HISTORY

Paper 9489/11
Document Question

Key messages

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question and accurately represented the arguments of the sources.
- In **part (a)** evidence from the sources should be given to support the comparison being made and quotations should be precisely selected. Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the prompt. It is important that the argument is explained rather than asserted.
- In **part (a)** contextual knowledge should be used to explain the similarities and differences between the sources. Commentaries on utility or reliability which lack contextual understanding and do not serve the needs of the question are not relevant.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they contribute to the evaluation of the source in context.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated comprehension of the sources and the ability to analyse effectively. Candidates were aware that **part (a)** requires identification and support of similarities and differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement in the question. Most responses provided relevant quotations, or direct paraphrases, to support their comparisons or argument.

It is important to read the sources carefully. On occasion, candidates missed nuances in sources or misrepresented the argument of a source. This resulted in comparisons, or support and challenge arguments, which were not valid. The best responses result from taking the time to read and think about the sources before starting the answer.

Some responses demonstrated knowledge of the topic, but it was not always deployed to best effect. Contextual understanding is vital for responses to achieve marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, it is necessary to consider the sources in context to work out why they are similar or different. Using contextual knowledge to explain the point of view of a source is only creditable if a comparison of viewpoints is relevant to the question and the difference or similarity is explained. Contextual understanding should underpin the reading of the sources so that candidates understand the point the author is making.

In **part (a)** it is most important to focus on the demands of the question. In **Question 1(a)** the focus of the question was about the Confederation. Therefore, comparisons about Prussia or the customs union were not valid unless they were linked to an inference about the Confederation. **Questions 2 (a)** and **3(a)** were both about events. However, it was quite common to see comparisons which were about the tone of the sources instead of events. In **Question 2 (a)** the sources both referred to the idea of a 'higher law', and some candidates simply matched this and other phrases between the sources rather than making a valid inference-based comparison which answered the question.

In **part (b)**, achieving the higher levels requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless it is linked to the question. Many responses contained lengthy sections of background information or generalised commentary on the bias and reliability of sources which was not made relevant to the question focus. The best responses considered how contextual knowledge supported or challenged the claims made in a source, or they considered how, if a

© 2025

source was produced for a specific audience or outcome, that motivation affected the source's weight as evidence.

It will always be possible to make a balanced argument for **part (b)** to support and challenge the statement in the question. However, candidates should not expect the number of sources on each side to be the same or expect that at least one source will be nuanced. Such expectations sometimes led to missed opportunities for valid source use.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815 – 71

Question 1

(a) Read Source A and Source D. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Confederation.

Many responses identified and supported a similarity between the sources. The most frequently seen comparison was that both sources agreed that the Confederate Assembly was not effective. It was pointed out that in Source A, the assembly was described as not being *'an effective political institution'*, while in Source D complained that *'nothing profitable can be expected from it'*. Others drew out the comparison that a separate organisation in the form of a customs union was being formed within the Confederation. However, sources need to be read in context, the inference on which the comparison is based must be valid for both sources and should not misrepresent the argument of either source. In many responses, candidates tried to argue that both sources complained that the Assembly had not brought about unification. Given that Metternich wrote Source A, it was highly unlikely that he would complain about the Assembly failing to unify the German states. Others tried to match words in the sources, selecting the phrase *'equality of rights'* from Source A and trying to match it against *'duty in respect of representative government'* in Source D. This was missing the point of the sources. In Source A, Metternich complained about Prussia's attempt to exercise more power than other states in the Confederation when they were all supposed to be equal. This was not the same sentiment as that expressed in Source D which was about political rights through representative government. Many responses identified a valid difference, quite often about whether the customs union represented a threat to the Confederation, as argued in Source A, and compared this with the more positive, inclusive conclusion of Source D. Weaker responses tended to lack focus on the question and made comparisons about the customs union rather than the Confederation. These could only be valid if they were linked by an inference, for instance about the probable impact of the customs union on the Confederation. Some responses showed awareness of the need to explain the similarities or differences but general comments on reliability were seen more frequently than explanation.

(b) 'The most important impact of the Zollverein was to strengthen the economies of the German states.' How far do the sources support this view.

Most candidates gave a two-sided response and there was evidence of effective source use and sound contextual understanding in many responses. Most identified Source A as a challenge source, explaining Metternich's complaint that Prussia would use the customs union (Zollverein) to undermine Austria, hence arguing that the political impact was more important. Some perceptive responses understood the challenge argument but also pointed out that Metternich's comment *'Prussia will use economic interests to weaken the influence of Austria'* unwittingly admitted that Prussia's power had grown through its increased economic strength. Source B supported the economic argument as it showed the numerous trade barriers which the Zollverein, and the earlier customs union, aimed to remove to increase trade. However, this cartoon was often misunderstood and those who attempted to evaluate it often fell back on general comments about it being a cartoon and therefore merely entertainment for the public. Source C could be used on both sides of the argument and many candidates recognised this. To support, they argued that the improvements to *'roads, the canals, the means of travelling'* would clearly be helpful to developing trade in the German states. To challenge, they pointed out the *'probable political consequences'* of the Zollverein. It was possible to make a similarly nuanced argument from Source D which also commented on the *'common economic interests'* shared by the states but linked these to political consequences such as *'a German policy, common direction and protection of national interests'*.

© 2025

Although many responses demonstrated awareness of the context, very few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger.

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

Question 2

(a) Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources about events in Christiana.

A considerable number of responses answered **part (b)** first and, as a result, found it difficult to focus properly on the question for **part (a)**. **Part (b)** was about reasons why people objected to the Fugitive Slave Law and those who answered **(b)** first often continued this focus rather than comparing the accounts of events in Christiana. The most frequently explained similarity was that both sources mentioned Gorsuch's attempt to recover his runaway slave and that this ended in the death of Gorsuch. Others made a comparison based on the importance of events; Source B arguing that what had happened in Christiana was a *'battle'* and *'the first blow of our Civil War'* and Source C agreeing that the events were an *'act of insurrection'* which could destroy the government. The most frequently discussed differences between the sources included whether Gorsuch's actions constituted an *'invasion'* or were *'peaceful and legal'* and whether he was *'murdered in cold blood'* or killed because the townspeople were forced to defend themselves. However, to be valid, comparisons needed to be like for like and focused on the question. Word matching between the sources on the phrase *'higher law'* was not a valid comparison about events. Some responses contained a paragraph of contextual knowledge, or a discussion of reliability based on the possible bias of each of the sources.

(b) 'People objected to the Fugitive Slave Law because they feared the reactions it would provoke.' How far do these sources support this view?

A considerable proportion of responses misread the question and did not see that it was based on the premise that people objected to the Fugitive Slave Law but had varied reasons for doing so. These answers wrote about whether people objected to the law and therefore struggled to be relevant. Source A was understood and used as to develop the support argument with most arguing that the Fugitive Slave Law would *'provoke great anger in the North'* and drive even those who did not support abolition to supporting this *'radical cause.'* Source B was used most effectively as a challenge and responses noted that opposition to the law in this source was based on moral grounds with the Law being described as *'immoral and irreligious'*. However, some argued effectively that the source supported the prompt, picking up the references to *'vigilance committees'* and and the thinly veiled threat that the safety of the *'man stealers'* could not be guaranteed. Source C was used to challenge as it suggested that the motive of those who were against the Fugitive Slave Law was jealousy of the Southern way of life. Source D was more cautious in its comments than Source A, but Lincoln admitted he would not pass the law now for *'fear of what it might provoke'*. While answers often considered provenance and commented on source reliability, it was common to see general evaluation. For example, Source D was from Lincoln and was therefore accepted without question as a valid and honest account.

Section C: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

Question 3

(a) Read Source A and Source B. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about events in Guernica.

To make effective comparisons it was important to focus on the phrase *'events in Guernica'*. Most answers supported at least one valid similarity, often that both sources agreed that the Germans had some involvement in the bombing of Guernica. Relevant source use to support this included that Source A mentioned that *'the sky was black with German aeroplanes'* while Source B referred to the claims of the Basque leader that *'German planes bombed Guernica'.* It was also possible to argue that both sources illustrated the interest of the international press in the bombing of Guernica as they referred to the correspondent from the Times as a witness. Some responses pointed out a second similarity which was that both sources showed distrust of the account of events given by the other side and raised questions about the claims they made. The simplest difference was that the correspondent from the Times was attacked according to Source A, but only saw the bombers

© 2025

in Source B. However, the most seen difference was that Source A wholeheartedly blamed the German air force for the destruction of Guernica, whereas Source B stated it was mostly caused by the agents of Aguirre, the Basque leader. Comparisons which were based on the tone of the sources, or reasons for the attack, were not valid. Some responses attempted to explain the differences between the sources. To be effective it was necessary to do more than claim that Source B was by the Nationalists and therefore biased or unreliable. The best answers made effective use of their contextual knowledge, often referring to the failure of the Non-Intervention Pact or the use of new methods of warfare by Germany, which were both alluded to by the left-wing British politician. The purpose of this speech was considered in the context of the Spanish Civil War and balanced against consideration of the nature and purpose of Franco's commission which produced Source B.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that Germany intervened in Spain in order to defeat Communism?

Most responses developed a balanced argument with Sources A and D cited as challenge sources and Sources B and C as support. Source A challenged the statement in the question as it argued that the main purpose of the raid on Guernica was to prove *'German aviation strength'*. A similar argument could be made from Source D which argued that the development of the German armed forces, and intimidation of potential opponents, were the main purposes behind the attack. Meanwhile, Sources B and C provided supporting evidence to argue that the main reason for the attack was to defeat Communism. Source B referred to the international press creating a *'wave of ink and slime*' against the *'heroic people'* who opposed Communism. Source C created a negative image of the Communists as *'Bolshevist sub-humanity'* and talked about Spanish villagers being *'slaughtered by the Reds'*. Weak responses sometimes resulted from misreading sources and creating a one-sided response. A small number of answers claimed that Source A and D could not be used to answer the question as they did not mention Communism. A minority of responses attempted to use their contextual understanding to evaluate the sources but generalised comments on reliability were more frequently seen. Anwers often argued that Hitler's speeches (Sources C and D) were the most reliable sources, despite their quite different arguments and clear purpose to generate support for the regime and justify its actions in Guernica.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/12
Document Question

Key messages

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question and accurately represented the arguments of the sources.
- In **part (a)** evidence from the sources should be given to support the comparison being made and quotations should be precisely selected. Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question. It is important that the argument is explained rather than asserted.
- In **part (a)** contextual knowledge should be used to explain the similarities and differences between the sources. Commentaries on usefulness or reliability which lack contextual understanding and do not serve the needs of the question are not relevant.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they contribute to the evaluation of the source in the specific context of the question.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated comprehension of the sources and the ability to analyse effectively. Candidates were aware that **part (a)** requires identification and support of similarities and differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement in the question. Most responses provided relevant quotations, or direct paraphrases, to support their comparisons or argument.

It is important to read the sources carefully. On occasion, candidates missed nuances in sources or misrepresented the argument of a source. This resulted in comparisons, or support and challenge arguments, which were not valid. The best responses result from taking the time to read and think about the sources before starting the answer.

Some responses demonstrated knowledge of the topic, but this was not always deployed to best effect. Contextual understanding is vital for responses to achieve marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, it is necessary to consider the sources in context to work out why they are similar or different. Using contextual knowledge to explain the point of view of a source is only creditable if a comparison of viewpoints is relevant to the question and the difference or similarity is explained. Contextual understanding should underpin the reading of the sources so that candidates understand the point the author is making.

In **part (a)** it is most important to focus on the demands of the question. In **Question 1(a)** the focus of the question was about the spread of liberal ideas in the German states. Therefore, detailed context regarding unity was not relevant. In **Question 2 (a)** the sources both referred to the 'Fugitive Slave Law', and some candidates simply matched phrases between the sources rather than making a valid inference-based comparison which answered the question about the **views** in both sources about slaves and slavery.

In **part (b)**, achieving the higher levels requires the evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless it is linked to the question. Many responses contained lengthy sections of background information or generalised commentary on the bias and reliability of sources which was not made relevant to the question focus. The best responses considered how contextual knowledge supported or challenged the claims made in a source, or they considered how, if a source was produced for a specific audience or outcome, that motivation affected the source's weight as evidence.

© 2025

It will always be possible to make a balanced argument for **part (b)** to support and challenge the statement in the question. However, candidates should not expect the number of sources on each side to be the same or expect that at least one source will be nuanced. Such expectations sometimes led to missed opportunities for valid source use. This was particularly evident in some responses to **Question 3(b)** on the Naval Agreement.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about attitudes towards the spread of liberal ideas in German states in the 1830s.

The best responses to this question used historical knowledge of revolutionary events in Europe and the growth of support for liberal ideas within the German states to interpret ideas from the sources. Good responses were able to recognise similarities and differences as evidence of both popular and governmental attitudes to liberal ideas. This could be explained using the context of Metternich's political beliefs and to earlier legislation such as the Carlsbad Decrees of 1819 together with knowledge of revolutionary activity across Europe in 1832 and student societies which promoted liberal ideas. 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. These responses lacked a clear focus on **attitudes** towards liberal ideas.

