

HISTORY

Paper 9389/11
Document Question

General Comments and Key Messages

- To make the best use of the one hour available to them, candidates should spend approximately twenty minutes on the **(a) question** and thirty-five minutes on the **(b) question**, leaving five minutes to check their work.
- To achieve good marks, candidates should read questions and the four sources with great care. The more they focus on answering the actual question set, the better they are likely to do. It is advisable to read each source at least twice. Once candidates have understood the sources, they should explain how far they help answer the question.
- To achieve higher marks, candidates need to evaluate the sources to decide their reliability in relation to the question being asked about them. Candidates need to evaluate their sources' reliability relative to each other. In other words, they should question the information which the sources provide on first reading them. How to question sources is explained in more detail below.
- Wherever possible, candidates need to incorporate their contextual knowledge of the subject. The most obvious way of doing so is to use it to help decide on the reliability of the sources.
- The **(a) question** asks candidates to compare and contrast two of the four sources. For this question there are three important points to remember. The first is that a specific question is being asked. Answering the question means that similarities and differences have to relate to the question; identifying broad similarities and differences will not gain higher marks. The second point is that to achieve higher marks, candidates need to identify both similarities and differences. The third is that better responses include some evaluation of the sources for reliability. Beginning answers to these questions with a sentence which, for example, states 'There are many similarities and differences between the two Sources about' shows that there is an attempt to answer the question. More importantly, it requires the candidate to spend a few minutes identifying as many similarities and differences as they can find. Such an approach is far preferable to one which describes the content of the two sources and only then identifies similarities and differences.
- For the **(b) questions**, candidates would benefit from reducing the time spent explaining and analysing the content of the four sources and increase the time spent on evaluating them. It was common to see 'this source is unreliable because it is a newspaper account' or, conversely, 'this source is reliable because its author was involved in events and knew what was going on'. Candidates should start by assuming the unreliability of a source as a starting point. All sources are unreliable to a greater or lesser extent – they selective in the information they provide, the arguments they make. This applies just as much to secondary works of history as to primary sources. Rather than making general assertions about a source, as given above, candidates should be as specific as possible in their evaluation, using their own knowledge or the other sources to make their point. It is also important to realise that the sources will have been chosen so that some support the hypothesis and some do not. Some candidates concluded that all the sources supported – or rejected – the hypothesis.
- As for this particular examination, most candidates coped reasonably well with its specific demands. Some misread the documents being considered. For the **(a) question**, of the two documents which candidates were asked to consider, some candidates looked at only one of the stated sources and another which was not the stated one, thus providing no valid comparison of the two specified documents and limiting the credit which could be awarded. For the **(b) question**, which asked candidates to consider Sources A to D, some considered only A and D. Again, this limited the credit which could be given, simply because only half of the sources had been analysed and evaluated. Other candidates appeared to answer on a topic that they had not been prepared for which put them at a

disadvantage as they lacked the contextual knowledge needed to achieve higher marks. Some candidates would have improved their responses by carefully reading the sources first.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: The Liberals in Prussia

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of the differences between the Liberals and the Prussian government.

Most candidates made a good attempt at answering this question. 'Compare and contrast' in effect requires candidates to identify the similarities and the differences between the two sources, at least as a starting point. Both Sources A and B specify differences between the Liberals and the Prussian government, which makes those differences a similarity, a point often overlooked. The two sources also agree that the Liberals are something of a threat to the Prussian state. The difference is that Source A seems genuinely fearful of the Liberals, whereas Source B is very dismissive. A second difference is that the Kaiser in Source A is talking about the threat posed by Liberals within Prussia, whereas Bismarck in Source B concentrates more on Liberals outside Prussia, in the medium-sized and small states.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D support the view that the Liberals were a serious problem for Bismarck?

This was well answered in most cases, at least in terms of source analysis. Some dismissed Source A because it did not mention Bismarck by name. However, the date of the source shows that the King was writing at the time when he was appointing Bismarck his Minister-President. This meant that the King's rather emotional view of the Liberals was bound to be a concern to Bismarck, even though he doesn't mention him, and is thus relevant. The other sources provided few problems. Some candidates appeared reluctant to evaluate the sources beyond saying that they were biased or unbiased, and gave general reasons to support their assertion. Thus Source D was seen as the most reliable of the four simply because it was written by a historian many years later. Such general comments are not enough. Had Source D been cross-referenced to Source C, from a German liberal who by 1864 was cheering Bismarck, then the evaluation would have been much more acceptable and achieved better marks.

Section B - American Option: The Raid on Harpers Ferry, 1859

Question (a)

To what extent do Sources A and B agree on who or what was responsible for causing John Brown to lead the attack on Harpers Ferry?

Candidates found differences between the two Sources relatively straightforward to identify. Source A saw the raid as the result of a plot by Northern abolitionists, whereas Source B blamed the raid on the sequence of events from the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, i.e. from 1850. Bleeding Kansas is clearly alluded to. Another difference, overlooked by some, was that Source A was more cautious in its assertion; the plot was no more than a suspicion, rather than hard fact. Source B, however, is more definite in its judgement: the authors of the 1850 Compromise and the events which followed are clearly to blame. Similarities are less obvious. Both agree that sectional differences are in some way to blame for John Brown's actions, even if they see those differences from opposite sides of the conflict. Both see Brown as misguided. Source A sees all involved in the raid as misguided, which must include John Brown. Source B calls Brown 'a monomaniac who believes himself to be a God-appointed agent' of liberation, which shows how misguided he is.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that people in the North supported the raid on Harpers Ferry?

Most candidates were able to analyse the sources to show how Sources A, C and D clearly supported the hypothesis. Some made the point that Source A talked of abolitionists of the North, rather than all Northerners, which is a valid point. There was a tendency to misread the final sentence of Source B as

candidates thought 'the blackest page of our national history' referred to the raid on Harpers Ferry, rather than to 'the chain of events' which caused it. This meant they misinterpreted Source B, an example to illustrate the point that sources need to be read with great care. Source C was unusual in that it was a Northern source showing Northern support for John Brown but then was critical of that support. Candidates could have made more of this paradox when evaluating Source C. When it came to Source D, some were misled by the title of the book. The assumption was that a history book was bound to be reliable. This is generally not the case with history books, especially one published in 1861 at the start of the civil war, when the propaganda war had only just begun.

Section C - International Option: Britain and the Beginnings of the League of Nations

Question (a)

Compare and contrast the views expressed by Hankey (Source A) and Crowe (Source B) about the issue of whether Britain should support the proposed League of Nations.

Source B is much more positive about the benefits of the League of Nations than Source A is. Source B hopes that the League will become an intermediary stage before an international dispute turns to war. Source A believes the League will be taken over by well-meaning idealists who will push through disarmament proposals, thereby harming the UK's ability to act alone in its national interest. However, both are cautious about the future, neither can be classified as 'well-meaning idealists'. Source A is cautious to the point of distaste for the whole idea of a League of Nations, whereas Source B's optimism is tempered by an awareness that 'resourceful diplomacy' will be required to achieve peaceful resolution of any and all international crises. Most candidates were able to identify the differences. Better responses managed to include valid similarities.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D support the view that Britain joined the League of Nations despite having doubts about its prospects of success in preserving international peace?

