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 on the sources in relation to focus of the question.

- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source and 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 often led to a confused response showing lack of clarity. Evidence from the sources should be demonstrated with a brief, precise quotation, or paraphrase. 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 points of comparison by taking parts of the sources out of context. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. This often came about by focusing too narrowly on identifying similar words in each respective source. However, 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 canals only rather than other similarities and differences between the sources which may be apparent, including comments on railways. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the sources' usefulness, the candidates should prioritise a focus on making a developed comparison, i.e., identifying similarities and differences.

Responses should also focus on contextualising the sources and applying historical knowledge. In ***Section A***, some candidates added substantial paragraphs of additional contextual knowledge about the development of railways which was irrelevant to the focus of the question. Candidates should ensure they are only using contextual knowledge which links to the question posed. This paper requires more than just


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

source comprehension. Candidates must be aware of and able to apply the historical context of the period as shown in the syllabus and be able to deploy this knowledge in an evaluative consideration of the source material. 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. As such, when explaining these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question with evidence from contextual knowledge rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable. For example, in ***Section A***, using contextual detail about 'canal mania' and the start of 'railway mania' and the industries which provoked change, could have been used to evaluate the sources.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A: European Option: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850*

**(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about canals.**

The best responses to this question used their historical knowledge of the events of the development of transport in industrial Britain to interpret ideas from the sources. Good responses were able to recognise similarities and differences as evidence of positive or negative evidence about the use of canals, their cost and effectiveness. Weaker 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) 'The development of railways was unpopular.' How far do these sources support this view?**

This question was generally well attempted, and responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the view 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 D which shows strong opposition to the railways, but also recognises that there is an intention to replace the canal with a railway and therefore that they must be popular in some sectors. The best responses were able to use their historical knowledge of the period to explain the context of these sources in the period of change between 'canal' and 'railway mania' and the discussions which were being held in the time of the transport revolution. Most candidates were able to recognise both support and challenge in the sources and stronger 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.

### *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.

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

**(c) To what extent do these sources agree about the Locarno Conference?**

This question required candidates to focus on the Locarno Conference in both source extracts. 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, particularly with regard to Franco-German relations in the period between the Treaty of Versailles and the conference. Again, it is important to note that 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. Many candidates lacked knowledge about the individual leaders especially Chamberlain and Briand, which limited their ability to evaluate in context. Overall, this question was well attempted.

**(d) How far do the sources support the view that French and German leaders were committed to seeking peaceful solutions to international problems?**

Most responses engaged with the sources carefully to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss the commitment to peaceful solutions, and the best responses began to use their contextual knowledge to do this. Many candidates were


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question. Most used evidence selected from the sources to clearly support their argument, although it is important to note that evidence should be precisely and concisely deployed. A number of candidates identified the nuanced depiction of Briand in the cartoon which meant that the different attitudes of Stresemann and Briand could be discussed both in support and challenge of the view in question. Source C was particularly well used as it enabled responses to discuss the wider context of Stresemann's 'Golden Age' in Germany in the period, which many candidates demonstrated with detailed knowledge shown. Some of the strongest answers used their knowledge of the period to attempt to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question.


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

# HISTORY

**Paper 9489/22**
**Outline Study**

## Key messages

The best responses showed that candidates had a clear awareness of the difference between description and explanation, whereas weaker responses tended to describe events. For example, in answering a question about the effects of the Treaty of Prague on Prussia some candidates provided a detailed description about the events leading to the Treaty and of the key terms of the Treaty. This meant that candidates were less able to show how these factors increased the power of Prussia after 1866 and so they were less successful in engaging with the question. The most successful responses were able to reach the higher levels of the mark scheme to **part (a)** questions because they explained significant factors in an event or action.

In **part (b)** questions candidates should ensure that they offer a supported account of two different interpretations of a specific historical situation. Questions generally share a similar format of asking how far, or to what extent, a candidate is able to support one particular interpretation. The purpose of such questions is to encourage candidates to look at alternative interpretations and decide how far they agree with the interpretation offered in the question. Sometimes candidates explain why they agree with a particular point of view without considering any alternatives. These are weaker responses than those which consider different viewpoints. Top level marks go to those who make a decision about which interpretation they agree with most and are able to show clearly why it is better than the alternative.