Many responses identified and supported a similarity between the sources. The most frequently seen comparison was that both sources agreed that liberal ideas were popular with students who were actively involved in political opposition to the state. Metternich's attitudes could be inferred from the enforcement against the universities to stop popular assemblies, and the images in Source C showed that students had managed to gather weapons and tried to free political prisoners. Weaker responses tended to lack focus on the question, in many cases focusing on ideas of German unity rather than liberal ideas. This tended to occur when candidates attempted **part (b)** before **part (a)**. The assessment is structured to be helpful to candidates. By focusing on two sources, **part (a)** is designed to help the candidates ease themselves into the sources and the topic before moving onto **part (b)** which requires work on all four sources. Some responses showed awareness of the need to explain the similarities or differences but general comments on reliability were seen more frequently than explanation.

(b) 'The desire for German unity was the main cause of discontent in the German Confederation.' How far do these sources agree?

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 complaining that there is a lack of *'a secure, unified bond, or any kind of institution in which the German nation might be represented.'* The writer also complains about Austrian and Prussia domination, implying that the German Diet is powerless to achieve national unity or independence because of their domination, but also highlights other complaints such as workers' discontent, lack of religious freedoms, and the desire for a constitutional monarchy. The best responses were able to use their knowledge to evaluate these sources in the context of the period of change between the upsurge of Nationalist feeling in the 1830s and the start of the 1848 revolutions. 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 most successfully when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further.

Only a minority of responses used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. Many attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable. The sources will always offer

© 2025

opportunities to address both elements of the argument, and all sources will be relevant to the view in question.

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

Question 2

(a) Compare and contrast the views in these two sources about slaves and slavery.

Most responses dealt with this question very well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. The question was focused on views about slaves and slavery. Many candidates explained a number of similarities between the sources, including their views on the upholding of the Fugitive Slave Law, views on the nature of slavery as a criminal act, and overall views on opposition to slavery. Many candidates also identified differences, including those surrounding views of sympathy towards enslaved people, and whether those who were formerly enslaved should hold the rights and privileges of all US citizens.

(b) 'How far do these sources support the view that the main reason for the growth of support for the Republican Party was its hostility to slavery?

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the view that the main reason for the growth in support for the Republican Party was its hostility to slavery. Source C was the strongest support for the assertion; slavery is seen as a '*crime*', and this is further reinforced by the comments on the Fugitive Slave Law and the actions and behaviour of the slave holders and their supporters. Source B was also argued to support the hypothesis, with most candidates identifying that the Party *'did not turn a deaf ear'* to the issue. Details from Source D were also used to support the hypothesis. Source A clearly challenged the assertion and stressed that the main support for the Republican Party came from those who were hostile to immigrants and the increasing number of Irish Roman Catholics who were coming into the North. Source D also mentioned the *'destructive'* divisions within the Democrats, which was fracturing badly into Northern and Southern sections. Candidates found source B more difficult to use in challenge, with many not identifying the nuance given by identifying the *'sufficiently broad'* nature of the Party to be able to encompass varying views.

The best responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less valuable when answering the question. Many responses demonstrated good contextual knowledge, for example, the splintering of the Whigs as Northern Whigs opposed the Fugitive Slave Act while Southern Whigs supported it; though few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. The sources included moderates, Free Soilers, and former Whigs who opposed the expansion of slavery but were not necessarily abolitionists, which could have been evaluated using the context of the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act and the widespread resistance to it. Some attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable without any links to the context or the question. Some weaker responses described source content without making a clear link to the question. A minority of responses took a one-sided approach, and it is important to note that the sources will always offer opportunities to address both elements of the argument.

© 2025

Section C: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

Question 3

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the making of the Naval Agreement.

This question required candidates to compare evidence about the making of the Naval Agreement. To make effective comparisons it was necessary to focus on the 'making' of the agreement, not the impact of the Naval Agreement on other countries, for example, France. Most candidates were able to recognise the differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme with many explaining the differences between equal engagement and Hitler's stating of his claims, and the sincerity of the German approach compared to the suggestion of a trap. Similarities presented more challenge to some candidates; most candidates identified the common similarity which professed that preliminary talks were quite friendly, and some identified that the Germans were was pleased with the negotiations. To make effective use of contextual knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. However, many attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable because it was written by Ribbentrop, using general evaluation of the provenance regarding Ribbentrop's post-war claims rather than evaluating the source in the specific context of the making of the Naval Agreement as the special ambassador for the negotiations, together with the likely intent and audience of his memoir.

(b) 'The Naval Agreement improved relations between European powers.' How far do the sources support this view?

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the idea that the Naval Agreement improved relations between the European powers. Source B was used well to support the view with many candidates recognising the Agreement being credited for the *'enduring Anglo-German friendship'* and for the removal of *'one of the causes of the First World War'*. Source D was also used in support with many candidates noting the importance of continuing dialogue with Germany, with the hope of a future tripartite *'Air Pact'* and the claim that France would also *'benefit'* from a reduction of Germany's arms. There were elements of challenge to select in all the sources, with the most commonly used being Sources A and C. Many candidates noted that Churchill's speech strongly condemned the British action for weakening international relations in connection with the League, the Stresa Front and collective security. However, very few used their contextual knowledge about Churchill's political rivalry with Chamberlain to interrogate the arguments made which might be seen to weaken the value of the source as evidence. Source C was used most effectively as a challenge source, with most candidates identifying the break in *'cohesion against the Third Reich'*, and that this would lead to *'many misfortunes'*. However, there were a number of responses which struggled to contextualise the sources because of a lack of detailed knowledge on the details of international diplomacy of the period which was required to do this effectively; thus, generalised comments on reliability were more frequently seen than evaluation in context.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/13
Document Question

Key messages

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question and accurately represented the arguments of the sources.
- In **part (a)** evidence from the sources should be given to support the comparison being made and quotations should be precisely selected. Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question. It is important that the argument is explained rather than asserted.
- In **part (a)** contextual knowledge should be used to explain the similarities and differences between the sources. Commentaries on usefulness or reliability which lack contextual understanding and do not serve the needs of the question are not relevant.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they contribute to the evaluation of the source in the specific context of the question.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated comprehension of the sources and the ability to analyse effectively. Candidates were aware that **part (a)** requires identification and support of similarities and differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement in the question. Most responses provided relevant quotations, or direct paraphrases, to support their comparisons or argument.

It is important to read the sources carefully. On occasion, candidates missed nuances in sources or misrepresented the argument of a source. This resulted in comparisons, or support and challenge arguments, which were not valid. The best responses result from taking the time to read and think about the sources before starting the answer.

Some responses demonstrated knowledge of the topic, but this was not always deployed to best effect. Contextual understanding is vital for responses to achieve marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, it is necessary to consider the sources in context to work out why they are similar or different. Using contextual knowledge to explain the point of view of a source is only creditable if a comparison of viewpoints is relevant to the question and the difference or similarity is explained. Contextual understanding should underpin the reading of the sources so that candidates understand the point the author is making.

In **part (b)**, achieving the higher levels requires the evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless it is linked to the question. Many responses contained lengthy sections of background information or generalised commentary on the bias and reliability of sources. The best responses considered how contextual knowledge supported or challenged the claims made in a source, or they considered how, if a source was produced for a specific audience or outcome, that motivation affected the source's weight as evidence.

It will always be possible to make a balanced argument for **part (b)** to support and challenge the statement in the question. However, candidates should not expect the number of sources on each side to be the same or expect that at least one source will be nuanced. Such expectations sometimes led to missed opportunities for valid source use. This was particularly evident in some responses to **Question 3(b)** on Chamberlain's policy of appeasement and Britain's position when war came.

© 2025

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Frankfurt Parliament.

The best responses to this question used the provenance and historical context of the time which had elapsed between the two sources being written, to explain the differences between the two sources, as by 1849 the Frankfurt Parliament had agreed to accept the Prussian Constitution, and Frederick William IV's divine right to rule. Good responses were able to recognise similarities and differences including the similarities which showed evidence of criticism of the elite composition of the Frankfurt Parliament, and that the Parliament was not reflecting the wishes of the ordinary people. Most candidates identified the key differences between the sources being that the Source B was urging for further effort, whereas Source D described the Frankfurt Parliament and its potential as 'finished'. Some candidates also identified the different reasons for failure. Some candidates used their historical knowledge of the timing of these two sources to explain the reasons for the different in the specific context of the fact that when Marx was writing Source D, the revolutions had finished and the Parliament disbanded. Several candidates approached the explanation of similarities between the sources. Similarities could be explained using contextual knowledge of the Frankfurt Parliament and that despite early popular support and widespread enthusiasm, the Parliament failed to make political headway and became divided and ineffective. Some responses showed awareness of the need to explain the similarities or differences but general comments on reliability were seen more frequently than explanation.

(b) 'The 1848–49 revolutions were a failure.' How far do these sources agree?

Responses effectively used the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question. Many responses also recognised the complexity in Source C which meant it could be used to both support and challenge the statement. The source was well described and interpreted to both support the view, with the size of characters being used to support the power of elites in government dealing with the revolutionaries, and also the fact that although they were being swept away, many of the revolutionaries were only being driven as far as Switzerland and thus their ideas and activities were not being entirely eliminated. Few candidates used their wider knowledge of Marx and Marxist views from across the syllabus to explain why he was so dismissive of the Frankfurt Parliament.

The strongest responses were able to use their historical knowledge of the events of 1849 to assess the validity of the message of the sources, and some evaluated Source D in the context, for example, of the reassertion of Austrian power through the Treaty of Omlütz. However, some of the knowledge used was not secure, in particular on the chronology of the revolutions. 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 most successfully when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further. However, many attempts to evaluate were limited, often just stating that the source was biased or unreliable.

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

Question 2

(a) Compare and contrast the views in these two sources about Stephen Douglas.

Most responses dealt with this question well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. The most frequently identified similarities were about Douglas's recent and 'sudden enthusiasm for 'free soil' ideas and his belief in popular sovereignty. Many candidates also identified differences, including those on his attitudes to enslavement and in particular the different views about his role in the Compromise of 1850. However, few responses sought to explain the similarities or differences and very few considered the different purposes of the sources. This required good knowledge of the chronology of events, including the election of 1860. Source A was written by a Senator of a strongly Southern Democrat area, which was passionate about the retention of slavery. Although written in the weeks before the election of 1860, which saw the election of Lincoln, there is a degree of hindsight when it comes to dealing with issues like the Compromise of 1850, which North Carolina did support. Like many in the South he saw Douglas as questionable on the fundamental issue

© 2025

of slavery and viewed his attempts at compromise as merely as devices to ensure the supremacy of the North and the ultimate abolition of slavery. Source C could also have been evaluated in the context of its Republican position to explain similarities and differences between the views as evidence about Douglas.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that Lincoln's victory in 1860 was caused by divisions within the Democratic Party?

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the view that Lincoln's victory in 1860 was caused by divisions in the Democratic Party. Source A, authored by a Southern Democrat clearly saw Douglas as a greater threat to his state's interests than Lincoln's Republicans. Source B was the strongest challenge, suggesting Lincoln's strengths in dealing adeptly with the issues around enslavement, were a key strength for his victory. Sources C and D both could be used for each side of the debate, with D containing ideas which could be used to support and challenge quite strongly on each side, and C showing divisions not only within the Democrats, but failure of others to unite against Lincoln which led to his victory.

The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explained how this evaluation made them more or less valuable when answering the question. Many responses demonstrated good contextual knowledge, particularly on Lincoln; though few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. Some attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable without any links to the context or the question, or relying on provenance from North or South. Some weaker responses described source content without making a clear link to the question. A minority of responses took a one-sided approach despite the sources always offering opportunities to address both elements of the argument.

Section C: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

Question 3

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the German takeover of the Sudetenland.

To make effective comparisons, candidates had to focus on the German takeover, not other parts of the source discussing impact on other nations or events. Most candidates were able to identify that the Czechs had to make significant losses and that the British Prime Minister had put pressure on the Czech government not to resist. Differences included the responsibility for this advice, and the emphasis within the sources about how the Czechs had reacted to it. To make effective use of contextual knowledge, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. However, few responses did this and many attempts to evaluate were limited, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable, using general evaluation of the provenance, or attempting to explain with evidence from very broad context of the Treaty of Versailles rather than specific context from the events of the takeover. Chronology of the events from 1938–9 was not secure in less effective responses.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that Chamberlain's policy of appeasement meant Britain would be in a stronger position when war came?

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the idea that Chamberlain's policy meant Britain would be in a stronger position at the advent of war. Sources A and C could be used to support the view, with preparations for defence as a result of the Munich Crisis and the idea of appeasement as of the 'highest moral value' generally being used well in support. Source D could have been used for both sides of the argument, with nuanced use of the source to show awareness of the threat, and the ineffectiveness of opportunities to rearm in challenge of the view. Source B was the strongest challenge, with a very negative view of the impact of appeasement.

The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less valuable when answering the question. However, very few used their contextual knowledge about Churchill's political rivalry with Chamberlain to interrogate the arguments in Source C, or to highlight politicians such as in Source B who were strongly anti-

© 2025

appeasement. The knowledge of the chronology of events, including the day of the declaration of war, which could have been very effectively used to explain the position of sources was seldom approached. Weaker responses struggled to contextualise the sources because of a lack of detailed knowledge on the details of international diplomacy of the period.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/21
Outline Study

Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates should consider the timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

General comments

Part (a) questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question. These were characterised by factual inaccuracy, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance, often by ignoring timeframes given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why the royal family's attempted escape from Paris in June 1791 caused a strong reaction against the monarchy.

