

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/11</b> <b>Structured Questions</b></p>
---

## **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 focused and balanced responses. If candidates are asked to compare two given factors or individuals, identified in the question, answers should be focused on these specified factors or individuals. 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 organise their points into distinct paragraphs. This should help to avoid separate points becoming blurred together and in maintaining focus on the original question.

For **Part (c)** responses it is a good idea for candidates to practice writing evaluative, rather than purely summative conclusions. In their conclusions they should make a judgement and justify this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in the response.

## **General comments**

Candidates displayed sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions. Many candidates communicated 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 accounts 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', 'how important' 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) This question was answered well, with many candidates able to recall specific terms of the Treaty of Versailles that applied to Germany's western border. Good knowledge of the territorial changes was shown, with many candidates recognising that the Rhineland became a demilitarised zone, or that Alsace-Lorraine was returned to France. Some strong responses also stated that the Saarland was to be run by the League for a period of 15 years. Less successful answers confused the Ruhr and the Saar, or provided accurate statements, for example about the Polish Corridor, which were not relevant to the focus of the question, which was the western borders.
- (b) Candidates were less assured on this question, and whilst they were able to describe aspects of the Treaty of Versailles, the political consequences were not always explained. Some answers also concentrated on the Spartacist revolt or the abdication of the Kaiser, both of which were prior to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. Stronger answers were able to explain how the Weimar politicians were blamed for the 'stab in the back' or denounced as the 'November criminals', and that this led to uprisings such as the Kapp Putsch and the Munich Putsch. Some answers were also able to explain that the economic terms of the Treaty led to the occupation of the Ruhr, and further disillusionment caused by the government's response to the occupation.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with the more successful answers able to explain whether Clemenceau's demands dominated the discussions at Versailles through explicit consideration of the outcomes of the discussions. Strong responses were able to explain, for example, that Clemenceau achieved many of his aims, for example that he gained security for France through the extensive military reductions imposed on Germany, indicating that he dominated. Some responses took a different but equally valid approach, and successfully argued that the destruction and loss experienced by France during the war gave Clemenceau a moral reason for dominating the discussions, particularly compared to Wilson, whose country had suffered less. Balance was often provided by explaining the aims he was not able to achieve. For example, he wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state in order to act as a buffer against Germany, thereby protecting France's eastern border. However, he was only able to get the Rhineland demilitarised because Wilson wanted to avoid causing long-term resentment and future wars. Less assured answers described the aims of the Big Three without a focus on Clemenceau, or on the outcomes achieved. Some answers did try to explain whether Clemenceau's demands dominated the discussions, but lacked the necessary contextual support, or produced generalised answers based on disagreements between the Big Three.

### Question 6

- (a) Most candidates were confident in their contextual knowledge of how the League of Nations helped refugees and were able to achieve at least two valid descriptions. Most often these were focused on the camps, and the food and shelter that they provided. Stronger answers were also able to provide specific examples of nationalities that had been helped, and some additionally were able to describe the effect of the Nansen Passport. Weaker answers were very generalised or wrote about the work done by the League to limit slavery, which was not the focus of the question.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe the Manchurian Crisis, often at length, but fewer were able to explain why it was important, through an explanation of the consequences. The most common successful approach was to explain that the crisis exposed the weaknesses of the League of Nations, for example that the USA not being a member weakened them militarily, or that the Eurocentric membership put the League at a geographical disadvantage. Another common and equally valid reason for importance was that the successful invasion of China by Japan encouraged Mussolini and Hitler in their aggressive foreign policies, leading to the invasion of Abyssinia and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. Other responses sometimes understood these consequences but did not explain the link to the Manchurian Crisis.
- (c) This question was answered well, and many strong responses were seen on how well the League dealt with international disputes in the 1920s. Many candidates provided an explanation of the successes the League such as the Åland Islands dispute with Sweden, accepting that the islands would go to Finland with some guarantees for the Swedish in the area. Stronger responses then went on to consider the failures of the League, such as over Corfu or Vilna. Some excellent evaluative conclusions were also seen, for example with candidates arguing that overall, the League dealt successfully with disputes, since their main aim was to prevent wars, and this is what they managed to achieve in the 1920s. There were a number of unbalanced responses, primarily

because candidates were less assured in their knowledge of the failures, in particular when considering the Corfu crisis and the role of the Conference of Ambassadors. Weaker responses often described the disputes, or the actions of the League, but neglected to explain why the outcome could be considered to be a success or failure for the League. Additionally, some candidates struggled to focus on the given time frame of the 1920s and wrote extensively about the Manchurian or Abyssinian crises.

#### Question 7

- (a) This question was answered well, with most candidates able to gain high marks. Most strong responses were able to show that it was an American policy introduced by Truman, and that it was to prevent the spread of communism. Candidates were also able to identify specific examples of when the policy was used, for example in the Greek Civil War. A rarer point made was that it was in response to Keenan's Long Telegram. Few weak responses were seen.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question, with a number of candidates unable to provide two explanations. Stronger responses recognised that the Greek Civil War was important since it showed that the USA had the will and resolve to stop the spread of communism, or that it proved containment could work. Less successful responses recognised that the Greek Civil War was a conflict between monarchists and communists but were unable to provide an explanation of importance. Weaker responses mistakenly believed that the Soviet Union was directly involved, or that it was the first example of Soviet aggression. Some responses would have benefited from a greater depth of knowledge about the Greek Civil War.
- (c) Some good answers to this question were seen, with most candidates able to provide material on at least one side of the argument, through explanations centred around Stalin's motivations. Many such answers focused on arguments that the Berlin Blockade was a defensive move, explained that it was a reaction to the actions of the West, for example the formation of Bizonia. Other arguments seen on this side were that it was because Stalin wanted to retain control of East Germany, or that Stalin was attempting to prevent US encroachment on territory. Responses were also often able to provide balance through considering Stalin's aggressive motives such as that he was trying to force the West out of Berlin, or that his actions were provocative. Weaker responses tended to be more generalised about the Cold War, in particular Soviet expansion, or mistakenly wrote about motivations for the building of the Berlin Wall.

