

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11 Paper 11

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully. This will help them to understand exactly what is being asked and will give them the opportunity to write focussed and balanced responses. If candidates are asked to compare two given factors or individuals, identified in the question, answers should be focussed on these specified factors or individuals only. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help ensure that responses only include relevant details.

In more extensive responses, candidates should be encouraged to organise their points into distinct paragraphs. This should help to avoid separate points becoming blurred together and in maintaining focus on the original question.

In **part (c)** responses candidates should be looking to produce evaluative, rather than purely summative conclusions, in which they make a judgement and justify this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their response.

General comments

Candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions. Many candidates communicate their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

There were few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

Part (a) answers should focus on description and only include relevant details. Answers therefore should be precise, as explanation is not required.

Parts (b) and (c) of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative or 'listing' approach.

Most **(b)** questions ask 'Why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, usually using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative or long introductions are not required.

In **part (c)** candidates need to argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Less successful responses often focused on one side of the argument only and these responses could have been improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced and stronger answer.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4



There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 5

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question, with most candidates able to recall at least some of the territorial demands made by Clemenceau. The most common responses stated that he wanted to be given the Saar Basin, that he wanted Alsace-Lorraine to be returned to France, or that he wanted Germany's colonies to be given to France. Better answers were able to identify the colonies such as Togoland and Cameroon. Some candidates did not focus on territorial demands, instead making reference to reparations or military restrictions.
- (b) Many answers to this question would have benefited from greater understanding about why the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was confirmed in the Treaty of Versailles. Stronger responses were able to explain that Wilson's ideas of self-determination were very relevant to the empire, and that this was achieved in countries such as Yugoslavia and Poland. Other candidates were able to explain Austria's role in the outbreak of war, and that the break-up of the Empire was punishment for this by the allies. Weaker answers identified that Austria had lost the war, or was being punished, but were unable to explain why this meant that the break-up had to be confirmed.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with the more successful answers able to explain why Clemenceau and Lloyd-George had to compromise and provide some evaluation of who had to compromise more. Candidates often had good understanding of what they were demanding at the Treaty of Versailles, and which of these demands they achieved or were not able to achieve. Many candidates considered Clemenceau's desire for very high reparations, but that Wilson and Lloyd-George forced him to compromise due to their fear of the consequences on Germany. Other responses considered Lloyd-George's concerns about Wilson's hope for self-determination, due to the effect it could have on Britain's colonies. These answers were able to show that Lloyd George refused to compromise on this issue, with Britain able to gain some of Germany's colonies. Less assured answers described the aims of Lloyd-George and Clemenceau, or what they achieved, but did not consider whether this meant that they had to compromise.

Question 6

- (a) Some very good answers were seen in response to this question, with candidates able to identify the events that led to Anschluss. These answers understood that Austrian Nazis had stirred up trouble, that Schuschnigg was put under pressure by Hitler, and that German troops entered Austria. Some candidates stated that the plebiscite happened, but this was held in April, and therefore outside of the dates stated in the question.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify or describe at least two reasons why the Spanish Civil War benefited Hitler, and there were some very good responses to this question. Candidates recognised the military benefits to Hitler, since he was able to test out the Luftwaffe and practice Blitzkrieg, for example at Guernica. Candidates were also able to explain that Hitler gained Mussolini as an ally, and that this meant that he was able to carry out the Anschluss in 1938. Few weaker responses were seen, but these tended to incorrectly state that he was able to gain Franco as an ally in the Second World War.
- (c) Some very good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to explain the reasons why Hitler agreed to the Nazi-Soviet Pact. The most common explanation seen was about how the Pact would enable Hitler to invade Poland, either referring to the secret clauses within the Pact, or stating that he would avoid the two-front war which had been so damaging in the First World War. Many then went on to provide balance by explaining that Hitler was not trying to avoid war with the Soviet Union but was merely postponing an invasion of the Soviet Union, since his foreign policy aim of Lebensraum would make this necessary. There were a number of unbalanced responses, with some candidates attempting to provide balance through explaining why Stalin signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact, rather than providing a focus on Hitler. Other candidates identified several valid reasons on both sides but needed to go on and explain how these led to the signing of the Pact.

Question 7

- (a) This question was answered very well, with most candidates recognising that the Truman Doctrine was a policy of containment which was designed to send aid to countries that were in danger of falling to communism. Some answers also identified that it was in response to events in Greece

and Turkey. The most common mistake was candidates who described the Marshall Plan, stating that it was finance offered to countries in eastern Europe.

- (b) Some good answers to this question were seen, with the most common response as to why the failure of the Berlin Blockade was important focussed on the propaganda success for the Allies, and the corresponding propaganda failure for Stalin. Other good responses were able to explain that the enormous response of the Berlin Airlift demonstrated that the USA was serious about the policy of containment. Weaker responses, sometimes lengthy, described the Blockade itself, rather than focussing on the importance of its failure. A few candidates confused the Blockade with the building or fall of the Berlin Wall.
- (c) Some good answers to this question were seen, but a number of candidates struggled to provide a balanced answer. Stronger responses were able to explain that it was not surprising that Britain and the United States agreed at Yalta that Eastern Europe should be a Soviet sphere of influence, since the Grand Alliance was still in place, and they also needed Stalin to help them defeat Japan. Other answers also explained a lack of surprise since Roosevelt felt that democracy would be restored through the free and fair elections that Stalin promised would take place. Balanced answers were then able to argue why the agreement of Britain and United States was surprising, either through explaining the distrust that existed between the countries, or through the known expansionist nature of communism. Weaker responses concentrated on Truman's known hatred of communism, which lacked relevance to the agreement at Yalta. Other responses focussed on why it was not surprising for Stalin to have signed the agreement, but the question focus was on the motivations behind the actions of the United States and Britain.

Question 8

- (a) Excellent answers to this question were seen, with most candidates able to describe MacArthur's role in the Korean War. These strong answers were aware that he commanded the UN forces, and that he pushed the North Korean troops back, thereby protecting the South Korean forces. Candidates were also aware that he was pushing for the use of nuclear weapons against the Chinese, and that he ignored Truman's views.
- (b) Many candidates were able to explain at least one reason why Kennedy decided to go ahead with the Bay of Pigs invasion, with the most common response explaining that Castro had declared himself communist, and that this was seen as a threat to the United States, particularly given the proximity of Cuba to the United States. Strong answers were then able to provide a second explanation, sometimes referring to Kennedy's desire to be seen as a strong leader since he was a new president, or through reference to the use of Cuban exiles making the invasion not only possible, but also less directly dangerous for the United States. Less successful responses described the invasion, rather than providing reasons for it, or more commonly stated that it was because missiles had been discovered on Cuba.
- (c) This question was often answered well, with candidates showing a good level of knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the failure of the United States in Vietnam. Some excellent answers were seen which made specific reference to the strategy and tactics of the United States, for example the use of Agent Orange, or Search and Destroy. Candidates were then able to explain how these lost the support of the Vietnamese people who were then willing to help the Vietcong. Arguments on the other side centred around the tactics of the Vietcong such as guerrilla warfare leading to American failure because of demoralised troops, or through an explanation of how the Vietnam War lost the support of the American population. Weaker answers tended to describe the strategy and tactics, or other reasons for the failure, rather than focussing on the effect that these reasons had.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 11

- (a) Some very good responses were seen, with candidates confident in their knowledge of the role of the SA in the Nazi party during the 1920s. Most candidates were aware that they acted as Hitler's

bodyguards at this time, and that they protected the Nazi rallies, whilst also disrupting their opponents' rallies. Some answers also recognised that they played a central role in the Munich Putsch. Other responses confused the SA with the Gestapo, or went outside the timeframe stated in the question.

- (b) Mixed responses to this question were seen. Candidates were very confident in their knowledge of why there was increasing support for the Nazi Party, but fewer were able to explain it in the context of the early 1930s. Stronger answers recognised that in response to the Great Depression, the Nazi Party targeted their propaganda and Hitler's speeches towards the problems caused by it, thereby gaining support. Similarly, other responses were able to explain that the Nazi Party focussed their attention on the groups most badly hit by the Great Depression. Some candidates were also able to explain that the increasing support seen by the communists encouraged businessmen to finance the Nazis, thereby enabling them to increase their campaigning. Weaker answers were more descriptive of the general reasons for the increase in support for the Nazi Party, identifying valid reasons such as the unpopularity of the 'November Criminals', or Goebbels's role in creating appealing propaganda. These answers, however, were not specific to the 1930s which was the aspect specified in the question.
- (c) Responses to this question were mixed, with few candidates able to provide a properly balanced answer to whether Hitler showed leadership quality during the Munich Putsch. Some candidates were able to explain that the fact that the putsch failed, either through poor planning, or a misjudgement of the amount of support the Nazis had, displayed a lack of leadership quality. Some strong responses were also seen arguing that Hitler did show leadership quality, as he had organised it at a time when the Weimar Government was unpopular due to the crisis of hyper-inflation, and also their decision to call off passive resistance in the Ruhr. Weaker answers did not focus on the issue of whether Hitler showed little leadership quality, and many responses instead were lengthy descriptions of the Munich Putsch and its consequences. Whilst these responses contained valid material, they did not address the question fully.

Question 12

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and were able to display detailed knowledge about how the SS controlled German society. Many candidates were aware that they controlled through fear, and were able to support this comment with details of their informers, or the powers that they held. Other responses recognised their role both in Kristallnacht and the concentration camps. Few weaker responses were seen, but candidates sometimes wrote about the SA, or their role in protecting Hitler, which was not controlling German society as a whole.
- (b) There were some very good answers to this question, with most candidates able to explain at least one reason why there was some opposition to Nazi rule. The most common answers explained why the Nazi policies for women or youth led to opposition, or how their anti-Semitic policies led to Jewish opposition. Some candidates were also able to explain the opposition from individuals such as the Bishop of Munster, and were able to explain that his opposition to euthanasia led to the Nazis abandoning this policy. In less successful responses some candidates simply identified groups or individuals, rather than explaining why they opposed the Nazi rule.
- (c) Some very good answers were seen to this question, with many candidates able to produce a balanced answer to explain whether economic policies or mass media was more effective in winning the support of the German people. Candidates were confident in their understanding of the role that reducing unemployment through works schemes had in leading to support. On the other side, candidates were often able to explain the role that radio and film had in limiting non-Nazi views, whilst promoting Nazi ideas to the population as a whole. Some candidates successfully evaluated which was more important through consideration of the inter-dependence of the two aspects, since the Nazi economic success could be publicised through the use of mass media.

Question 13

- (a) Good answers were seen to this question, with most candidates showing some good knowledge of Bloody Sunday. Most candidates were aware that it was a large demonstration, and that it ended with some of the protestors killed. More detailed answers were also able to show that it was led by Father Gapon, the reasons for the demonstration, and the consequences of the event.