Most candidates could identify and explain at least one or several causal factors. The most common reasons given were that the people of France saw this as a betrayal and lost confidence in the monarchy, that the king was opposed to the revolution, that the royal family was seeking foreign aid, or that the king had left his people in a poor economic and political state and was unwilling to resolve his country's problems. Stronger answers provided explicit links to particular

© 2025

strong reactions against the monarchy in terms of the radicalisation of the revolution and the eventual execution of the king, thereby achieving Level 3. Weaker responses identified or described one or more causal factors with no clear explanation or, presented narratives discussing the causes of the French Revolution, for example Louis XVI's inability to deal with problems facing France. These responses offered limited or no links to the question. There was some confusion in a few responses, sometimes with chronology, e.g. that the flight to Varennes was what started the revolution. Very few answers presented connected factors to reach a reasoned conclusion.

(b) 'Napoleon's coup of 1799 succeeded because he had the support of the army.' How far do you agree?

Many candidates demonstrated understanding of the demands of the question and were therefore able to attempt to provide a balanced response. When considering the given perspective several arguments were presented to show how far Napoleon's coup of 1799 succeeded because he had the support of the army. Common approaches attempted included the status that Napoleon had with the army, his military victories that had made him a national hero ensuring continued support of the army, or the lack of armed opposition because the army supported Napoleon. Many of these arguments presented, however, were limited, with very few responses going into any considerable depth. Arguments to challenge the view were frequently more substantial and developed, with candidates considering the failures and unpopularity of the Directory, as well as the role of Sieyes and Napoleon's brother Lucien. Napoleon's overall leadership skills and popularity were often referred to, as well as the importance of propaganda. Stronger responses provided assessment with at least some balance, attaining marks in Level 3, while the weaker ones often presented explicit comment with limited support, or at times, description, scoring in Level 2 or top of Level 1. Very few answers in Level 4 and above were seen due to the lack of depth provided whilst assessing the given perspective.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why the factory system developed.

Stronger answers took a multi-causal approach to this question, arguing the importance of factors such as the development of machines, the consequence of population changes and the growth of capitalism to provide investment in new factories. These responses were also able to support their arguments with specific knowledge, for example by describing Richard Arkwright's work, or providing examples of machines such as the Spinning Jenny and the power loom. Some candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of the development of the factory system, but used this to explain only one factor, and therefore were credited at the bottom of Level 3. Weaker responses often contained some knowledge, but this was not linked to the focus of the question. For example, some candidates were able to describe the cottage system and recognise that it had low productivity but did not explain how factories overcame this. Responses such as this remained in Level 2.

(b) By 1850 industrialisation had undermined aristocratic influence.' How far do you agree?

Many responses were credited at Level 3 for explaining at least one perspective. This was generally achieved by assessing the given perspective through an understanding of the consequences of the growth of the middle-class. As support for this, candidates often referred to greater political involvement through the 1832 Reform Act or the appointment of Robert Peel and the subsequent repeal of the Corn Laws, all of which undermined aristocratic influence. Stronger responses were also able to provide balance, and as support used examples of government roles, land ownership and suppression of worker's rights to strengthen the aristocracy's position. Weaker responses were often descriptive, for example providing a narrative of the process of industrialisation or the poor living and working conditions of the lower classes, but without trying to link these to aristocratic influence. These responses were credited at Levels 1 or 2.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why division amongst their enemies led to Bolshevik success in the Russian Civil War.

Most candidates were able to identify more than one of the divisions that existed such as the ideological and geographical divisions. Weaker answers gave generic comments about division,

© 2025

without precise factual support or explanation as to why these had an impact. These could be credited at Level 2, but to be credited at Level 3 the candidates needed to go beyond recognising the differences to explain how this led to Bolshevik success, and this was approached by candidates in two different, but equally valid ways. Most candidates compared a specific division with the comparable strength of the Bolsheviks, for example by explaining that the enemies were unable to coordinate their attacks due to geographical division, whilst the Bolsheviks were in control of the cities in Central Russia which allowed them control of the railways to organise attacks. An alternative approach was to concentrate only on the divisions of the enemies, explaining how this weakened them. For example, some candidates argued that the ideological fragmentation amongst the groups including monarchists, Mensheviks and the Greens made it hard for them to gain the support of the population. Weaker responses provided often lengthy reasons for Bolshevik success, but these were credited at Level 1 since the focus of the question was about division of the enemies. The weakest answers were out of the given time frame, often focussing on one or both of the 1917 Revolutions, and these could not be credited.

(b) To what extent were Stolypin's land reforms a success?

Some good responses were seen to this question, although many candidates lacked the specific contextual knowledge required to provide a balanced answer to achieve the higher levels. The most successful responses, when agreeing with the given perspective, had good knowledge of Stolypin and his land reforms, and were able to use this to assess the strengths, for example by increasing support for the Tsar, or the creation of the Kulak class. Assessment of alternative perspectives often lacked this level of specific support, but some candidates were able to assess the weaknesses of the reforms by arguing that they were short lived or not taken up by all. Alternatively, some responses referred to the poor quality of the land in Siberia. A common feature seen in weaker responses was a tendency for answers to lack focus on Stolypin, instead commenting more generally on Russia during this period. For example, some candidates confused land reforms with the industrial reforms of Witte or made generic comments on land productivity. Such comments could only be credited at the lower levels. The weakest responses lacked an understanding of the context, confusing Stolypin's reforms with Stalin's collectivization, and these answers were unable to be credited.

Section B: The history of the USA, 1820–1941

Question 4: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why Grant's enforcement of Reconstruction policies was inconsistent.

Many responses lacked contextual knowledge and understanding specific to Grant. The most successful answers were able to explain more than one factor, with some explaining the idea of conflicting priorities and splits within the Republican Party. Other responses focused on Grant's personality, either through a discussion of how he tried to balance competing interests, or through the scandals surrounding his Presidency. Weaker responses could identify a factor but were unable to support this with evidence of the impact it had on Reconstruction. A significant number of responses seen were not confident with the chronology, referring to pre or post Reconstruction events, with many references to Lincoln. Other responses made generalised statements, for example about differences between the North and South, and these could only be credited at Level 1.

(b) 'The main aim of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments was to suppress states' rights.' How far do you agree?

Most candidates who answered this question were able to achieve at least Level 2 since they had good contextual knowledge and understanding of the two amendments and so were able to describe their aims or the details of what they did. Responses which linked the two together could be credited at Level 3, for example by recognising that the intention was to improve the lives of African Americans by ensuring their citizenship and by providing them with voting right. Most such answers were less assured when considering the given perspective of suppressing states' rights, with many candidates ignoring it altogether, or making assertions which lacked contextual support. This meant that fully balanced responses were rare – requiring quite precise knowledge and a strong breadth of arguments on both sides. These responses went beyond description to assess the 'main aim' and compared the suppression of states' rights with rights for African Americans. The weakest responses gave generalised descriptions of what life was like for African

© 2025

Americans at that time, without showing how the amendments were intended to improve the situation.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why late-nineteenth-century cities were unhealthy and unsafe.

Most candidates demonstrated a secure understanding of the general living conditions in late-nineteenth-century cities. Stronger responses focused on poor sanitation, overcrowded living environments, and the spread of disease resulting from inadequate urban planning. Many candidates were able to identify the link between rapid urban growth and the inability of local authorities to provide sufficient clean water, sewage systems and waste management. These answers reflected sound contextual knowledge. Several candidates also successfully incorporated specific examples, such as the poor quality of foods, particularly in reference to the meat industry, and the dangers inherent in factories, including unsafe working conditions and a lack of regulation. Although these details were not central to the question, they were relevant when tied to the broader theme of urban health and safety. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive rather than explanatory. Some candidates focused on irrelevant factors or wrote primarily about twentieth-century reforms and events, showing limited engagement with the period specified. In these cases, there was a lack of analysis of why conditions developed as they did, or of how governmental failings and inadequate regulation contributed to urban problems.

(b) How far do you agree with the view that trusts and corporations were beneficial to the USA?

Most candidates showed an understanding of both sides of the argument. Stronger responses were able to assess the contribution of trusts and corporations to the rapid economic growth of the USA, for example that large industrial organisations allowed for the expansion of the railroad network, the rise of the oil and steel industries, and the efficient exploitation of natural resources. They recognised that these developments helped propel the USA towards becoming a leading global economic power in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Such answers showed awareness of the ways in which large corporations stimulated investment, stabilised prices and created employment. Candidates also demonstrated a good awareness of the negative impacts. There was frequent reference to monopolistic practices, price fixing, and limited consumer choice. Many candidates described how workers employed in such organisations experienced low wages, long hours, and unsafe conditions, which showed an understanding of the human cost of industrial growth. Some responses also noted the detrimental effects on farmers. This often helped candidates achieve a balanced argument. Where answers were less successful was in the depth of support. While most candidates provided some assessment, many relied on generalised statements without specific examples of key individuals (e.g. Rockefeller, Carnegie), landmark corporations, or relevant legislative outcomes. Without such supporting detail, responses tended to remain at Levels 2 or 3.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

(a) Explain why the economy declined in 1937–38.

Stronger responses took note of the time frame of the question and provided detailed, multi causal answers that were credited at the top of Level 3. Such responses argued that the root cause of the Roosevelt depression was the premature and sudden reversal of New Deal federal leading to a major credit squeeze that had a huge impact on business confidence and consumer spending. In subsequent paragraphs candidates often made the claim that the financial squeeze was made worse because of banking reforms that had insisted upon banks maintaining higher levels of liquidity as a safeguard against rash lending. In a small number of responses candidates plausibly argued that the anti-employer legislation of the second New Deal, for example the Wagner Act, undermined business confidence and projected an impression that the federal government was anti-business. Weaker responses ignored the dates given in the question and based their responses on the causes of the Great Crash and the depression. In such cases candidates wrote – often at great length – about the causes of the Great Crash, but these narratives were unable to be credited since this was not the focus of the question.

(b) 'Conservative opposition to Roosevelt's New Deal was more effective than that from the liberal left.' How far do you agree?

© 2025

This question required candidates to focus on the overall effectiveness of opposition in either circumventing and destroying elements of the New Deal package in the case of the right, or else in obliging Roosevelt to go further in areas such as welfare, pension provision and trade union rights as in the case of the left. Many candidates were able to identify the sources of opposition (both left and right) and stronger responses assessed instances of success, for example the actions of the Supreme Court declaring swathes of the first New Deal unconstitutional and the 'success' enjoyed by the left in persuading Roosevelt to adopt a more progressive looking Second New deal focusing on welfare and union rights. When identifying the sources of New Deal opposition and why these groups were opposed to Roosevelt's policies, candidates were more confident with regard to identifying sources of opposition from the right for example the Supreme Court, big business and laissez faire Republicans. Some responses were able to identify sources of opposition from the left such as Huey Long and Francis Townsend, but responses were often one-sided. Some extremely strong responses were seen that kept the focus of the enquiry well to mind. These made relative judgements about the success or otherwise of left and right and compared reasons why one was more effective than the other, as well as offering thoughtful consideration why this should be so; hence conservative control over the institutions of government sometimes trumped the idea of huge populist support for progressive measures.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

(a) Explain why the Treaty of Paris, 1898, marked an important development in US overseas policy.

Stronger responses explained how the treaty opened doors for the US, by opening new regions to extract raw materials for their industries. A multi causal approach was then achieved by linking this to new markets to sell produced goods and the development of a navy or military to protect their newfound interests. An alternative valid approach was to consider the move away from isolationism, resulting in the US breaking away from this with the corollary and fiercely guarding their new sphere of interest. The strongest responses were then able to connect the closure of the Western frontier and the need for new markets with the new opportunities presented by the territorial expansion to open up new ventures. Weaker responses displayed some understanding of the US becoming an interventionist country in Latin America but were unable to provided supported explanations. Less effective responses also lacked clear understanding of what the Treaty of Paris was. These responses often stated it was a Treaty between the US and France, arguing that it opened trade for the US between themselves and European nations. Other inaccuracies were that it allowed the US to trade with Africa, that it banned slavery, or that it allowed the US to follow its policy of Manifest Destiny.

(b) How important was technological innovation in the development of New Imperialism after 1871?

Stronger responses showed a good understanding of the topic as a whole and were able to effectively explain the significance of technological factors such as use of railroads, telegrams, military equipment and medicine. Medicine sometimes appeared as a technological advancement or under other developments – both of which were valid. A wide range of alternative perspectives were seen, with candidates, for example, assessing the role of Darwinism and racial theories, explorers such as Livingstone and Stanley, the 'White man's burden' and to regain prestige as in the case of France after the Franco-Prussian War. Structurally, these essays were often well-balanced, well argued, and contained a good use of historical evidence to support their views. The strongest responses were able to not only explain the innovation but also assess its role. One essay seen, for example, explained the significance of a metal boat with a shallower hull enabling further exploration on the River Niger by Britain in West Africa for the palm oil trade. In weaker responses, candidates were aware of general technological advancements such as 'weapons' or 'steel ships' and 'the telegram' but did not include sufficient development about these technologies and how they helped in the development of New Imperialism. Some responses misunderstood the question statement 'technological innovation' as a growth in technology that supported industrialisation and therefore explained the benefits of technology to the Industrial revolution which was not the question focus.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

© 2025

(a) Explain why the Corfu crisis was a failure for the League.