## General comments

The entry for this session was very small. Responses were fairly evenly distributed between ***Sections A*** and ***C***. Despite the small entry there was a good range of responses. Most candidates showed a sound grasp of the basic factual detail of the topics they had studied. Better candidates were able to apply that knowledge to answering the specific questions that were set. Weaker candidates were less able to deploy relevant information to develop a relevant explanation or argument.

## Comments on specific questions

***Section A: Modern Europe, 1750-1921***

**Question 3** was attempted most often with similar numbers answering **Question 1** or **2**.

### Question 1

**(a) Explain why Louis XVI recalled the Parlements at the start of his reign in 1774.**

Most candidates had some understanding of the problems facing France in 1774 when Louis XVI succeeded to the throne which identified a relevant factor. However, weaker responses were less able to provide a valid explanation of why this led to the calling of the Parlements. Some weaker candidates confused the term 'Parlement' with Parliament and wrote about the calling of the Estates General in 1789.


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

**(b) To what extent did internal divisions cause the counter-revolutionaries to fail in the period from 1790 to 1795?**

Candidates generally demonstrated sound knowledge of events in France in the period 1790-1795 and provided detail of some events that showed why counter-revolutionary activity failed. The strongest responses were able to differentiate between groups of counter-revolutionaries. Less successful candidates wrote about divisions between revolutionaries (Jacobin, Girondin etc.,), and so were less focused on the question.

**Question 2**

**(a) Explain why the Treaty of Prague, 1866, increased Prussia's power in Germany.**

There was understanding why the Treaty of Prague was signed though some candidates chose to provide detail of events leading to the signing rather than considering the effects of the Treaty from a Prussian perspective. More successful responses did provide explanation of how the outcome of the Treaty was beneficial in giving Prussia control of the North German Confederation and removing Austrian influence from Germany without making a serious enemy of Austria. Such responses scored well.

**(b) 'The humiliation of Olmütz weakened German nationalism.' How far do you agree?**

Stronger answers showed understanding of this event and were able to explain its effects on the relationship between Austria and Prussia and the effect this had on the development of the idea of a united Germany. However, responses were less successful in linking the events to the development of German nationalism often equating this to longer term factors like the middle class and academic nature of nationalists, the innate conservatism of many Germans and of lack of support of the Princes. Weaker responses tended to be less balanced in their approach because they did not link the explanation of the Humiliation of Olmütz to its consequences.

**Question 3**

**(a) Explain why the Kronstadt rebellion of 1921 happened.**

The strongest responses showed detailed understanding of the Kronstadt rebellion. Most candidates were able to identify War communism as one cause, along with general dissatisfaction with the Bolshevik leadership. Less successful responses were confused about the chronology of the Revolution, writing about the Lenin's April Theses, the Provisional Government and Kornilov Affair as part of their answer.

**(b) 'The opposition to the Tsarist regime in the period from 1906 to 1914 was not a serious threat.' How far do you agree?**

Many candidates were aware of the reasons for the survival of the Tsarist Government in this period and were able to provide some sound arguments about grass roots support and the success of repressive measures in maintaining the regime during this time. However not all of these provided explanation of the divisions of opposition to the Tsar other than Bolshevik-Menshevik split. This led to largely one-sided arguments and so were less successful.

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

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


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

***Section C: International History, 1870-1945***

**Questions 7** and **8** were equally popular, **Question 9** less so.

**Question 7**

**(a) Explain why the United States began an extensive modernisation of its navy in the late nineteenth century.**

Better candidates had a good grasp of this topic. They recognised that the root cause was a rapid growth of interest in overseas trade and territories and were able to explain some of the basic reasons for this. These include the Spanish-American War of 1898, that gave the US overseas possession, the closing of the Frontier and the economic crisis of 1893, which revealed some fundamental weakness stemming from over reliance on internal trade to sustain the economy. Good responses provided detailed explanation, but weaker candidates described rather than explained these factors, and were less secure in their supporting evidence.