- (b) There were mixed responses to this question, with some candidates able to provide at least one reason for the importance of the Tsar's decision to take personal command of the Russian army. These answers often focused on the subsequent blame that was placed on him for any military defeats, and also for the food shortages that were being suffered. An alternative reason that was explained in some answers was that the Tsar's decision left the Tsarina in charge, and that this was a very unpopular decision since she was both German and heavily influenced by Rasputin. Weaker responses were aware of these factors, but described or identified them, rather than showing their importance.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with many candidates having some knowledge and understanding as to whether the 1905 Revolution led to a period of significant reform, but fewer responses able to support these identifications. Candidates were often aware that the October Manifesto created a Duma but were unable to provide specific support about why this could be considered a significant reform. Candidates were also aware that the introduction of the Fundamental Laws limited reform, but were unable to explain, for example, that the ability to dismiss the Duma in reality retained the Tsar's power, with the first two Dumas being dismissed. Few responses went outside of these two main points, with some stronger answers able to explain Stolypin's combined approach of reform and repression.

Question 14

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

Question 15

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to achieve high marks. Candidates were confident in their knowledge that Sacco and Vanzetti were Italian immigrants who were accused of armed robbery and murder, and that they were the victims of prejudice. Most candidates also knew that they were eventually executed, even though they had witnesses who said that they could not have committed the crimes.
- (b) There were some good responses to this question, with most candidates able to explain at least one reason why many Americans disapproved of the 'Roaring Twenties'. Strong answers were confident in their knowledge and understanding of the disapproval some Americans had of how some women were behaving. These answers were able to show that the shorter dresses, smoking in public and going out without a chaperone appeared immoral to some people. An alternative approach seen from candidates was to explain that the 'Roaring Twenties' were disapproved of by people, particularly in the South and rural areas, who wanted to retain tradition, and therefore did not like aspects such as the new jazz music, or the kissing on screen in films. Weaker answers generally accurately identified reasons but would have been improved by explaining them.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with many candidates able to agree with the statement that prohibition was introduced because people believed drinking alcohol caused poverty and neglect, but fewer candidates able to provide alternative reasons. Strong answers agreeing with the statement were able to argue that there was concern about the violent treatment of women and children if a man had been drinking, or that men would spend much of their wages on alcohol. Some candidates were also able to provide alternative reasons for the introduction of prohibition, such as the anti-German feeling in the US at that time, and the fact that many of the brewers were German. Another valid approach seen was that politicians saw the growth in temperance movements and therefore supported prohibition in order to gain votes. Less successful responses did not focus on the introduction of prohibition, but instead explained the consequences of its introduction, such as the rise in crime and gangsters.

Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12 Paper 12

Key messages

It is important that candidates read the question very carefully before they begin their response, in order to understand exactly what is being asked and thus only include relevant factual details. They should note the particular focus of any given question.

Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to ensure that responses only include knowledge within the time span of the question.

Candidates should avoid 'listing' points and they should write in continuous prose. In more extensive responses, ideas should be organised into distinct paragraphs - otherwise points can become blurred together or candidates can be prone to losing focus on the original question.

General comments

Strong responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study questions. These responses included a clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. These responses included conclusions that were more than purely summative and in which candidates came to a judgement and justified this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their essays.

In weaker responses candidates, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by description and lists of facts, with no explanation.

There were very few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question:

Part (a) responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. There is no need for background information. Explanation is not required. Most candidates now realise that responses to **(a)** questions can be short and concise.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and always write in continuous prose, rather than using a 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'Why' a particular event happened so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than a description of what happened. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Less successful responses often focussed only on one side of the argument. These could have been improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1,2,3 and 4

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most popular questions in the Core Section.

Question 5

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated good understanding of the territorial terms of the Treaty of St Germain. Credit was given for the naming of both countries which became independent and the territory that was awarded to specific countries. Knowledge awarded included that: 'The treaty dealt with Austria', 'The Austro-Hungarian Empire was broken up', 'The union of Austria and Germany was forbidden' and 'Hungary became an independent country'. Weaker responses included information on the non-territorial terms of this Treaty which were not relevant to this question. A number of candidates either confused the Treaty of St Germain with the Treaty of Versailles and discussed Germany's territorial losses or made very general statements, such as 'they lost land'. A common misconception was that 'Austria was not allowed to reunite with Germany'.
- (b) This question was well answered. Most candidates were familiar with the reasons why Lloyd George did not want to punish Germany harshly. Two well explained reasons were needed. Two commonly explained reasons were firstly, that prior to the First World War Germany had been Britain's second major trading partner and secondly, that there was also a concern that a weakened Germany may turn to communism. Strong responses supported their statements with clear examples, such as: 'Before the First World War Germany had been a major trading partner of Great Britain. After the War, Lloyd George didn't want Germany to be too crippled, as he wanted to resume trade with Germany in order to improve Britain's economy, whether it was importing or exporting materials, but especially providing British jobs. The German economy would not flourish and help the British economy if reparations were set high and industrial areas removed from Germany.' Weaker responses readily included identification of reasons such as: 'Germany would want revenge if it was treated too harshly' or 'Lloyd George didn't want France to become too powerful', without any explanation. It is important to support statements with factual details. Some responses drifted from the focus of the question to discuss the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and whether Lloyd George liked them or not which lacked relevance to this question. It is important for candidates to link the points that they make to the question set. A small number of candidates confused Lloyd George with Woodrow Wilson.
- (c) The strongest responses were well organised and produced a balanced answer by explaining how both Clemenceau and Wilson had to compromise during the peace negotiations in Paris. These strong responses usually identified an aim of either Clemenceau or Wilson and then linked a term to a specific aim to address how far it had been a compromise. For example: 'Clemenceau was concerned about French security and wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state and the German army to be disarmed completely, as France had been invaded by Germany twice in the last fifty years. In the final Treaty he had to compromise because Lloyd George and Wilson didn't agree and didn't want France to become too powerful. He had to accept that the Rhineland was only demilitarised and the German army was allowed 100 000 men.' Others stated that: 'One of Wilson's Fourteen Points was self-determination for all countries. However, this wasn't achieved and he had to compromise because of the imperialistic ambitions of Britain and France. They wanted to keep control of their empire and in the Treaty of Versailles former German colonies became mandates controlled by the League of Nations which effectively meant that Britain and France controlled them.' Weaker responses tended to include lengthy explanations of the aims of both Clemenceau and Wilson and the reasons behind these aims, without specifically mentioning the precise terms of the Treaty, which had led them to compromise. Others concentrated their answers on what Clemenceau or Wilson achieved in the Treaty, with no mention of compromise. Two common misconceptions were that Clemenceau wanted to split Germany into small states. This was the view of Poincare, not Clemenceau. The second one was that Clemenceau wanted the Rhineland to be demilitarised. In fact, he wanted it to be an independent state.

Question 6

- (a) This question worked well for most candidates, who were able to describe Germany's relationship with the League of Nations between 1920 and 1939. There were lots of relevant examples that candidates could have included in their responses. Relevant points included: 'Initially Germany was not allowed to join the League of Nations, until it proved it was a peaceful nation. After the Locarno Treaties in 1926, Germany was accepted into the League of Nations.' Marks were also awarded for examples of Hitler's relationship with the League of Nations, including his withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference and subsequent leaving of the League of Nations. Weaker responses included generalised terms such as: 'They had a bad relationship'. It is important to support a general statement with a specific fact, for example a name or a date.
- (b) Weaker responses showed limited knowledge of Haile Selassie. They also confused the chronology and assumed that Haile Selassie addressed the League of Nations at the start of the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935, whereas the date in the question was June 1936. There were often in answers lengthy details of the background to the Abyssinian Crisis, including why the Italians invaded Abyssinia, which lacked relevance to this question. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons. The reasons explained included: the ruthlessness of the invading Italians, the demand for more sanctions, including the closure of the Suez Canal, and the outrage at the contents of the leaked Hoare-Laval Pact.
- (c) Most responses demonstrated some understanding of the League of Nations handling of the Manchurian Crisis. Strong responses were well organised and considered both sides of the argument. There was a strong feeling that the League of Nations did as much as they could in view of their limitations. The most common reason for this view was that they did send an investigation to find out what had happened, the Lytton Report fed back their results and they morally condemned Japan for the invasion. These responses then explained that, although the Japanese ignored the advice of the League and withdrew from the League of Nations, they could not have done much more because the USA and Russia were not members of the League. If they had imposed sanctions these would not have been effective because the USA, not being in the League, would continue to trade with Japan. In addition, the League had no army and without the powerful American and Russian armies it would be very difficult to beat the Japanese army. Strong responses also explained reasons on the other side of the argument for the League not doing as much as it could, most notably the self-interest of Britain and France. Responses highlighted that it was a good excuse that Japan was too far away, as they did not want to annoy Japan as they wanted to continue trading with their colonies in the Far East. The Lytton Report could be used on either side of the argument because, despite the sending of officials to Manchuria to assess the situation, it was a full year after the invasion before they presented their report. Weaker responses were less secure on the chronology of events and often drifted away from the question to include general details why the League failed, often including examples from other failures, such as Corfu, which lacked relevance to this question. Some also wrote in detail the reasons why Japan invaded Manchuria, which was not relevant to this question. A common misconception was that sanctions were imposed on Japan.

Question 7

- (a) Responses to this question were varied, with the stronger responses able to identify key areas of disagreement at the Potsdam Conference. Reparations, Germany, Poland and Eastern Europe were the most frequently mentioned. Candidates gained marks for including details such as: 'Stalin wanted to cripple Germany with steep reparations, whereas Truman did not want to make the same mistakes as the Treaty of Versailles. The future of Poland also caused disagreement as Stalin wanted it to be under the Soviet sphere of influence, rather than to have free elections as Truman wished'. Stalin's wish to become involved in the war against Japan gained credit in a small number of scripts, while de-Nazification was rarely included. Weaker responses tended either to set the scene (covering Roosevelt's death and the succession of Truman, as well as Atlee replacing Churchill) or to focus less on the contentious issues and more on broader matters such as Truman's antipathy to communism or Stalin being informed by Truman of the USA's development of an atomic bomb. These may have contributed to the atmosphere but were not specific subjects of dispute at Potsdam. A small number of candidates wrote about the decisions taken at Yalta, rather than the differences evident at Potsdam.