Most candidates demonstrated sound factual knowledge and understanding of the Corfu Crisis, with many able to identify several relevant factors. These responses often recognised that the actions of the League were seen as unfair by rewarding an aggressive country or focused on the fact that a leading member of the League was undermining it. Stronger responses explained specific features of the crisis such as the role of the Council of Ambassadors in undermining the League. Most responses were able to explain at least one factor in some depth, although clear links between factors or evaluative comments were less common. Some candidates found it difficult to distinguish the League's failure into separate causes, leading to more factors being listed than effectively explained. Weaker responses tended to generalise the League's actions as 'doing nothing' or failed to situate the Corfu Crisis within its proper context by neglecting key stakeholders, such as Italy. Other responses were generalised, often describing weaknesses of the League such as the lack of an army or the absence of the US and lacked focus on the Corfu crisis. Such responses remained in Level 1.

(b) 'During the 1920s, relations between the USSR and other European nations were unfriendly.' How far do you agree?

Most candidates attempted a balanced response, although these sometimes lacked the supported assessment required for the higher levels. When agreeing with the given perspective, candidates highlighted the widespread fear of communism as a central factor shaping European attitudes toward the USSR. Many also referred to the impact of the Rapallo Pact on European nations such as France, although often without fully exploring its significance. A considerable number approached the question through discussion of the various conferences of the 1920s, for example the exclusion of the USSR from the Paris Peace Conference; however, these discussions were not always supported by accurate or sufficiently relevant factual material. Stronger responses provided clear reasoning regarding the extent to which relations were unfriendly, primarily through consideration of the Rapallo Pact. These answers explained how, why, and in what ways relations varied across different contexts. Stronger candidates also analysed the USSR's bilateral relationships with individual European states, demonstrating a more nuanced understanding of the complexity of international relations in the 1920s. Weaker responses tended to move beyond the stated timeframe, extending their analysis into the 1930s. Others limited their discussion to only one or two points—typically the fear of communism and the Rapallo Pact—without developing a broader assessment of relations or offering analysis.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

(a) Explain why Yuan Shih-kai was forced from power in 1916.

Some good responses were seen that displayed contextual understanding of the unpopularity of Yuan Shih-kai's actions, particularly with regard to declaring himself Emperor. Some responses were also able to explain the impact of Sun Yat Sen coordinating evidence against Yuan Shih-kai, as well as Song Jiaoren's assassination. The impact of the acceptance of the 21 demands was sometimes identified, but fewer explanations were seen of this factor. Weaker answers wrote more generally about China at this time, for example by providing descriptions of the abdication of Emperor Puyi, and these responses were credited in Level 1. The weakest responses lacked contextual awareness, providing no relevance to the question focus.

(b) How important were problems with the USA in the Japanese decision to go to war in 1941?

Many answers assessed both the given and alternative perspectives to provide a balanced argument. Such responses assessed the deteriorating relationship between Japan and the USA, for example through consideration of the US response to the invasion of Manchuria, and the impact of the oil embargo. An alternative and valid approach was to consider longer-term issues such as the resentment caused by the Washington Naval Conference or the relationship between the USA and Japan with regard to the Open Door Policy. Some candidates explained how the loss of the silk trade affected Japan in the Great Depression and related it to the USA by explaining that the Wall Street Crash began in America, so causing problems for Japan. The impact of the Great Depression was also used effectively by candidates who argued it as an alternative perspective, making Japan more aggressive with the need to expand for land and resources. Weaker responses were narrative in nature and tended to detail the events of the attack on Pearl Harbour. Other responses tended to lose focus, explaining events such as the Meiji Restoration (without further

© 2025

development,) or the First Sino-Japanese War. Several candidates misread the question and focused solely on the problems the USA had with Japan, thereby defending the US' decision to enter the Second World War.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/22
Outline Study

Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates should consider the timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

General comments

Part (a) questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question. These were characterised by factual inaccuracy, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance, often by ignoring timeframes given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why Napoleon's regime can be seen as a dictatorship

Most responses provided some specific details of Napoleons reign, and many were able to focus on specific information that demonstrated dictatorial qualities. A few responses confused this with a **part (b)** question and tried to provide information to counter the argument for dictatorship – this is not required in a **part (a)** question. Many responses included 3 clear examples: *The first example of dictatorship ins his use of censorship that suppressed alternative viewpoints. He closed all newspapers except three which were tightly controlled by the government….Also, as first consul*

© 2025

*and the emperor he had complete control over all government departments….Finally, he employed the police to protect his regime and received daily reports on any dissent that might begin…*and the strongest showed how they were linked to enhance Napoleon's overall control thus demonstrating that his regime might be seen as a dictatorship.

(b) To what extent had the Revolution changed France by the end of 1791?

Most responses offered good descriptions of events in France in the period between the start of the Revolution in 1789 and the end of 1791. Stronger responses went beyond description to explain how these events represent significant changes in the social, economic and political state of France, noting the end of the Ancien Regime and the move toward a more democratic form of government. These responses were also able to pinpoint key areas where there had been little change, often focusing on the continuing presence and resistance of monarchy and the persistence of severe economic problems which the new regime was not able to resolve. For example, *To summarise democracy was limited to those with sufficient income and ignored women, so it was not true democracy for everyone though it was a significant change from the ancien regime. The power of the church had been reduced considerably and changes in the justice system made it fairer and more equal. However, the economic crisis was still unsolved which only served to raise tensions and Louis retained significant power that he might use against the revolution in future. So, in conclusion issues of inequality and monarchy still persisted though basic government and society had been changed significantly from the ancien regime.* Weaker responses were often descriptions of the state of France before 1789, giving only a summary of changes, and little on continuities. A few went significantly beyond 1791, writing about events like the establishment of a Republic and execution of the King, and some even going as far as 1798 and Napoleon's rise to power.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why capitalism was important for the development of the Industrial Revolution in Britain.

Stronger responses provided detailed analysis of the ways in which capitalism functioned in the early stages of the Industrial Revolution, often centred around the twin factors of entrepreneurship and investment. These responses were supported by a range of examples linking key inventions with the availability of funds for the development of new ways of production and better means of transporting both raw materials and finished goods. Weaker responses showed limited understanding of the term 'capitalism' and were descriptive accounts of some of the key changes brought about by the development of new techniques and machines.

(b) 'Governments responded positively to demands for change caused by industrialisation.' How far do you agree?

Many responses were able to offer some suggestions of reforms that were triggered by pressure for change though most concentrated heavily on living and working conditions. Only a few of the strongest responses showed awareness of pressure for change from the growing middle classes which led to the Great Reform Act of 1832, and these responses often recognised the limitations of these changes, suggesting they were more about retaining upper class control rather than expanding the franchise. Weaker responses struggled to provide a counter argument, and some drifted from the question into a more general consideration of the poor quality of life of the working classes. Many responses were able to identify a relevant alternative view of Government responding negatively to protest including events like Peterloo and the Tolpuddle Martyrs which then provided the framework for effective analyis. For example, *The view that the government responded positively to demands for change caused by industrialisation could be agreed as the government took into consideration the public health of the population in general, especially after the Cholera outbreaks, and they also offered some improvements in working conditions, particularly for women and children. However, the view can be challenged by looking at government acts of repression like the Peterloo massacre, the Combination Acts and the treatment of the Tolpuddle Martyrs.*

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why the Bolsheviks were successful in October 1917.

© 2025

Effective responses concentrated on October 1917, and responses were able to offer a range of factors that focused attention on the lead up to the Revolution. These referred to the importance of the Kornilov Affair, the significance of Trotsky's military power and Lenin's decision making in terms of taking decisive action with the strongest responses demonstrating the acceleration of events to this crucial climax. Weaker responses wrote only generally about Lenin's influence and the weakness of the Provisional government, concentrating more on why the Provisional Government failed rather than why the revolution succeeded in October 1917.

(b) How important was the war with Japan in the development of the Revolution in 1905?

Stronger response showed an understanding that the loss of the war was not just about national humiliation in losing to an Asian nation, but about the social and economic impact that the war itself had and the implications of the loss for confidence in the Tsar's competence and in the whole system of autocratic government. A few weaker responses confused events in 1905 with those of the 1917 revolution discussing, for example, the Tsar taking direct control of the army and leaving the Tsarina and Rasputin in charge, details that were not relevant to this question.

Section B: The history of the USA, 1820–1941

Question 4: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why there was opposition to Johnson's plans for Reconstruction.

Most responses concentrated on the conflict between Johnson and the radical Republicans in Congress, although few candidates engaged fully with the exact nature of Johnsons' policies, concentrating mainly on the fact that he was more sympathetic to the South when the Radicals wanted them to be punished for their role in the conflict. For example, *Johnson's main focus was on the rebuilding and restoration of the South. His lack of sympathy for the situation of ex slaves led him to ignore and neglect the hard-earned rights of the black population and these two factors led to bitter clashes with Congress where the aim of the Radical Republicans was the exact opposite of this.* Stronger responses established some of the more specific issues like the Freedman's Bureau and the conflict over the legislation on black rights generally, mentioning Johnson's attempt to veto key legislation and the response of Congress to this.

(b) 'Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation for military reasons.' How far do you agree?

Some responses showed confusion over exactly what 'military purposes' might be. Several wrote generally about the possibility of recruiting former slaves to the Northern armies which was a valid point and some suggested that this also limited the South in that the loss of slaves made it more difficult to supply the army's needs. Such responses were often generalised. The issue of possible support from European nations for the South was sometimes seen as a military aspect of the decision, but it was more often characterised as a diplomatic manoeuvre to discourage European support for the South rather than one with specific military implications.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why the movement for female emancipation remained split throughout the late nineteenth century.

Some responses mentioned issues over black voters or differences between states and different religious groups, but often in a general way. Many responses were unable to identify issues that specifically divided people on the suffrage issues in the specified period and often wrote about the 20th century as well as the nineteenth and few considered wider issues of women's rights.

(b) How far do you agree that Progressive reforms were more successful at state than at federal level?

Stronger responses understood the difference between 'federal' and 'state' governance and were well-constructed accounts of developments in both spheres. The analysis in these responses was supported with some relevant examples. Weaker responses tended to lack a clear focus or did not distinguish between the 'state' and 'federal' level. These also lacked alternative interpretations.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

© 2025

(a) Explain why people bought goods on hire purchase in the 1920s.

The strongest responses were able to link developments in technology and production methods of consumer goods with developments in the banking system to demonstrate why there was such a significant growth in hire purchase of household items in the 1920s. For example, *The ordinary people bought good on hire purchase because of the sudden growth in production of goods that gave the illusion of unlimited choice. This was coupled with the effect of advertising that created the illusion of 'the Americal Dream' that was available to everyone. There was little understanding of the risks of overproducing or of taking on too many loans to buy all the goods on offer.* Weaker responses often confused the use of hire purchase to buy consume goods with the borrowing of money to invest in the stock market and whilst they gave detailed accounts of buying on the margin, they did not focus effectively on the question set.

(b) How far do you agree that the key to Roosevelt's success was his ability to communicate effectively with the American people?

Most responses were aware of the successes of Roosevelts administration in the 1930s and provided detailed explanation of his New Deal reforms and why they were popular with so many Americans. Weaker responses found it difficult to establish an effective counter argument based on Roosevelts 'ability to communicate' and for most this just included his 'fireside chats'.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

(a) Explain why the Second Boer War led to heavy criticism of Britain.

Strong responses were able to establish clear reasons for criticism largely based on scorched earth policies and the use of concentration camps. Many also referred to German interest in the Boer states and the effect on Anglo German relations, thus building an effective answer. A few responses discussed internal questions, but this was not valid in a question about international responses to Britain's actions. Weaker responses were general and provided information about the related events including the Jameson Raid and even British loss of the First Boer War with no clear link to the question focus. A few of these referred to the Boers as an indigenous group rather than European settlers.

(b) To what extent did the Anglo-Japanese Alliance contribute to the Japanese victory over Russia in 1905?

Responses were able to build an effective argument for the significance of the alliance with Britain in the contributing to Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese War. Factors referenced included the effect on the confidence of the Japanese, the deterrent effect of potential allies, particularly France, coming to the aid of Russia. More detailed responses looked at the impact on the war itself including the effect of the Dogger Bank incident and the consequent closing of the Suez Canal and thus built a clear case for British influence. However, most responses recognised that this contribution was quite limited and that other factors were more important. These included the revitalisation and restructuring of Japan after the Meiji Restoration and the weaknesses of Russia at that time. Stronger responses reached valid judgements of relative importance: *All in all, there were several reasons why Japan became the first Asian country to defeat a major European power and the Anglo-Japanese certainly helped in providing implicit backing and increasing Japanese confidence of victory. However, this was of lesser importance than Japan's rapid pre-emptive modernisation and industrialization following the Meiji Restoration. This gave Japan the military resources and training to take on a significantly larger European opponent with hope of success,* Weaker responses rested heavily of the relative strengths of Japan and Russia and did not really consider the Anglo-Japanese alliance. These responses often did not have balance and were descriptive without significant analysis.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

(a) Explain why the work of the Refugee Commission of the League of Nations was particularly important in the period to 1923.