#### 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

- (a) Excellent responses to this question were seen, with most candidates achieving high marks due to the impressive factual recall displayed. Strong answers recognised that Stresemann stabilised the currency, for example by introducing the Rentenmark, and through negotiating for US loans. Some answers were also able to show how Stresemann benefited the economy by solving the Ruhr crisis. Errors were rare, but such answers generally confused Stresemann's policies with Nazi economic policies.
- (b) Mixed responses to this question were seen. Candidates were very confident in their knowledge of why the Communist uprisings failed but less able to provide two separate explanations. Stronger answers were able to explain that the uprisings failed since the Freikorps were used by the Weimar government to quell the rebellion due to the extreme violence, ending in the deaths of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. They were then able to provide a separate explanation, often based around the lack of organisation behind the uprising. Weaker answers provided lengthy and accurate descriptions of what happened but struggled to address the question. In other responses, the whole answer supported just one explanation.

- (c) Some good responses to this question were seen, mainly on one side, although some candidates were able to produce a balanced argument. Most answers were confident in explaining how culture thrived during this period. These answers were supported by a good level of contextual knowledge such as material on the boom in nightlife, for example jazz clubs, or the impact of film stars such as Marlene Dietrich. Responses were less assured when examining the other side of the argument, through considering the achievements in foreign policy. Stronger answers were able to explain that the Locarno Treaty gave Germany respectability, allowing for admission to the League of Nations, and removal of French and Belgian troops from the Ruhr. Less successful responses lacked explanation, instead providing sometimes detailed descriptions of the cultural achievements, or arguing that the cultural changes were not popular with some groups in Germany, which was not the focus of the question.

#### Question 12

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and were able to display detailed knowledge about how the Nazis used the Gestapo. Many answers were aware that they were used as the secret police, and that their role was to find and eliminate opposition to the Nazi regime. Candidates were also aware of the powers that they had, such as sending people to concentration camps, or tapping phones and opening mail. Very few errors were seen on this question.
- (b) There were some good answers seen to this question, with most candidates able to explain at least one reason why the Nazis took control of the mass media. The most common approach was for responses to consider that through mass media the Nazis were able to control what the German people were able to read or hear, thereby enabling control. Other responses explained that it was a way for the Nazis to gain the support of the people since they were only exposed to positive news about the Nazis. Weaker answers often had a good knowledge of the reasons for taking control but would have been improved by supporting this through direct reference to the methods that were used.
- (c) Responses to this question were mixed, with many answers neglecting to address the specific question. Stronger answers were able to explain that Hitler had campaigned on the promise to reduce unemployment, and that therefore there was an expectation that this would be done. Therefore, by reducing unemployment, for example through road building schemes, Hitler would gain support. Balanced answers were also achieved, often through an explanation that the main aim of the Nazi economic policies was actually to prepare for war, for example through rearmament and increasing the size of the military. There were some excellent evaluative conclusions that argued the main priority was to prepare for war, and that the reduction in unemployment was a side effect of this rearmament. Weaker answers did not address the motivations behind the policies, instead describing what the Nazis did.

#### Questions 13 and 14

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

#### Question 15

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to achieve high marks. Candidates were able to show that the production and sale of alcohol was banned, and that this resulted in the growth of speakeasies and gangsterism, with gangsters such as Al Capone. Weaker answers were able to show knowledge about prohibition, but lacked focus on the question, for example writing about the reasons for its introduction. Few errors were seen, but at times candidates were vague or inaccurate on the dates of its introduction and removal.
- (b) Some very good responses to this question were seen, with candidates clearly displaying a good level of knowledge about why the lives of many women changed in the 1920s. A common approach was to recognise that after the war more women were working, and that this resulted in greater freedom and a level of economic independence, which was a reason for the growth of the flappers. A second explanation often considered the impact of female emancipation, and the impact that getting the vote had on them. Weaker answers were able to describe the lives of women in the 1920s, but did not consider causation, which was the focus of the question.
- (c) Nearly all responses showed a clear understanding of groups who suffered from discrimination, and there were some excellent answers seen to this question. Contextual support was often of a

very high standard. When considering the ways that immigrants suffered, candidates were able to explain the consequences of the Red Scare, or the Sacco and Vanzetti trial. To provide balance, responses were able to explain discrimination that black Americans faced, with most exploring the impact of the Ku Klux Klan in the South. Other responses also considered the suffering of Native Americans, through attempts to remove their culture through education. Some candidates were able to provide evaluative conclusions by explaining that each group suffered in different ways, but that all suffered. Very few weak answers were seen, but some answers were very generalised.

**Questions 16, 17 and 18**

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

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/12</b> <b>Structured Questions</b></p>
---

## Key messages

Candidates need to read the question carefully before starting their response to ensure that they focus on the issue in the question.

Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted so that responses only include details within the time span of the question.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose. In **part (b)** and **(c)** questions, candidates should look to explain separate points in distinct paragraphs - otherwise, points can become blurred together or, alternatively, candidates can lose focus on the question set.

## General comments

Strong responses reflected sound understanding and good knowledge in both the Core content and Depth study questions, supported by a wealth of factual detail. 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 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 essay.

Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, showed difficulty in applying their knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts lacking explanation. Other weaker responses included incorrect factual details. Some of the weakest responses were very brief and generalised, with little supporting factual detail.

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 reward recall and description. Explanation is not required. Most candidates recognised that responses to **(a)** questions could be short and concise. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

**Part (b)** responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and 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 provide a description of what happened. Two relevant explanations with supporting contextual detail are required. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Some less successful responses included narratives about the topic and neglected to address the question.