As the League of Nations did not come into existence until January 1920, some candidates argued that Sources A and B, both written in 1916, had little relevance to the question. In reality, the British government was involved in discussions about setting up the League from the middle of the war. The arguments of people at the centre of government such as Hankey and Crowe, broadly representing the pessimistic and optimistic views of the League, would still be heard as Britain joined the League. Hankey and Crowe take opposite sides of the argument. Hankey has major doubts about the chances of the League being able to preserve peace. Crowe, on the other hand, does not have any significant doubts about the benefits the League will bring to international diplomacy, even if he does not actually refer to the success of the League. Lloyd George's position, as expressed in Source C, is closer to Hankey than Crowe. Source D is a cartoon which shows the League as a rabbit in an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation with a large snake labelled 'international strife'. To drive the point home about the imbalance of power between the two, the cartoon is labelled 'moral persuasion', something which more candidates could have mentioned. This British cartoon showed grave doubts about the League's chances of success. The source which is key to understanding the issue in the question is thus Source B. More candidates needed to give it the careful scrutiny it required. It is surprising to find a senior member of the British Foreign Office, presumably a supremely realistic and very experienced individual, expressing such idealism, especially in the middle of a total war unprecedented in nature. Lloyd George, a pragmatic politician to his core and at the centre of international politics in July 1919, would undoubtedly have doubts. The cartoonist represents the sceptical views of the British public. Even after the sources have been evaluated, they show that Britain joined the League accompanied by considerable doubts about its likely success.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/12
Document Question

General Comments and Key Messages

- To make the best use of the one hour available to them, candidates should spend approximately twenty minutes on the **(a) question** and thirty-five minutes on the **(b) question**, leaving five minutes to check their work.
- To achieve good marks, candidates should read questions and the four sources with great care. The more they focus on answering the actual question set, the better they are likely to do. It is advisable to read each source at least twice. Once candidates have understood the sources, they should explain how far they help answer the question.
- To achieve higher marks, candidates need to evaluate the sources to decide their reliability in relation to the question being asked about them. Candidates need to evaluate their sources' reliability relative to each other. In other words, they should question the information which the sources provide on first reading them. How to question sources is explained in more detail below.
- Wherever possible, candidates need to incorporate their contextual knowledge of the subject. The most obvious way of doing so is to use it to help decide on the reliability of the sources.
- The **(a) question** asks candidates to compare and contrast two of the four sources. For this question there are three important points to remember. The first is that a specific question is being asked. Answering the question means that similarities and differences have to relate to the question; identifying broad similarities and differences will not gain higher marks. The second point is that to achieve higher marks, candidates need to identify both similarities and differences. The third is that better responses include some evaluation of the sources for reliability. Beginning answers to these questions with a sentence which, for example, states 'There are many similarities and differences between the two Sources about' shows that there is an attempt to answer the question. More importantly, it requires the candidate to spend a few minutes identifying as many similarities and differences as they can find. Such an approach is far preferable to one which describes the content of the two sources and only then identifies similarities and differences.
- For the **(b) questions**, candidates would benefit from reducing the time spent explaining and analysing the content of the four sources and increase the time spent on evaluating them. It was common to see 'this source is unreliable because it is a newspaper account' or, conversely, 'this source is reliable because its author was involved in events and knew what was going on'. Candidates should start by assuming the unreliability of a source as a starting point. All sources are unreliable to a greater or lesser extent – they selective in the information they provide, the arguments they make. This applies just as much to secondary works of history as to primary sources. Rather than making general assertions about a source, as given above, candidates should be as specific as possible in their evaluation, using their own knowledge or the other sources to make their point. It is also important to realise that the sources will have been chosen so that some support the hypothesis and some do not. Some candidates concluded that all the sources supported – or rejected – the hypothesis.
- As for this particular examination, most candidates coped reasonably well with its specific demands. Some misread the documents being considered. For the **(a) question**, of the two documents which candidates were asked to consider, some candidates looked at only one of the stated sources and another which was not the stated one, thus providing no valid comparison of the two specified documents and limiting the credit which could be awarded. For the **(b) question**, which asked candidates to consider Sources A to D, some considered only A and D. Again, this limited the credit which could be given, simply because only half of the sources had been analysed and evaluated. Other candidates appeared to answer on a topic that they had not been prepared for which put them at a

disadvantage as they lacked the contextual knowledge needed to achieve higher marks. Some candidates would have improved their responses by carefully reading the sources first.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: The Problems of Italian Nationalists

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence about the attitudes of foreigners towards Italy.

The foreigners are two ambassadors, the Belgian and the British. The former is reporting from Rome in 1848, the latter from Piedmont in 1849. The first sentences of each identify a difference in the focus of their reports. The Belgian ambassador says that external factors – which must include Austria – are not an obstacle to independence. The British ambassador states that Austria has an undue influence over Piedmont and thus limits the independence of Italy. This contrast is then explained and illustrated by the two sources. Another contrast is that Source A does mention Italian unification, while Source B concentrates on the state of Piedmont. However, both agree that Italian independence is unlikely to happen, that the peoples of Italy are too divided and the state of Piedmont too weak to achieve such goals. Both mention the need for intervention by foreign powers either to restore order (Source A) or limit the power of Austria (Source B). Most answers did focus on the points made above.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D agree that Austria was the greatest problem faced by Italian nationalists?

Candidates appeared to find this question reasonably straightforward. Sources A and C both argued that Italian disunity was the main problem facing Italian nationalists. Source B highlighted Austrian opposition to the state of Piedmont, which some argued was marginal to the question as the king of Piedmont was not an Italian nationalist. In fact, he was hoping to put himself at the head of the movement for Italian independence by forcing Austria out of Lombardy and Venetia. This is an example of where candidates' contextual knowledge should be used to help analyse sources. Candidates might also have noted that the King of Piedmont in Source B - new, young, inexperienced and under great pressure from Austria, is the same king who in Source D had become King of Italy and who makes no mention of Austria whatsoever. That is because in 1866 Austria had abandoned her Italian province of Venetia to France, which handed it over to the new state of Italy. More candidates could have mentioned this development. Some reflection on Cavour as a politician and his position in July 1860 was also needed to help evaluate Source C. Some candidates spent much time describing the content of the sources; deciding on their relative value in answering the question would have been a better approach to take.

Section B - American Option: The Death of John Brown, 1859

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources C and D as evidence about Southern attitudes towards the death of John Brown.

Both sources are from Southern newspapers. Both are examples of how the South predicts the likely response of the North to the death of John Brown, which is a similarity. Another is that both are critical of John Brown and his raid on Harpers Ferry. While Source C talks of his crimes, Source D refers to his mad act. Thus both by implication welcome the death of John Brown. The main difference comes in their analysis of Northern responses to the death of John Brown. Source C believes that Northern fanaticism will cause its sympathy for John Brown to remain at a very emotional level almost indefinitely. On the other hand, Source D believes that the intense sympathy the North initially showed towards John Brown was the response of a small minority. It has already been replaced, Source D argues, by a moderate, reasonable expression of Northern patriotism. Most candidates made most of these points. Better responses provided some evaluation of the two sources, using contextual knowledge to do so.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the impact of the death of John Brown was short-lived?

Candidates found few problems in identifying which sources supported the assertion and which did not. Source D clearly supported and Sources A, B and C were opposed, if to slightly different degrees. Some responses would have been improved if the sources had been given the careful evaluation needed to ensure higher marks. All sources were written within a few weeks of John Brown's execution. Contextual knowledge of developments in 1860–61 was needed to give a longer-term perspective which could then help evaluate the sources. More cross-referencing should also have been used. How can Sources C and D, two Southern sources, have such different views of the reaction of the North? Which is the more valid? Again, either contextual knowledge and/or reference to Sources A and B would help decide which of the two sources was the more reliable. As for Sources A and B, they are more in agreement with each other, which is to be expected. How much value do they have, though? Written in the heat of the moment, they are to be considered with some mistrust. The comment of Source A that 'before many years it (the death of John Brown) will bring the opposing forces ... face to face for a final conflict' was to prove very prescient. By making such arguments, candidates can evaluate the sources, and the strongest responses did this. Others just explained what the sources said, rather than placing a value on their arguments.

Section C - International Option: The League of Nations and Collective Security

Question (a)

Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and D about the work of the League in the 1920s.

Source B, a cartoon published in 1927, shows the League having a marginal role in maintaining peace. The League can only ask the world statesman what he is doing to stop war breaking out – and the statesman is not doing much. On the other hand, Source D argues that the League was successful in maintaining peace in the 1920s. The similarity is that both see the League has a peacekeeping role of some sort. In fact, some candidates argued that the cartoon showed the success of the League in that the cartoon shows the giant of war tied down with a few ropes. This interpretation does not bear close examination, however. There is peace because the giant is asleep. As soon as he wakes up, he can break the rope that the world politicians have put on him – presumably when he was asleep. Most candidates found this a straightforward comparison of differences, even if some found similarities harder to find.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D support the view that collective security did not work?

Candidates struggled to make Source A relevant because it is the statement of the League's intent to uphold collective security. It is useful, however, as a benchmark by which to assess the actions of the League, both in the other sources and in contextual examples. Source A shows how high the bar had been set by the founders of the League: firstly, member states should *immediately* sever all economic ties with a state which goes to war; secondly, the League should draw up plans for military action of some kind. Contextual knowledge, especially of the work of the League in the 1930s, shows how the ideal of collective security was not upheld. Some candidates were able to demonstrate that Source A plus contextual knowledge shows that collective security did not work.