**(b) 'The Second Boer War made little difference to Britain's relations with other European powers.' How far do you agree?**

There was generally a sound understanding of the Boer War, of who the Boers were and why the British had a problem with them. However, weaker responses did not fully address the question which is about relations with European Powers. Better candidates were able to offer comment on the effect on relations with Germany. A few very strong responses widened the scope of their investigation to consider the effect on other European Powers or to consider how the war altered Britain's own approach to its relationship with those Powers.

**Question 8**

**(a) Explain why Italy's relations with Britain and France changed after 1934.**

Good responses considered a range of factors like the Stresa Front, the Italian invasion of Abyssinia and the rise of Hitler and his growing challenge to the Western Powers. Even if they did not cover all of these in detail there were some very creditable responses that explained the realignment of Mussolini's foreign policy in the mid 1930's because of these factors. Weaker responses were those who gave descriptions of Mussolini's actions but who were less able to explain his intentions and motivations.

**(b) 'It was the departure of key nations that left the League of Nations powerless in the 1930s.' How far do you agree?**

Candidates were mostly aware of which 'key nations' left the League (Japan, Germany and Italy). However, whilst there was a clear understanding of why they left, there was less developed explanation of how this affected the operation of the League of Nations. There was better understanding and explanation of other factors that weakened the League in its operations. These included the effects of the Great Depression, the failure of the World Disarmament Conference and the general focus on internal problems of the remaining Great Powers (Britain and France). The strongest responses were able to provide a balanced answer that evaluated a range of factors.

**Question 9**

**(a) Explain why attempts to form a stable government in China between 1912 and 1916 were unsuccessful.**

More successful responses were able to provide an account of the career of Yuan Shi-kai and how his actions and intentions undermined attempts to form a democratic government. Weaker responses tended to describe the fall of the imperial dynasty in China which happened before 1912 and thus was outside the scope of this question. Good responses also considered other factors like this rise of regional warlords in the face of the collapse of central authority and were able to produce supported explanation of the failure to establish stable government.


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

**(b) How far was the failure of democracy in Japan a result of the Great Depression?**

Relatively few candidates wrote about this but there were some very creditable responses. Most candidates had a clear understanding of the wider problems facing Japanese democracy like lack of experience of democratic processes and issues of corruption and bias in the governments that were formed. Good responses set this against the effects of the Great Depression which created economic collapse and which democratic leaders seemed unable to deal with. They also recognised the significance of extremist tendencies and the power of the military elite that finally destroyed the democratic processes and established a military dictatorship.


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

# HISTORY

**Paper 9489/32**
**Interpretations Questions**

## Key messages

- Candidates should allow plenty of time at the start of the examination to read through the extract. It is vital that they are aware of everything that the extract says, so that they can consider the extract as a whole and infer the historian's interpretation from it.
- The interpretation will be consistent with everything the extract says, though not everything the extract says will be equally important. Candidates need to select relevant material from the extract to explain how they have inferred the historian's interpretation from it.
- The question asks about the extract, not the historical events to which the extract relates. If candidates find themselves writing about events, rather than the extract, their answer will be losing focus.

## General comments

The general standard of responses was good, with candidates experiencing little difficulty in identifying the main features of the historians' interpretations. However, weaker responses were characterised by less well-structured approaches. Ideally, an answer will first identify what it sees as the historian's interpretation/approach, and then in subsequent paragraphs use detailed points from the extract to explain how the interpretation can be inferred from what it says. The focus should be on who or what the historian blames, and how references to the extract can illustrate this. In short, the answer should be about what the historian thinks, rather than what the extract says. Less effective answers did not sustain a consistent focus on the interpretation because they were constructed around a summary of the extract, starting at the beginning and going through to the end. Better answers wove into this some comments on how particular points related to the interpretation; weaker answers lost sight of the interpretation and summarised/paraphrased what the extract said. The most successful answers picked and chose from the content of the extract in order to construct an explanation of who/what the historian was blaming.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

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

### Question 2

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Hitler for deciding on the mass murder of the Jews from an early stage, even though the development of genocidal policy was held back by practical constraints. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In practice, almost all candidates saw that Hitler was blamed, and identified the approach as intentionalist. However, weaker answers failed to make a distinction between Hitler wanting genocide and determining the time when he made the decision to kill all Jews - the second of which is the true focus of the historian's interpretation. The main determinant of the quality of candidates' answers was the effectiveness with which the extract was used, with better answers keeping a focus on illustrating the interpretation by referring to specific points in the extract, whilst weaker answers tended to state what they saw as the interpretation at the start of their answers, and then summarise what the extract said, rather than explaining the historian's view.