- (b) This question was well answered, with most responses able to provide at least one explanation as to why the blockade of Berlin failed. Nearly all identified and explained how the Allied airlift was the main reason for failure. Responses included details of the types of things that were flown in and the number of journeys the planes made. Strong responses were then able to develop paragraphs either exploring Stalin's reluctance to escalate to full scale war by shooting down planes or explaining the counterproductive effects of the blockade in terms of propaganda and/or the impact on East Germany. Weaker responses often included details of why Stalin blockaded Berlin or confused the blockade with the building of the Berlin Wall and the events of 1961.
- (c) There were many strong responses to this question, which demonstrated a good understanding of both sides of the argument. In support of Stalin's policies being defensive, the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine were well discussed, as were the genuine Soviet fears of invasion following Hitler's attack in 1941 and of US military capabilities, following the use of atomic bombs at the end of the Second World War. On the other side of the argument, Stalin's salami tactics, his use of rigged elections and the breaking of previous promises were all used effectively to demonstrate Stalin's expansionism and aggression. The strongest responses were able to offer specific cases of countries affected, such as Czechoslovakia where the events of 1948 were often used convincingly and succinctly as evidence of Soviet aggression. Strong responses often included Cominform and Comecon on one or other side of the argument but there was occasional confusion about the purpose of each of these and of their starting dates. Other responses strayed outside the parameters of the question to include the formation of the Warsaw Pact (though some thought this was an instant reaction to the formation of NATO in 1949) and the quelling of the Hungarian Uprising (1956). It is important to read the dates given in the question to ensure that only relevant details are included in the response.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) The majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the Dawes Plan and gained high marks. Appropriate factual knowledge included that in 1924 the Dawes Plan was arranged between Charles Dawes, an American banker, and Stresemann. It gave loans to Germany to help relieve their economic crisis and helped them in the payment of reparations. It did mean, however, that Germany was heavily reliant on these loans and when the Wall Street Crash occurred in 1929, it impacted hard on the German economy. A small number of responses confused the Dawes Plan with the Young Plan.
- (b) There were many strong responses to this question, which demonstrated a good understanding of the reasons why Germany introduced a new currency in 1923. Two explanations were needed. Most responses considered the reasons for and the impact of hyperinflation on the German economy. They explained some of the events leading up to hyperinflation including Germany's failure to pay reparations resulted in the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr taking what was owed to them in the form of raw materials and goods. The German workers went on strike and the Government printed money to pay the workers, which led to hyperinflation. The most commonly used second explanation was that of the impact of hyperinflation, which included savings becoming worthless and the price of goods skyrocketing. Stresemann introduced a new currency in 1923 to stabilise the economic situation.
- (c) There were some one-sided responses to this question, as candidates were more familiar with the effects of the people's reaction to the Treaty of Versailles on Germany than they were to the effects of the 1918 Revolution on Germany. Some thought that the 1918 Revolution was the Spartacist Uprising. Strong responses to this question were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. These responses considered the events and effects of the 1918 Revolution,

highlighting that the sailors mutiny in Kiel had led to the abdication of the Kaiser and the setting up of a new democratic government headed by Chancellor Ebert. This had led the way to increasing voting rights and fundamental changes in the way Germany was governed under a new constitution. This was opposed by extreme groups like the Spartacists who were Communists and tried to lead a revolution to overthrow the government, which had to be rescued by the Freikorps. On the other side of the argument, most responses were familiar with the people's reaction to the Treaty of Versailles and the effect on Germany. These responses explained how the terms of the Treaty had created hatred and resentment leading to the 'stab in the back' myth and that those responsible were labelled as the 'November Criminals', as they were believed to have betrayed their country having accepted such harsh terms. Strong responses included some of the many different impacts of the Treaty on Germany, including the growth of extremism, the Kapp Putsch and the Munich Putsch. Responses often included the high reparations to emphasise the outrage of the Germans and how the non-payment of reparations led to the occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 by French and Belgian troops, which resulted in Germans being willing to take part in passive resistance in the Ruhr. Others detailed how the terms of the Treaty of Versailles led to outcry and the rise of the Nazi Party, as one of Hitler's main aims was to reverse the terms of the Treaty. Weaker responses drifted from the main question and included extensive description of the terms of the Versailles Treaty, without including any emphasis on the importance for Germany.

Question 12

- (a) This question was well answered and most responses gained high marks for identifying features of the League of German Maidens (BDM), such as, it was a youth group for girls, which taught them Nazi values, including their role as homemakers and mothers. Others included the various activities which were set up for them including camping, marching and physical education. Some responses demonstrated no knowledge of the League of German Maidens and thought it was about women and the issue of medals for procreation.
- (b) Strong responses to this question identified reasons why the Nazis made changes to the school curriculum, most commonly, that they wanted to indoctrinate children at a young age with Nazi ideas, including those of race and the role of girls and boys in the future of Germany. They then supported these identifications with examples such as eugenics on the timetable and the increase of physical education in order to make the girls healthy to be mothers and the boys to be strong soldiers. Weaker responses tended to describe the changes to the school curriculum, rather than emphasise why these changes were made.
- (c) There were some good responses to this question, which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. Candidates needed to produce a balanced answer by explaining how far racial theories explain why minorities were persecuted in Nazi Germany. Then, on the other side of the argument, they needed to explain other reasons why minorities were persecuted. Responses tended to be stronger on the side of racial theories, with the majority of responses outlining clearly Hitler's view on the superiority of the Aryan Race and how the Jews especially were considered as outcasts. On the other side of the argument, the most commonly used explanation was the view that minorities like mentally handicapped and disabled people, drunks and beggars were weakening the Nazi state. They were persecuted by the Nazis because they believed they were undesirables who were not contributing to society and were a drain on German resources. Some responses included the Jews on both sides of the argument due to Hitler's hate and jealousy of the Jews who were often rich and successful business people. Weaker responses were characterised by long descriptions of the treatment of the Jews and could have been improved by an explanation of why they were persecuted. Others identified minorities but would have benefited from explaining why they were persecuted.

Questions 13 and 14

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 15

- (a) This question was very well answered, with most responses describing four ways in which the lives of many young women in cities changed during the 1920s. Women gained the vote, they could smoke and drink in public, their fashions changed and they no longer needed a chaperone to go out were some of the examples used.

- (b) The majority of responses identified reasons why restrictions on immigration were introduced in the 1920s. Most commonly used were the Red Scare and the fact that Americans thought that immigrants would take their jobs. The best answers supported these identifications with factual detail. For example: 'Restrictions were introduced because the Red Scare made many more Americans afraid of immigrants. The rise of communism in Russia made them worry about these ideas coming to America and they thought that immigrants from Eastern Europe were bringing these ideas into the country. These fears were made worse when there were a number of bomb attacks in America by anarchists.'
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question and some were one sided. Candidates were more confident discussing the other problems caused by prohibition, rather than the corruption of police and judges, with weaker responses not developing identifications to explain ways in which the police and judges were corrupt. Others tended to list the problems together in one paragraph, rather than taking a paragraph to explain each problem. Strong responses produced a balanced argument by explaining that the gangs running the production and selling of alcohol bribed the police and judges with money. This meant that many in the police would ignore what the gangs were doing and the judges would let them off if they appeared in court. On the other side of the argument, strong responses were able to identify and explain other problems caused by prohibition. The growth of gangs and the resulting increase in violence in the cities, people making their own illegal moonshine which was often poisonous, and the growth of speakeasies were the most frequently mentioned. Other responses lost focus on the question set and included details such as why prohibition was introduced.

Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13 Paper 13

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

In **part (c)** questions, the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond restating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important' or 'how successful', depending on the question set.

General comments

A significant majority of answers to this year's questions reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and had a great deal of information to impart and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions, which reward straightforward recall and description. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph which was an appropriate approach.

The best answers to **part (b) and (c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the questions were asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information which lacked relevance. Candidates are credited for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but the best responses go further and develop each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

A significant number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation) but also attempted to arrive at a judgment in the conclusion. These responses looked to explain and analyse how far the argument both supported and disagreed with the focus of the question. Some weaker conclusions just asserted 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 5

- (a) This was a popular question. Typically, answers included references to the transfer of colonies to Britain and France, and that many colonies became mandates managed on behalf of the League of Nations.
- (b) In **part (b)**, many candidates identified that Turkey was harshly treated because it had fought on Germany's side during the First World War, and that Britain and France were keen to acquire parts of the Ottoman Empire. Explanation and development of these identified factors characterised

better answers. For example, candidates might explain that Britain and France had secretly started planning the breaking up of the empire as early as 1915 and had reached an agreement about what to do two years later. The British wanted Palestine while France wanted Syria and Lebanon.

- (c) Many candidates showed good knowledge in **part (c)** of the aims of the peacemakers at Versailles; valid descriptions of aims were given. Better answers included explained comparisons of the work of the peacemakers – Wilson and Clemenceau on the one hand and Lloyd George and Wilson on the other. For example, ‘Clemenceau was more difficult to deal with for Wilson because he wanted such a harsh treaty and Wilson did not want this. Clemenceau was under pressure from the French people to achieve long-term security for France. Clemenceau wanted to punish and weaken Germany through measures such as very high reparations. Most of these demands went against Wilson’s approach of a moderate treaty. He wanted a settlement that would ensure peace in the future. Therefore, he found Clemenceau difficult to deal with.’

Question 6

- (a) Relevant points in **part (a)** included Mussolini’s empire building, the invasion of Abyssinia, as well as participation in the Spanish Civil War and the association with militaristic powers when Italy became a signatory to the Anti-Comintern Pact.
- (b) Candidates knew a great deal about the importance of the Spanish Civil War to Hitler. There was an understanding that the War allowed Hitler to try out new weapons and tactics. Better answers developed this by explaining, for example, that ‘the Luftwaffe was able to practice dive-bombing, which it did in the attacks on the town of Guernica. This tactic was later widely used in the Second World War where it developed into Blitzkrieg which was an important part of Germany’s tactics’. Further explanations often centred on why Hitler gained benefits from his closer association with Mussolini.
- (c) Many valid factors were identified in answers to this question and candidates tried hard to create arguments which explained Germany and Britain’s contribution to increasing tension and the outbreak of war in 1939. Explanations dealt with appeasement, the Nazi-Soviet Pact and with the impact of Hitler’s aggression against Czechoslovakia and Poland. For example, in some responses Germany was seen as more to blame ‘Because Hitler had promised to leave the rest of Czechoslovakia alone when he got the Sudetenland in 1938. But in 1939 the Germany army took over the rest of the country. Hitler then went on and invaded Poland. Britain and France had given Poland a guarantee that they would help it if it was attacked. Hitler knew this, and so he knew that his invasion of Poland would lead to a major European war.’ Strong answers were balanced ones in which other arguments were explained, such as why Britain’s policy of appeasement contributed to Hitler’s over confidence and lack of restraint in pursuing increasingly aggressive aims. The best answers then went on to reach a valid judgement.

Question 7

- (a) There were some good answers to **part (a)**. Many responses included the imposition of economic sanctions against Cuba, Eisenhower’s concern because Castro was getting closer to the USSR and becoming a threat to the USA, and Eisenhower’s support for an invasion of Cuba by Cuban exiles.
- (b) The best answers to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question which focussed on the problems America faced because of the use of the ‘search and destroy’ policy. Descriptions of ‘search and destroy’ were seen but in better responses candidates went on to explain the *problems* aspect of the question. Candidates often focussed on the impact of ‘search and destroy’ on public opinion in the USA and how it turned the Vietnamese against the American military, making it more difficult to prosecute the war.
- (c) The aim in **part (c)** was to write a balanced answer which debated whether the Korean War was a defeat for North Korea. As it was, responses tended to emphasise that the War ended in stalemate, therefore the North’s efforts to impose communism on the South failed. Some one-sided answers were seen. Others were able to explain the opposing argument. For example, ‘It was not a defeat for North Korea. At one point, the UN and US forces were close to overrunning the whole of North Korea and creating a united and democratic Korea. This was the aim of the UN forces. This would have been a defeat for the North Koreans. However, helped by China, they managed to push the UN and US troops back and a communist North was saved.’