**Part (c)** requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argued both for and against the focus of the question and reached a balanced judgement. A valid conclusion should avoid repeating points already made in the essay and should try to explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some of the best answers consisted of two good, supported explanations (one on each side), and a valid reasoned judgement. However, some candidates found that they were better able to provide a valid top-level judgement having provided more than two valid

explanations to draw upon. Weaker responses often provided well organised explanations but only on one side of the argument. These responses could have been improved by the inclusion of relevant explanations, supported with contextual examples on both sides of the argument, in order to produce a balanced response. Responses which included narratives about the topic without addressing the question were also seen.

### **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**

This was the most popular question of the Core content questions.

- (a) This question was well answered. Candidates needed to name four relevant pieces of land which Germany lost in the Treaty of Versailles. For example, Germany lost Alsace-Lorraine, North Schleswig, Saarland and Upper Silesia. Credit was also gained for naming other land lost, including West Prussia, overseas colonies, Eupen and Malmedy. Weaker responses were characterised by general statements such as, 'Germany gave land to Poland' or 'Germany lost a lot of land'. Some responses included incorrect information, such as Germany lost the Sudetenland and the Rhineland. A small number of responses were overly long, as a result of explaining who received the land and other terms of the Treaty of Versailles, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) Two explained reasons were required from candidates. The strongest responses identified one of the Fourteen points and then explained why Lloyd George and Clemenceau were suspicious, for example, 'Lloyd George and Clemenceau were unhappy because of Wilson's point on 'self-determination' because Britain and France both had large empires and it could mean colonies deciding to become independent.' A second explanation commonly included was, 'Wilson's point on 'reduction of armaments for all countries' was not well received by Clemenceau because, although he wanted Germany's armed forces to be destroyed, he did not want France's forces reduced as a precaution against a rejuvenated Germany in the future, with the potential to attack France again.' Weaker responses gained credit for identifying some of the fourteen points and could have been improved by the inclusion of some valid explanation. Some responses drifted from the focus of the question and provided detailed accounts on what each of the 'Big Three' wanted from the Treaty of Versailles, with little or sometimes no reference to Wilson's Fourteen Points.
- (c) Overall, this question was reasonably well answered. Most responses gained credit by identifying that there were problems in paying back the reparation payments or the government leaders were called 'the November Criminals'. Strong responses were well structured and produced a balanced response by explaining whether, up to 1923, the economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles were more important for Germany than the political consequences. A good example of the economic consequences would be that, 'Germany had to pay enormous reparations and in 1922 did not pay anything. France and Belgium went into the Ruhr and took what they were owed in raw materials, which was legal under the Treaty. The German workers went on strike and the government printed money in order to pay the strikers, leading to hyperinflation. The consequences being that money became worthless, with people losing the value of their savings and pensions, and prices of everyday items rocketed.' A common explanation used on the other side of the argument was, 'The political consequences were that the Weimar Republic was nearly brought down by the hostility shown to the government over the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles through the Kapp Putsch, the Munich Putsch and the political assassinations. The Kapp Putsch nearly succeeded because the army refused to intervene and defend the government and it was only the German workers who defeated the coup by a general strike.' Stronger responses produced at least one well developed explanation on each side of the argument and then a judgement on how far they agreed with the statement. A few responses drifted from the main focus of the question to include details on all the terms of the Treaty of Versailles without making any link to the question. Others included post-1923 details, which lacked relevance to the question.

Overall, most candidates demonstrated more confidence when explaining the economic consequences, compared to the political consequences.

### Question 6

This was also a popular question.

- (a) This question was answered very well. Most candidates knew the circumstances in which the Saar plebiscite was held, the choices available to those who voted, the pressure and propaganda applied by the Nazis and the result. In many cases responses demonstrated more than enough information to secure full marks here. A small number of responses confused the geographical location of the Saar and either wrote about the plebiscite in Upper Silesia involving Germany and Poland or about the plebiscite in Austria at the time of the Anschluss in 1938. There was also in a very small number of responses confusion with the Ruhr or the Sudetenland. In some weaker responses there was also uncertainty and inaccuracy about Hitler's role, for example, asserting that Hitler decided to call the plebiscite or that Hitler marched his troops triumphantly into the Saar, confusing the event with the remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936.
- (b) Strong responses to this question explained two valid reasons for Britain's decision to go to war. The reasons most commonly used were the failure of appeasement as shown by events after the Munich Conference, the Anglo-French Guarantee to Poland and the greater readiness for war achieved by Britain (and France) in 1938-39. Many responses included much contextual information to support the first of these reasons, citing Hitler's takeover of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, and the change in British public opinion as Hitler proved his untrustworthiness. Strong responses then explained one of the other two reasons listed above and some were able to give examples of Britain's efforts at rearmament, especially with regard to the air force. Some responses demonstrated confusion in some candidates' understanding of events. Some asserted that Hitler had been handed the whole of Czechoslovakia at the Munich Conference. Others wrote that that Britain's guarantee to Poland was made at the time of the Munich conference. A small number thought Churchill was Prime Minister in the period 1938-39.
- (c) The question was well answered, with many candidates able to identify and explain important motives behind the signing of the Nazi- Soviet Pact. Most also clearly stated on which side of the argument ('surprising' or 'unsurprising') these factors fell. The points most commonly identified on the 'surprising' side were the different ideologies of the two countries and Hitler's intention to take Russian territory in the quest for Lebensraum. On the 'unsurprising' side, responses frequently referred to Hitler's wish to avoid a war on two fronts, Stalin's lack of confidence in Britain and France, the need for Russia to prepare for eventual war with Germany and the interest of both powers in gaining land in Poland. The ideological point was often the one least well explained. This was because responses tended to simply identify Hitler's hatred of communism or pointed to a mutual antipathy between the two leaders, while neglecting to provide evidence of this antipathy. The best explanations referred to Hitler's treatment of communists in Germany, to German participation in the Spanish Civil War and to the creation of the Anti-Comintern Pact. Where responses attempted to explain Stalin's need to prepare Russia for future conflict, this was usually put down to difficult economic circumstances. The purge of the high command of the Red Army in 1937-38 was very rarely mentioned. There were some very strong responses which included at least one explanation on either side of the argument and included a valid judgement as to how far the Pact between Germany and the Soviet Union was 'surprising'. Less successful responses would have benefited from a more certain chronology and more accurate information. Some thought that Hitler wanted to recruit Stalin as an ally in a future war with Britain and France, or (in a small number of responses) a war had already started.