Source B, a cartoon based on Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, also shows that collective security did not work, ropes being preferred to the chains of organised security. Some candidates identified the cartoon figures. They thought the world statesman was Woodrow Wilson, presumably because he was wearing a top hat. They overlooked the date of the cartoon, which was published six years after a seriously-ill Wilson had left the US presidency. The identity of the politicians is irrelevant to the message of the cartoon, however, and is not needed to help analysis and evaluation. For the record, the two figures standing on the giant's foot are Robert Cecil and Lloyd George. Cecil had been a key figure in the establishment of the League of Nations, of which he was a keen supporter. Lloyd George had also helped establish the League, if less enthusiastically. By 1927 he had been out of government office for five years.

Source C, from the pragmatic and cautious Stanley Baldwin at the time of the Abyssinian crisis, is another source which supports the hypothesis. Source D is the essential source which counters the hypothesis. On a point of detail, some candidates said that France was a permanent member of the League of Nations. To do so is to confuse the League of Nations with the United Nations. In the UN, the concept of permanent members applies only to the Security Council. In terms of evaluating Source D, praise for the League, rare at any time from the 1930s, is something of a surprise. However, a combination of the leading role of France in the League and the very last meeting of the League might explain why such a rose-coloured interpretation is given. It also explains why the source is not that reliable. This evaluation of the only source which challenges

the hypothesis, which featured in better responses, provides crucial information in helping answer the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/13
Document Question

General Comments and Key Messages

- To make the best use of the one hour available to them, candidates should spend approximately twenty minutes on the **(a) question** and thirty-five minutes on the **(b) question**, leaving five minutes to check their work.
- To achieve good marks, candidates should read questions and the four sources with great care. The more they focus on answering the actual question set, the better they are likely to do. It is advisable to read each source at least twice. Once candidates have understood the sources, they should explain how far they help answer the question.
- To achieve higher marks, candidates need to evaluate the sources to decide their reliability in relation to the question being asked about them. Candidates need to evaluate their sources' reliability relative to each other. In other words, they should question the information which the sources provide on first reading them. How to question sources is explained in more detail below.
- Wherever possible, candidates need to incorporate their contextual knowledge of the subject. The most obvious way of doing so is to use it to help decide on the reliability of the sources.
- The **(a) question** asks candidates to compare and contrast two of the four sources. For this question there are three important points to remember. The first is that a specific question is being asked. Answering the question means that similarities and differences have to relate to the question; identifying broad similarities and differences will not gain higher marks. The second point is that to achieve higher marks, candidates need to identify both similarities and differences. The third is that better responses include some evaluation of the sources for reliability. Beginning answers to these questions with a sentence which, for example, states 'There are many similarities and differences between the two Sources about' shows that there is an attempt to answer the question. More importantly, it requires the candidate to spend a few minutes identifying as many similarities and differences as they can find. Such an approach is far preferable to one which describes the content of the two sources and only then identifies similarities and differences.
- For the **(b) questions**, candidates would benefit from reducing the time spent explaining and analysing the content of the four sources and increase the time spent on evaluating them. It was common to see 'this source is unreliable because it is a newspaper account' or, conversely, 'this source is reliable because its author was involved in events and knew what was going on'. Candidates should start by assuming the unreliability of a source as a starting point. All sources are unreliable to a greater or lesser extent – they selective in the information they provide, the arguments they make. This applies just as much to secondary works of history as to primary sources. Rather than making general assertions about a source, as given above, candidates should be as specific as possible in their evaluation, using their own knowledge or the other sources to make their point. It is also important to realise that the sources will have been chosen so that some support the hypothesis and some do not. Some candidates concluded that all the sources supported – or rejected – the hypothesis.
- As for this particular examination, most candidates coped reasonably well with its specific demands. Some misread the documents being considered. For the **(a) question**, of the two documents which candidates were asked to consider, some candidates looked at only one of the stated sources and another which was not the stated one, thus providing no valid comparison of the two specified documents and limiting the credit which could be awarded. For the **(b) question**, which asked candidates to consider Sources A to D, some considered only A and D. Again, this limited the credit which could be given, simply because only half of the sources had been analysed and evaluated. Other candidates appeared to answer on a topic that they had not been prepared for which put them at a

disadvantage as they lacked the contextual knowledge needed to achieve higher marks. Some candidates would have improved their responses by carefully reading the sources first.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Cavour and France

Question (a)

Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence of the value of the French alliance to Piedmont.

Source B was Cavour's report of the meeting at which Napoleon III agreed to help Piedmont 'drive the Austrians out of Italy once and for all' by going to war. Source D listed the highlights of the armistice agreement signed by France and Austria almost exactly a year later, following the war. The agreement was reached without Piedmont's agreement. Cavour was so furious that he resigned as a result – though he was brought back within six months. The two sources agree on the importance of the French alliance to Piedmont, both in preparing for war (Source B) and in being the means by which Lombardy was transferred from Austria to Piedmont (Source D). The main difference comes as a result of the different nature of the two sources and their position in relation to the Franco-Austrian war of 1859. Source B is a private memo from Cavour to Victor Emmanuel. He wanted to sell the benefits of the alliance to his king and so played down the importance of Savoy and Nice – Piedmontese territory which did go to France in 1860. Source D is the main terms of the subsequent armistice, a list of factual points aimed at no-one and everyone. Contextual information should be used to highlight the contrast. Candidates familiar with the Treaty of Villafranca knew that most of its terms, overtaken by events, were never implemented. Most candidates just highlighted the similarity between the two sources, which limited the credit they could receive.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D show that Cavour's policies were successful?

Cavour is one of the leaders of the Italian Risorgimento. Successful responses showed a sound knowledge and understanding of his aims, policies and success. They were able to bring much contextual knowledge to assist their analysis and evaluation of these sources. Many other responses would have benefited from such an approach. Source A supports the assertion. It argues that Piedmont had clearly put itself at the head of the movement of unification, using political methods to do so. And yet it needs to be treated with great caution as it is a public speech made by Cavour himself. Source B needs to be treated with just as much, if not more caution, because Cavour is still the author and the subject of his private memo an amazing event: a secret meeting between two political leaders who plan to go to war against one of the leading great powers of Europe. The secret meeting did not remain secret for long, as Source C indicates. This source is useful in helping to support both Source B, thus making it a little more reliable, and Source D. Source D itself can be used either to support or undermine the hypothesis. In support, its third section shows Piedmont gaining Lombardy and the forming of an Italian confederation. In opposition, Source D shows Austria is still in Italy, while contextual knowledge shows Cavour's response to Villafranca was to resign. These are examples of points that better responses considered, and approaches they took. Other responses were restricted to an analysis the sources and an identification of which side of the argument each supported.

Section B - American Option: The Compromise of 1850.

Question (a)

To what extent do Sources A and D agree on how the USA should address the issue of slavery?

The two sources are speeches to the US Senate given by leading Senators, one from the South, the other from the North. Calhoun was a Southern Democrat, a former Vice-President and a Senator since 1832. Seward was a Northern Whig, new to the Senate, and a leading abolitionist. The differences are clear to see. Source A lists three concessions the North needs to make to the South, one of which explicitly concerns the fugitive slave issue. Source D argues that slavery should be confined to existing Southern states and not allowed to expand beyond those states. Furthermore, both mention an equilibrium between North and South. Source A wants it protected, Source D argues it never existed. However, there are similarities. Both identify slavery as a problem which needs addressing. Neither makes any mention of the use of force to resolve the problem. Both make recommendations which, in the context of 1850, stand little chance of being implemented. Most candidates were stronger on differences than similarities. To achieve higher marks they

need to include both.

Question (b)

How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the 1850 Compromise helped only to further divide the USA?

It is worth mentioning two general points about the use of sources. The first is that sources will often make references to points which candidates need to apply their contextual knowledge to in order to understand. Thus Source A refers to 'the acquired territory', which means the lands gained from Mexico in 1848. It also talks of 'the equilibrium between the sections...destroyed by the action of this government'. The equilibrium is the Missouri Compromise of 1820. The action of this government which has destroyed this equilibrium refers to talks which result in the 1850 Compromise. Candidates who 'translate' nineteenth century references into their twenty first century understanding usually analyse the sources with more confidence. The second is the need for careful reading of the sources. The best example comes from Source B, which was often seen as a pro-Southern source on the evidence of 'the South "has no concessions or surrender to make"'. Candidates who argued thus overlooked 'Mr C says...' at the beginning of the sentence and 'We cannot take this seriously' afterwards. Such misinterpretations show the dangers of reading the texts too quickly in order to get on with writing the answer.