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

**Question 3**

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames the Soviet Union for pursuing an aggressive, expansionist policy in the early post-war period, which left the West no choice but to respond to the threat it faced. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates had no difficulty in recognising that the Soviet Union was being blamed. The debate that most commonly arose was over whether the historian's approach was orthodox/traditional or post-post-revisionist. Properly supported answers arguing for either approach could achieve a high level, but in the way it exonerated the West, and in its lack of focus on Stalin's personality, the extract could more plausibly be seen as orthodox. As with the Holocaust topic, the main discriminator between weaker and stronger answers was the effectiveness with which the extract was used to illustrate and explain the interpretation, with less successful answers lapsing into summary of what the extract said, rather than using what it said to show how the historian's interpretation could be inferred.


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

# HISTORY

**Paper 9489/42**
**Depth Study**

## Key messages

- A consistent focus on the specific nature of the question set is crucial in enabling candidates to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Strongest answers are typically analytical throughout and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant, accurate and wide-ranging factual detail.
- Candidates must have sound chronological understanding and should only employ material which is relevant to the dates stipulated in the question, where appropriate.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument. These answers consider any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations of the causes or consequences of events and provide a clear judgment of relative significance which follows a clear line of reasoning.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before choosing and writing is strongly recommended.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be used frequently in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

## General comments

The best responses were consistently analytical in their approach and contained a coherent and clearly defined argument which was effectively supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge. These answers reached a logical final judgement, which was based on a consistent line of reasoning, evident throughout the essay. Examples of this could be seen in **Question 3** where the strongest answers discussed Hitler's personal attributes, before widening the focus to the Nazi Party, the wider economic background and dissatisfaction with the government's ability to deal with the challenges. Strong analysis showed that these factors were linked rather than treating them as completely distinct. However, some responses indicated that candidates had not fully considered the specific nature of the question. Material relating to von Papen and Hindenburg's actions in early 1933 partially explain why Hitler became chancellor, but not why he had risen in popularity in the previous four years. Careful consideration of the precise demands of the question will always be of the utmost importance.

Candidates consistently demonstrated their understanding of the need for balance, and this was seen in all questions, although some responses to **Question 1** did not go beyond religion and so were not properly addressing the terms of the question. However, all responses to **Question 2** were able to compare the importance of the errors and omissions of Stalin's rivals to his own responsibility for his rise, for example.

## Comments on specific questions

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

**Question 1**

**'Mussolini's dealings with the Catholic Church were his most successful social policy'. Discuss this view.**

The best responses demonstrated good knowledge of Mussolini's policies in relation to the Catholic Church, most obviously the Lateran Treaty and Concordat, and were able to analyse the extent of their success. Some candidates drew the conclusion that Mussolini was able to gain the support of Catholics in Italy through his policies, whilst also exploring weaknesses in the relationship between church and state, for example in relation to antisemitism. To answer the question fully, a comparison with other examples of social


© 2024

policy was necessary. Common examples were education and youth policies and policies towards women. Some candidates were able to discuss the Fascist regime's attempts to gain loyalty through controlling the population's social lives. As a result, most responses were able to access the higher levels, although there were examples of responses which dealt solely with religious policies without sufficient depth of supporting material.

**Question 2**

**'The main reason why Stalin was able to seize power by 1928 was because of the weaknesses of his opponents'. Assess this view.**

A comparison of how far responsibility lay either with Stalin's opponents or with his own political skills was required for this question and candidates proved well able to do so. There was a good deal of discussion of Trotsky's personality and lack of political acumen, and some responses went beyond him to examine the role of others, most notably Kamenev and Zinoviev. Most candidates were able to provide commentary on their failure to publish Lenin's Testament and the reasons for, and consequences of, this decision. There was also consideration of the role of Lenin himself in some responses; some candidates criticised Lenin's actions and argued that these actions led to the power vacuum which would ultimately be filled by Stalin. Many candidates were able to explore Stalin's own role fully. His cunning personality was particularly well suited to the power struggle, and he made the most of the roles that he had acquired; many responses provided analysis on the significance of his position as General Secretary. The strongest responses showed the link between the power Stalin wielded as General Secretary and the failures of his rivals to understand this power. These responses often referred to the dismissive nicknames that Stalin was given, such as Comrade Card Index. This argument allowed for a fully developed and linked analysis showing the interaction of the different factors.