© 2025

Many effective responses focused particularly on the Nansen Passport and its significance in dealing with the large number of stateless persons in the newly created states of Eastern Europe. Such responses also made reference to specific issues like the repatriation of prisoners of war and the outbreak of communal violence in Turkey in 1923 making good use of the focus prescribed by the question. Weaker responses were able to identify the refugee issue and the problems created by the treaties that ended the war without explaining, in any detail, the involvement of the Refugee Commission.

(b) 'The Locarno Treaties established a trusting and friendly relationship between Germany and other European countries' How far do you agree?

Most responses showed understanding of the Locarno treaties and were able to describe some of the key details. Stronger responses were also able to demonstrate how some of the terms of the treaties led to a clear improvement in relations, especially between France and Germany and used relevant detail to support of this. Many also referred to the subsequent admission of Germany to the League as evidence to support this. The strongest responses were also aware that some issues were not resolved and countries bordering German to the East, especially Poland were not satisfied by the treaties. These often recognised that the improvement in relations was short lived as the economic collapse of 1929 renewed distrust as the underpinning of the improvements, provided by American financial support, was suddenly withdrawn. For example, *In conclusion, whilst the Locarno Treaties lessened tension by provided additional security for France and Belgium and an offer of support from Britain and Italy, as well as giving Germany an international voice through its admission to the League of Nations, this success was partial. There were no similar explicit guarantees offered to eastern European nations bordering Germany. Also, they were created in a spirit of goodwill, but with the collapse of the German economy following the Wall Street Crash in 1929, this goodwill quicky evaporated and was replaced by an air of suspicion and distrust. So, any success was short-lived, showing that there remained an underlying mistrust an insecurity in relations between Germany and other nations.*

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

(a) Explain why the appointment of General Tojo as Japanese Prime Minister was significant in the Japanese decision to go to war in 1941.

Most responses were able to provide some explanation of the reasons for the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941. Stronger responses were also able to identify the significance of General Tojo as a leading supporter of aggressively expansionist policy. For example, *Conclusively the appointment of General Tojo was a significant factor in Japan's entry into World War Two as he had an expansionist ideology and was not afraid to use military measures to achieve his ambitious goals.* The strongest responses would go a step further and link such conclusions to the overall circumstances of late 1941 like the progress of the war in Europe or the growing sanctions being imposed by the USA, especially on oil supplies. In these circumstances the appointment of Tojo, an extreme militarist, can be explained more fully.

(b) How important was the support of the USSR in the success of the Northern Expedition?

Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the organising and operation of the Northern Expedition and provided sound analysis of key elements of the Soviet contribution like the provision of advisors and training and well as training for senior officers in Moscow, leading to a well-disciplined and organised force. Strong responses were also able to offer a reasonable account of other factors like the weaknesses of the warlord forces and the appeal of the Three Principles of Sun Yat-sen amongst the large peasant population in the countryside, as well as workers in the major cities. Weaker responses often lacked balance or spent time describing the breakdown of relations between the KMT and CCP which was not related to the success of the expedition. A feature of stronger responses was a clear opening paragraph which provided the basis for balanced discussion, for example: *The KMT launched an offensive against the warlords in an attempt to unify a fragmented China. The USSR took a great interest in the Northern Expedition as a strong China might be beneficial to the USSR which lacked allies. Therefore, they provided support that was highly beneficial in terms of supplies and training. However, foreign help alone does not win a civil war and there were many other factors in the success including new ideologies and public support coupled with the unpopularity of the warlords. These were possibly more important than the support of the USSR.*

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/23
Outline Study

Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates should consider the timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

General comments

Part (a) questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question. These were characterised by factual inaccuracy, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance, often by ignoring timeframes given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why the Assembly of Notables failed.

Stronger responses demonstrated sound knowledge of the period. Weaker responses struggled with the focus of the question and either provided general analysis of the problems of the period without explaining their relevance to the question, or they conflated the events of 1787 and 1289 and wrote about the calling of the Estates General and the problems that it faced on first meeting. Many of these were able to identify some of the issues that faced the Assembly of Notables but failed to explain the response of the Assembly to them.

© 2025

(b) 'The insurrection of 10 August 1792 happened because of France's war with Austria and Prussia.' How far do you agree?

Stronger responses demonstrated clear and detailed knowledge of the events of the French Revolution up to August 1792 and were able to show how this increased hostility towards the king, leading to the attack on the Tuileries with heavy casualties on both sides. The strongest responses provided clear evidence of the steady erosion of support for the king due to his obstructive approach to reform and his attempted escape in the Flight to Varennes. They were able to set this against the shorter-term effects of the war with Austria and Prussia which was going badly and exacerbated existing problems. These responses often identified the Brunswick Manifesto as a trigger to the violent response of the Paris mob: '*France's war with Austra and Prussia led to the Brunswick Manifestos which was a short-term cause for the insurrection. However, something like the insurrection was bound to happen due to the state of tension in France and the steady rise of anti -monarchical feeling. This had been growing because of the king's obstruction of reform and the attempted Flight to Varennes in 1791 which made him appear like a traitor especially to the extremists of the Paris mob. Republicans built on this distrust and the result was the attack on the Tuileries and ultimately the end of monarchy.'* Weaker responses often wrote general accounts of events from 1789 onward and went beyond the end point for the essay to describe the fate of the royal family and the rule of Robespierre.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why the Luddite movement developed.

Good responses concentrated on the effects of technology and of the rise of factories and demise of cottage industries based on a skilled labour force. Several included focused openings such as *'As a response to the introduction of machinery threatening the jobs of skilled artisans a group of workers began a campaign of machine breaking. The potential for large profits encouraged the introduction of machinery but this threatened the livelihood of these workers*.' However, in some cases these responses then drifted from the focus of the essay and discussed events such as the Swing Riots. Weaker responses often wrote about issues raised by industrialisation generally like poor working and living conditions. which had limited merit as they did not address the specific issues that led to the outbreak of machine breaking and attacks of factories and their owners in the period 1811 to 1816.

(b) 'It was improvements in transport that brought about industrial development.' How far do you agree?

Most candidates had detailed knowledge of the factors that led to the industrial revolution in Great Britain. Effective responses were able to draw selectively on this knowledge to produce a balanced account of the role of transport and of other factors such as new inventions, developments in agriculture, availability of resources. The strongest responses were often able to provide supported judgements about the relative importance and interconnectedness of different elements. Weaker responses provided lengthy descriptions without really addressing the question and some discussed only transport and neglected other factors.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why the Kronstadt rebellion threatened Bolshevik power.

The strongest responses explained clearly the importance of the Kronstadt sailors both in the specific sense that they had been some of the earliest and most committed supporters of the Bolshevik Revolution, and in the more general sense, that their revolt represented a wider dissatisfaction with the way the Bolsheviks were running the country. Many specifically mentioned War Communism as a highly unpopular policy. There was a general understanding that this was a protest the Bolsheviks could not afford to ignore: '*Ultimately the Kronstadt Uprising was extremely dangerous for the Bolsheviks as some of their own supporters were turning away from them. This showed an inner turmoil and weakness making them vulnerable and subject to possible wider revolt. The Uprising could have been the end of Bolshevik rule entirely.'* Weaker responses were often confused about the chronology of events, with some referring to earlier actions in the Revolution and others describing events that followed the Kronstadt rebellion.

© 2025

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

Most candidates were very familiar with the events that led from the overthrow of the Tsar in February 1917 to the Bolshevik seizure of power in October 1917. Many provided reasonable description of key actions and events like the issuing to the April Theses, the continuation of the war against Germany, the July Days, Kornilov affair and the role of other key individuals like Lenin and Trotsky. Weaker responses did not organise their account into an analysis of Kerensky's role compared with other factors which was the focus of the question. Stronger responses focussed on specific key decisions and offered some assessment of other factors beyond Kerensky's control. Several such responses also reached valid and supported judgements in response to the question.

Section B: The history of the USA, 1820–1941

Question 4: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why white Southerners were hostile to Reconstruction governments.

There was good awareness that the South in general was unhappy with the post war situation. Stronger responses were able to give a clear explanation of why there was opposition to the Reconstruction amendments and the establishment of military districts, as well as other measures taken by the Republican Congress, in the first instance and later by the Grant administration. Weaker responses tended to describe the results of this opposition, like the introduction of Black Codes and the development the Ku Klux Kan, rather than explaining the reason for the opposition.

(b) 'To what extent did President Lincoln abuse his powers as Commander-in-Chief?

Strong responses had some awareness of actions that were viewed, at the time, as illegal, but only a few understood the nuances of the distribution of power between the President and Congress. Some argued that even if he did abuse power it was justified by the war effort, but these offered limited support: *Through these actions it is clear that Lincoln had a strategic agenda to improve the Unions standing in the Civil War. which could only be achieved by the extension of his powers. The reason behind his abuse is clearly in order to win the Civil War and, for example, the issuing of the Emancipation Proclamation, technically outside his powers, paved the way for the winning of the Civil War and the issuing of the thirteenth amendment. So though he may be judged to have abused his powers his actions can be justified as contributing the eventual success for the North.* Weaker responses lacked awareness of what powers the Commander-in-Chief possessed and so it was difficult for them to assess the extent of abuse of power. These responses provided an overview of criticisms of Lincolns management of the war.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why new immigrants from southern and eastern Europe were often exploited.

Most responses discussed, in broad terms, the poor living and working conditions and many showed knowledge of the exploitation of immigrants by City bosses like Boss Tweed in New York. Several were able to engage successfully with the reasons why these immigrants were so vulnerable to exploitation though a common response was that the conditions were still better than they had endured in the countries from which they came.

(b) 'Prohibition was introduced because the government was no longer reliant on liquor tax,' How far do you agree?

Only stronger responses demonstrated knowledge of government finances in the early twentieth century. Some responses showed awareness of the sixteenth amendment and used this as a significant part of their answer, going on to consider other factors in the introduction of Prohibition like the temperance movements and the First World War. Several responses suggested that increasing revenue from tariffs replaced liquor tax but in fact President Wilson supported the Underwood Tariff Act in 1913, reducing tariffs for the first time since the Civil War. Responses were generally more confident when dealing with other factors, but the result was often unbalanced explanations.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

© 2025

(a) Explain why there was panic selling of shares in late October 1929.

Most responses showed understanding of the causes of the panic on the stock market in October 1929 and were able to offer clear reasons for the loss of confidence including overproduction and unchecked speculation using borrowed money. Some responses tried to explain the practise of 'buying on the margin' and this was generally done effectively.

(b) To what extent did Roosevelt introduce the Second New Deal to gain the support of the liberal left?

Most responses showed good knowledge of the New Deal and specifically of the Second New Deal and of the interests of the liberal left. There was also effective analysis from many candidates of the actions that Roosevelt took that might be seen as conciliatory to the ideas of the liberal left. Weaker responses generally had difficulty separating the measures of the First and Second New Deals and tended to resort to descriptive writing rather than analysis. Stronger responses were often able to identify specific individuals who represented the ideas of the liberal left and discussed how far New Deal measures satisfied them. Some of the strongest responses were also able to offer alternative explanations for the Second New Deal like the continuation of measures already taken or the change of focus from rescue to recovery of the economy. For example: *Reforms like the introduction of fairer labour standards and welfare measures for the vulnerable can be seen as measures to appeal to the liberal left and improved his chances of re-election. They also represent a more general change in direction. Whilst the First New Deal was aimed at relief of the hardship caused by the Great Depression the Second New Deal had broader measures to apply to more conservative groups like the southern Democrats.* The development of arguments like this provided stronger responses with a sound base for an effective analysis and overall judgment.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

(a) Explain why the USA became involved in Panama from 1902 onwards.

Most responses were able to explain the basic change in US foreign policy that led to them taking a direct interest in Panama however only a few demonstrated awareness of the specific circumstances behind that involvement. Those responses which did not address specific circumstances were quite general and offered only a surface level explanation. A response like*: The USA became involved in Panama as a result of increased military strength and their desire to expand their global trade. Building a stronger navy gave them the confidence to become more active in global trade for which the Panama Canal represented a strategic route…*provided one general explanation but further argument on trade with China and around the Pacific did not add further to the significance of their involvement in Panama and only represented one explained factor. Those with more detailed knowledge of the Canal Project and of the internal issues of Panamanian nationalism were more effective.

(b) To what extent were internal reforms responsible for the emergence of Japan as a world power?

Many candidates achieved a good balance in their analysis of the issue of Japanese emergence as a significant power. There was good knowledge and understanding of the Meiji Restoration and its impact on the social, economic, industrial and military development of Japan in the later decades of the nineteenth century. Effective responses contrasted this with external factors like the first Sino-Japanese War, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 and the outcome of the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 – 5. The strongest responses were able to make effective links between the two lines of development, often reaching and supporting an overall judgment that without the first the second would not have been possible. For example, *Overall, whilst it is possible for foreign overseas strategic interests and actions to be highlighted as accounting for Japan's emergence as a significant power, this is not the whole picture. These successes would not have been possible without the internal reforms which put Japan in position to be taken seriously. Furthermore, though the weakness of countries like China and Russia can be seen as responsible for Japanese success, without the Meiji Restoration and subsequent reforms Japan would not have been able to take advantage of these weaknesses. This makes internal reform more fundamental to Japanese emergence as a world power.*

© 2025

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

(a) Explain why Poland faced a number of border disputes as a result of the Paris peace settlement.