On first analysis, the sources are evenly divided. Sources B and D are strong criticisms of the Compromise that was being thrashed out in 1850. Source B attacks the man from the South, Source D the arguments of the South. Thus the gap between North and South is widened. Source C argues that the Compromise will gain support from the South, the more anxious of the two sides in the negotiations. Source A argues that a Compromise will be agreed, the South will be reassured. Calhoun says that reassurance can 'easily' be given, that there will be 'no difficulty' in devising a provision to provide that reassurance.

However, Source A's arguments are overly optimistic. Devising a constitutional amendment might be easy; passing it will be so hard as to be impossible. Some candidates used contextual knowledge of the constitution to evaluate Calhoun's analysis. Some cross-referenced Source A to Sources B and D to indicate the impossibility of achieving Calhoun's goals and thus how unreliable the source was in helping to answer the question. The Source is also a public speech of an old man, which makes it additionally unreliable. (In fact, Calhoun died with a month of making this speech. Source B's calling Calhoun a dying monster is taken to be an unfortunate coincidence.) Source D's reliability is also undermined by its being a public speech. Sources B and C are two partisan newspaper reports, North and South, Source B's disparaging dismissal of Calhoun's arguments supports Source D in showing the North's growing impatience with the South and is thus useful, if unreliable. Source C is less partisan than Source B, more reasoned. However, it bases its analysis on a report from another Southern newspaper, the Baltimore Sun, which weakens its arguments.

Most candidates could identify the extent to which the content of the sources supported the assertion. Better responses included valid evaluation, although in other answers, evaluation rarely went beyond the generic, for example, 'this is from a newspaper therefore it must be biased'. The convincing source evaluation seen was based on specific evidence, rather than the generic.

Section C - International Option: The Replacement of the League of Nations by the United Nations

Question (a)

Compare and contrast the views expressed by Paul-Boncour (Source C) and Noel-Baker (Source D) about the UN's prospects of succeeding where the League of Nations had failed.

Source C, from a French diplomat, combines both pessimism and optimism about the chances of the UN being more successful than the League of Nations. It is pessimistic in that the UN has less public support, largely because of the failure of the League. It is optimistic because it thinks that the UN has learnt from the lessons of the League. Source D, from a British diplomat, is positive and upbeat about the UN's future. So similarities and differences can easily be identified. Most answers to this question showed an understanding of these points. Some would have done even better had they evaluated the two sources as well. Both come from diplomats of liberal democracies who had played leading roles in the League of Nations. The speeches were made at the same time to the same event. Why any difference at all? Paul-Boncour provides one explanation - the Nazi occupation of France. Candidates should consider how convincing this argument is. Better responses used contextual knowledge attempts at evaluation.

Question (b)

‘Simply the League of Nations under a different name.’ How far do Sources A to D support this interpretation of the establishment of the League of Nations?

The use of these sources to answer this question showed the importance of reading the sources with great care in order to decide on which side of the fence each falls. Candidates interpreted Sources B and D in different ways, using different sections of each source to do so. Source B challenges the assertion that the UN was simply the continuation of the League of Nations under a different name. The key extract is ‘so it has been decided to bury it and start afresh’. Yet some candidates took the first line of Source B – ‘the work of the League is unmistakably printed on the social, economic and humanitarian life of the world’ – to argue for the hypothesis. With Source D, ‘in every case the work (of the UN) has started where the League left off’ was used for the assertion while the frequent use of the adjective ‘new’ was used to argue the opposite. So long as candidates provide relevant quotes from the source for their interpretation, together with an explanation to support their selection, they will receive credit for doing so. Better candidates provided interpretations rather than simple right-or-wrong judgements. The other two sources were more clear-cut. Source A, from Stalin, opposed the assertion. Candidates were able to use contextual information to explain why he did so, especially the initial exclusion of the USSR from the League of Nations, which in turn weakened Stalin’s arguments. Source C supports the assertion, as best shown by ‘The League leaves behind it lasting works. ...the new Organisation will merely have to carry them on’. As with other **(b)** questions on this paper, candidates could analyse the sources with some insight but were less convincing when it came to source evaluation. It is the latter which, building on source analysis but going that important stage further, can lead to higher marks. Candidates would benefit from giving more time and space to evaluating the sources they have to consider.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/21

Outline Study

General Comments and Key Messages

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time very well, apportioning an appropriate amount to each question. The overall standard was satisfactory, although the quality of scripts varied widely. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, although some found it a struggle to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part (a) and Part (b) questions. Many candidates clearly realised this and attempted the two Part (a) questions consecutively, followed by the two Part (b) questions (or vice-versa).

In **Part (a) questions**, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a wide range of factors to show how they inter-reacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance. In **Part (b) questions**, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

Part (a) questions: Candidates should be aware that these questions are about causation. The more effective answers seen in this examination session included detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. Better responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. Less successful responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to feature less relevant material and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they would have benefited from more detailed and specific material, backed up with appropriate factual support.

Part (b) questions: Candidates should be aware that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses fell into one of three categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. Weaker answers were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they would have benefited from greater factual and chronological accuracy, points based on better factual support, and more relevance; keeping to the date parameters in the question would have improved a number of responses.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Modern Europe, 1789-1917

1 France, 1789-1804

(a) Why did the Estates General fail to solve France's problems?

Virtually all candidates were able to display sound knowledge of the composition of the Estates General and the negative impact which this had on its ability to make agreed decisions. The most impressive responses went beyond these general points, outlining specific problems which confronted France and explaining why the Estates General was unable to find practical solutions to them. Other responses would have benefited from greater range and depth.

(b) How far did Napoleon show himself to be ‘the son of the Revolution’ as First Consul from 1799 to 1804?

Many candidates were able to produce high-quality responses, based on the deployment of appropriate factual evidence to aid the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments. Many responses comprised accounts (often in considerable detail) of Napoleon’s various policies - a narrative/descriptive approach which often lacked explicit relevance to the requirements of the specific question. This was particularly evident in responses which drifted into outlines of Napoleon’s foreign adventures.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

(a) Why did the Industrial Revolution change patterns of trade?

Even in the most effective responses, there was a tendency to explain *how* patterns of trade changed as a result of the Industrial Revolution, rather than *why*. Some responses relied on generalised assertions regarding the British experience, relatively few candidates being able to make appropriate reference to continental Europe.

(b) Evaluate the reasons why industrialisation was later to develop in continental Europe than in Britain. Refer to at least one continental country in your answer.

There were some high-quality responses to this question, based on a fully-focused and balanced assessment of appropriate and accurate factual evidence. Many candidates successfully described a variety of reasons why industrialisation took place in Britain, but seemed unable to counter this with relevant detail regarding the situation confronting one or more continental countries. Other responses would have benefited from greater focus on the question, specific factual support and greater chronological awareness.

3 The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

(a) Why did Germany invade Belgium in 1914?

Most candidates were able to demonstrate good, and often very detailed, knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan. The rationale behind the Plan and the reasons why it involved a German invasion of Belgium were clearly understood and generally well explained. Coverage of the Schlieffen Plan alone, however, did not address the full requirements of the question; it was also necessary to explain why the Plan was activated in 1914. The most impressive responses, therefore, showed clear understanding of German policy following the events in Sarajevo which subsequently led to the mobilisation of Russian forces. Weaker responses to this question, of which there were relatively few, were based on vague and unsupported assertions regarding Germany’s desire for territorial expansion.

(b) Assess the consequences of the Alliance System for international stability from c.1900 to 1914.

It was abundantly clear that the vast majority of candidates possessed detailed knowledge of the background to, and outcomes of, the Alliance System. Some struggled to apply this knowledge in an explicitly relevant manner, focus on the consequences of the Alliance System for international stability often being confined to generalised assertions (such as that it was largely responsible for the outbreak of World War I), or assumptions (such as that it was the cause of the naval arms race between Britain and Germany). The most effective responses were able to provide a more balanced and focused assessment of the evidence.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

(a) Why did Tsar Nicholas II continue to face problems from 1906 to 1914?

There were a number of high-quality responses to this question, based on detailed knowledge and understanding of the situation confronting the Tsar throughout the period from 1906 to 1914. A characteristic of weaker responses was a tendency to drift outside the timeframe established in the question; many candidates, for example, wrote at length about the causes and immediate impact of the 1905 Revolution, while others described the impact of Russia's failures during World War I in the period after 1914. Greater relevance to the period from 1906 to 1914 would have improved a number of responses which comprised mainly vague and unfocused reference to Stolypin's reforms.