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) It was rare to read a poor answer to **part (a)** as candidates gained marks by describing the use and impact of gas on the Western Front, such as its first use at Ypres in 1915 and the damage caused by chlorine to soldiers' lungs. There was an appreciation that gas was difficult to use as it was dependent on changes in wind direction and that it was responsible for only a small percentage of deaths in the First World War.
- (b) There were detailed narratives of the use of aircraft in **part (b)**; the best answers met the specific demands of the question, whilst weaker answers tended to make generalised observations. Explained points about importance or impact were provided by a number of candidates, for instance, 'In the First World War it was important to know where the enemy positions were and if there were any movements of troops. The only way to do this at the time was by using aircraft. From the air they could spot enemy positions and its strong and weak spots. They could also give advance warning if the enemy was moving troops and planning an attack.'
- (c) Answers to **part (c)** reflected many details about the Battle of the Somme but were less clear about criticisms of Haig. An analysis of the relative merits of his leadership was needed. This might have included the argument that Haig made too many easy assumptions about the effectiveness of the preliminary bombardment because German positions had not been knocked out. However, on the other hand, there is the view that Haig has been criticised too much. Haig had to plan the Battle of the Somme very quickly after the German attack on Verdun. He was not given the number of troops he believed he needed to win the Somme. He thought he needed double the number he had. Also, he was a product of his time and was bound to use the tactics that he had been trained in. It would take commanders some time to realise that new tactics were needed.

Question 10

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

Question 11

- (a) Candidates knew a great deal about Rosa Luxemburg, including her leadership of the Spartacists, her role in the Uprising and eventual murder at the hands of the Freikorps.
- (b) Answers to **part (b)** contained detailed knowledge about the reasons why Germans in the Ruhr began passive resistance in 1923, emphasising the response to French and Belgian troops who had entered the Ruhr, taking what was owed to them in the form of raw materials and goods. Candidates explained how, as a protest, and when told to do so by their government, the German workers went on strike. Better responses also mentioned mistreatment of German workers by the occupying forces.
- (c) **Part (c)** enabled candidates to write at length about the work of Stresemann in leading the recovery of the Weimar Republic. The quality of the answers relied on a discussion of 'importance'. Many candidates would have found it helpful to engage with the idea of analysing impact, explaining Stresemann's achievements (such as stabilising the economy) against other factors which had less to do with Stresemann and more with wider trends (such as the cultural revival and the underlying strength and potential of German industry).

Question 12

- (a) Candidates wrote in detail about the use of Nazi censorship in **part (a)**; some provided two developed points, while others gave four short descriptions.
- (b) **Part (b)** provided an opportunity to explain the importance of the Gestapo. Weaker responses were narratives of Gestapo activities. In better answers, candidates explained their impact. These

explanations included a conceptual understanding of how control, and creating a climate of fear, played such central roles in the police state.

- (c) In **part (c)** candidates were asked to consider sources of opposition to the Nazi state. Those candidates who used their knowledge to go beyond description and explain impact provided good responses. Many candidates constructed an argument; for example, they contrasted the threat posed by named youth groups with, say, the July bomb plot or religious groups. Some also debated the extent of the threat posed by different elements of German youth as part of their answer.

Question 13

- (a) In **part (a)** it was rare to see a poor answer to the question about Kerensky, many focussing on the roles and posts he held in government and his policies as Prime Minister.
- (b) Responses to **part (b)** enabled students to explain the importance of the mutiny at Kronstadt. The quality of the answers relied on a discussion of 'importance' and better answers related the mutiny to Lenin's changes in policy and practices. Most focussed on the ending of War Communism.
- (c) Many good answers to **part (c)** contained strong lines of argument, explaining the impact of Trotsky on communist forces on the one hand, with an analysis of the weaknesses of the Whites on the other. Less successful responses tended to lack balance.

Question 14

- (a) There were a limited number of responses to this question. Some knew about Stalin's aim that the USSR should focus on its own revolution to show what a model communist country would look like and that Stalin wished to strengthen the USSR internally before exporting world revolution.
- (b) This question gave candidates the opportunity to explain that Lenin's Political Testament was not published until later because it was very critical of Stalin. Typically, answers included Stalin's concern 'that it might damage his chances of becoming leader if it was published. Lenin did not want Stalin to succeed him, and Stalin obviously did not want people to know this. He was in competition with Trotsky to become the next leader.'
- (c) There were some good arguments about Stalin's Purges in **part (c)**; In strong responses, candidates balanced an explanation of the impact of the Purges on the one hand, with other factors, such as the Cult of Personality.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates knew some of the problems of the coal industry in the USA in **part (a)**. They focussed on overproduction, industrial unrest and new sources of power which were replacing coal.
- (b) This question attracted a great deal of description relating to motor cars in the USA during the 1920s. The key here is to relate the narrative to the explanation of 'importance'. Better answers showed this understanding, explaining the impact motor cars had on lots of other industries. For example, 'Many people could afford a car and millions were sold. This created a demand for lots of other products like rubber and glass. It also meant that more roads had to be built as well as garages and restaurants. Many parts of the American economy were stimulated, and new jobs created, by the motor car.'
- (c) **Part (c)** responses tended to lack balance and were often descriptive, focussing on the argument that many farmers did not benefit from the economic boom. This was based on overproduction and declining demand because of the end of the war, and competition from Canada and other countries. Hence, many farmers went bankrupt. Better answers added to this one-sided explanation the contrasting view that farmers with very large farms in the Mid-West did prosper, as well as fruit growers in California. Typically, responses stated that 'The large wheat growers in the Mid-West had mechanised and could produce wheat cheaply so they prospered. The fruit growers in areas like Florida and California benefited from the fact that more Americans turned to eating more fruit. So, this increased demand for their produce.'

Question 16

- (a) Candidates knew that Roosevelt placed much emphasis on his promise of a New Deal in the 1932 election. Some candidates also described the help pledged to different groups in American society.
- (b) It was rare to read a poor answer to **part (b)** and there were some detailed explanations about why the Wall Street Crash took place in October 1929.
- (c) A lack of balance characterised some **part (c)** responses. Very often the focus was on Hoover's failures to deal with the Depression at the expense of points which argued that Hoover was not entirely to blame. These other points, when seen, sometimes included an understanding that the problems of the Depression were overwhelming. More usually, candidates pointed out that Hoover did try to pass some measures. For instance, 'He started building programmes like the Hoover Dam to provide jobs. Taxes were reduced and tariffs were introduced to protect American companies. He also provided companies with loans to keep them going. Without these measures the situation would have been a lot worse.'

Questions 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21 Paper 21

Key messages

- Answers should be focused and concise. Each question asks for a specific issue to be explained. Candidates should avoid repeating what the source(s) say. Responses must use the content of the source(s), which means selecting relevant material to answer the question.
- Before answering any of the questions, candidates should read all the sources. Although individual questions direct candidates to use specific sources, it is often the case that knowing what other sources on the paper say or show can help in constructing an answer.
- Time management is crucial. It is very important to complete the paper. Most candidates do this, but it is not uncommon to see signs of curtailment in the final answer, most often **Question 6**, which carries the highest number of marks.

General comments

The level of comprehension of what sources said or showed was good, and the ability to use source content at face value, for example to compare, was sound. Contextual knowledge was often excellent, although not always applied relevantly in answering the questions. Most responses constituted valid responses to the question asked, though here, too, not all the material used in answers was necessarily as well focused as it could have been. Many answers included what sources said but would have been improved by demonstrating why and how this was relevant. More candidates could have spotted opportunities to evaluate the sources, and some of those who attempted it could have done so more effectively. Not all questions require source evaluation, as whether or not a source can be believed is not always an issue in what is being asked. However, where it does arise, the most obvious evaluation technique is cross-reference: that is, can claims made in the source be checked against contextual knowledge or against comparable claims in other sources? An alternative, and generally better, approach is to analyse the likely purposes the author of the source had in representing events in the way s/he did. Here, it is important this analysis must be plausible in context, and not just speculation. Most attempts to evaluate were limited to comments based on source type – whether the source is from a newspaper, a speech, a politician etc., and can/cannot therefore be trusted – and thus did not test the specific claims made in the source in question.

The majority of candidates answered the questions on the twentieth-century option. There were, however, a good number of responses on the nineteenth century.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

Agreements between the two sources were more numerous than disagreements, but in both cases there were straightforward details that could be matched, such as agreement that the Klan was founded in Tennessee, or disagreement over the date when it was founded. Most candidates were able to identify at least one agreement, and better answers included details both of agreements and disagreements.

Question 2

Although the question asked for reasons why the cartoon was published, an essential first step towards a successful answer was to interpret the source. Contextual knowledge was therefore important, for example of the 1868 Presidential election, of the terms 'scalawag' and 'carpetbagger', of the fact that Ohio is a Northern state, and even of the donkey as a symbol of the Democratic Party. Not many answers could use all these points, and although better answers did incorporate the election, most were limited to giving reasons for publication based on the violence of the Klan. A good number of answers saw the cartoon as a threat. This could be simply a threat to any enemy of the Klan, or for better answers a threat to a specific enemy of the Klan, such as Northerners. If the context of the Presidential election was added to this, then a well-reasoned answer would be the result.

Question 3

Weaker candidates struggled to compare the two sources and could not detect the disagreements they contained. For most of the other candidates, the fact that Source D was sympathetic to the Klan, and Source E hostile, was sufficient in itself to mean that one or other could not be believed. Such answers would have benefitted from an explanation of why one source was credible, and the other not. Both sources were taken from testimony given to a Congressional Committee investigating the activities of the Klan. Using other sources, or knowledge about the Klan, it should have been possible to support an argument that Source E could be believed, whilst Source D could not. The speaker in Source D had obvious reasons for misrepresenting the Klan, particularly in the light of the proposed Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871.

Question 4

This question was answered reasonably well, with most candidates able to identify some sub-messages within the cartoon, such as ex-slaves being worse off after the war than before, or the Klan being prepared to use violence against ex-slaves. The most common cause of misinterpretation was to assume that the cartoonist was in favour of what the cartoon depicted, rather than condemning the situation where Reconstruction had failed to end white supremacy.

Question 5

This was another question that required answers to be based on a comparison of two sources, and as with **Question 3**, although candidates were usually able to see contradictions, they much less often were able to explain why these were, or were not, surprising. The clearest basis of comparison was the avowed aim of the Klan in Source G to protect the weak from violence with the brutal treatment of Elias Hill at the hands of the Klan in Source H. For most candidates the difference was what was surprising. However, any consideration of what the sources said should have taken the historical context into account. This could then have led into a thorough analysis of the claims made by the Klan in Source G, and indeed of those made by Hill in Source H, in order to judge the issue of surprise.

Question 6

Most candidates seemed aware of the need to use the sources to find evidence both to confirm and to question the given hypothesis. They were more effective, however, in supporting it. Several of the sources mentioned the Klan's support for the Democrats or hostility to the Republicans, and answers usually found some of these. The greater difficulty in questioning the hypothesis was may have reflected candidates' being unsure about what other purposes the Klan might have had, particularly when some of these came up in sources which had already been used for confirmation.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

The question asked what impressions about the Soviets could be inferred from Source A. It was clear from weaker responses that some candidates did not understand what was required of them, as they repeated or paraphrased the source. An inference is something one can tell from a source, even though the source does not say or show it. Here, this had to be something about the Soviets – about their nature, about what they were. There was a wide range of possibilities, most of them unflattering. Suggestions made by candidates included the ideas that they were manipulative, dishonest, indecisive, weak, bullying or even simply that they were bad. As the question asked for answers to be explained using details of the source, the best answers illustrated how the inferences could be reached from what the source said.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to detect the fundamental difference between the two sources, the first approving towards Kania and the second disapproving. However, most answers went no further than claiming the difference itself to be the cause for surprise. These answers would have been improved by using the context to further explore and explain why the clear change in attitude from one source to the next was actually not a surprise at all. The key to the best answers was an awareness of how much had changed between the appointment of Kania in 1980 and the situation which culminated in martial law in 1981. The emergence of Solidarity as a mass movement brought about a much more serious crisis, with which Kania failed to deal, leading to his replacement by Jaruzelski. Brezhnev's exasperated comments in October 1981 were, in this context, not surprising.