### Question 7

- (a) This question was well answered. Most candidates were able to name the two sides in the Greek Civil War, the monarchists and communists, and some understood that Britain and the United States of America supported the monarchists. More responses could have described the events, for example, 'There was a civil war in Athens which the British put down' and 'In 1946 an election was held, and the King was restored.' Others also cited that 'the British pulled out in 1947 because they could not afford the cost' and 'the United States stepped in and paid for some of the British troops to stay in Greece.'



- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why Stalin was worried by the introduction by western powers of a new currency in Germany in 1948. They were rewarded for identifying and explaining two reasons, most commonly the economic and military threat to the Soviet Union from a rejuvenated Germany. Other responses drifted from the question to write about the differences between communism and capitalism, without mentioning the impact of the new currency. A few responses included details of the Berlin Blockade, but this was not relevant to this question. Some credit was given for the Allies breaking their promises at Potsdam. A few acknowledged that the main reason a new currency was introduced was because after the destruction of World War II, there was economic chaos in their zones, and it was clear to the Allies that things would get worse, so the real reason for doing it was not to threaten Stalin.
- (c) Strong responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The best responses explained the purpose and details of the Truman Doctrine and emphasised why it was a threat to Stalin. Then, to produce a balanced argument they did the same for the Marshall Plan. Most responses were more confident explaining the threat from the Marshall Plan, for example, 'The Marshall Plan was much more of a threat, because Truman believed that Communism succeeded when people faced poverty and hardship, so he provided aid for European countries to recover after the war. Stalin viewed Marshall Aid with suspicion, in his view the anti-Communist aims behind Marshall Aid would weaken his hold on Eastern Europe.' Weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons such as, 'The Marshall Plan would weaken Stalin's position,' 'It was based on dollar imperialism' and 'The Truman Doctrine would contain Communism.' Supporting contextual details were needed to develop these identifications into explanations. There were also some responses which would have been improved by greater clarity on the differences between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

#### Question 8

- (a) This question was well answered, with most candidates demonstrating a good understanding of Alexander Dubcek. Relevant points made by candidates included, 'He was the Communist leader of Czechoslovakia in 1968', 'He introduced 'Socialism with a human' face', 'He allowed freedom of speech' and 'His period of reforms was called the Prague Spring'. Credit was also awarded for his insistence that his reforms were not a threat to Communism and he did not want to pull out of the Warsaw Pact. A few responses mistakenly thought that he was the leader of Hungary and wrote about events there.
- (b) The best responses tended to include two explanations as to why the Soviet Union responded violently to opposition in Hungary in 1956. The most common reason identified and explained was the fact that Nagy wanted to take Hungary out of the Warsaw Pact. The importance of the security aspect of the Warsaw Pact was emphasised and what worried Khrushchev was that if Hungary was allowed to leave, others may have followed and this would have weakened the Soviet Union's defensive barrier against the West. Another creditable explanation put forward was related to the increasing resentment of the Soviet Union towards Nagy's reforms in Hungary such as free elections and private ownership, which seemed to undermine Communism. Weaker responses, although demonstrating some understanding of the question, tended to just identify reasons, rather than develop them into an explanation, for example, 'Nagy planned to leave the Warsaw Pact', or 'There were huge anti-Soviet demonstrations.' Some responses drifted from the focus of the question to give details of the events of the Soviet invasion of Budapest in November 1956.
- (c) This question was well answered, and strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of the roles played by both Walesa and Gorbachev in the collapse of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. Candidates identified the ways that Walesa was important to the collapse of Soviet control, most commonly through the setting up of Solidarity and the fact that it showed that the Communist governments could be challenged by people power. Ways in which Gorbachev was responsible for the collapse of Soviet control in Eastern Europe were identified, including how his policies of Glasnost and Perestroika in the USSR made people in Eastern Europe expect and demand reform. Specific contextual knowledge was used to support both Walesa and Gorbachev's reasons, resulting in a sensible, structured response. Weaker responses, whilst often acknowledging reasons why both men were responsible, would have benefited from including the contextual information needed to develop a convincing explanation.