Many responses showed a good awareness of the measures contained in the various treaties that affected Poland, but only a few discussed at length the Russo-Polish war and its outcome with little on other issues. Stronger responses concentrated on the conflicts with neighbouring states that were a direct result of the Treaties, like the Silesian coalfields issue and the Polish corridor that created conflict with Germany, the issue of Polish seizure of Vilnius and dispute with Czechoslovakia over the resource rich area of Teschen.

(b) To what extent did American intervention resolve Germany's financial problems in the 1920s?

Most responses demonstrated knowledge of the Dawes and Young Plans and their potential to have a positive influence on the German economy. Many candidates were able to outline the initial economic problems facing Germany as a result of the effects of the war and the imposition of reparations, which led to the Ruhr Crisis, and to the American intervention via the Dawes Plan. Stronger responses were able to explain why this was only an interim measure that ended the hyperinflation and allowed Stresemann to introduce a new currency to Germany but did not resolve the underlying issues caused by the payments of repatriations that were still required. Many responses then moved on to the Young Plan, intended to resolve the problems, but only the strongest responses recognised the underlying weakness of this in its reliance on US loans. Effective responses also showed how the Wall Street Crash exposed these underlying weaknesses and showed that US involvement had a limited long-term effect.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

(a) Explain why the Xi'an incident was important.

Many responses concentrated on the effect on the CCP and the growth of the support for communists, though some discussed the Long March which was not significant for this question. Some responses saw the significance of Xi'an primarily in the creation of the Second United Front as a result of the incident, and its longer-term effects on the relative positions of the KMT and CCP. For example, *Overall, the most important result was the short-term effect of creating the Second United Front which released more resources for the fight against the Japanese. however, in the long- run the further growth of the CCP was a highly significant result of the agreement reached following the Xi'an incident.* Effective responses concentrated on the results of the incident, whilst weaker ones often focused mainly on describing what led to the incident rather than concentrating on its outcome.

(b) To what extent were economic factors responsible for the decline of democracy in Japan.

Most responses demonstrated a balanced approach often beginning with the economic impact of the Great Depression and the context of Japan's wider economic difficulties especially in terms of supply of raw materials. This was usually contrasted with other issues like the lack of long-term experience of democracy and the corruption of political parties, alongside the steady rise of militarism and extremist political groups. Stronger responses referred to the significant role of the emperor and to the importance of the issue of Manchuria in bringing about the ultimate failure of democracy. For example, *In summary, through the political instability played a part in the decline of democracy this did not have much impact until after the start to the Great Depression that caused the growth of mistrust in the democratic government. Furthermore, the growth of militarism and nationalist groups would not have been so significant without the decline of industry as a result of shortages of resources, which led to army's defiance of the government in seizing control of Manchuria. This makes economic factors the most fundament cause of the decline of democratic government in Japan.* Weaker response tended to offer only general discussion of the Great Depression or the army's seizure of Manchuria, without demonstrating clear links to the question.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/31
Interpretations Question

Key messages

- It is important to read the extract carefully and spend time thinking about what it argues. Answers need to demonstrate understanding of the interpretation of the extract as a whole.
- Answers do not need to be long to be effective and including unnecessary material from the extract, details about the context or the work of different historians, often means that focus on the interpretation of the extract is lost or that claims are made which cannot be supported.
- The interpretation concerns who or what the historian holds responsible for the First World War, Holocaust or Cold War. Effective answers identify this feature then use the extract to demonstrate how it can be used to explain the interpretation. Relevant material from the extract should be used to illustrate the explanation.

General comments

The most effective responses developed from a perceptive reading of the extract which enabled candidates to identify and analyse the key arguments of the interpretation. It was clear that time had been spent reading and thinking about the extract before starting to write the answer. Typically answers maintained a clear focus on the extract throughout. They demonstrated confidence in the content and ranged across it to select the most appropriate support. Where responses were less carefully read and planned, the answer often came close to a summary of the extract rather than an explanation of the interpretation. However, most answers contained positive features and candidates understood that they must use the extract to show what they had learned about the historian's interpretation.

Taking a paragraph-by-paragraph approach was one of the main features of weaker responses. This technique limited the possibilities for grasping the main argument until the end of the answer and often meant that the focus was on sub-messages. Inferences about the interpretation of the historian tended to be on single points of content rather than the overall argument of the extract. It was quite common for candidates who took this approach to write contradictory responses which claimed there was a different approach in each paragraph.

To explain the historian's interpretation, it can be useful to recognise the approach they have taken. Many candidates used historiographical 'labels' to identify approaches, but sometimes their understanding of what the labels implied was flawed. This undermined answers as it meant that they missed important references in the extract by following a pre-conceived notion about the approach. This often resulted in responses which addressed the approach in generic terms, with candidates looking for pre-determined features of an approach, whether or not it existed in the passage, rather than explaining what the historian argued about the causes of the First World War / Holocaust / Cold War. This resulted in missing elements of the main argument, the overstatement of sub-messages and making claims that the extract did not support.

When responses referred to 'other' historians (i.e. historians other than the one who wrote the extract) and made claims about whether the interpretation of the extract was similar or different, frequently these comparisons were not valid and demonstrated misunderstanding either of the extract or the 'other' historian. Although candidates need to be familiar with the main historiographical strands in their chosen topic, and it can be helpful to think about where the given extract would fit, the focus should be on the passage presented. Even in strong responses, which correctly identified significant points from the extract, there was frequent digression into discussions of how similar / different the argument was from that of an historian who candidates had encountered in their studies. This led some responses to identify the argument of the historian who wrote the extract but not properly support it. In other instances, candidates selected a specific historian and attempted to apply features of their argument to an extract which did not support those features.

© 2025

It is not necessary to use contextual knowledge to illustrate the extract or evaluate it by commenting on what the historian has 'left out', or to challenge what is argued based on the views of other historians. The focus of the task is to explain and illustrate the interpretation of the historian who wrote the specific extract presented.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The main interpretation of this extract was that (i) Austria was aggressive and reckless in starting a war against Serbia but (ii) although a European war was not Austria's intention, it developed due to contingent factors. Most responses understood that the extract offered a revisionist approach in that it did not blame Germany. Although many responses identified Austria as the culprit, they overlooked the distinction between blaming Austria for risking a local war in the Balkans against Serbia and blaming it for outbreak of the entire First World War. Responses often saw that Russian mobilisation was highlighted as a crucial step but did not place this in the context of contingencies, such as Austria's failure to anticipate what would happen or the activation of the alliance system, which gave mobilisation its importance. Some responses disaggregated the argument, blaming individuals such as the Emperor and Conrad, rather than seeing these elements as part of the way that Austria was blamed. Others tried the make the extract fit pre-conceived ideas about what caused the war and looked for aspects of the extract which could be linked to factors such as the alliance system, militarism and imperialism. A few responses attempted to argue that the extract blamed Germany, even though it received little attention. Others spent time assessing what they considered to be weaknesses of the extract by discussing what the historian had left out. Weaker responses provided a list of the causes of war including colonialism, nationalism, naval agreements, and earlier crises and paid limited attention to the historian's argument.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract was that Hitler was blamed because (i) the logical endpoint of his anti-Semitic polices was the destruction of the Jews and (ii) that the Night of the Broken Glass made apparent this radical shift in policy. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract, concluding that it demonstrated an intentionalist approach. Although responses generally understood that a genocidal intent was implied, the role of the Night of the Broken Glass was less well understood. Properly argued, it was a step change in policy which ushered in a more violent phase of persecution. However, some focused on the mention of Goebbels and the Nazi murder squads as evidence of 'working towards the Fuhrer' and labelled part of the interpretation as structuralist. In fact, the way Goebbels was portrayed in this extract was passive, approving of events rather than instigating them. Some responses misread the section of the extract where Hitler rejected proposals for emigration, misreading this as evidence that it was the war which brought about genocide and labelling this element as structuralist. Weaker responses often suggested that there was a coherent plan for genocide rather than seeing there was a process of intensification. Some less effective responses paraphrased the extract or made generalised comments about the author blaming Hitler because the Nazis did not like the Jews.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The main interpretation of the historian who wrote this extract is that both the USA and USSR were to blame for the Cold War because, by 1947, (i) the USA took a hard line to increase its influence over Europe and (ii) Stalin developed a negative attitude towards international relations for reasons of personal and state security. The most effective responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates recognised that the extract was post-revisionist in that it blamed both sides for causing tensions to escalate. However, many argued the approach was post-post-revisionist based on comments about Stalin's personality and 'intense paranoia'. Reaching this conclusion suggested that the first paragraph of the extract had been overlooked. This clearly argued that the US made choices about Europe based on a pessimistic and negative attitude which made cooperation with the USSR much less likely. A minority of responses were based on the idea that the extract was post-revisionist because it blamed neither side and the Cold War was caused by mutual mistrust. Weaker responses were sometimes based on misunderstanding the nature of the task. Such answers often used contextual knowledge to illustrate the extract, referring to events which often postdated those in the extract, such as the Berlin Airlift or even the Cuban missile crisis. Others seemingly resulted from reading the extract too quickly and several used quotes from the extract which gave the view of Stalin or Truman as if they were the citing

© 2025

the view of the historian. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins and development of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/32
Interpretations Question

Key messages

- It is important to read the extract carefully and spend time thinking about what it argues. Answers need to demonstrate understanding of the interpretation of the extract as a whole.
- Answers do not need to be long to be effective and including unnecessary material from the extract, details about the context or the work of different historians, often means that focus on the interpretation of the extract is lost or that claims are made which cannot be supported.
- The interpretation concerns who or what the historian holds responsible for the First World War, Holocaust or Cold War. Effective answers identify this feature then use the extract to demonstrate how it can be used to explain the interpretation. Relevant material from the extract should be used to illustrate the explanation.

General comments

The most effective responses developed from a perceptive reading of the extract which enabled candidates to identify and analyse the key arguments of the interpretation. It was clear that time had been spent reading and thinking about the extract before starting to write the answer. Typically answers maintained a clear focus on the extract throughout. They demonstrated confidence in the content and ranged across it to select the most appropriate support. Where responses were less carefully read and planned, the answer often came close to a summary of the extract rather than an explanation of the interpretation. However, most answers contained positive features and candidates understood that they must use the extract to show what they had learned about the historian's interpretation.

Taking a paragraph-by-paragraph approach was one of the main features of weaker responses. This technique limited the possibilities for grasping the main argument until the end of the answer and often meant that the focus was on sub-messages. Inferences about the interpretation of the historian tended to be on single points of content rather than the overall argument of the extract. It was quite common for candidates who took this approach to write contradictory responses which claimed there was a different approach in each paragraph.

To explain the historian's interpretation, it can be useful to recognise the approach they have taken. Many candidates used historiographical 'labels' to identify approaches, but sometimes their understanding of what the labels implied was flawed. This undermined answers as it meant that they missed important references in the extract by following a pre-conceived notion about the approach. This often resulted in responses which addressed the approach in generic terms, with candidates looking for pre-determined features of an approach, whether or not it existed in the passage, rather than explaining what the historian argued about the causes of the First World War / Holocaust / Cold War. This resulted in missing elements of the main argument, the overstatement of sub-messages and making claims that the extract did not support.

When responses referred to 'other' historians (i.e. historians other than the one who wrote the extract) and made claims about whether the interpretation of the extract was similar or different, frequently these comparisons were not valid and demonstrated misunderstanding either of the extract or the 'other' historian. Although candidates need to be familiar with the main historiographical strands in their chosen topic, and it can be helpful to think about where the given extract would fit, the focus should be on the passage presented. Even in strong responses, which correctly identified significant points from the extract, there was frequent digression into discussions of how similar / different the argument was from that of an historian who candidates had encountered in their studies. This led some responses to identify the argument of the historian who wrote the extract but not properly support it. In other instances, candidates selected a specific historian and attempted to apply features of their argument to an extract which did not support those features.