Question 3

As with all questions asking why something occurred, there were several possible types of reason that could be given. The first was to base the answer on context. Here better responses used the specific context of December 1981; that is, the speech was made because martial law had just been introduced. Weaker contextual answers relied on the more general background of the growth of Solidarity and the wave of protest that accompanied it. Another approach was to use the message that Jaruzelski wanted to get across, and here again there were those that understood and used his central message of defending and justifying the imposition of martial law, whilst less successful responses simply used what was said in the source itself. Finally, some candidates used Jaruzelski's purposes in making the speech – the end results he wanted to produce. The best answers managed to put elements of each of these into explaining, for example, that Jaruzelski made this speech because he wanted his announcement of martial law to bring to an end the strikes and protests by persuading his audience that Poland could not recover unless order was restored.

Question 4

A few candidates misinterpreted the cartoon as being critical of Walesa, and welcoming the fact that life was returning to normal. The great majority of answers, though, were able to provide at least one of the sub-messages of the cartoon based on the ideas that the chance of freedom had been crushed and hope for reform was now gone. However, there was another element to the cartoon that a number of answers completely missed, which was the sunlight coming through the prison window. Those that spotted it saw the sunlight as a sign of hope and could thus provide a fuller message which included not just the fact that Solidarity had temporarily been crushed, but also that it would sometime in the future rise again to carry on its work. Noticing the fact that the cartoon was published in Britain was often key to detecting the cartoonist's sympathetic opinion towards Solidarity, with its hopeful message, and its condemnation of the imposition of martial law.

Question 5

Any question asking whether one source proves another source to be right is raising the issue of reliability. Most answers stopped short of this, comparing the content and basing any judgement of proof on whether the two sources agreed or not. These answers were more or less equally split between those that thought that the two sources agreed and those that saw them as disagreeing. In the first group, Brezhnev's confidence in Jaruzelski expressed in Source F was confirmed by Source G's picture of Jaruzelski clearing up the mess in Poland. For the second group Source G provided a very different picture, where Jaruzelski was merely sweeping Poland's problems under the carpet. Furthermore, he is depicted as a puppet, which contrasts with Brezhnev's picture of Jaruzelski as 'very strong and able'. This second group had a better understanding of the full implications of the two sources. Nonetheless, they were still reaching a judgement on source content alone. Advancing the argument on proof would additionally need some reference to other sources (such as Sources D and E) or to context. Some answers, for example, suggested that Solidarity's eventual triumph in 1989 confirmed the impression given in Source G, that Jaruzelski's efforts would eventually be fruitless.

Question 6

As is always the case with **Question 6**, the sources offered plenty of opportunity both to confirm and to question the hypothesis. Most candidates managed to provide some evidence on both sides, but some of the sources needed to be explained properly as evidence. It is often the case that something said by a source is sufficient in itself in relation to the hypothesis – for example, quoting Source F as saying 'Jaruzelski is very strong and able, on most occasions, to find proper solutions' self-evidently provides evidence for the hypothesis. However, other sources need to be used through a process of explanation. For example, Source

E just shows Walesa in jail. Without some additional explanation, it is not in itself sufficient. So, you would need to add, for example, 'Source E shows Walesa in jail. This suggests the Polish leadership was able to deal with the problems because they now have control over the leader of the protests.' On the approach candidates should take to **Question 6**, some candidates group sources and then make generalised comments which are intended to apply to all the sources given, but often they do not. When sources are grouped, anything that is written must apply to all the sources within the group. Generally, it is better not to group sources, but to deal with them one at a time.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22 Paper 22

Key messages

Candidates should read through all the sources and plan their answers. Questions need to be answered directly, starting in the first sentence of the response. Sources should not be summarised or described. Knowledge and understanding of the topic can be used to help interpret the sources. When interpreting written or pictorial sources, it is important that candidates consider the overall point that is being made. Knowledge and understanding of the topic should help them explain why sources were published, or when evaluating sources. When quoting from a source, candidates must avoid using truncated versions of quotations. If a quote is worth using, then to make it work it needs to be given in full. When answering **Question 6**, candidates need to use the content of sources to explain **how** they agree or disagree with the hypothesis.

General comments

There were many more scripts on the twentieth century option than on the nineteenth century. The overall standard was good, with very few candidates struggling with the sources or unclear about what it was they had to do. Almost all candidates comfortably completed all six questions. Very often, sources were sensibly interpreted and candidates cross-referencing of sources was effective. Many candidates also understood when it was appropriate to evaluate sources. In some instances, candidates needed to directly address the question earlier in their answers. They tended to write about the sources and only gradually come round to the question towards the end of their answers. However, overall, the performance was strong, with a wide range of source skills being demonstrated, all set in a sound grasp of the historical context.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates managed to find agreements between the two sources by explaining that they both state that the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) was mysterious and that people at the time thought it was doing some good. In terms of disagreements, many candidates spotted that Source A claims the KKK was organised, while Source B says it was not organised. This question was answered best by planning the answer first. Candidates need to go through both sources carefully making matches and mismatches. Once they are clear about these, they can explain both. This avoids the need to produce long summaries of both sources which can distract from clear and direct point-by-point comparisons. Some candidates made it harder to produce point-by-point comparisons by summarising the two sources and stating that the summaries did somewhere contain agreements and disagreements. A number of candidates managed to produce strong answers by explaining that Source A is generally favourable towards the Klan, while Source B is more critical. This needed to be supported with examples from the sources.

Question 2

To answer this question well candidates needed to first understand that the cartoon is criticising the situation in the USA in the period after the Civil War. It is about the period of Reconstruction and is clearly suggesting that the treatment of black Americans was worse than before the war. Organisations like the KKK and the White League are being blamed for this state of affairs. Many candidates were able to use this understanding to explain how the cartoon is useful for telling us all this. Many candidates could have gone further by using their knowledge or by cross-referencing to other sources to support the situation portrayed in

the cartoon. The best answers showed an understanding that the cartoon's real use is as evidence that there were at the time people and magazines critical of the KKK or of Reconstruction. A number of candidates produced good interpretations of the cartoon but neglected to explain how this made the cartoon useful. A few candidates misinterpreted the cartoon or made assertions about it being biased and therefore not useful.

Question 3

The key feature of Source D that candidates needed to focus on is that it is a law being passed by a Southern legislature against the KKK. Some answers missed this central point and focused instead on the details of Source D. However, by using contextual knowledge and/or other sources, a large number of candidates were still able to provide strong responses. The best ones focused on the fact that a Southern legislature was taking strong action against the KKK and explained why this is surprising. A few candidates were not surprised. They were able to explain that by the late 1860s the tide had turned against the KKK and that much legislation was being passed against it. It is crucial in questions such as this one that candidates focus on whether they are surprised or not. A number wrote sensibly about the source and its context but did not use it to say whether they were surprised.

Question 4

A small number of candidates struggled to find any connection between the content of the two sources. However, most candidates were able to explain that Source E is supportive of the KKK while Source F is critical. This led to the conclusion that Source F does make us doubt the account in Source E, although a number of candidates did not address the issue of doubt. The best answers did not stop at the differences between the two sources and went on to evaluate at least one of them, for example, the account in Source E is questionable because it comes from Tennessee where there was much support for the KKK.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. A large number of candidates wrote that Forrest denied saying what is reported in the source because much of it shows him supporting outrageous actions. Better answers focused more on the possible consequences of these hearings for the KKK, while the best answers recognised the significance of the date and argued that by 1871 the tide had definitely turned against the KKK and that Forrest realised the weakness of his position. Less successful answers identified parts of Source G that Forrest might want to deny but were unable to suggest any valid reason for this.

Question 6

The task in **Question 6** is to use the sources to test the hypothesis, which was about whether people supported the KKK. Some weaker responses appeared to be based on a different hypothesis about whether the Klan behaved well. However, many candidates responded well to the actual hypothesis. When answering this question, there needs to be specific use of the content of a source.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

Candidates generally performed well on this question. Most were able to identify and explain agreements and disagreements. For example, the sources agree that Jaruzelski was expected to deal with the protests more forcefully, while they disagree over whether the Soviets had made any preparations for military intervention. This question is answered best by planning the answer first. Candidates need to go through both sources carefully making matches and mismatches. Once they are clear about these, they can explain both. This avoids the need to produce long summaries of both sources which can distract from clear and direct point-by-point comparisons. A small number of candidates produced weaker responses. Their difficulties were usually caused by starting with summarising the sources, rather than using a point-by-point approach. However, they usually managed to compare the provenance of the two sources. A small number of the strongest candidates managed to compare the big messages of the sources: Source A says that the Soviets did not want to intervene but Jaruzelski wanted them to, while Source B claims that they planned to intervene, while Jaruzelski did not want them to.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to extrapolate from the cartoons whether the cartoonists would have agreed with each other. There was a tendency for candidates to describe both cartoons. There is no need to do this.

Candidates need to spend a few minutes thinking about the cartoons and looking for instances where the cartoons make points about same thing. For example, they both have something to say about the intervention of the Soviets and about the strength of Solidarity compared to that of the Soviets. Recognising and explaining points of agreement or disagreement (sub-messages) took most candidates to a reasonable level of response. The best answers focused on the points of view of the cartoonists and explained how they were both criticising the Soviets or Brezhnev. Candidates should always try to consider the point of view of the person who produced the cartoon. These answers had to be supported. Answers that were almost as strong were those that compared the big messages of the two cartoons. They both show the Soviets being aggressive, while claiming not to be. In Source C the Soviets make the ridiculous claim that they are coming to the aid of the Polish government which is being threatened by Solidarity, while in Source D Brezhnev makes the equally absurd claim that they would never interfere in Poland's affairs. A small number of candidates misinterpreted one or both of the cartoons by taking at face value the claims of the Soviets and an equally small number only managed to describe what was happening. When trying to explain cartoons candidates should not first refer to the surface details. They should infer what the cartoon is saying about the people or organisations that are being represented in the cartoons. Reference to surface detail might then be useful to support their interpretations.

Question 3

The starting point for answering this question is to identify the crucial point that the two sources agree or disagree about. In Source E Andropov is clear that there will not be a Soviet invasion of Poland, while in Source B Strong is reporting that the Soviets plan to invade. Most candidates understood this and consequently were able to produce a reasonable response, as long as they used their understanding to address the issue of whether Andropov was lying. A large number of candidates understood that the disagreement between the sources did not necessarily prove that Andropov was lying. They realised that at least one of the sources needed to be evaluated. This was done well by many candidates. Some questioned Andropov, for example he might have been challenging Brezhnev, while others questioned Strong's motives. In the strongest answers, evaluation was carried out in a developed and informed way. A number of candidates would have benefited from stating whether or not they thought Andropov was lying, as required by the question. The best answers were those where the candidate had done planning and knew what their answer was going to be before they started to write it.