## 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) This question was well answered, and most candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of the events in 1932–33 that led to Hitler's appointment of Chancellor in January 1933. Four relevant points were required, such as, 'In the July election the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag', 'Hindenburg refused to appoint Hitler as Chancellor', 'Von Papen failed to find support as Chancellor' and 'Von Schleicher became Chancellor but he failed to find support'. Many responses demonstrated awareness of the machinations behind the scenes which led to 'Hindenburg being persuaded by Von Papen to appoint Hitler as Chancellor with him as Vice-Chancellor' and 'In this way they thought they could control him'. A small number also gained credit for noting the results of the presidential elections of 1932. Weaker responses were confused regarding the chronology and often included detailed descriptions of events which occurred after Hitler became Chancellor, such as the Reichstag Fire and The Night of the Long Knives. Such events were outside the scope of the question.
- (b) There were some very good responses to this question which explained two reasons why the Nazis had little success before 1930. The two reasons most commonly identified were the economic prosperity under Stresemann and the failure of the Munich Putsch. Strong responses then included plenty of contextual information to support these reasons such as, 'Stresemann brought hyperinflation under control by introducing a new currency and negotiating the Dawes Plan to provide loans to support German industry, resulting in a higher standard of living, which meant that that there was no reason to support extremist parties like the Nazis.' Others explained the impact of the cultural revolution and the recovery of Germany's international reputation on German society and how people were happy with the Weimar Republic, again giving them no reason to support the Nazis. The violence linked with the Nazi party, the failed Munich Putsch, Hitler being put in prison and the Nazi Party being banned was another explanation as to why they had such little success. Weaker responses tended to switch the focus of the question and explain how the Nazis gained success due to the Great Depression caused by the Wall Street Crash, many going beyond 1930.
- (c) This question was well answered, and many responses demonstrated a good understanding of both the Night of the Long Knives and other factors in Hitler's consolidation of power 1933–34. Strong responses were well structured and often first explained how and why Hitler carried out the Night of the Long Knives. Strong explanations included details of Ernst Rohm, including his aims for the SA, the threat to Hitler's position and the fears of the army. They then assessed the impact of the murders on Hitler's position: 'As a result of the murders of Rohm and key opposition members, the SA was now under Hitler's control, the army was pleased and Hitler's position was much more secure'. On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained alternative reasons for Hitler's consolidation of power, most commonly the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act. Some mentioned other events from 1933–34 which helped to consolidate his power, such as purging the Civil Service of Jewish and Nazi opponents, the banning of trade unions and the death of Hindenburg. Having included at least one valid explanation on either side of the argument, some candidates went on to make a judgement supported with evidence, as to the most important factor in Hitler's consolidation of power. Many suggested that the Night of Long Knives was the most important factor, 'Because by March 1934, Hitler, as result of the Enabling Act, had achieved many extra powers and was almost like a dictator. However, the army was still very suspicious of Hitler and the Nazis. By dealing with Rohm and the SA, Hitler won the support of the army and in August 1934 everyone in the army signed an oath of loyalty to Hitler. Only then was Hitler truly secure.' Less successful responses, although showing some understanding of events, tended to struggle with the chronology. Some had the misconception that Hitler did not become Chancellor until after the Reichstag Fire and they sometimes confused the Emergency Decree with the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives with the Night of Broken Glass. It is important to read the question carefully as a small number of candidates wrote in detail on the reasons why Hitler rose to power, rather than his consolidation of power.

### Question 12

- (a) Many candidates were well informed on the ways in which women helped the German war effort and made four relevant points such as, 'They filled in men's jobs who were conscripted to fight', 'They worked on the land in agriculture', 'They became nurses' and 'They worked in factories making armaments'. Marks were also awarded for other specific jobs that they did including their work as air-raid wardens, drivers of trains and fire engines, and administrative jobs in the armed forces.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most responses identified increasing the birth rate and producing more soldiers as being the main reason why Hitler attached much importance to the German family. Some responses would have been improved by the inclusion of contextual details in order to develop the identification into an explanation. Some weaker responses also went into much detail about Hitler's tempting financial incentives for married couples to have children without explaining why this was so. Strong responses included details as to why he wanted to increase the number of soldiers, including his aims of a greater Germany and to spread eastwards in order to provide Lebensraum, adding that this could only be achieved through war, and for that he needed more soldiers. Some candidates struggled to explain a second reason, though successful responses did make a strong case that the family was important for achieving Hitler's vision of a superior race and the traditional ideal family could be used as part of Hitler's propaganda campaign.
- (c) Strong responses demonstrated a very good understanding of the Hitler Youth by including clear explanations in response to the question. Most responses were able to identify reasons for its popularity, including the numbers who joined, the varied leisure activities on offer, the socialising with friends and the sense of belonging being a member of the group gave to them. Most commonly explained were the varied activities which were on offer, including camping, hiking, athletics, map reading and firing guns, which were enjoyed. A second valid explanation was often built around the parades and how those taking part felt excited by wearing a uniform and marching with loud bands, resulting in a feeling of belonging to a great nation. The most successful responses then explained reasons why the Hitler Youth was not popular and were very familiar with the activities of the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement. Some also explained the change in nature of the movement once it had become compulsory in 1939 and the start of the war. In particular, they mentioned the changes in the leadership of the Hitler Youth, as the experienced leaders were drafted into the army and replaced by keener Nazis, who rigidly enforced Nazi rules, with the main focus now being on the war effort and military drills. A number of responses were able to include at least one valid explanation on either side of the argument and assess and weigh up the extent of the Hitler Youth's popularity. Weaker responses found it difficult to differentiate between school routine and the after-school activities of the Hitler Youth and included a lot of details about the different subjects studied at school.

### 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, and most responses demonstrated a very good understanding of the 'Red Scare'. The best responses included four relevant points such as, 'It was the fear of immigrants coming in from Southern and Eastern Europe,' 'It was the fear of communism,' 'The USA had watched with alarm as Russia became Communist after the Russian Revolution,' and 'The fear of anarchists bringing in radical ideas.' Marks were also awarded for the evidence that the Americans saw around them to confirm their fears, such as the widespread strikes and bomb blasts in 1919 and the response of the American authorities to immigration.
- (b) Most candidates were very familiar with the reasons why the cinema grew in popularity during the 1920s and there were many successful responses containing two relevant explanations. The best responses identified and then explained the reasons. For example, 'In the 1920s Hollywood produced a large number of films. These films included comedy, daring adventures and romance. The introduction of sound and speech in 1927 made films much more exciting and people flocked to the cinema.' Many responses included the names of film stars with a high profile at the time such as Charlie Chaplin, Douglas Fairbanks and Clara Bow. Weaker responses identified reasons, most

commonly higher incomes, but did not include any supporting contextual detail such as the impact of the economic boom and increased leisure time.

- (c) There were many strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the problems caused to the United States in the 1920s by gangsterism and the Ku Klux Klan. Many responses identified problems caused by gangsterism, especially the increase in crime, corruption of law enforcers and violence, and then included plenty of contextual information to support these reasons and develop them into explanations. The activities of Al Capone and events of the St. Valentine's Day Massacre were well known and often used to explain the problems caused. A balanced answer was then achieved through discussing the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Problems identified and explained included the size of the movement, the support from politicians and the violence towards black Americans. A number of strong responses were able to include at least one valid explanation on either side of the argument and then to assess and weigh up which was more of a problem. Many considered the Ku Klux Klan more of a problem because, 'Although gangsters were a problem, especially in the cities because of Prohibition, in 1933 when Prohibition was abolished gangsterism was largely defeated. The Ku Klux Klan were much more of a problem because of the size of the group, the murders and the racist attitudes that they represented.'