(b) 'The Bolshevik seizure of power came as a surprise.' How far do you agree with this claim?

The vast majority of candidates made a genuine attempt to remain fully-focused on the requirements of the particular question, facilitating the development of balanced arguments and reasoned judgements. Responses varied in quality according to the depth and accuracy of the factual evidence used to support these judgements. For example, a frequent claim was that Bolshevik success was not a surprise because of the weaknesses and inefficiencies of the Provisional Government; this clearly required further detail to explain why it was the Bolsheviks, rather than any other revolutionary group, which was able to exploit these weaknesses.

Section B - American Option: The History of the USA, 1840-1941

5 The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s

(a) Why, in 1904, did President Roosevelt introduce what became known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine?

This question was attempted by a small number of candidates. While some were able to define the Corollary as providing the USA with a justification for intervening in the affairs of states in Central and South America, more needed to explain Roosevelt's motivation for introducing the policy in 1904, beyond generalised statements about protecting the USA's interests.

(b) How consistently did the USA support an Open Door policy towards China in the years from 1899 to 1931?

Most of the responses to this rarely attempted question would have benefited from greater coverage of the period from 1899 to 1931. This would have helped them to achieve a balanced assessment regarding the consistency of the USA's support for the Open Door policy. Some candidates were able to provide an accurate definition of the policy and show how the USA consistently supported it up to and including the Washington Naval Conference of 1922. Few were able to demonstrate how, thereafter, the USA adopted a more isolationist approach and took no action to enforce the policy (for example, by not responding effectively to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931). Weaker responses lacked adequate knowledge and understanding of what the Open Door policy entailed.

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

(a) Why was the Compromise of 1877 agreed?

The most impressive responses came from candidates who were able to provide a detailed explanation of the political and constitutional motives which led to informal agreement between the Republican Party and Southern Democrats. Some responses, which outlined the impact of the Compromise, lacked relevance. Weaker responses lacked adequate factual knowledge.

(b) How far, by 1877, did the position of the ex-slaves change because of Reconstruction?

While responses varied enormously in terms of the range and depth of factual support they contained, most candidates made a genuine attempt to develop balanced arguments fully-focused on the particular requirements of the specific question. The most impressive responses were based

on effective analysis of appropriate, accurate and often very detailed factual evidence. Less successful answers contained mainly vague generalisation and largely unsupported assertion.

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Account for the rise of the Progressive Movement in the late nineteenth century.

Candidates generally struggled to focus on the key issue of why the Progressive Movement developed during the late nineteenth century. The majority of responses tended instead to describe the Movement's aims and achievements, invariably drifting well outside the timeframe established in the question. Explicitly relevant comments were seen but usually restricted to growing animosity towards big business, monopolies and trusts, or vague generalisations regarding poor living and working conditions. Many responses would have benefited from greater range and depth.

(b) How far did the Progressive reforms make the USA more democratic?

Many candidates were able to outline at least some of the Progressive reforms. Analysis of their impact was often confined to social issues, such as the position of women in American society, and most candidates needed to provide better supporting evidence to back up the assertions made. Focus on the political impact, and particularly the key issue of whether the reforms made the USA more democratic, characterised better responses.

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

(a) Why was political opposition to the New Deal ineffective?

While some candidates were able to describe opposition to the New Deal organised by campaigners such as Huey Long, rarely were the reasons why such opposition was ineffective analysed. Similarly, very few candidates were able to identify reasons why the Republican Party was unable to mount any realistic opposition to the New Deal. A small number of candidates outlined the judicial opposition to the New Deal mounted by the Supreme Court; they then needed to go further and make this explicitly relevant to the question.

(b) How radical were the reforms of the First and Second New Deals?

The reforms which constituted the First and Second New Deals were largely well known and understood. In general, however, candidates found it difficult to deploy their knowledge in order to focus explicitly on the particular requirements of the specific question. As a result, most responses were narrative/descriptive in nature.

Section C - International Option: International Relations, 1871-1945

9 International Relations, 1871-1918

(a) Why did Britain and France agree the Entente Cordiale in 1904?

French fears of diplomatic isolation and vulnerability to attack by Germany and its Triple Alliance partners were widely understood and perceived as the reason why France was prepared to reach agreement with Britain, despite traditional hostility between the two countries. In general, British motives were less well understood, most candidates simply asserting that Britain could not afford to be left out of European affairs. The most impressive responses were able to demonstrate how Britain, concerned by adverse European reaction to its involvement in the Boer Wars, threats to its Far Eastern interests and the rapid growth of German naval power, had already moved away from its long-term policy of 'splendid isolation' by signing an agreement with Japan in 1902. The Entente Cordiale was, therefore, perceived as evidence that Britain felt its security could no longer be guaranteed by diplomatic isolation in Europe.

(b) To what extent was the Scramble for Africa the result of economic rivalry between the major powers?

There were some very good responses to this question, based on a fully-focused and balanced assessment of the reasons why European nations became involved in the race to acquire African land during the late nineteenth century. Other responses relied almost exclusively on a

narrative/descriptive approach; several factors which led to the Scramble for Africa were identified, each outlined in isolation with only limited analysis of how they inter-connected and only implicit relevance to the relative significance of economic rivalry between the major European powers. As a result, while most candidates were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge, they were unable to deploy it effectively in order to address the particular requirements of the specific question.

10 International Relations, 1919-1933

(a) Why was France unhappy with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles?

Most candidates clearly understood that France had wanted, and expected, harsher terms to be imposed on Germany. The best responses effectively compared Clemenceau's aims at the Paris Peace Conference with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles which emerged from it. This provided a clear factual basis for an explanation of French resentment. Other responses adopted a rather more narrative/descriptive approach; although the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were outlined accurately, there was only limited (and largely implicit) reference to the reasons why France was disappointed by them. Weaker responses were characterised by vague generalisations and unsupported assertions.

(b) To what extent was the USSR successful in its attempts to establish improved relations with the rest of Europe in the period from 1919 to 1933?

While there were some very impressive responses, some candidates needed to apply greater detailed factual knowledge required to address this question effectively. A number of responses featured generalisations regarding French and British fear of communism, more specific evidence being restricted to largely unfocused reference to the Treaty of Rapallo.

11 International Relations, 1933-1939

(a) Why did Italy, Germany and the USSR become involved in the Spanish Civil War?

Some responses would have been improved by better range and depth, the most common argument being that Italy and Germany wanted Spain to have a fascist government, while the USSR's motive was to support Spanish communists. More candidates could have provided deeper analysis by looking at the advantages which Mussolini, Hitler and Stalin individually sought to gain by involvement in Spain's internal conflict. For example, understanding of Mussolini's desire to secure his own power in Italy by gaining a glorious foreign policy victory was seen in only a small number of responses. Similarly, Hitler's desire to keep Mussolini occupied in Spain so that he was unable to interfere with Germany's designs on Austria was rarely considered.

(b) How far do you agree that Britain's appeasement of Hitler during the 1930s was a misjudgement?

Virtually all candidates were able to demonstrate good understanding of what the policy of appeasement actually entailed, supported by appropriate examples of the policy in action. The most common conclusion was that appeasement clearly was a misjudgement because it allowed Hitler to destroy the Treaty of Versailles and develop a large, well-equipped military capability which threatened peace in Europe and, eventually, led to World War II. As a result, a number of responses tended to lack balance, appeasement being viewed as an unjustifiably weak response to Hitler's aggressive actions. The most impressive responses were able to show that, while hindsight undoubtedly suggests that appeasement was a misjudgement, there were perfectly logical reasons why the policy was adopted in the 1930s. This approach facilitated the development of fully-focused arguments based on balanced assessment of the evidence.

12 China and Japan, 1919-1945

(a) Why did Japan attack Pearl Harbor in 1941?

This question was answered by a small number of candidates. The majority of responses tended to focus on long-term factors, such as the USA's increasing concerns that Japanese expansion posed a threat to American interests in the Far East. As a result, there was only limited (and implicit) explanation of Japanese motives for attacking the American naval base in 1941. The most impressive responses were based on a clear understanding of the impact of the USA's trade

embargo on Japanese policy; while apparently willing to negotiate, Japan was continuing to expand in search of alternative supplies of vital resources, such as oil. The attack on Pearl Harbor was, therefore, perceived as an attempt to weaken the USA's Pacific fleet sufficiently to allow time for Japan to acquire these resources and develop its own naval power in the region.

(b) To what extent was the Kuomintang's rise to power by 1928 dependent on support from the Chinese Communist Party?

