



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**HISTORY****9389/32**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question 32

**May/June 2020**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Published**

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **7** printed pages.

### Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

#### GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

#### GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

#### GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

#### GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

#### GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

#### GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**General levels of response**

The interpretation is taken to be what the historian says in the given extract, the nature of the claims made and the conclusions drawn. 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 relationship between the interpretation and the approach, since the former emerges from the latter. 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>   | Marks |
|---------------|---|-------|
| 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     |

| AO1(a)  | Recall, select and use historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of History in a clear and effective manner     | Marks |
|---------|---|-------|
| 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, or show awareness of elements of the BM but make demonstrable errors elsewhere in the answer.

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.

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1        | <p><b>The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b><br/>           The main interpretation is that <u>any imperial relationship must be based on force, and that this was true of the British Empire which was therefore morally wrong.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract is written by a historian who is a critic of empire, and this criticism is not merely of what the British Empire was and did, but of its very existence. To reach L5, answers must show awareness that the historian’s criticism is of empire itself, as it is inevitably based on coercion and racism, and demonstrate how this shows the British Empire as being morally unjustified. L4 answers are likely to focus on the evils of the British Empire, rather than showing awareness of the author’s critique of empire in general. Answers in L3 will be focused on sub-messages, rather than on the central aspects of the interpretation. These sub-messages could include e.g. the idea that the Empire was racist, or that the British would not have liked being colonised themselves.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> the two main areas of interpretation have been (i) on whether imperial policy was determined at the centre (the metropole) or at the periphery (in the territories of the empire). This can involve debates on who was making the decisions at the centre (the ‘official mind’, ‘gentlemanly capitalists’ etc.) or at the periphery (the ‘man on the spot’): and (ii) on whether the British Empire was characterised by a preference for formal (i.e. direct rule over annexed territory) or informal (i.e. indirect control mainly through and for commercial interests). What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.</p> | 40    |

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2        | <p><b>The Holocaust</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b><br/>           The main interpretation is <u>that whilst British/US inaction in responding to the Holocaust was wrong, many critics have failed to understand sufficiently the constraints under which US policymakers operated.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects.</p> <p>This is an interpretation about bystanders; it does not address causation of the Holocaust so any attempt to use labels listed below will indicate lack of understanding. The historian looks at the conclusions of previous writers on bystanders and finds them flawed for a variety of reasons. The interpretation does not deny the failure of US policy, but argues against morally absolutist judgements. Instead historians need to understand the practical limitations on the actions that governments could take. In particular, the author downplays the influence of anti-Semitism. Overall, this is a more sympathetic and nuanced judgement on bystanders than those produced by early historians of this aspect of the Holocaust. In L5 answers must show awareness that the historian believes what Western governments did was wrong, but seeks to explain why they acted as they did. L4 answers are likely to explain the second aspect of the main interpretation, as focusing solely on the first is unlikely to work as a way of explaining the historian's message (the historian does not set out to prove the West was wrong). L3 answers will focus on sub-messages within the extract, for example the idea that the US government was unwilling to act, or that much US public opinion was against helping the Jews.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> Candidates may use some/all of the following terms:<br/> <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 can be used to support it.</p> | 40    |

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 3        | <p data-bbox="316 248 1126 282"><b>The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950</b></p> <p data-bbox="316 315 655 349"><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p data-bbox="316 349 1313 517">The main interpretation is <u>that the Cold War could have been prevented by the US taking a tougher line against the Russians, but blame for the Cold War still rests with Russian expansionism.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects.</p> <p data-bbox="316 551 1313 1021">By following Roosevelt’s policy of conceding to Russia’s demands, Truman made a mistake which led to the Cold War. But although the historian shows that Truman missed an historic opportunity, he also understands that this happened because Truman acted in good faith, and therefore does not blame Truman. Instead, the error is shown simply to be a failure to confront an expansionist Russia. The historian shows the US as being misguided, but tolerant and scrupulous in its dealings with the Russians. The only acceptable labels used in L4/L5 answers would be traditional/orthodox, as the historian both blames the Russians and exonerates the West. The extract does not, in the revisionist sense, ‘blame’ the US, nor does it share the blame in the way a post-revisionist would, so using either of these labels would be evidence of misunderstanding. Sub-messages in L3 could include e.g. that Churchill understood that the Russians were expansionist, or that Roosevelt’s policy was to preserve a friendly relationship with the Russians.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1055 1313 1447"><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 can be used to support it.</p> | 40    |