### Questions 16, 17 and 18

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

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/13</b> <b>Structured Questions</b></p>
---

## 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 actual 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 provided a great deal of information and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions which reward recall and description. Many candidates structured their answers appropriately, in the form of a short paragraph.

The best answers to **part (b)** and **(c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information which lacked relevance. Candidates were rewarded for the identification of relevant 'why' factors, but the best answers were those which went further and developed 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 judgement in the conclusion. However, some conclusions were limited to assertions on 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other. Some of the best answers were able to present two good explanations (one on each side) and a valid reasoned judgement. However, many candidates found that the best route to a valid judgement was one in which they had more than two valid explanations upon which to draw.

## 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**

This was a popular question. Candidates were able to achieve high marks on **part (a)** by stating four separate but specific terms of the Treaty of Versailles which disarmed Germany. Typically, that the army was limited to 100 000 men, conscription was banned, Germany could have only six battleships and no

submarines or aircraft. While references to the Rhineland were accepted, comments such as 'Germany's forces were significantly reduced' were rather general.

**Part (b)** was answered well. Causal factors included compensation for wartime damage, fears for future security because of repeated invasions and the demand for revenge – explaining why the French perception of what constituted 'harsh' was so important. Good quality answers followed a familiar pattern of identifying two points, explaining them, and adding supporting evidence. For example, 'The French wanted Germany to be punished harshly because of the damage that Germany caused in the war. Most of the fighting had taken place on French soil and terrible damage had been done to France's farmland and industry. Millions of Frenchmen had died. At the end of the war when Germany was retreating, the German troops had deliberately destroyed railways, towns and factories. The French wanted Germany to compensate for all this, partly as a punishment and partly to help France recover. This is why Clemenceau demanded very high reparations.'

Most candidates constructed good arguments in **part (c)** about the extent of agreement and disagreement between Wilson and Lloyd George when considering how Germany should be treated in the Treaty of Versailles. The best answers were characterised by balanced explanations. For instance, on the one hand, it could be argued that Lloyd George did disagree with Wilson over Germany. He was under enormous pressure from the British public to punish Germany harshly, when Wilson did not want to do this. The British people had suffered lots of hardships during the war and knew that Germany had been harsh on Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. In the election campaign of 1918, Lloyd George had promised to make Germany pay. Lloyd George also had other worries. He wanted to protect the British Empire and so wanted Germany's colonies. This went against Wilson's aim of self-determination. Wilson did not want to punish Germany so harshly that it would want revenge in the future. On the other hand, there is a case for arguing that Lloyd George agreed with Wilson on a number of issues. Neither of them wanted to punish Germany too harshly. Lloyd George wanted Germany to be able to recover because it was an important trading partner of Britain. He was also worried about the threat of communism and wanted a strong Germany in the future, to stand up to Russia. Both men were worried that Germany might cause problems in the future if it was punished too harshly. The best responses were those which were able to substantiate a judgement to the hypothesis given in the question, rather than just restating points already made in the answer. For instance, some candidates claimed that Lloyd George and Wilson ended up agreeing over Germany although not always for the same reasons.

## Question 6

In **part (a)** most candidates wrote about Mussolini's support for the Nationalists, the provision of military equipment such as bombs, machine guns and tanks, as well as tens of thousands of troops and aircraft which helped bomb Republican targets. Details of specific military interventions were rarely seen, and some answers focussed, in error, on German involvement in the Spanish Civil War.

Candidates knew details of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, but some would have benefited from applying their knowledge to the question (**part (b)**). Identifying relevant points gained credit, but the best answers focussed on why the Pact was a 'surprise' to many. For instance, many expressed surprise because Germany and the Soviet Union represented two opposing ideologies. The Soviet Union was communist, and Germany was fascist. It would have made sense if they had gone to war with each other, which they eventually did. Better responses went on and developed points like this one, for example: 'Hitler hated communism and in *Mein Kampf* had said that one of his aims was to destroy it. In Germany, the communists had been his greatest enemies and when he came to power, he had put many in concentration camps or had them executed.'

In **part (c)**, candidates gained credit for explaining points for and against the proposition that 'appeasement seemed reasonable at the time'. There were some strong answers which explained why it was reasonable not to go to war because Britain was not in a state to do so, citing such factors as public opinion, the need for rearmament and attitudes across the Empire. On the other hand, candidates explained that appeasement was not reasonable as it encouraged Hitler to fulfil more of his published aims, in which case he should have been stopped earlier. Many learners' explanations were accompanied by appropriate context: for instance, events in the Rhineland, Austria and Czechoslovakia.

## Question 7

In **part (a)**, the best answers about Czechoslovakia, 1945 to 1948, referred to Soviet troops withdrawing in 1945 and the elections in 1945 which led to a coalition government, with the Communists becoming the largest single party in 1946. Candidates then went on to describe the Communist coup in 1948 and the

rigged elections which followed. A small number of candidates wrote about the roles of individuals such as Benes, Jan Masaryk and Gottwald.

Good responses to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question which focussed on why there were disagreements amongst the Allies over what to do about Germany after the end of the Second World War. Candidates identified several causal factors, such as the issue of reparations and punishment, whether Germany should be broken up into small states, the Western Allies wanting a strong Germany as a defence against Communism and a wish to avoid the same mistakes made in the Treaty of Versailles. The best answers identified two points, explained them, and added supporting evidence. Restating key words from the question is a helpful device which helps candidates focus precisely on what is required. Questions of this type which relate to disagreements between different groups or people need references to both sides so that the point of comparison is clear. Some candidates discussed the aims of each in two separate paragraphs, which sometimes made it difficult to explain contrasts. A good answer argued: 'The main reason why there was disagreement over Germany was because of Stalin's fear of Germany. In the Second World War Germany had invaded Russia and millions of people had died. He wanted to make sure that Germany stayed weak and could not recover. This would safeguard Russia from another attack. This is why he wanted Germany to be divided up and kept weak. In contrast, the Western Allies wanted a strong Germany as a defence against communism, fearing that a punishing settlement, such as the Treaty of Versailles, would be a mistake and lead to further conflict.'