Responses to this rarely attempted question would have been improved by greater balance. There was general understanding of the vital contribution which the CCP made to KMT success by 1928, although the depth and accuracy of the evidence used to support this view varied enormously. More candidates could have provided balance by outlining other factors which enabled the KMT to gain power by 1928. Some candidates drifted from the requirements of the question by explaining why Chiang Kai-shek ended KMT collaboration with the CCP after 1927.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/22
Outline Study

General Comments and Key Messages

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time very well, apportioning an appropriate amount to each question. The overall standard was satisfactory, although the quality of scripts varied widely. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, although some found it a struggle to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part (a) and Part (b) questions. Many candidates clearly realised this and attempted the two Part (a) questions consecutively, followed by the two Part (b) questions (or vice-versa).

In **Part (a) questions**, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a wide range of factors to show how they inter-reacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance. In **Part (b) questions**, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

Part (a) questions: Candidates should be aware that these questions are about causation. The more effective answers seen in this examination session included detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. Better responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. Less successful responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to feature less relevant material and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they would have benefited from more detailed and specific material, backed up with appropriate factual support.

Part (b) questions: Candidates should be aware that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses fell into one of three categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. Weaker answers were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they would have benefited from greater factual and chronological accuracy, points based on better factual support, and more relevance; keeping to the date parameters in the question would have improved a number of responses.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Modern Europe, 1789-1917

1 France, 1789-1804

(a) Why were there dangers to the French Revolution from the counter-revolutionaries from 1789 to 1795?

There were some very impressive responses to this question, based on clear understanding of the various groups which opposed the Revolution and the reasons for their opposition. Some candidates were able to explain how and why threats to the Revolution developed and changed over time in the period from 1789 to 1795. Some responses lacked such analytical depth and candidates found it difficult to focus on the required timeframe. Weaker responses were the result of a lack of clear understanding of the term 'counter-revolutionaries'.

(b) Analyse the ways by which Napoleon was able to increase his authority over France as First Consul from 1799 to 1804.

As in responses to **Part (a)**, some candidates struggled to confine their answers to the given timeframe, reference to Napoleon's actions after becoming Emperor being relatively common. Most responses were based on narrative/descriptive accounts of Napoleon's policies and would have benefited from more explicit reference to the impact which they had on his authority over France. The most impressive responses were characterised by analytical depth and remained fully-focused on the requirements of the question.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

(a) Why did changes in roads and canals encourage the Industrial Revolution in Britain?

The quality of responses to this question varied enormously. Some relied mainly on generalised assertions lacking specific factual support. Relatively few candidates, for example, were able to substantiate the view that canals aided the transport of heavy or bulky goods by providing actual examples. Others lacked relevance, outlining the subsequent impact of railways.

(b) Assess the claim that the middle classes benefited most from the Industrial Revolution by 1850. Refer to any two countries in your answer.

Some high-quality responses to this question were seen. Others lacked real understanding of who the middle classes actually were. As a result, most responses lacked focus on the precise requirements of the question, dealing with more general issues relating to the impact of industrialisation, usually confined to the poor conditions suffered by the urban poor. Some candidates made reference to Britain's 1832 Reform Act, although its implications could have been more widely understood. The most impressive responses contained meaningful comparison between the circumstances of the middle classes in Britain and elsewhere in Europe.

3 The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

(a) Why was there instability in the Balkans from c. 1900 to 1914?

This was a very popular question and most candidates were able to demonstrate good knowledge of events in the Balkans between 1900 and 1914. In general, there was a tendency to describe these events chronologically, rather than to focus on the key issue of why there was instability in the region. The most impressive responses were founded on clear explanation of the underlying tensions in the Balkans, together with detailed analysis of the motives behind the involvement of major powers such as Austria-Hungary and Russia. This provided an explicitly relevant context for coverage of particular events such as the Balkan Wars of 1908-9.

(b) 'France was most responsible for the outbreak of World War I.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

There were many high-quality responses to this popular question, characterised by detailed analysis of French culpability for the outbreak of World War I, explicitly balanced against the relative significance of other causal factors. Some candidates found it difficult to remain fully-focused on the requirements of the specific question, tending to drift into a descriptive account of the causes of World War I with limited analysis of their relative significance and little mention of France beyond its resentment at the loss of Alsace and Lorraine in 1871.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

(a) Why was World War I an important reason for two revolutions in Russia in 1917?

Most candidates were able to identify general reasons why Russia's involvement in World War I bred disenchantment and further exposed weaknesses in the country's leadership. The most effective responses went beyond such general factors, clearly identifying differences between the two separate revolutions. Weaker responses lacked such range and depth, the majority concentrating almost exclusively on the ways in which World War I was responsible for the overthrow of the Tsar.

(b) 'Nicholas II was popular with most Russians during the period up to 1914.' How far do you agree with this claim?

There were a number of impressive responses to this question. These were based on balanced assessment of appropriate factual evidence, leading to the development of arguments which were fully-focused on the requirements of the question. Other responses concentrated almost exclusively on the two extremes of the timeframe established by the question, dealing with the causes/immediate impact of the 1905 Revolution and the consequences of Russia's involvement in World War I. Better detailed knowledge of the Tsar's circumstances in the period between 1905 and 1914 would have improved some responses.

Section B - American Option: The History of the USA, 1840-1941

5 The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s

(a) Why, in 1846, did the USA declare war on Mexico?

Many candidates were able to identify some of the immediate factors which led to the American declaration of war against Mexico in 1846. That Mexican forces had crossed the Rio Grande and clashed with American troops was widely understood. Some candidates were able to provide greater depth by demonstrating how President Polk had actually provoked this Mexican response. The most impressive responses provided analysis of Polk's motives for doing this by demonstrating the relevance of the slavery issue in the context of the Missouri Compromise. Other responses needed greater range and depth.

(b) How far were the motives for waging war against Native Americans in the period from 1840 to 1890 economic?

Most candidates were able to identify economic factors which led to wars against Native Americans. The lure of gold and silver, the need for additional agricultural land and the requirements of railroad expansion were all well-understood. Non-economic factors appeared to be less well-known, even the best responses tending to rely on general statements regarding the significance of the manifest destiny concept. As a result, a number of responses lacked balance.

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

(a) Why was the South unable to capitalise on its early successes in the Civil War?

There was widespread understanding of the fundamental advantages from which the North benefited during the Civil War. Most candidates argued that, while the South was able to experience success initially, this could not be sustained once the North had effectively coordinated all its resources. The most impressive responses were able to balance this with explanations of inherent weaknesses in the South's war efforts. Other responses needed more range and depth.

(b) How far do you agree that Lincoln's leadership was a major reason why the North achieved such limited success in the first two years of the Civil War?

While there were some high-quality responses to this question, others would have benefited from greater range, depth and balance. Most candidates argued that Lincoln's lack of military experience was the reason for the North's initial failures; a small number of better responses provided evidence to demonstrate exactly how his inexperience undermined the North's war efforts. Similarly, only the most impressive responses contained a valid counter-argument, demonstrating

the political factors which restricted Lincoln's decisions and outlining the effectiveness of Confederate military leadership under Lee and Jackson. Other responses tended to lack balance and specific supported points.

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Why was prohibition introduced?

The most effective responses were characterised by clear understanding of a range of factors, political, social and cultural, which led to the introduction of the eighteenth Amendment in 1919. Most candidates were able to identify some reasons for the introduction of prohibition, although their responses tended to lack range and depth. For example, many argued that prohibition was the result of campaigns mounted by pressure groups, but neglected to substantiate the point by providing examples. Weaker responses were based on vague and generalised assertions regarding the economic impact of excessive drinking by the working classes.

(b) How far did the USA benefit from the mass immigration of the late nineteenth century?

Most candidates were able to provide balanced accounts of the impact of mass immigration on the USA. It was widely understood that the immigrant workforce was vital to the development of manufacturing industry, which had such a significant impact on the rapid growth of the American economy in the late nineteenth century. This was commonly balanced with explanation of how many Americans believed that immigration simply led to lower wages and increased crime. The most impressive responses were characterised by factual and analytical depth, leading to the development of sustained and fully-focused arguments. A small number of candidates misunderstood the question and wrote about migration, interpreting this as meaning westward expansion.

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

(a) Why did the US economy return to recession in 1937?

This question was attempted by a small number of candidates. In general, candidates needed to show deeper knowledge, some relying on vague and unsupported generalisations. For example, it was commonly asserted, without factual explanation, that a return to recession was the inevitable consequence of New Deal policies.