© 2025

It is not necessary to use contextual knowledge to illustrate the extract or evaluate it by commenting on what the historian has 'left out', or to challenge what is argued based on the views of other historians. The focus of the task is to explain and illustrate the interpretation of the historian who wrote the specific extract presented.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract was that Germany was blamed for (i) choosing to go to war in 1914 because of its deteriorating international position and (ii) for the Schlieffen Plan which, in a time of crisis, would force nations to go to war more rapidly. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Some of the most effective answers understood that the extract blamed Germany but, despite this, argued against the Fischer thesis. Stronger responses explained that German politicians were blamed, not for being aggressive but because they were pessimistic and increasingly alarmed by the international situation which was turning against them. It was understood that this was blameworthy as Germany went to war to forestall any further deterioration. Some answers missed this point and wrote in general terms about Germany being to blame or made claims that other powers were blamed as well. For example, some argued that France and Russia were to blame based on misreading comments about their military preparations in the first paragraph. Weaker responses often picked out that German leaders 'were not ruthless militarists' and were 'far from confident' but found it difficult to use these ideas to establish who was being blamed. Few responses engaged effectively with the argument about the Schlieffen Plan, again focusing on the role of other powers rather than seeing them as reacting to German war plans. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins of the First World War with little reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The main interpretation of this extract was that this historian blamed Hitler because (i) genocide was implicit in Nazi policies towards the Jews and (ii) that it became explicit early in 1939 as war approached. The most effective answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Stronger responses understood that the extract showed an intentionalist approach. They explained that the discussion around the possibilities of emigration, and Hitler's attitude towards creating a Jewish state in Palestine, showed that the historian believed that the Nazis already intended to murder the Jews but kept this intention hidden. The strongest responses recognised that as war approached, the intention became explicit, and many pointed to the Prophecy speech of January 1939 to illustrate this. Some responses misinterpreted the comment that 'Hitler's moves towards war and his Jewish policies were closely connected' as evidence of a functionalist approach. This argument overlooked the point that the war was planned, and it was known in advance what the fate of the Jews would be when war broke out. The last line of the extract made it clear that functionalism was not an appropriate label. Other responses asserted that elements of the extract were structuralist, often basing this on comments about Himmler and the SS or the role of Eichmann. These arguments could not be supported from the extract. The weakest responses wrote about the origins of the Holocaust with limited reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract was that both the USA and USSR were responsible for the Cold War because (i) the US attempted to apply pressure to the USSR to achieve their own aims and (ii) the USSR was inflexible and aggressive. The strongest responses recognised these features of the interpretation and illustrated them using the extract. Most candidates recognised that the extract carried some blame on the Russians, often using the example of Molotov resisting Byrne's attempts to be friendly. However, the most effective answers understood the slightly more subtle argument that the US was also to blame. These responses understood that the US did not keep to its agreements, played to public opinion and were trying to use the bomb to extend their influence. A small number argued that the extract was post-revisionist but that neither was to blame. These answers were often based around the comment in the last paragraph that 'difficulties between the two countries were caused by misunderstandings.' Many misread this as a statement from the historian rather than Truman being disingenuous about the real nature of the relationship between the US and USSR. Weaker responses sometimes resulted from illustrating the extract with contextual knowledge rather than illustrating the interpretation with details from the extract. The weakest answers paraphrased points or wrote about the origins and development of the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/33
Interpretations Question

Key messages

- It is important to read the extract carefully and spend time thinking about what it argues. Answers need to demonstrate understanding of the interpretation of the extract as a whole.
- Answers do not need to be long to be effective and including unnecessary material from the extract, details about the context or the work of different historians, often means that focus on the interpretation of the extract is lost or that claims are made which cannot be supported.
- The interpretation concerns who or what the historian holds responsible for the First World War, Holocaust or Cold War. Effective answers identify this feature then use the extract to demonstrate how it can be used to explain the interpretation. Relevant material from the extract should be used to illustrate the explanation.

General comments

The most effective responses developed from a perceptive reading of the extract which enabled candidates to identify and analyse the key arguments of the interpretation. It was clear that time had been spent reading and thinking about the extract before starting to write the answer. Typically answers maintained a clear focus on the extract throughout. They demonstrated confidence in the content and ranged across it to select the most appropriate support. Where responses were less carefully read and planned, the answer often came close to a summary of the extract rather than an explanation of the interpretation. However, most answers contained positive features and candidates understood that they must use the extract to show what they had learned about the historian's interpretation.

Taking a paragraph-by-paragraph approach was one of the main features of weaker responses. This technique limited the possibilities for grasping the main argument until the end of the answer and often meant that the focus was on sub-messages. Inferences about the interpretation of the historian tended to be on single points of content rather than the overall argument of the extract. It was quite common for candidates who took this approach to write contradictory responses which claimed there was a different approach in each paragraph.

To explain the historian's interpretation, it can be useful to recognise the approach they have taken. Many candidates used historiographical 'labels' to identify approaches, but sometimes their understanding of what the labels implied was flawed. This undermined answers as it meant that they missed important references in the extract by following a pre-conceived notion about the approach. This often resulted in responses which addressed the approach in generic terms, with candidates looking for pre-determined features of an approach, whether or not it existed in the passage, rather than explaining what the historian argued about the causes of the First World War / Holocaust / Cold War. This resulted in missing elements of the main argument, the overstatement of sub-messages and making claims that the extract did not support.

When responses referred to 'other' historians (i.e. historians other than the one who wrote the extract) and made claims about whether the interpretation of the extract was similar or different, frequently these comparisons were not valid and demonstrated misunderstanding either of the extract or the 'other' historian. Although candidates need to be familiar with the main historiographical strands in their chosen topic, and it can be helpful to think about where the given extract would fit, the focus should be on the passage presented. Even in strong responses, which correctly identified significant points from the extract, there was frequent digression into discussions of how similar / different the argument was from that of an historian who candidates had encountered in their studies. This led some responses to identify the argument of the historian who wrote the extract but not properly support it. In other instances, candidates selected a specific historian and attempted to apply features of their argument to an extract which did not support those features.

© 2025

It is not necessary to use contextual knowledge to illustrate the extract or evaluate it by commenting on what the historian has 'left out', or to challenge what is argued based on the views of other historians. The focus of the task is to explain and illustrate the interpretation of the historian who wrote the specific extract presented.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract was that (i) although there was an international system of great power relationships which should have prevented war, (ii) this failed because of the poor quality of individual decision-making. The most effective responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most answers focused on the issue of weak leadership and poor decision-making, and this element of the interpretation was often effectively illustrated from the extract. However, many overlooked the point about the international system, often claiming instead that it was beyond repair and therefore to blame for the outbreak of war. The extract argued that the system could have worked were it not for the irresponsible behaviour of key statesmen and bureaucrats. Some responses attempted to argue that specific countries, for example Serbia and Austria-Hungary, were to blame but missed that many countries were included in the extract and none escaped responsibility. However, it was generally recognised that the historian did not single out a specific nation for blame, and this meant that, even where candidates did not detect the specifics of the historian's interpretation, they often had an understanding of what was being argued.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract was that the Final Solution (i) emerged from a series of ad hoc measures which were introduced to deal with the circumstances which arose from the failure of deportation schemes and (ii) that explaining why these extended to genocide only in the case of the Jews required consideration of Nazi anti-Semitism. It was possible to argue the extract as functionalist or as a synthesis of functionalism and intentionalism. There were many effective responses that understood at least the outline of the historian's message. Most saw that the failure of deportation schemes led to more radical policies but sometimes overlooked the precise argument that it was the circumstances arising from the failure of these schemes which led to the introduction of genocidal policies. Some did not consider the wartime context of the extract and argued that 'bad planning' was responsible for the development of genocide. Many responses understood that anti-Semitism was an important reason for the shift to genocide but sometimes missed that the writer sought to explain why the Jews, rather than all deportees, were targeted. Many responses contained lengthy discussions of the views of other historians. Although comment on the historiography of the Holocaust can be valid if directed at the passage, in some answers there was so much discussion of the work of other historians that elements of the interpretation were identified but not explained or illustrated from the extract. Weaker responses sometimes argued that the extract contained a structuralist approach, citing sub-messages about Eichmann at the expense of the main argument.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract was that (i) the US was initially reluctant to take a dominant role in the postwar period but that (ii) by the end of the 1940s this attitude had changed to active involvement to counter the perceived menace of the USSR. Although the extract seemed to reject the idea that the US was an economically imperialist power, the approach was most effectively labelled as revisionist. Most responses recognised the focus on the US and that there was at least implicit blame for the start of the Cold War. Some responses put this down to 'inconsistencies' in the behaviour of the US, but the extract presented this argument as a British view, rather than that of the historian. The strongest responses noted the 'hesitancy' and 'reluctance' in the position that the US took immediately after the war and linked this with uncertainty about what line to take towards the USSR. Most responses understood that the American position had shifted by 1949 to become confrontational. However, some answers were weakened by misreading elements of the extract, for example attributing this change to the influence of British and European leaders. Weaker responses sometimes overstated sub-messages about Truman to argue that he was to blame for the Cold War. Others misread elements of the extract and attempted to argue that both or neither were to blame.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/41
Depth Study

Key messages

- Effective responses carefully read the questions to establish the question focus.
- The strongest responses were able to adapt their knowledge to the specific focus of the question.
- Providing a balanced response remains crucial for success. The most effective responses understood that alternative arguments need to be used.

General comments

Nearly all candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis throughout. Stronger responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays in order to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left their overall judgements to the conclusion. The level of supporting detail is important, and the most successful responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the specific enquiry and were able to ensure that their answer directly addressed the wording of the question. Less effective responses tended to use general evidence and produced answers that were not directly focused on the question demand or were more generic.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Assess how popular Mussolini's policies were with the Italian people in the years 1925 to 1941.

Responses tended to assess the popularity of individual policies rather than dealing with them as a whole. Most were able to include a good range of examples of economic, social and foreign policy initiatives and provided sound levels of supporting detail. The quality of analysis generally depended upon whether responses were able to fully explain why policies were popular or not. For instance, there was some discussion of how Mussolini's foreign policies, such as the invasion of Abyssinia, helped to boost national morale and restore confidence in Italians. Alternatively, the Battle of Births was sometimes judged to be unpopular due to the restrictions that it placed on women's opportunities and rights. Less successful attempts at analysis tended to conflate success with popularity and were usually assertions rather than explanations. Some responses did not consider the timeframe stipulated and provided examples such as the Corfu Crisis which were not relevant.

2 'Stalin's economic policies brought few benefits to the workers and peasants in the Soviet Union.' Discuss this view.

The strongest responses focused on the outcomes of the economic policies, which were generally understood to relate to industrialisation and collectivisation, rather than describing the policies or their general level of effectiveness. Candidates found it easier to agree with the proposition, pointing to the negative consequences of rural policies such as famine and violence to support their argument. Poor living and working conditions, harsh workplace discipline and low pay were frequently cited as examples in relation to the impact of the Five-Year Plans on industrial workers, although the degree of supporting material was variable. To achieve balance, responses highlighted employment opportunities, particularly for women, and improved health and educational facilities. Some discussion of the Stakhanovite movement took place, but only the strongest responses indicated knowledge of the extent to which specialist workers could benefit from better pay and housing conditions and that technical training and education allowed some to elevate

© 2025

their position. Weaker responses focused on the success of the industrialisation programme in improving the Soviet Union's economic position, without paying much attention to its impact on the workers.

3 Assess how far increasing support for the Nazi party in the years 1929 to 1932 was the result of skilful propaganda.

Most responses provided balanced analysis. Many references to the work of Goebbels, rallies and marches and Hitler's speech-making were made to agree with the proposition. Often Hitler's charismatic persona was included as a counterargument, rather than an integral part of the propaganda machine. The best responses were able to show how propaganda was used to increase Nazi popularity by highlighting the interaction between it and the political and economic context of Germany in this period. Many responses contended that the impact of Depression was most important, but that Hitler was able to use it in his propaganda, for examples by promising 'work and bread.' There was also reference to dissatisfaction with the Treaty of Versailles and Hitler's desire to reassert Germany on the international stage. Some stronger responses also considered the role of the upper and middle classes' fear of communism and that Hitler appeared to be the best bulwark against it. Less successful responses included terror as a factor and seemed to mistake 'popularity' for 'control' and others were restricted by poor chronological knowledge, which led to a good deal of material which related to 1933 onwards being included.

4 'Recovery from the Great Depression in Britain was the result of government economic policies.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The history of the USA, 1944–92

5 'A defeat for the Republican party rather than a victory for Truman and his policies.' Assess this view of the presential election of 1948.

Responses to this question generally produced a balanced analysis of the reasons for the outcome of the 1948 presidential election, although most were more confident in countering the proposition than in agreeing with it. Some of the strongest responses addressed a range of policies introduced by Truman during his presidency and explained why they were unlikely to have won widespread support, although most discussed his successes in both foreign and domestic fields. Responses tended to look towards Dewey's lacklustre or complacent campaign and compare it directly to Truman's 'whistle-stop' tour in order to explain how the result could be seen as a result of Republican failings.

6 'The growth of feminism in the 1960s and 1970s was mostly the result of the work of women's organisations.' Evaluate this view.

Responses to this question were mostly effective, basing their arguments on the work of groups such as NOW and of individuals such as Betty Friedan. Balance was achieved through the inclusion of counterarguments, such as social changes and the influence of the wider protest movement of the period, with particular attention paid to African American civil rights. Some weaker responses did not consider the focus of the question and sought to explain why there was opposition to the feminist movement.

7 'The Iran-Contra Affair was deeply damaging for Reagan and the Republicans.' Discuss this view.

Responses to this question showed a good level of subject knowledge and analysis which explained the nature of the scandal and how and why it reflected poorly on the president and government before going on to argue that it generally did not affect Reagan and his administration's popularity.

8 Assess how successfully the US managed its relations with the USSR in the period 1950–63.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 'Soviet suppression of the 1956 uprising in Hungary had limited impact on US–Soviet relations.' Assess this view.