**Question 3**

**'Hitler's personal popularity was the main reason for the increased support for the Nazi party in the period 1929–33'. Discuss.**

This was a popular question. The most successful answers gave a balanced response, through the comparison of the stated factor with alternative explanations. Candidates tended to use Hitler's oratory and skilful use of propaganda to help to explain the proposition in the question. It was usually understood that Hitler was able to gain the support of different groups in German society by adapting his message accordingly. Good responses expanded this explanation into a wider examination of the appeal of the Nazi Party, with references made to the role of the SA and of Goebbels in marketing Hitler as Germany's last hope. They then went on to discuss other examples, most notably the economic context. Discussion of the problems facing Germany and the failure of Weimar governments to solve these problems allowed for an analysis of the impact of Hitler's promises, such as 'work and bread.' There was also commentary on the importance of the support of élite groups and the money they provided to Hitler which funded his campaigns. This support from the élites was sometimes linked skilfully to their fear of communism. Some less successful responses spent time on the political intrigue which led to Hitler's appointment as chancellor in January 1933, but this was not the focus of the question. Careful reading of the question and planning for its specific demands are crucial.

**Question 4**

**Poor relations between employers and Trade Unions were the main problem facing the UK economy in the years 1919–39. Evaluate this view.**

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

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

**Question 5**

**Assess the reasons why Americans supported McCarthyism.**

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


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

**Question 6**

**Assess the extent to which external challenges affected the US economy in the 1960s and 1970s.**

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

**Question 7**

**Assess the impact of the ideas of the Religious Right in the 1980s and 1990s.**

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

**Question 8**

**Analyse the reasons why the US aimed to establish global economic leadership in the period 1944–1970.**

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

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

**Question 9**

**Assess the extent to which President Carter was responsible for the outbreak of the Second Cold War.**

Most candidates understood the necessity to provide a balanced assessment of the different levels of responsibility on Carter, Reagan and the Soviet leaders, although some responses did not cover all of these examples. Responses dealt with the stated factor by discussing Carter's growing irritation with the Soviet Union's failure to abide by elements of the Helsinki Accords, for example on human rights.

There was also exploration of Carter's responses to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, including the Carter Doctrine, the failure to sanction SALT II, and the boycott of the Moscow Olympics in 1980. Although some responses did not cover Reagan in sufficient detail, better answers did consider his, and other neo-Conservatives' hawkish responses. There was consideration of Reagan's reference to the 'Evil Empire' and his increased defence spending, with Star Wars frequently referenced. A more common argument was to assign most responsibility to the Soviet Union because of their actions in Afghanistan. Those responses that did provide balance and good supporting evidence were rewarded marks within the higher levels at both AO1 and AO2.

**Question 10**

**Analyse the extent to which the Korean War was brought about by the actions of the United States.**

Most candidates grasped the need to weigh up American responsibility with that of the Soviet Union, China and the Koreas. Good responses understood the situation in Korea in 1950 and there was some effective and detailed discussion of the importance of NSC-68 and of Dean Acheson's actions. The USA's policy of containment and its influence with the United Nations was also referred to in places, with some responses going on to examine how MacArthur widened the conflict by adopting a goal of roll-back. Candidates were able to discuss the ambitions of both North and South Korea and how this helped contribute to conflict breaking out, with both Kim Il Sung and Syngman Rhee harbouring hopes of re-unification under their leadership. However, ultimately it was the actions of North Korea and the support of Stalin which led to the outbreak of war and candidates usually drew this conclusion.

**Question 11**

**'Lack of national unity was the main obstacle to establishing effective governments in the newly independent African nations.' Assess this view.**

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


© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

**Question 12**

**'Ben Gurion's decision to involve Israel in the Suez Crisis was a mistake.' Discuss this view.**

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


© 2024