(b) How justified is the view that, of all the groups opposing the New Deal, opposition from left-wing liberals was the most effective?

This question was attempted by small number of candidates. Most responses were based on narrative/descriptive accounts of why and how the New Deal was opposed by various groups and they would have been improved by more analysis of how effective their opposition was. Few candidates seemed able to identify who the 'left-wing liberals' were.

Section C - International Option: International Relations, 1871-1945

9 International Relations, 1871-1918

(a) Why did Britain and Japan form an alliance in 1902?

Relatively few candidates attempted this question. Most were aware of the fact that Britain was moving away from its policy of 'splendid isolation', and the reasons for this and the particular advantages which Britain hoped to gain from an alliance with Japan were explained in better answers. Japanese motives for reaching agreement with Britain needed much more attention.

(b) To what extent was rivalry between France and Germany the biggest threat to international peace in the period from 1871 to 1914?

Most responses to this rarely attempted question would have been improved by better balance. Most candidates were able to explain French resentment at the loss of Alsace and Lorraine and the possible threat which this posed to the security of the newly-unified Germany. Some were able to show how this played a key role in the development of the rival alliance systems, which, in turn,

enhanced tensions between the main European powers. A small number of responses provided balance by outlining other factors which threatened international peace during the period.

10 International Relations, 1919-1933

(a) Why did the USA refuse to ratify the Paris Peace Settlement?

Most candidates were able to outline a variety of factors to explain the USA's refusal to ratify the peace settlement. Responses did, however, vary considerably regarding the depth of explanation provided for these factors. For example, while most candidates argued that American public opinion in general, and the Republican Party in particular, favoured a return to the traditional policy of isolationism, relatively few analysed the reasons for this. Similarly, it was commonly stated that ratifying the peace settlement was perceived as likely to involve the USA in future wars, but the logic behind this perception often needed to be explained in greater depth.

(b) To what extent did the Paris Peace Settlement make a future war more rather than less likely?

Candidates generally were able to demonstrate good knowledge of the difficulties facing the peacemakers in Paris and the terms of the various treaties which comprised the final peace settlement. Most candidates focused on the settlement's weaknesses, in particular outlining the reasons for German resentment and the ways in which these were exploited by Hitler. As a result, the majority of responses argued that the settlement made a future war more likely. The most impressive responses were the product of a more balanced assessment of appropriate factual detail.

11 International Relations, 1933-1939

(a) Why did Mussolini sign the Pact of Steel with Germany in 1939?

Virtually all candidates argued that the main aim of Mussolini's foreign policy was to restore Italy's 'greatness', to make Italy 'great, feared and respected'. It was generally argued that Mussolini believed increasingly close ties with Hitler's Germany, culminating in the Pact of Steel in 1939, provided the best way of achieving this grand ambition. The most impressive responses provided greater range and depth, explaining how Mussolini adopted a more aggressive foreign policy after 1935 as a propaganda exercise to address his declining popularity in Italy in the wake of severe economic depression. Following the invasion of Abyssinia, Mussolini ended close diplomatic relations with Britain and France, withdrew from the League of Nations and sought agreements with Hitler.

(b) To what extent was Hitler responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War?

This question was generally well-answered. Most candidates were able to identify appropriate evidence to support the view that Hitler was indeed responsible for the outbreak of World War II in 1939, although this varied enormously in terms of factual depth and chronological accuracy. Most were also able to provide a logical counter-argument, usually focusing on the weaknesses of the Paris Peace Settlement and/or the impact of the appeasement policy. As a result, the majority of responses were both balanced and fully-focused on the requirements of the question. The most impressive contained clear judgements, leading to the development of sustained and well-supported arguments.

12 China and Japan, 1919-1945

(a) Why did the popularity of the Kuomintang in China decline during the 1930s?

This question was attempted by a small number of candidates. The majority of responses focused on the reasons why the Chinese Communist Party gained in popularity during the 1930s. While this was clearly relevant, it missed vital issues relating to the policies adopted by the KMT once it had gained power in 1928. In general, therefore, responses needed more range and depth.

(b) To what extent was the Japanese takeover of Manchuria in 1931 due to economic factors?

This question was attempted by a small number of candidates. The majority of responses tended to describe how, rather than why, the takeover occurred. In general, candidates struggled to differentiate between economic, political and military motives behind Japanese expansion in general and its takeover of Manchuria in particular. As a result, responses generally lacked focus on the specific requirements of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/23

Outline Study

General Comments and Key Messages

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time very well, apportioning an appropriate amount to each question. The overall standard was satisfactory, although the quality of scripts varied widely. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, although some found it a struggle to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part (a) and Part (b) questions. Many candidates clearly realised this and attempted the two Part (a) questions consecutively, followed by the two Part (b) questions (or vice-versa).

In **Part (a) questions**, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a wide range of factors to show how they inter-reacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance. In **Part (b) questions**, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

Part (a) questions: Candidates should be aware that these questions are about causation. The more effective answers seen in this examination session included detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. Better responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. Less successful responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to feature less relevant material and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they would have benefited from more detailed and specific material, backed up with appropriate factual support.

Part (b) questions: Candidates should be aware that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses fell into one of three categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. Weaker answers were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they would have benefited from greater factual and chronological accuracy, points based on better factual support, and more relevance; keeping to the date parameters in the question would have improved a number of responses.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - European Option: Modern Europe, 1789-1917

1 France, 1789-1804

(a) Why did the Jacobins gain power in 1793?

This was a highly popular question, and most candidates were able to identify and explain at least some of the factors which enabled the Jacobins to gain power in France. The most effective responses were characterised by detailed analysis of a wide range of issues, with a particular focus on the significance of 1793. Other responses tended to be rather more generalised, while the weakest drifted into accounts of what the Jacobins did once they had gained power, which lacked relevance.

(b) Which social group benefitted more by 1804 from the changes introduced by Napoleon: the middle class or the peasantry?

Candidates generally were able to demonstrate sound knowledge of the policies carried out by Napoleon in the role of First Consul prior to declaring himself Emperor in 1804. The most impressive responses went beyond a basic narrative account of these policies to analyse their impact on the French middle class and peasantry, enabling the development of balanced and fully-focused arguments. A small number of candidates, while able to explain the benefits and disadvantages which the peasantry derived from Napoleon's changes, found it more difficult to provide the same level of analysis regarding the middle class; there appeared to be some confusion over who the middle class actually were. Weaker responses were characterised by unsupported assertions, chronological confusion and a tendency to drift into coverage of Napoleon's foreign adventures, which lacked relevance.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

(a) Why were railways important to the Industrial Revolution?

Most candidates were able to show how railways facilitated the transportation of goods more quickly, efficiently and cheaply than ever before, although more specific examples were needed to substantiate the point. More responses could have analysed the impact which the development of railways had on issues such as industrial output, urbanisation, investment and employment. Some of these responses were generalised and would have benefited from fuller range, depth and focus on the requirements of the question.

(b) How far was the Industrial Revolution accompanied by the growth of urbanisation? Refer to any two countries in your answer.

Most candidates argued that industrialisation inevitably led to the growth of large towns; the reasons for this could have been more often explained and substantiating evidence more often provided. Candidates needed to provide a valid counter argument by showing how urbanisation was not a universal outcome of the Industrial Revolution.

3 The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

(a) Why did Russia go to war with Germany and Austria in 1914?

There were many highly impressive responses to this question. These were characterised by detailed explanation of the long-term factors which led to Russia's poor relations with both Germany and Austria, together with clear understanding of why Russia finally declared war in 1914. Other responses tended to lack such range and depth, largely falling into one of two categories – firstly, those which outlined the background to Russia's problems with Germany and Austria but did not explain why this led to the Russian declaration of war in 1914; secondly, those which focused entirely on events following the assassination in Sarajevo without providing any longer-term context.

- (b) **'Both of the major alliances before World War I were essentially defensive.' Assess this judgement.**

This question was generally well-answered, the majority of candidates being able to produce fully-focused and balanced arguments. The most common judgement was that the alliances were originally created for defensive purposes, but that several factors, such as changes in German foreign policy instituted by Kaiser Wilhelm and disputes between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans, conspired to change their character over time. Less successful responses were characterised by generalised and, often, inaccurate assertions. For example, many candidates wrote that the naval arms race between Britain and Germany was a direct result of the alliance system. Similarly, it was widely argued that the Alliance System was somehow responsible for causing the Morocco Crisis, an event which more impressive responses saw as an example of the Alliance System being relatively successful in preserving peace.