Question 4

There were many good answers to this question, with most candidates able to interpret at least sub-messages of the cartoon, for example Brezhnev is worried about Solidarity, the Soviets control Eastern Europe and Eastern Bloc countries might be attracted by Solidarity's ideas. Better answers explained the big message – that Brezhnev was worried that Solidarity could threaten Soviet control of Eastern Europe. The question is about the cartoonist's message, and this led the best answers focusing on the cartoonist's point of view – that the cartoonist is making fun of, or is critical of, Brezhnev for being scared of Solidarity. These answers were mostly carefully explained and supported by relevant contextual knowledge, although some lost control and wrote a lot about Solidarity. A small number of candidates misinterpreted the cartoon. They thought that the cartoonist was praising Brezhnev as the protector of Eastern Europe.

Question 5

There was a wide range of interesting answers to this question. Many good answers simply used contextual knowledge or other sources to explain whether they were surprised by the content of Source H. There is plenty of scope to be both surprised and not surprised, especially in relation to other sources, for example in Source H Jaruzelski gives the clear impression that he is against Soviet intervention, but in Source A he was demanding it. Less successful answers either made far more general claims (valid in a general way) or used everyday empathy to explain why they were surprised or not surprised by aspects of Source H. However, a good number of candidates realised the significance of the date of the source – 1995, a few years after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the fall of communism in Poland and the rest of eastern Europe. This helped many of them provide very strong responses by arguing that they were not surprised by the fact that Jaruzelski was attempting to rewrite history with himself as the staunch defender of Poland facing up to the bullying Soviet Union. Some candidates did not go quite so far and simply stated that they were not surprised he was writing this account of himself because he wanted to keep on the right side of the West. While a good number of candidates explained there were good reasons for being surprised and not surprised, a number of others would have improved their responses by remembering to address the issue of 'surprise'.

Question 6

There were many very good answers. The strength of these answers was the fact that they explained how each source they used supported or was against the hypothesis. A very small number of responses just asserted for each source that the Soviet Union wanted or did not want to send armed forces to Poland. The vast majority of candidates, however, avoided this and gave explanations specific to particular sources. Very few candidates failed to base their answer on the sources. The main weakness was attempts at evaluation. These were often assertions or added on in a way or in a section of the answer that was completely separate from the main arguments about the sources.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23 Paper 23

Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and all the sources before attempting to answer the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main focus of the paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding should then inform their answers and help them to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. A helpful strategy is for candidates to directly address the question in the very first sentence of the answer, for example, 'Source B does/does not make source C surprising because' or 'Jaruzelski made this announcement to the Polish people because'.
- Two of the questions asked candidates to use two sources and this inevitably requires comparison of what they say or show. Candidates must identify similarities and/or differences, but remember that valid comparisons can only be made on the basis of a criterion that is common to the two sources – for example, do they agree or disagree about a common issue? Direct comparisons of the content of the two sources are what is required, rather than a summary of first one source and then the other. On a similar note, explaining that one source says things that the other says nothing about is not the approach to take.
- On **Question 6**, candidates must ensure that the sources are used as the basis of the answer. Candidates should engage with the content of the sources and make it clear whether they are using it to agree or disagree with the given statement. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support **and** challenge the given hypothesis. The best answers address both sides of the argument.
- If quotations from the sources are used, and this can be particularly useful when answering **Question 6**, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of quotation that misses out some of the words and replaces them with ellipsis points. The words that are used must make sense and support the point the candidate wants to make, so giving the quotation in full is crucial.

General comments

An overwhelming majority of the scripts were on the twentieth-century option. Consequently, there were too few responses on the nineteenth-century option for meaningful comments to be made. Most candidates completed all six questions. There were a few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both the nineteenth and twentieth century options. The general level of responses was very good, but it is worth noting that many candidates wrote much more than they needed to. There is, for example, no need to paraphrase a written source, or describe what can be seen in an image, before addressing the question. Examples of this were seen on **Question 2** and **Question 3**, where many candidates first described what each of the two sources said or showed before attempting any comparisons. Nonetheless, most candidates produced responses that demonstrated well developed skills of source handling and were able to apply their contextual knowledge relevantly to their answers.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

There were too few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.



Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

Candidates performed well on this question. The question asked candidates to explain the impression Source A gives of Jaruzelski, using details of the source. There were many different valid impressions that could be inferred from the image, but as the overall impression is negative, responses based on negative impressions were stronger than those that identified neutral impressions, such as 'stern', 'serious' or 'strict'. What was crucial was that a clear reference to the source was made and that this served to support the inferred impression; some candidates supported their inference with contextual knowledge without reference to the source. A number of candidates misinterpreted the source; most commonly these responses were based on Jaruzelski being a victim of the Soviets, weak or a positive force for good in Poland.

Question 2

This question focussed on two sources in which Brezhnev addresses Jaruzelski. The question asked whether one, Source B, makes the other, Source C, surprising. Many candidates were able to gain good marks by identifying points of agreement or disagreement between the sources and using these to explain surprise and/or lack of surprise. Better responses were provided by candidates that could explain valid reasons for being surprised and not surprised. While there were numerous agreements and disagreements between the two sources, the most commonly referenced was the change in Brezhnev's opinion of Jaruzelski – in Source B, Brezhnev is convinced Jaruzelski will act effectively to deal with problems in Poland, but in Source C, Brezhnev is disappointed in Jaruzelski's performance. In the strongest responses to this question candidates evaluated at least one of the sources by referring to their own knowledge. While most candidates attempted to answer the question by addressing the issue of surprise, there has been an increasing tendency to base responses on being surprised 'to a certain extent' or 'barely surprised' or 'a little surprised'. Such an approach often results in an unclear argument uncertainty over whether a candidate is arguing that they surprised or unsurprised. Candidates should state clearly whether or not they are surprised and then explain the reason for this, based on the content of the source/s and their own knowledge.

Question 3

In **Question 3**, candidates were asked to consider two cartoons by the same artist and conclude whether his opinion had changed between drawing them. While it was possible to contend that the cartoonist's opinion had changed, the majority of candidates stated that his opinion had remained constant and there were many sub-messages that could be used as the basis of such an argument. For example, in both cartoons the Soviets are portrayed as strong, they are depicted as threatening and Brezhnev is clearly in control in both cartoons too. A comparison of the big messages of the cartoons could lead to the conclusion that the cartoonist's opinion had changed and not changed – it had not changed in that the Soviets were going to deal with Poland or Solidarity in both cartoons, but there is a change in who acted - in D the Soviets will directly deal with things themselves, whereas in E, they will use Jaruzelski to do it for them. The best answers looked to the cartoonist's overall point of view and used this as the basis of their comparison. The cartoonist is anti-Soviet in both cartoons; he is clearly critical of the Soviets for their involvement in Polish affairs. What was crucial was a direct and explicit answer to the question. In some less successful answers, there was no statement about whether the cartoonist's opinion had or hadn't changed.

Question 4

This question was answered reasonably well. Candidates were asked to explain the overall message of a cartoon. Many were able to correctly interpret the source and explained that the cartoon shows that Solidarity will not be beaten by martial law. Those that fell short of this were able to explain valid sub-messages such as Solidarity is powerful or that the Polish government has acted against Solidarity. When candidates are asked about the message of a source, they should always try to consider the author or cartoonist's voice or opinion. In this instance, the strongest responses were given by those candidates that could explain that the cartoonist is pro-Solidarity, or anti-Jaruzelski, because Solidarity is defeating martial law. A small number of candidates misinterpreted the source by stating that Solidarity had been defeated or that Jaruzelski had been successful.

Question 5

There were many reasonable, but few very strong, answers to this question. The question asked why Jaruzelski made the announcement to the Polish people on 25 December 1981. Questions such as this that essentially ask why a source was produced require three explanatory elements in the response. First, it is

necessary to consider the context in which the source was produced, second, the message that the author was trying to get across must be understood and third, the purpose the author had in relaying his message must be examined. Context only answers tended to include information about the situation in Poland in very general terms and were limited in the credit they could achieve. The majority of candidates were, however, able to move beyond this and explain the message of Source G as a reason for the announcement; that being that Jaruzelski was explaining his reasons for introducing martial law. His purpose in his explanation was to justify his actions and defend the imposition of martial law. The candidates that could explain this in the specific context of the opposition to martial law provided the best answers.

Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved high marks by carefully explaining how some of the sources (A, B, F and G) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that Jaruzelski was in control in Poland, while others (B, C, D, E F and G) argue that Jaruzelski was not in control. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Some candidates would have improved their answers by making it clear whether the source under discussion was being used to support or challenge the given statement. Some other less successful responses appeared to answer on a slightly different hypothesis from the one set. A small number of candidates addressed only one side of the hypothesis and consequently limited the credit they could receive. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question 6** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement; candidates should use the words from the question to do this. They should then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given. It is not enough to just summarise each source. Many candidates used direct quotes from the sources as the basis of their explanations and this is a strategy that works well. However, as mentioned above, a full quote that makes sense must be used. Most candidates did not attempt evaluation, but those that did were successful when they examined the purpose of the writer or cartoonist; evaluation based on source type, undeveloped provenance or where it was unrelated to the hypothesis was not required.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03 Coursework

Key messages

Candidates should be familiar with the idea of significance and with using a range of criteria to assess it. They should be aware that a person, development or event can be significant in some ways but not in others. Coursework assignment titles must be appropriate and allow candidates to assess significance. Lengthy description is not required but assessment and the use of argument and counter-argument are needed. Candidates should aim to write developed and supported conclusions about the most important way in which their subject was significant.

General comments

The standard of work was high, with many candidates showing an impressive understanding of the concept of significance and how to assess it. Most of the marking was accurate and included useful summative comments on the candidates' work. The relevant forms were generally correctly completed.

Comments on specific questions

Most of the titles used by centres worked well. They allowed candidates to focus on the assessment of significance. There are a number of reasons why titles such as 'Assess the significance of Stresemann' or 'Assess the significance of the New Deal' work well. Firstly, they stress the idea of 'significance', and allow candidates to focus on the subject. Secondly, they focus on assessment, rather than description or explanation. Thirdly, they allow candidates to use a range of criteria to investigate the different ways in which their subject may or may not have been significant. Finally, they give candidates enormous scope in how far they want to take their answers in terms of long-term significance.

Titles such as 'How significant was the Depression in Hitler coming to power?' do not work as well. This is because it is not a question about significance as such but one in which the wording encourages answers about causation. It is likely to lead to candidates comparing the importance of a number of factors that led to Hitler coming to power. Candidates will write about the Depression, but they will also write about the role of other factors and possibly spend over half the answer on these other factors. The focus on the Depression is therefore lost, as is the focus on the concept of significance. A title such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' is more open and should lead to a very different type of answer.