The strongest responses were able to focus on the consequences of Soviet suppression of the uprising in Hungary, providing examples of how far peaceful coexistence was maintained in the period after it. Some

© 2025

discussion of why there were hopes of a thaw in the Cold War in 1954–55 was appropriate to provide context to the extent of change from 1956 onwards. Valid commentary on the reasons for US inaction was made by many candidates, highlighting American concerns over events in Egypt and unwillingness to intervene in the Soviet zone of influence. Evidence such as the Camp David summit in 1959 were cited by some candidates as evidence of limited change and of the continuation of peaceful coexistence. Counter-arguments such as the events in Berlin were used to indicate that US failure to respond in 1956 had emboldened Khruschev and had therefore worsened relations. Less successful responses tended towards a narrative and descriptive approach of the Hungarian uprising and Soviet response, without placing it in the wider Cold War context.

10 'The Korean War was caused by Stalin's ambition to strengthen Soviet influence in Asia.' Assess this view.

Stronger responses were able to discuss why Stalin considered that conflict on Asia would help to draw attention away from the European situation and to bolster Soviet influence in Asia at the expense of the Americans. There was also some consideration of the Sino-Soviet relationship in Stalin's calculations. Many responses were more confident discussing alternatives such as the role played by North and South Korea and the USA in bringing about conflict. There was comment on Kim Il Sung and Syngman Rhee's shared desire to re-unify the peninsula under their control and the impact of Dean Acheson's Defense Perimeter Speech on Soviet thinking. Weaker responses explored Stalin's granting of permission to Kim to launch an attack as an explanation of his responsibility but did not discuss anything more.

11 Evaluate how far the UN was responsible for its failure in Somalia.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 Assess how far the creation of the state of Israel in 1948 was the result of US involvement.

Responses were able to offer examples of US support, considering Truman's role and US pressure placed upon the UN to create an actual state for Jewish people. Balance was achieved through discussion of the UN's actions in passing resolution 181 as a result of the British withdrawal from Palestine in 1948, which was itself partially a consequence of action taken by Zionists, including the campaigns of groups and individuals such as David Ben Gurion and Irgun.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/42
Depth Study

Key messages

- Effective responses carefully read the questions to establish the question focus.
- The strongest responses were able to adapt their knowledge to the specific focus of the question.
- Providing a balanced response remains crucial for success. The most effective responses understood that alternative arguments need to be used.

General comments

Nearly all candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis throughout. Stronger responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays in order to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left their overall judgements to the conclusion. The level of supporting detail is important, and the most successful responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the specific enquiry and were able to ensure that their answer directly addressed the wording of the question. Less effective responses tended to use general evidence and produced answers that were not directly focused on the question demand or were more generic.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Evaluate the view that Mussolini's foreign policy from 1922 to 1941 had little chance of achieving its aims.

The question was focused solely on Mussolini's foreign policy and material on social or economic policy, including the drive for autarky, was extraneous. The best responses used Mussolini's foreign policy aims as criteria and focused on the whole period, arguing that Mussolini's aims were too ambitious and could not be achieved. There was also analysis that as Italy ended up in a war for which it was ill-prepared, foreign policy was a failure and did not meet its aims. Balance was achieved by using examples considered to be a success, such as the invasion of Abyssinia and explaining how they clearly demonstrated that the aims were achievable. Most responses were more confident about the 1930s than 1920s.

2 Assess the reasons for Stalin's industrialisation programme.

The focus was on industrialisation in particular and material on collectivisation was less likely to meet the demands of the question. The best responses concentrated on motivations, rather than outcomes or descriptions of the Five-Year Plans. It was generally understood that Stalin saw rapid industrialisation of the Soviet Union as essential for national security, although the ideological dimensions were less commonly explored. Some responses argued that Stalin used these policies to enhance his own prestige and legacy. It was valid to argue that industrialisation was a way to improve living standards, although responses which took this approach tended to assert the point rather than explain it. Weaker responses often adopted general arguments or did not focus explicitly on the question demand.

3 Assess the extent to which German society was changed in the years 1933 to 1941.

Responses often contained a good range and depth of supporting material for this question. Definitions of German society varied somewhat, and a good deal of material covered political and economic aspects of

© 2025

Nazi policy. The strongest and most focused responses considered the extent to which Nazi policies transformed society by focusing on policies towards women, children, minority groups or religion. Less successful responses generally argued that there was change and neglected to consider continuities, such as the continued adherence of millions of Germans to the Christian churches, or opposition to Nazi control of their lives from young people. This made it difficult for them to fully engage with the focus of the question by exploring the 'extent' of change.

4 Assess the reasons for the change in living standards in Britain in the 1920s and 1930s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The history of the USA, 1944–92

5 Assess the reasons for the failure of the Democrats to defeat Eisenhower in the presidential elections of the 1950s.

There were good responses to this question, with a range of examples provided. The strongest responses provided well-balanced discussion which focused on both Democrat failure and Republican success and paid attention to both elections. Other responses tended to consider Eisenhower's appeal, particularly in 1952, but were less confident about the limitations of the Democrat candidates.

6 Evaluate the reasons for the opposition to the counter-culture movement in the 1960s and 1970s.

There was a general understanding of what the counter-culture entailed, with a fair range of explanations put forward, including religious opposition and some consideration of the impact of African American civil rights, which led to a loss of focus on occasion. Not all responses stuck to the timeframe provided in the question and strayed into the 1980s, with some anachronistic references to the impact of AIDS included. Weaker responses offered some general points with little balance or explicit analysis.

7 Assess how far living standards changed in the 1980s and early 1990s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

8 'A generous and idealistic response to the needs of Europe.' Evaluate this view of the Marshall Plan.

Responses tended to deal with motivations behind Marshall Aid with great success. In addition to being able to explain the humanitarian aspect of US support for Europe following the trauma of the Second World War, candidates were typically aware of the counterarguments. There was sound discussion of the policy in its Cold War context and as an example of Containment. Responses further demonstrated awareness of the argument that Marshall Aid was distributed to provide demand for American exports and to maintain economic hegemony, with some references to 'dollar imperialism' made.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 Evaluate the impact of the Korean War on US–Soviet relations.

Stronger responses considered the period after the fighting ended and offered effective and balanced analysis of the impact of the war on the relationship between the USA and Soviet Union. This usually included discussion of developments such as the creation of SEATO and implications for the arms race in the 1950s. Weaker responses tended to provide descriptions of the actual course of the war itself rather than discuss the impact of the conflict on relations between the two nations.

10 'The main outcome of the Vietnam War was the humiliation of the United States.' Discuss this view.

Most responses discussed the impact of the war on the United States, with the strongest responses widening the analysis to include the outcomes for Vietnam, for instance. These responses were therefore able to provide some balanced discussions. Some weaker responses did not offer much explanation or analysis, tending towards narrative or only described the fighting. These overlooked the requirement in the question to focus on consequences.

© 2025

11 Analyse the extent to which social divisions created challenges for the newly independent African nations between 1950 and 1992.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 Analyse the impact of Soviet policies in the Middle East during the Cold War.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 9489/43
Depth Study

Key messages

- Effective responses carefully read the questions to establish the question focus.
- The strongest responses were able to adapt their knowledge to the specific focus of the question.
- Providing a balanced response remains crucial for success. The most effective responses understood that alternative arguments need to be used.

General comments

Nearly all candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis throughout. Stronger responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays in order to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left their overall judgements to the conclusion. The level of supporting detail is important, and the most successful responses carefully selected which information was relevant to the specific enquiry and were able to ensure that their answer directly addressed the wording of the question. Less effective responses tended to use general evidence and produced answers that were not directly focused on the question demand or were more generic.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Evaluate how far Mussolini's policies affected the Catholic Church's influence in Italy.

Responses to this question were mostly well-focussed and well-supported. Most responses were based on the Concordat and Lateran Treaty and its consequences for the role of the church, although some also considered Mussolini's earlier pivot away from anti-clericalism which helped to allow him to gain support and control of Italy initially. Candidates were often able to point to the decline of the church's political influence, whilst arguing that, in a strongly religious country, it retained a significant degree of support from the population. Examples from the 1930s such as the row over Catholic Action youth groups and the Papacy's in raising objections to antisemitic policies were often cited as examples of the church continuing to play an important role.

2 'Stalin's policies towards women and children made little improvement to their lives.' Discuss this view.

Most responses dealt well with both women and children and were able to construct balanced arguments for both. In relation to women, the opportunities afforded through employment were generally put forward at counter the proposition, in particular in areas such as education or health. Candidates were aware that women remained subject to unequal treatment in the workplace and the so-called 'double burden' of work and domestic duties in a male-dominated society continued to place great demands on them. There was usually good awareness of the implications of Stalin's 'Great Retreat' and laws relating to divorce and abortion. It was generally accepted that children benefitted from educational opportunities and various statistics relating to the extent of improvements in literacy were put forward. Among the strongest responses was an acknowledgement that, at university level, opportunities were still limited and more widely available to the children of high-ranking party members. The extent of propaganda in the educational system was often used as a counterargument. Some responses considered the role of youth groups such as Komsomol in providing wider opportunities for young people.

© 2025

3 'Hitler's foreign policy was largely successful in achieving its aims by 1939.' Assess this view.

The most successful responses clearly understood the aims of Hitler's foreign policy. The most relevant and frequently used of these were lebensraum or living space for Germany's expanding population, pan-Germanism and the destruction of both the Treaty of Versailles and international Communism. Several responses did not distinguish between foreign and economic policy, and a smaller majority wrote largely about purely domestic issues. Weaker responses often did not match events with the achievement of a particular aim. For instance, claiming that the re-militarisation of the Rhineland was an example of Lebensraum. Most responses largely concluded that many of Hitler's aims were being achieved by 1939 but had not been completed. In these responses the necessity of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 was cited as an example of Hitler having to compromise on his attitude to the Communist Soviet Union. Others argued that the fact that their policies drew Britain and France into war in 1939 could also be used to argue against the proposition in the question.

4 Assess how far political extremism challenged the British Government in the 1930s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The history of the USA, 1944–92

5 Assess the reasons why there was so much support for segregation in the southern states of the US in the 1950s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

6 Assess the reasons for the growth of the gay rights movement in the 1960s and 1970s.

Responses to this question often demonstrated good knowledge about the social changes in this period and how they related to the development of the gay rights movement. There was effectively deployed detail of the key events, groups and individuals associated with these changes, such as Stonewall, the Gay Liberation Front and Harvey Milk, as well as an understanding of the role of the increase in wider protest movements.

7 Assess the importance of economic factors in Clinton's victory in the 1992 presidential election.

This question was well-addressed, and responses drew upon an appropriate range of examples to build a balanced argument. In dealing with the stated factor, candidates understood the economic challenges facing the USA at time of the election and commonly referred to Bush's failure to deliver tax cuts and frequently employed the aphorism, 'it's the economy, stupid!' to express its significance. There was a good deal of discussion of Clinton's charismatic persona and how even the negative aspects of his past seemed to work in his favour. The significance of Ross Perot's campaign on the incumbent was also covered in most arguments.

8 Analyse the reasons why the US did not maintain the policy of détente by the 1980s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 'It was Reagan that ended the Cold War.' Assess this view.

Responses to this question were generally very successful. Those which demonstrated the strongest level of analysis clearly understood the key aspects of Reagan's foreign policy and references to SDI and its impact on Soviet policy were common, as was his 'evil empire' speech. The strongest responses showed knowledge of a wide range of rearmament policies and that SDI was not actually implemented. There was also knowledge of Reagan's willingness to negotiate, and the efforts made towards arms reductions at various conferences. Typically, candidates were able to consider Gorbachev's role, and the best analysis showed the interaction between US policy, Soviet economic problems and Gorbachev's attempts to shore up communism in the Soviet Union. Glasnost, Perestroika and the Sinatra Doctrine were routinely invoked, although their link to the ending of the Cold War was not always demonstrated effectively and was, in weaker responses, asserted rather than fully explained.

10 Analyse the significance of UN involvement in the Korean War.

© 2025

The strongest responses focused directly on the UN and answered the question set directly rather than making comparisons with other participants in the conflict. Weaker responses tended to spend time discussing the roles of China and North Korea. Well-focused responses achieved balance by arguing that the UN's role was significant due to its success in protecting South Korea's independence and differentiating itself from its predecessor. Counterarguments showed awareness of the dominance of the USA in the conduct of the war and the direction of its tactics and therefore argued that the UN's significance was limited.

11 'Popular support was the main reason why Nkrumah was able to lead the Gold Coast to independence.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 'During the build-up to war in 1967, Nasser had every reason to be confident of achieving victory over Israel.' Assess this claim.

Stronger arguments focused on the contemporary context in 1967, although were generally confined to an assessment of the range of international support available to Egypt and Isreal at the time. The most effective responses were able to distinguish between the extent of American and Soviet assistance, as well as showing awareness of the coalition of forces supportive of the Egyptians. Some responses incorrectly claimed that Nasser had the element of surprise in his favour, despite the ponderous nature of the military build-up giving the Israelis ample time to prepare for conflict. Weaker responses tended to assert that the outcome of the Suez Crisis should have provided Nasser with many reasons for optimism, despite the military defeats suffered by the Egyptians.

© 2025