broader historiography. This often includes use of historiographical 'labels' such as intentionalism, revisionism and others. It is a central aspect of the Interpretations study that the development of the historiography of the topic should be understood, and that students should be able to use topic-specific terminology accurately and appropriately.

General comments

Examples of work across the entire spectrum were seen, with the general level of scripts being of a good standard. The best candidates could demonstrate a complete understanding of the historian's interpretation, using the extract effectively to explain how they were able to make inferences from it about the historian's views and approach. In contrast, weaker scripts did not deal with the extract as a whole. Instead, they seized upon single words, phrases, or sentences which they saw as indicative of the historian's message, though what they then wrote was often no more than a paraphrase of what the extract said. Almost all candidates showed an awareness of what the question demanded, consistently focusing on the extract, and trying to explain what they saw as an interpretation. However, answers often contained inconsistencies, with conclusions drawn from one part of the extract contradictory to those from other parts. Since candidates should be aware that the interpretation will apply to the extract as a whole, including these conflicting elements in their answers is presumably caused by an inability to reconcile them properly. Another explanation may be the approach adopted by many candidates of working through the extract paragraph by paragraph, commenting as they go on what it says, and therefore not developing an overview of the extract as a whole. The best answers almost always start with the interpretation and then bring together pieces of evidence from the extract, explicitly chosen to illustrate and explain. This makes it much easier for the answer to keep its focus and coherence. One last point worth making about using the extract. Using truncated quotes (e.g. *'The most significant……American exceptionalism.'*) should be discouraged. It runs the danger of lacking clarity and will often be insufficient to offer the kind of support a point needs.

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.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 2: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that there was no original intention to exterminate the Jewish race and that the decision to murder all Jews was contingent on the circumstances brought about by the invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941 (or on the declaration of war on the USA). The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. This was invariably recognised as a functionalist interpretation. This argument could be more or less proven by what the historian included on the Nazis pursuing a territorial 'solution' until early 1941. Many candidates agreed that the approach was functionalist, but on the grounds that war brought about genocide. This was not sufficient since the war started in 1939. Yet, the decision to eliminate all Jews was taken (as the extract states *'if at all'*) only in the latter part of 1941, so, to demonstrate a proper understanding, answers needed to show what had changed. In fact, several answers seemed to think that the war only started in December 1941, which tended to undermine their arguments. It was notable that weaker answers often showed limited understanding of historiographical 'labels', for example, seeing the approach as intentionalist on the grounds that it was Hitler who made the decision for genocide, or seeing things in the extract that were not there, such as a structuralist interpretation based on Hitler being a 'weak dictator'. The weakest answers of all, of which there were very few, simply paraphrased points in the extract, or described events, and never satisfactorily focused 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 all the 'actors' in the Cold War were motivated by 'emotional beliefs' rather than logic, but that those held by Truman and his colleagues in the US policy-making elite were particularly harmful. The strongest answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In fact, relatively few candidates grasped the idea of 'emotional beliefs', which inevitably limited what they saw as the historian's view of Truman. Many could see that the historian was blaming Truman, and even reached the sensible conclusion that the approach was revisionist, yet could not adequately explain what the historian was criticising him for. Searching for material to support their conclusions, these answers often resorted to citing contextual knowledge about the Marshall Plan, Truman Doctrine or Kennan's Long Telegram, losing sight of what the extract was arguing. As with the Holocaust extract, there was some misunderstanding of historiographical 'labels', with several candidates identifying the approach as post-post-revisionist, because it dealt with 'ideology' (i.e. Truman's ideology) – seemingly unaware that post-post-revisionists have generally based their interpretations on seeing Stalin as being driven by ideology. There were also misinterpretations based on details of the extract, such as seeing the historian as blaming Stalin because the extract states that if he was pushed, he would push back harder – a 'shoving match' that led to the Cold War. Yet the historian's argument here is blaming Harriman for pushing Stalin in the first place. The weakest answers of all, of which there were very few, simply paraphrased points in the extract, or described events, and never satisfactorily focused the answer on the historian.

© 2023

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 responses contain consistent analysis and typically address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging in nature.
- Candidates must demonstrate a good chronological understanding and should ensure that they only use material which is directly relevant to the =question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative 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 beginning is strongly advised.
- Candidates should allocate enough time for each response.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions, and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular.
- Judgements should be based on criteria, which might be outlined from the outset.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered **Questions 1**, **2** and **3** from **Section A**. Those who tackled **Section C** questions often answered **Question 9** and a combination of **Questions 10** and **12**. There were very few responses to **Section B** questions.