The main exception to what has been said above is titles about turning points. A title such as 'How far was the Reichstag Fire a turning point for Germany?' can work very well. However, it is important that candidates focus closely on the attributes of turning points. For example, did their event/individual change the course of events or merely hasten developments that were already underway? Criteria are also useful when using these titles because an event or an individual can be a turning point in some ways but not in others.

Many candidates now use a range of criteria in their answers. However, in some centres all of the candidates used the same criteria and presented it in the same order. If possible, candidates should be introduced during normal lesson time to the different types of criteria that can be used. They should then be free to choose which they think will work best in their coursework. The best answers were nearly always those where the candidates had developed their own ideas and arguments.

The best answers did not just explain how an event or individual was significant, they assessed its significance using criteria. This led many of them to use argument and counter argument to decide that it was significant for some reasons but not for others. It is also important to remember that just explaining what an event led to, or what an individual did or achieved, is not a very convincing way of establishing why they were significant. Candidates need to assess how far what the event led to, or what the individual did or

achieved, mattered at the time and later. The best responses took this approach, and such an approach also helps candidates to avoid lengthy description.

The beginning and the conclusion of some answers could have been improved. At the beginning, some candidates wrote a long introduction, rather than starting their assessment. Conclusions often summarised what had been written earlier. The best answers, however, used the conclusion to develop and support their view about the most important reason why their event or individual was significant.

Much of the marking of the coursework was accurate. The mark scheme should be used in a holistic way. The overall characteristics of an answer should be identified and then a 'best-fit' match made with the most appropriate level. Comments at the end of a candidate's answer briefly explaining why a certain level was awarded were very helpful. Judgement about the levels should only been made about the whole answer, although it can be helpful to indicate parts of an answer that contribute towards the answer achieving a certain level.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41 Alternative to Coursework
--

Key messages

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 and Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41 were the most popular of the Depth Studies undertaken in this examination session. There were also a number of responses for Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18 and Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940–94. Overall, answers showed some level of knowledge, and most candidates attempted balance in their answers. A small number of candidates produced brief plans and many successful answers used these to select relevant information which could be used specifically to answer the question. Other plans and answers showed a lack of understanding of the question, as material was included which lacked relevance. Material should be selected and deployed to answer the specific question set. Many candidates provided detailed background information but would have improved their responses by providing material which could have been deployed to answer the question.

General comments

Some answers lacked development but still managed to produce balance by providing relevant and detailed material. In a number of other responses, candidates picked up on only part of the question and wrote a narrative response, sometimes with limited links. Some candidates would have benefitted from focussing on the chronological parameters of the question. Candidates need to firstly analyse the question and know exactly what it is asking, recognise the time parameters set and organise their work through planning. There were also some rubric infringements where more than one question was answered. Successful answers were balanced and addressed the question directly, deploying contextual knowledge to fully support a line of argument. They made judgements and came to conclusions which were well explained and supported with evidence.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1

This question asked candidates to consider the early stages of the war on the Western Front. The given factor was the role of the BEF and to provide balance, other aspects of the early war on the Western Front would need to be covered. Successful responses were able to describe the role of the BEF and understand their importance in the early stages of the fighting, including their importance to the outcome of the Battle of Mons and the Battle of the Marne. The race to the sea was also described, as well as the beginning of stalemate. Balance was provided through looking at other aspects of the early war, for example new technology and weapons, Belgian resistance, Russian mobilisation and the failure of the Schlieffen Plan. Many candidates had a good knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan and how its failure shaped events on the Western Front. The role of the BEF was also generally well known. Less successful responses did not take account of the second part of the question; ‘in the early stages of the war on the Western Front’ and provided material including descriptions of life in the trenches and reasons for German defeat in the later stages of the war. Some would have benefited from a focus on the Western Front, rather than on the war at sea.

Question 2

Successful responses were able to show how important the Royal Navy was to preserving supply lines to the British Isles, inflicting losses on the German navy in the Battle of Heligoland (1914) and the Battle of the

Falkland Islands. Other supporting material included the Battle of Jutland and the blockade of German ports. Balance was provided by including factors such as the US entry into the war, the German Revolution, the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive and improved tactics of the Allies such as the creeping barrage. Less successful responses lacked detail and some missed the focus of the question by providing detail about the arms race leading to the First World War.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Question 3

This question focused on the development of the Weimar Republic up to 1923. There were a number of successful responses to this question, with candidates able to provide a good level of knowledge relating to the Kapp Putsch. Balance was provided by looking at factors such as the Weimar Constitution, the unpopularity of the democratic politicians, left wing revolts and the impact of the Ruhr occupation. Less successful answers went beyond 1923 and described Stresemann's response to the hyperinflation crisis. Others, having legitimately outlined the events of the Munich Putsch, continued to demonstrate how this led to the rise of Hitler to power by 1933. There was also some confusion between left-wing and right-wing revolts, with some mixing up the Spartacists and Freikorps. Others confused the Munich Putsch with the Kapp Putsch.

Question 4

This question focused on the ways in which the Nazis dealt with opposition to their rule, with the given factor being the use of concentration camps. Successful answers were able to differentiate between camps for political prisoners and opponents of the regime and extermination camps used during the Holocaust. These responses were able to show how fear of the camps led to less opposition over time, as well as imprisoning likely opponents in the early part of the regime. Balance was provided through also looking at the role of the police state, the SS and Gestapo, the court system, informers and Block Wardens, as well as censorship of the media. Some candidates did not fully address the second part of the question, dealing with opposition, and instead wrote more generally about racial policy in relation to camps.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Question 5

Many candidates had some knowledge of the background to Russification and were able to point out that the policy aimed to overcome the problems of ruling such a large culturally and linguistically diverse Empire. To provide balance, other aspects of the Tsar's rule such as (but not limited to) the impact of the Russo-Japanese War, the 1905 Revolution and Bloody Sunday, as well as attempts to placate the people through the October Manifesto and Stolypin's reforms, were included in responses. Descriptions of the use of terror and the Okhrana were also valid. Some candidates had limited knowledge of Russification and so found it challenging to write a balanced answer. Others went beyond 1914 and described the revolutions of 1917 or provided details of the Tsar's misjudgements during the First World War.

Question 6

This question focused on the reasons for Stalin's purges during the 1930s. The given factor is the significance of factions within the Communist Party. Successful responses showed how different members of the Communist Party had disagreements about the way the USSR should develop. These would include those who supported Trotsky's idea of Permanent Revolution, as opposed to Stalin's idea of Socialism in One Country. As a result, once Stalin took control, he felt the need to get rid of the right-wing opposition such as Bukharin and Rykov, in order to implement his own vision for the Soviet Union. This led to the Purges, as Stalin intended to remove threats to his control. Balance was provided through describing other reasons for the Purges, such as attacking the Red Army which had been created by Trotsky, purging the secret police, dekulakisation in order to impose collectivisation and generally creating terror to increase his grip on power. Weaker responses showed a general misunderstanding of the term 'factions'. They lacked balance and some responses lacked detail overall, relying mainly on the claim that Stalin was paranoid and offering no support for this statement.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

Question 7

The focus of this question was on reasons for problems in agriculture and older industries during the 1920s. The given factor for these was overproduction. Successful responses identified traditional industries like coal and textiles and showed how these were affected by the introduction of new industries like oil and synthetic textiles, causing them to be unable to sell their products. They also showed how farming was affected by the introduction of tariffs and foreign competition, leading to a surplus of crops and falls in prices. Balance was provided by showing that Europe no longer needed US imports when the First World War ended, changing consumption patterns and a lack of diversity in farming, new machinery improving efficiency and Republican policies which offered no support for failing businesses. Some less successful responses did not fully understand what overproduction was, with some including a lot of material comparing the 1920s to the modern period. This lacked relevance. There were some very short answers, which indicated that the question had not been understood. Generally, candidates had more knowledge of problems in farming and some were unclear about what the traditional industries were.

Question 8

This question looked at reasons why prohibition failed by 1933. The focus on bribery and corruption was well understood by most candidates. Successful answers were able to describe the small numbers of poorly paid agents who were open to bribery but also the extent of this corruption, including the bribing of government officials and mayors. The role of crime lords and gangsters such as Al Capone was also described. To provide balance, such factors as lack of support for Prohibition, especially in cities, the loss of government tax revenue, and increased violence from gangsters, for example the St Valentine's Day Massacre in 1929, were described. Less successful answers looked at the causes of prohibition, rather than why it failed, which meant they struggled to provide a direct answer to the question.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

There were too few responses to **Question 9** and **Question 10** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940–c.1994

Question 11

This question required an assessment of how the South African government was able to maintain segregation before 1948. The given factor was government limitations on travel. Successful answers were able to show how the government used Pass Laws to maintain segregation by monitoring the movements of black South Africans. Balance was provided through descriptions of the removal of voting rights for non-white people, the introduction of the Immorality Act and limits on land ownership. Answers demonstrated some good knowledge of the Pass Laws but quite often this lacked depth.

Question 12

This question focused on reasons for the weakening of the system of apartheid, with the given factor being the growth in Black Consciousness. There was generally a good knowledge of the role of Steve Biko as the founder of the movement, with some detailed accounts of his life. Candidates also linked him to the Soweto Riots, showing how he was an inspiration for young people. To create balance, some candidates were aware of the role of the UN and international sanctions. Some answers featured generalised material, with a lack of focus on the period at times.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were too few responses to **Question 13** and **Question 14** for any meaningful comments to be made.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice this examination session, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41. There were also a number of responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18, Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41, Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990 and Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945. There were too few attempts at Depth Study F (South Africa) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but more could have provided a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These answers provided much information about the topic in general, instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also drifted from the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to significant sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1

A small number of strong answers were able to correctly define the term ‘war of attrition’ and explain how new and improved weapons such as machine guns, artillery and gas contributed to its development on the Western Front. These answers examined the nature of the stalemate on the Western Front and cited some good examples of battles where the war of attrition could be observed. This was then balanced by other factors such as the trench system and its conditions, the lack of effective tactics used by the commanders on both sides and the use of conscription to continually bolster the size of the armies. Weaker responses tended to misinterpret or misdefine the term ‘war of attrition’, which often led to overviews of the different weapons used over the course of the war which was not the focus of the question.

Question 2

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Question 3

This was the more popular question from this Depth Study and it was generally well answered. Candidates had a sound knowledge of the Stresemann era and were able to provide balanced answers that examined his economic policies, such as the introduction of the Rentenmark and the Dawes Plan, and examine alternative policies such as the Locarno Treaties and Germany’s entry into the League of Nations. The best

answers also had a wider scope and considered how Hindenburg's election helped stabilise the Weimar Republic and many also examined the cultural revival and explained how this had a stabilising effect in the cities. Strong answers tended to be very accurate chronologically and were able to give a high level of detail about each of the different factors and explain how it did or did not have a stabilising effect which allowed some of the best responses to draw convincing conclusions and make substantiated judgements. Weaker responses were more narrative in style and often gave a narrative of the Weimar Republic from 1919, missing the chronological parameters set out in the question. These answers also tended to be more descriptive, lacked in-depth contextual knowledge and made errors concerning dates, names and places.