There were many good answers to **part (c)** which explained that Stalin suspected the Marshall Plan was an attempt to contain communism and make countries dependent on the US dollar. On the other hand, these high-quality responses argued that Stalin's suspicions were not justified because they were more to do with his suspicions of the USA and capitalism generally, rather than any real dangers there were from the Marshall Plan. This involved US money going to European countries to help them recover from the dreadful state they were in after the end of the Second World War. Some candidates explained that Stalin had no justification to be suspicious of the Marshall Plan, given his own policies and actions in satellite states behind the Iron Curtain.

## Question 8

Candidates were secure in their knowledge of the Berlin Wall in **part (a)**. References to the division of Berlin into two halves, communist and capitalist, that the Wall was built by communist East Germany to stop the flow of people from East to West, that it split families and friends and that people trying to cross the wall were often shot and killed, were all accepted as valid answers. The inclusion of points about checkpoints were also creditworthy.

The next question, **part (b)**, asked for an explanation of the Soviet suppression of the Prague Spring. Some answers included generalised narratives of Dubcek's reforms which fell short of explaining precisely why the Soviet Union reacted so violently to events in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Causal factors typically seen included loss of control, loss of resources for Soviet industry and the danger of ideas spreading to the rest of the Warsaw Pact. Here is one example how identified points can form the basis of a good explanation: 'The Soviets were particularly worried about the developments in Czechoslovakia. It was one of the most important countries in the Warsaw Pact and so very important to the Soviet Union. Geographically, it was in the centre and had close contacts with other countries in the Pact. All this made the new ideas in Czechoslovakia very dangerous because they might spread to other Warsaw Pact countries. In fact, the leaders of both East Germany and Poland were worried about this and put pressure on the Soviets to act.'

The **part (c)** question enabled candidates to construct effective arguments about the extent of the threat Solidarity posed to the Soviet Union. Many candidates displayed good understanding; on one side there was an appreciation that Solidarity posed a threat because the economic problems in Poland made many people very unhappy with communist rule. People started to go on strike and soon Solidarity had been set up and had over 7 million members. This gave it enormous strength as is seen by the fact that the Polish government gave in to most of its demands. It was a real threat because it had so many members and because its ideas such as free trade unions independent of the Communist Party were a threat to Communist control and thus Soviet control. After a decline it reappeared in 1989 and showed its power when it helped form the first non-Communist government in the Soviet bloc, a powerful sign to other eastern European countries. Candidates also referenced support from the Vatican against a background of Polish Catholicism. On the other hand, there was an appreciation that the impact of Solidarity was lessened when the Communist authorities used force; the Polish government was always in a position to crush it when they wanted to. It only lasted so long because it hesitated about what to do. However, by the end of 1980 the government came under pressure from the Soviets, who threatened to intervene. They appointed Jaruzelski

as the new leader and he soon introduced martial law, suspended Solidarity and put its leaders such as Walesa in prison. Once Jaruzelski was in power and decided to use force, Solidarity quickly crumbled.

The best answers to both **(b)** and **(c)** questions were from candidates who had organised their extended writing so that each argument included a point, an explanation, and some accurate evidence in support.

### **Section B: Depth Studies**

#### **Question 9**

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

#### **Question 10**

The best answers to **part (a)** described the main points from the Armistice. Typically, this included details that the fighting on the Western Front stopped, the Germans left French territory in France and Belgium and surrendered war materials such as planes, ships and machine guns. Also, that Allied prisoners of war were to be released, but there was no relaxation of the naval blockade of Germany.

Candidates knew a great deal information about the events at the end of the war which coincided with the Kiel Mutiny in **part (b)**, although the best answers met the key point of the question, focussing precisely on why it took place. Explanations included the German plan for one last attack, low morale, socialist ideas amongst the sailors and dissatisfaction with the Kaiser. For example, 'It took place because the German admiralty had decided to have one last battle in the North Sea. However, the German navy was outnumbered and outgunned by the British navy. German sailors from two ships at Kiel decided that this was a ridiculous plan and that they would not sacrifice their lives like this and refused to sail.' The very best responses added a second explained point from those identified.

When answering this **part (c)**, candidates should focus on linking their knowledge to why Germany signed the Armistice. Many answers quite rightly referenced the Spring Offensive as the stated factor, as well as alternative factors, such as fear of a Socialist revolution, low morale on the Home Front, the abdication of the Kaiser, the impact of the Blockade and increasing US strength. Better responses showed an appreciation of the impact of these aspects which led to the Germans seeking an Armistice and an end to the fighting. Some candidates treated this as a question about why the Spring Offensive was a military failure, when the context was much wider than that.

#### **Question 11**

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**; credit was given for points such as Germany's successful application to join the League of Nations and the signing of the Locarno Treaty and Kellogg-Briand Pact, as well as for relevant agreements which related to finance, such as the Dawes and Young Plans.

Many candidates had a good knowledge of the Freikorps in **part (b)**, and the better answers took time to explain why their activities attracted support, which was the key element in the question. For instance, 'People supported the Freikorps because they did not like the Treaty of Versailles. They thought that it was far too harsh on Germany and should not be accepted. Many of the people who supported the Freikorps were discharged soldiers and the part of the Treaty they disliked the most was the limiting of the German army to 100 000 troops. This meant that many of them lost their jobs in the army. They joined the Freikorps as a way of continuing in military life.' The best answers added another explained point, for example related to a wish to return to previous systems of government, their strong nationalism or dislike for communism.