The best responses were fully analytical and contained clearly defined arguments, and were supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge to reach a logical final judgement. This was based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. An excellent example of this was **Question 1**, where the best responses set out Mussolini's economic aims as criteria before providing a balanced response clearly linked to those aims. Most candidates understood the importance of balance, as responses to **Question 3** demonstrated. Typically, a range of other explanations from those provided in the question were offered and compared.

Centres should be aware that questions might be set on individual bullet points within the specification and ensure that candidates have sufficient knowledge of each to base an answer on. It was evident in responses to **Question 9** that many candidates lacked understanding of events in Malaya after 1945 which prevented a detailed response.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1

Evaluate the view that Mussolini had failed to achieve his economic aims by 1941.

This was a relatively popular question and was generally accessible to candidates. The better responses made clear what Mussolini's aims were and the strongest demonstrated how they changed over time. However, it was rare for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of De Stefani's relatively orthodox management of the economy in the first half of the 1920s. Candidates were almost always able to discuss

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

Mussolini's battles, often in some depth and were usually able to link them to his aims and to make an assessment of their success. In some responses there also some discussion of the Corporate State and responses to the Great Depression. The best analysis was based on criteria, rather than making judgements on individual policies in isolation.

Question 2

Analyse the extent to which Stalin's industrialisation policies were successful.

This question focussed on Stalin's industrialisation policies and not a detailed analysis of agriculture policies. However, many candidates did not appreciate this. The strongest answers included criteria for basing judgements on and linked examples of policies back to these, therefore developing a consistent line of reasoning. Candidates discussed Stalin's political and ideological motivations for the massive industrialisation programme and were able to use examples from the Five-Year Plans to address these. The best of these responses used precise knowledge of specific achievements regarding production increases. The strongest answers were fully balanced, with candidates sometimes addressing the challenges facing industrial workers. For example, the failure to provide consumer products and the dreadful living conditions experienced by many in the rapidly expanding urban centres.

Question 3

'Weimar politicians were mostly responsible for Hitler's rise to power in January 1933.' Discuss this view.

This was the most popular question on the paper and was usually answered with a degree of success. The most successful approach set out the alternatives to the stated factor from the outset and proceeded to compare their relative impact in helping Hitler come to power, with strong answers demonstrating the inter-linking of factors. Most answers related how Hindenburg and von Papen miscalculated when offering Hitler, the chancellorship on the assumption that he could be controlled. Some responses also discussed how Weimar governments had failed to deal with the consequences of the Great Depression, therefore offering Hitler the opportunity to increase his popularity. Less successful approaches were based on a generalised history of the earlier Weimar years, including coverage of the Treaty of Versailles and hyperinflation, without making explicit how this helped Hitler, beyond the general unpopularity of the new democracy with sections of the German populace. Alternative discussions commonly included the impact of Depression itself and the appeal of Hitler and the Nazis.

Question 4

Assess the view that government policies to deal with the Great Depression 'did more harm than good'.

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

Assess the extent to which the SALT agreements affected US–Soviet relations.

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. The focus of the question was the SALT agreements of the 1970s and the extent to which they contributed to Détente in that decade. The best responses were firmly focused on the issue, showing knowledge of the agreements and their implications. Some candidates discussed other examples of the thawing of relations, such as the Helsinki Accords, to explore the extent to which tensions had lessened, although there was no need to compare their impact directly. However, an approach which explained why Détente came about was less likely to succeed in addressing the focus of the question directly and such responses often contained irrelevance. The strongest answers achieved balance by explaining that Cold War tensions continued in the 1970s, by exploring the limitations of SALT I or by discussing events around the world, for instance in Angola or Ethiopia. Candidates also explained how Détente came to an end through the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the subsequent

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

failure of SALT II agreement to be ratified. Some responses lacked a clear grasp of the SALT treaties and this undermined their success severely.

Question 10

Evaluate the strength of the opposition to the re-establishment of British colonial control in Malaya after 1945.

The candidates who answered this question often did not include enough knowledge of the specific context of British Malaya to develop convincing arguments. In addition, there was little specific information about the development of opposition movements and of British policies, with candidates instead relying on more generalised comments relating to the success of guerrilla warfare. This is an area that should be focused on in the future.

Question 11

'The United Nations' Operation in the Congo had limited effect.' Discuss this view.

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

Question 12

'Opposition to the Shah's attempts to westernise Iran was the main cause of the Iranian Revolution.' Assess this view.

Those candidates who answered this question were generally able to provide supporting detail to agree with the proposition that the Shah's attempts to westernise Iran were the leading cause of the 1979 Revolution. Some knowledge was included about Khomeini and his values, sometimes leading to a description of post-1979 policies, which were superficially lacking in relevance but were used to support the argument. Candidates found it harder to provide balance by including alternative arguments, although some understood the implications of the Shah's economic policies. However, the repressive nature of the regime was generally unexplored.

© 2023