4 **The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917**

- (a) **Why did the Bolsheviks emerge as a strong radical group by April 1917?**

There were a number of high-quality responses to this question, characterised by a clear understanding of the strategies adopted by the Bolsheviks under Lenin's leadership in the period following the revolution of February 1917. Candidates generally demonstrated sound knowledge of the problems facing the Provisional Government, the significance of the Soviets and the impact of Lenin's April Thesis on popular support for the Bolsheviks. A tendency of weaker responses was to drift beyond the timeframe of April 1917, a number of candidates describing how the Bolsheviks were able to gain power as a result of the October Revolution.

- (b) **'By 1914, Nicholas II's government had recovered from the effects of the 1905 Revolution.' Assess this claim.**

Many candidates were able to produce high-quality responses. These were based on a balanced and fully-focused analysis of appropriate factual evidence, leading to the development of well-supported arguments. Weaker responses tended to lose focus on the period between 1905 and 1914. Many candidates, for example, provided much unnecessary detail about the 1905 Revolution and/or wrote about growing resentment of the Tsar following defeats in World War I battles after 1914, which lacked relevance.

Section B - American Option: The History of the USA, 1840-1941

5 **The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s**

- (a) **Why did the USA not join World War I until 1917?**

The most impressive responses were fully-focused on the precise requirements of the question, containing detailed analysis of a range of factors to explain the USA's initial unwillingness to enter World War I. Other responses tended to change the question's focus, explaining why the USA **did** join the war in 1917, rather than the reasons for its reluctance to do so earlier. As a result, relevance to the key issue was implicit at best.

- (b) **How far were US relations with the great powers of Europe affected by the Civil War?**

Although a small number of candidates responded to this question with the range and depth of knowledge it required, most responses contained mainly vague and generalised statements regarding the impact of the Civil War on the British cotton industry, with little focused analysis on how this affected short and long-term relations between the USA and Britain. It was widely asserted that the Civil War had no impact on the USA's relations with other European powers.

6 **Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877**

- (a) **Why did Congress impeach President Johnson in 1868?**

There were a number of high-quality responses to this question. These were based on detailed analysis and explanation of the varied and complex issues which led to growing tensions between the President and Congress, together with clear understanding of how Johnson's dismissal of

Edwin Stanton provided the immediate impetus for impeachment. Most candidates were able to give context to the impeachment, outlining how Johnson and Congress held different views regarding reconstruction policies. Weaker responses were characterised by vague, generalised and often inaccurate assertions.

(b) How successful was Radical Reconstruction?

Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of Radical Reconstruction, its aims and achievements. While there was wide variation in terms of analytical depth, most responses remained fully-focused on the requirements of the question and attempted a balanced assessment of appropriate factual evidence. The most effective responses contained a clear and sustained judgement regarding the extent to which Radical Reconstruction could be considered successful.

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Why, in 1920, did the USA give women the right to vote?

While some responses were based on vague generalisations with only limited factual support, most candidates were able to identify valid long-term factors which culminated in women gaining the right to vote. Understanding and explanation of why this right was granted in 1920 rather than earlier was less evident, and most often confined to assertions regarding the vital contribution which women had made to the USA's involvement in World War I.

(b) How far do you agree that President Wilson did more for the Progressive cause than did President Theodore Roosevelt?

Most candidates possessed sound knowledge of the policies carried out by Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt. Some found it difficult to deploy this knowledge to address the requirements of the specific question explicitly, resulting in narrative/descriptive answers and a lack of focused analysis. The most impressive responses were characterised by the presence of a clear and sustained judgement, fully supported by appropriate factual evidence.

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

(a) Why did Franklin Roosevelt win the presidential election of 1932?

Virtually all candidates were able to identify some of the factors which led to Roosevelt's success in the 1932 elections. Greater range, depth and balance would, however, have improved a number of responses. The impact of Roosevelt's radio broadcasts and the portrayal of his policies as offering new hope to the American people were widely understood. More candidates could have made reference to other key issues, such as the unpopularity of Hoover and divisions within the Republican Party, thus preventing responses which were rather narrow in focus.

(b) How far does Franklin Roosevelt deserve to be described as the 'saviour of American capitalism'?

The majority of candidates described the various reforms which comprised Roosevelt's New Deal, in varying levels of detail and accuracy. It appeared to be generally assumed that these reforms were successful in addressing the problems confronting the USA as a result of the depression and, therefore, that it is justified to refer to Roosevelt as 'the saviour of American capitalism'. The most effective responses were based on a more detailed analysis of the impact of Roosevelt's reforms, enabling the development of fully-focused, sustained and well-supported judgements.

Section C - International Option: International Relations, 1871-1945

9 International Relations, 1871-1918

(a) Why did the USA declare war on Spain in 1898?

There were relatively few responses to this question. Most comprised generalised statements regarding the USA's determination to enforce the Monroe Doctrine and mono-causal explanations, usually citing the sinking of the American battleship 'Maine' as the reason for the USA's declaration

of war against Spain. Candidates would have improved their responses by explaining the significance of this event in the wider context of the USA's on-going political debate between expansionists and isolationists.

(b) Did the existence of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente make the outbreak of a major war more likely or less likely?

Some of the small number of responses to this question would have benefited from more balance. That the existence of two rival sets of alliances led to an increase in tension between the major European powers was widely understood, but much of the evidence used to support this view was flawed. It was widely assumed, for example, that issues such as the naval arms race, the Moroccan crisis and rivalry in the Balkans were a direct consequence of the Alliance System. As a result, most candidates argued that the Alliance System was the main cause of World War I. Better candidates were able to provide evidence to support the counter-argument that the Alliance System made a major war less likely.

10 International Relations, 1919-1933

(a) Why did Germany resent the terms of the Treaty of Versailles?

This question was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to link general points, such as the fact that the Treaty was effectively imposed on Germany and was not based entirely on Wilson's Fourteen Points, with specific and appropriate examples of a variety of terms which led to German resentment. Weaker responses tended to focus on one particular issue, usually the War Guilt Clause, lacking range and depth as a consequence.

(b) How successful were attempts to improve international relations in the period from 1919 to 1933?

Most candidates were able to show sound knowledge of the various attempts which were made to improve international relations between 1919 and 1933. The most impressive responses were characterised by in-depth analysis of how successful these attempts actually were, enabling the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments. Other responses, while containing much the same factual information, tended to remain at the narrative/descriptive level, focus on the particular requirements of the specific question being implicit only or reliant on unsupported assertions (such as that the Locarno meetings led to improved relations between France and Germany). Weaker responses were characterised by factual inaccuracies and chronological confusion.

11 International Relations, 1933-1939

(a) Why did Britain and France do little to oppose Mussolini's invasion of Abyssinia in 1935?

There were many high-quality responses to this question. These were characterised by clear understanding of a wide range of factors and, in particular, the dilemma facing the British and French governments – should they honour their commitments to the League of Nations by mounting strong opposition to Mussolini or should they endeavour to maintain good relations with Italy as a bulwark against the growing power of Germany? Other responses missed this key issue, and lacked range and depth, usually arguing mainly that Britain and France were not prepared to go to war in defence of a distant country, especially given the heavily anti-war sentiment of public opinion.

(b) 'Hitler's foreign policy in the period from 1934 to 1939 was based on lies and deceit.' How far do you agree?

This question was generally well-answered, although some candidates found it difficult to maintain balance. Virtually all responses contained a wide variety of detailed and accurate evidence which was used to support the view that Hitler deployed lies and deceit in pursuit of his foreign policy aims. The most impressive responses were able to provide a valid counter argument, usually by demonstrating how Hitler had made his foreign policy objectives, such as dismantling the Treaty of Versailles and the acquisition of Lebensraum, abundantly clear as early as the mid-1920s.

12 China and Japan, 1919-1945

(a) Why had the Kuomintang achieved so little by 1925?

Relatively few candidates attempted this question. In general, responses could have focused more on the requirements of the question, some simply describing Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles and/or explaining how the KMT was developing its military capability with the assistance of Russian advisers. Some candidates missed the question's timeframe by describing how Chiang Kai-shek was able to gain power for the KMT by 1928.

(b) How far do you agree that China's weakness was more of a concern than an opportunity for Japan?

Relatively few candidates attempted this question. Most responses tended to describe Japan's relationship with China – mainly through accounts of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, rather than explicitly addressing the requirements of the question.

