

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/33**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question 33

**May/June 2017**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**General levels of response**

For the purposes of marking, the interpretation is taken to be what the historian says in the given extract, the nature of the claims made and the conclusions drawn. It is not what the extract says: it is what you can infer from the extract. The approach is seen as what the historian brings to their study of the topic, what they are interested in, the questions s/he asks, the methods they use. There is a close inter-relationship between the interpretation and the approach, since the former emerges from the latter, and marking will not insist on any rigid distinctions between the two. Marks will be awarded according to the following criteria. Markers will be instructed first to determine the level an answer reaches in relation to AO2(b), and to award a mark accordingly. In general, the mark subsequently awarded in relation to AO1(a) will be in the same level, since the ability to recall, select and deploy relevant historical material will be central to any effective analysis and evaluation of the interpretation. However, in exceptional cases, generally where answers lack effective contextual support, markers will have the discretion to award marks in different levels for the two assessment objectives.

<b>AO2(b)</b>	<b>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Level 5	Demonstrates a complete understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. Explains the interpretation/approach(es) using detailed and accurate references both to the extract and to historical context.	17–20
Level 4	Demonstrates a sound understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. Explains the interpretation/approach(es) using the extract and historical context.	13–16
Level 3	Demonstrates understanding of aspects of the interpretation. Explains points made using the extract and historical context.	9–12
Level 2	Summarises the main points in the extract. Demonstrates some understanding of the historical context.	5–8
Level 1	Writes about some aspects of the extract. Includes some accurate factual references to the context.	1–4
Level 0	Response contains no relevant discussion.	0

<b>AO1(a)</b>	<b>Recall, select and use historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of History in a clear and effective manner</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Level 5	Demonstrates detailed and accurate historical knowledge that is entirely relevant, and is able to communicate this knowledge clearly and effectively.	17–20
Level 4	Demonstrates detailed and generally accurate historical knowledge that is mainly relevant, and is able to communicate this knowledge clearly.	13–16
Level 3	Demonstrates mainly accurate and relevant knowledge, and is able to communicate this knowledge adequately.	9–12
Level 2	Demonstrates some accurate and relevant knowledge, and can communicate this knowledge.	5–8
Level 1	Demonstrates some knowledge, but ability to communicate is deficient.	1–4
Level 0	Demonstrates no relevant historical knowledge.	0

### **Interpretation of the General Levels of Response**

The critical decision in marking is on the correct level in AO2 in which to place an answer. All depends on the meaning of certain key words:

L5 – complete understanding of the interpretation: these answers show a consistent focus on the Big Message, with appropriate support from the extract and knowledge (which can be knowledge of interpretations as well as contextual knowledge).

L4 – sound understanding of the interpretation: these answers engage with elements of the Big Message, but without explaining the BM. They may only cover part of the BM. They may think the extract has *other* BMs, which actually are only sub-messages. They will also be properly supported.

L3 – understanding of aspects of the interpretation: these answers see the extract as an interpretation (i.e. the creation of an historian), but only engage with sub-messages which are supported, or identify aspects of the BM without properly supporting them.

L2 – summarises the main points in the extract: at this stage there is work on the extract but this is simply on what it says. There is no valid explanation of the extract as an interpretation.

L1 – writes about some aspects of the extract: these answers barely engage with the extract. There are merely fragments of relevant material.

In L4 and L5, you may allow minor slips in accuracy, relevance, consistency etc. as long as you judge that they do not undermine the argument as a whole.

**Section A: Topic 1 The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939**

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the British Empire to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is that <u>the Empire was less central to British life and culture than has often been claimed, and that those who assert the opposite lack the necessary evidence to support their case.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract argues that while evidence of Empire certainly was obvious in the daily lives of British people, this doesn't necessarily mean it was important to them, and it certainly was not how they defined their identity. Much of the extract is a dismissal of the approaches and conclusions of the 'new imperial history'.</p>	40

## Section B: Topic 2 The Holocaust

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Holocaust to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is <u>that the Holocaust could not have occurred without the prior conditioning of the German people through anti-semitic propaganda and the pre-war persecution of the Jews (i.e. the conditioning was a <b>necessary</b> precondition).</u> However, this only explains how the Holocaust became possible and not how it actually occurred (i.e. that the conditioning was not a <b>sufficient</b> cause). Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The last sentence of the first paragraph is critical – only under the impact of war against the Soviet Union did the Holocaust proceed. If the extract is to be given a causation label, for L5 this would have to be functionalist ('impact of war') or, just conceivably, synthesis. Answers which argue that the approach is intentionalist – although a complete understanding of the extract would refute this, may reach L4 as long as an aspect of the Big Message is adequately covered. The extract is clearly distinct from Goldhagen's pre-existing eliminationist anti-semitism, though some candidates may be drawn into comparing them. The focus of this extract is on <i>preconditions</i> rather on the immediate causes of the Holocaust.</p> <p><u><b>Glossary:</b></u> Candidates may use some/all of the following terms: <i>Intentionalism</i> – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start. <i>Structuralism</i> – interpretations which argue that it was the nature of the Nazi state that produced genocide. There was no coherent plan but the chaotic competition for Hitler's approval between different elements of the leadership produced a situation in which genocide could occur. <i>Functionalism</i> is closely related to structuralism. It sees the Holocaust as an unplanned, ad hoc response to wartime developments in Eastern Europe, when Germany conquered areas with large Jewish populations. Candidates may also refer to <i>synthesis</i> interpretations, i.e. interpretations which show characteristics of more than one of the above. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract is used to support it.</p>	40

## Section C: Topic 3 The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Cold War to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is that <u>the Cold War was the product of misunderstandings between the two sides</u>. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of this, with answers using the extract to demonstrate the role of ideology OR recent history in creating this misunderstanding reaching L4, and BOTH factors L5. The focus on misunderstandings should lead candidates to conclude that this is a post-revisionist interpretation. Developed attempts to argue for any other label can be no better than L3.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> <i>Traditional/Orthodox</i> interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after WW2. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin’s expansionism for the Cold War. <i>Revisionist</i> historians challenged this view and shifted more of the focus onto the United States, generally through an economic approach which stressed the alleged aim of the US to establish its economic dominance over Europe. <i>Post-revisionists</i> moved towards a more balanced view in which elements of blame were attached to both sides. Since the opening of the Soviet archives post-1990 there has been a shift to attributing prime responsibility to Stalin – a <i>post-post-revisionist</i> stance which often seems very close to the traditional view. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract is used to support it.</p>	40