Question 4

Some candidates misinterpreted or misdefined the term 'resistance group' and instead provided material on all opponents of the Nazis after 1933. A few other responses included the SA and the purge carried out in the Night of the Long Knives, which lacked relevance. Stronger answers examined a range of resistance groups such as youth opposition like the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose, church resistance such as the Confessing Church, and army and conservative opposition organisations. Most commonly, balance was provided by counterargument and candidates tended to examine the nature of the Nazi police state and how effectively it, along with propaganda, dealt with resistance groups to the point that they were hardly a threat for most of the Nazi rule. A small number of the best responses contained detailed examples and explanations, with many of them drawing valid conclusions with a convincing argument.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Question 5

Some strong responses were seen, and many candidates were able to confidently get to grips with the question. The strongest answers demonstrated a solid grasp of the importance Russia's continued involvement in the First World War as a reason for increased Bolshevik support in the Provisional Government era. Many answers stressed the socio-economic issues caused by the war such as food and fuel shortages, the consequences of the Summer Offensive for Kerensky's government and the continued desertions on the eastern front. This was then most commonly given balance by examining the impact of Bolshevik propaganda and Lenin's April Theses, the strong leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the role of Lenin and Trotsky and the impact of the Kornilov Affair on Bolshevik support. Weaker responses tended to lack accurate knowledge or confused the November and March Revolutions of 1917 and so examined the tsarist period.

Question 6

This question was generally answered convincingly. Some of the best answers had a good understanding of the significance of the gulag system as an aspect of Stalin's system of control in the USSR after 1928. Many candidates were able to cite accurate figures and link these to the purges of the 1930s. To provide balance, many candidates also examined other significant factors such as Stalin's cult of personality, Communist Party propaganda, control over the education system and young people, as well as the suppression of non-Russian culture. Less successful responses often did not accurately define the term 'gulag' and gave vague responses to the question, sometimes with errors linked to chronology. Other answers also examined factors pre-1928 which was outside the parameters of this question.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

Question 7

There were some very strong responses from candidates. Many candidates were able to provide a detailed and comprehensive set of explanations that examined the importance of government policies, which included low taxation, protectionism and a laissez-faire approach to business. Many of the best answers were able to give detailed explanations of how the policies contributed to the boom years and supported these with relevant examples. This was then balanced against other factors such as mass production and the development of the assembly line, the availability of credit, the importance of the First World War and new innovations. A few of the best answers made comparative evaluations of the different factors and reached convincing judgements about the most important factor. Other responses tended to focus too much on social aspects of the 1920s and examined the impact of the prosperity on the people, culture and their behaviours, which was not the focus of this question.

Question 8

Many responses to this question tended to focus on the issues faced by agriculture in the 1920s such as tariffs, overproduction and foreign competition from countries like Canada, rather than examine the problems faced by agriculture during the Depression years of the 1930s. Although many of the issues were the same, most candidates that did this cited examples from the 1920s rather than the 1930s and so their material was less convincing. Other weaker responses focused too much on the causes of the Depression rather than examining aspects of the Depression which include its consequences for the economy, society and political system. Stronger responses focused on the question and were able to give relevant examples which included the migration of many black American labourers to the cities, the impact of the Dust Bowl and the introduction of further tariffs by Hoover. Balance was provided by explaining the significance of other aspects of the Depression such as unemployment in industry, decline in trade and production, lower wages, homelessness, the impact of the Bonus March and the political implications for Hoover and Roosevelt's election and his New Deal programme. The best answers contained well selected and accurate examples and assessed relative significance in their explanations.

Depth Study E: China: c.1930–c.1990

Question 9

This was answered well in most cases. Candidates were able to examine in some detail the impact of the Japanese invasion of China for Communist support. Answers often cited how the Communists were able to win the support of the peasant villages, while the Nationalists were seen as corrupt and ineffective in fighting the invaders. Balance was provided by examining other factors that helped bolster Communist support such as the nature of Mao's leadership and ideology, the effective propaganda and indoctrination at Yen'an, the weaknesses of Chiang Kai-shek's leadership and the support built up during the Long March. The best answers were able to make some comparative assessments of the different factors and reach valid conclusions, supported by good explanations. Weaker responses would have been improved by more detailed contextual knowledge. They often gave generalised narratives of the period or limited descriptions of events.

Question 10

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

Depth Study F: South Africa: c.1940–c.1994

There were too few responses to **Questions 11** and **Question 12** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

Question 13

This question was generally very well answered. Contextual knowledge of the Middle East in the period up to 1948 was very strong and many candidates were able to give convincing explanations of the importance of Jewish immigration to tension in the region. Many cited the impact of Zionism and how it led to an increase in Jewish settlers, the impact of immigration after the Second World War and how US support for immigration increased tension in the region with Palestinians and neighbouring Arab states. This was then balanced by addressing other important factors that led to increased tension such as the role played by the British mandate, the role of Jewish resistance movements such as Irgun and Lehi, increasing Arab nationalism and the failure of the UN partition plan. The best answers were well organised and contained a sustained line of argument which included continual assessment of the relative importance of the different factors. A small number of weaker responses would have benefited from being less narrative and descriptive in approach, in order to properly explain the material.

Question 14

This question was very well answered for the most part. Candidates had a detailed and accurate knowledge of the Yom Kippur War and were able to provide a well-balanced argument assessing the significance of the different reasons that determined the outcome of the war. Many answers gave a breadth of detailed examples on the significance of Israeli military tactics, which most commonly included references to the speed of the Israeli counterattack, the use of air power and superior firepower and tactics. This was then

balanced by examining other relevant factors such as the role played by the USA, which included an influx of arms and the use of the oil weapon. The strongest answers explained each factor and assessed its relative significance against other factors throughout the response and drew convincing judgements in their conclusions. A small number of the other responses were more narrative and descriptive in approach, with some focussing too much on background causes.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

Depth Study B: Germany 1918–45 was the most popular choice this examination session, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41. There were also a number of responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E (China), Depth Study F (South Africa) and Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but more could have provided a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These answers provided much information about the topic in general, instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also drifted from the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to significant sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1

This question was generally well answered. Many responses were able to give detailed contextual knowledge of the importance of the Battle of the Marne to the nature of the fighting on the Western Front. Most responses focussed on the development and expansion of trench warfare and the subsequent race to the sea. This was then balanced against other factors such as the failure of the Schlieffen Plan (including Belgian resistance and Russian mobilisation), BEF entry into the war, new weapons and technology such as machine guns, and the impact of the First Battle of Ypres. Good answers were focussed on the nature of the fighting and provided well supported descriptions and explanations in each paragraph to reach valid conclusions. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive or had a loss of focus which resulted in narratives of the early stages of the First World War on the Western Front.

Question 2

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Question 3

This was the more popular question among candidates and generally well-answered. Candidates had a sound knowledge of the Munich Putsch and its impact on Nazi support and membership. Many answers provided detailed descriptions of the rebellion and the subsequent trial of Hitler and other leading Nazis and

their imprisonment. Many candidates explained the publicity this brought the Nazis and how it impacted Hitler's tactics for future elections. A few candidates also counterargued this point and explained how the Putsch was a failure and led to the banning of the Nazi Party and Hitler's imprisonment for treason which lost them vital middle-class support. This was balanced against other important factors such as the onset of Depression after 1929, the role of propaganda and the SA as well as the importance of Hitler's leadership. The strongest responses gave detailed explanations and supported these with relevant examples. Less successful responses often tended to be narratives of the Weimar period, with many focussing their material too much on pre-1923, when the Nazis did not stand for elections.

Question 4

Some candidates provided convincing explanations and focussed fully on the question by examining the significance of racial policy to the Nazi vision of society after 1933. These candidates examined the Nazi boycotts of Jewish shops and businesses, the Nuremberg Laws, Kristallnacht and later the Final Solution. A small number of candidates also included the impact of the Nazis' racial policies on other ethnic minorities such as the Roma population and black Germans. This was then balanced against the importance of other policies such as employment, militarisation, policies towards young people, women and the family and the creation of a police state. Good answers were well-structured and balanced and cited detailed examples in their descriptions and explanations. Other responses would have benefited from less description and more contextual knowledge of the period. Some focussed their responses on the nature of Nazi control or Hitler's consolidation of power between 1933–34, which was not the question set.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Question 5

There were some strong responses, and many candidates were able to confidently tackle the question. The strongest answers demonstrated a solid grasp of the importance of the Russian secret police in maintaining Tsarist rule up to 1914. Candidates here examined the use of the Okhrana in infiltrating radical political groups and its role in crushing opposition during and after the 1905 Revolution. This was then balanced against other important factors such as the issuing of the October Manifesto, Stolypin's reforms and the Tsar's use of the army to remove resistance in the countryside on their return from the Russo-Japanese War. These responses were detailed and contained good examples to support the descriptions and explanations. Weaker responses would have been improved by a greater focus on the question. These responses tended to give a narrative of the time period from 1905 to 1914. Some candidates went beyond the 1914 cut off and examined the revolutions in 1917.

Question 6

There were some good responses from candidates. The strongest answers were able to give detailed contextual knowledge on the significance of Stalin's control over religion and culture and how this allowed him to create a totalitarian state in the USSR after 1928. Many cited Stalin's religious policies such as closing down the Orthodox churches, arresting priests and the development of his cult of personality. This was then balanced against other factors such as the use of the gulag system to create fear, the role of the NKVD, the purges of the 1930s and Stalin's industrialisation and modernisation policies such as the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation of agriculture. These responses were rich in detail and gave explanations to address relative significance. Other responses were lacking in strong or convincing contextual knowledge of the period and gave generalised material or narratives, with some of these focussing on Stalin's rise to power before 1928 which was outside of the parameters of the question.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

Question 7

There were some very strong responses to this question. Many candidates were able to provide a detailed and comprehensive set of explanations that examined the importance of the entertainment industry as an aspect of the Roaring Twenties. The best responses focussed on cinema, radio, sports and the 'Jazz Age' in and then balanced this by examining other important factors such as the importance of the motor car, the impact of immigration, racism, Prohibition and other forms of intolerance. Strong responses clearly concentrated on the social aspects of the 1920s in the USA, rather than causes of the economic boom. Other responses spent much time examining the government economic policy and the impact of assembly line production methods in factories.

Question 8

Some of the stronger candidate responses were very focussed on the importance of the Alphabet Agencies to the New Deal reforms introduced by Roosevelt from 1933. These answers were able to give a range of examples of agencies introduced in both the First and Second New Deal such as the FERA, TVA, CCC, NRA, WPA and AAA. Detailed descriptions of the impact these agencies had on different sectors of society and the economy led to valid conclusions being drawn by many candidates. This was then balanced against other aspects of the New Deal such as the significance of Roosevelt's 'fireside chats', the Emergency Banking Act and his social reforms in the Second New Deal, which included the Wagner Act and Social Security Act. A few of the best answers also provided counterarguments and examined how the agencies were often not that significant in dealing with issues such as unemployment or the problems faced by farmers and farm labourers. Weaker responses sometimes muddled Alphabet Agencies up or included the Emergency Banking Act as an example of an agency. These responses lacked the detailed contextual knowledge needed to provide balanced descriptions and explanations.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

There were too few responses to **Question 9** and **Question 10** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940–c.1994

There were too few responses to **Question 11** and **Question 12** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were too few responses to **Question 13** and **Question 14** for any meaningful comments to be made.