**Part (c)** was produced some unbalanced answers. There was often good knowledge of the impact of the invasion of the Ruhr by France and Belgium in 1923. In the short term, this led to the printing of money and the collapse of the mark. However, candidates seemed less secure when tackling the longer-term causes of hyperinflation and the endemic nature of the problem which predates the invasion of 1923. For example, Germany had to pay £6600 million in reparations, so it was greatly in debt. This reduced the value of the mark, and this caused inflation. When the first payment of reparations became due in 1921, the value of the mark fell quickly, and inflation went up. Germany had to pay the reparations in foreign currency. Germany bought this foreign currency at any price, and this caused more inflation. Germany printed money to buy the currency to pay the reparations. So, even before the occupation of the Ruhr, there was high inflation.



### Question 12

Candidates in **part (a)** were able to describe the Nazi programme of the early 1920s, often making four secure points from the 25-Point programme. Care was needed to avoid ascribing policies implemented after 1933 to the earlier decade.

Responses in **part (b)** often included a great deal of accurate but descriptive information about the Munich Putsch. Good answers explained why it failed, thereby meeting the precise requirements of the question. Two explained points were seen from many candidates, typically referencing lack of support, poor organisation and mistakes made by leading figures in the Putsch. For example: 'The Munich Putsch failed because Hitler was mistaken about how much popular support he would get. When the Nazis announced they were taking over the government of Bavaria and took over public buildings, there wasn't very much support from the Bavarian people. This made it an easy task for the Bavarian police to round them up and arrest them. Not even much shooting was needed.'

A number of answers would have been improved by the application of relevant knowledge to both sides of the **part (c)** question, which called for a judgement about the success of Hitler and the Nazis in the years 1925 to 1932. Candidates wrote more confidently about the effects of the Depression and the Nazi use of violence and propaganda in the election victories which attended Hitler during 1930 and 1932. On the other hand, counter arguments were less developed and relied on descriptions of the changes Hitler made following the failed Munich Putsch. Better quality answers, however, explained their impact. For instance, the use of legal means through elections, rather than trying to start a revolution. Responses noted that he re-organised the party so that it was efficient and could spread propaganda throughout the country. Although a number of unbalanced answers were seen, there were also answers which could argue from both sides. Some of these included a 'clinching argument' in the conclusion (and not a repetition of earlier points). One such example concluded that the changes Hitler made to the party were important, but he made many of these long before the fortunes of the Nazis changed. Even by the late 1920s they were gaining much support. What really changed the situation for them was the Great Depression. This was when their voting figures shot up. So, it was the great Depression that led to the Nazis being more successful.

### Question 13

A small number of candidates responded to this question. Candidates coped well with each part. The key in **part (a)** was to focus on the 'lives of the Russian people' and it was good that so many answers did so. Food shortages and high prices, the suppression of protests and demonstrations, and high casualties were often mentioned in answers.

There was good understanding of Stolypin in **part (b)** and students were able to explain his importance by referencing the suppression of revolutionaries on the one hand, and on the other, his reformist policies related to land ownerships, banks and working conditions.

Some of the responses to **part (c)** would have benefited from greater balance, and from explanation, rather than a more narrative approach. Candidates tended to describe the mistake made when the Tsar decided to go to war against Japan, against a background of an economic depression which reduced many people, particularly in cities, to terrible poverty.

### Question 14

The small number of candidates that answered this question coped well with each part. **Part (a)** attracted some lengthy answers which detailed Stalin's cult of personality. A closer focus on the 'visible signs' of the cult would have improved some answers. For instance, such features as portraits of Stalin in people's homes, statues of Stalin in public places, films, regular public processions praising him, and towns and streets named after him.

For **part (b)**, candidates were able to explain the differences between the ideas offered by Trotsky and Stalin, and often went further and added another explanation such as the impact of Lenin failing to name a successor when there was no one clear, obvious candidate.

**Part (c)** was well answered, as there was good understanding of the use of terror on the one hand, and propaganda on the other, to explain Stalin's grip on power. Some candidates also included the impact of the 1936 Constitution as an alternative factor. Some interesting analytical conclusions were seen; one valid argument was that: 'Propaganda was a useful weapon for Stalin, and it made many Russians see him as the great hero of the Soviet Union, but most ordinary people were not in a position to challenge Stalin. However,

powerful people like Bukharin and Radek, and those at the top of the army and the secret police, were in positions from which they could threaten him. This is why Stalin's use of terror was the biggest reason why he stayed in power. It dealt with people who could directly threaten him.'

### Question 15

In **part (a)**, candidates were sometimes unclear about 'buying on the margin' and confused it with the advent of hire purchase. Better answers focussed on buying shares without paying the full price, borrowing the money for most of the cost of the shares and on the problem that when the value of shares went down, they were in trouble, and could not repay the loans.

In **part (b)**, a focus on the problems facing farming, old industries and banking could be used to explain the underlying weaknesses of the US economy in the 1920s. For example, on the issue of overproduction: 'This was happening in farming where modern machines like the combine harvester had made farming more efficient so that more food was produced. However, this was not needed. More wheat was produced than was needed and this lowered prices. The same was happening in the coal industry, where a fall in demand and overproduction led to lower prices.' Some candidates provided two explained reasons.

For **part (c)** it was important to balance the contribution of Hoover and Roosevelt in relation to the result of the 1932 Presidential election. Candidates wrote more confidently about Hoover's deficiencies as president. On the other hand, explanations of Roosevelt's successful campaigning were less developed. Explicitly focussed writing might have included how he toured the country for weeks to meet many Americans and how they were impressed with him because he was open and won their confidence. For example: 'He was optimistic and promised a way out of America's problems. He promised people a New Deal and gave people hope. They were ready to trust him because he had a reputation for helping the poor after his work as Governor of New York State.' Some answers managed to argue effectively from both sides, although unbalanced answers were also seen. A valid judgement might have drawn the conclusion that although Roosevelt ran a good campaign and gave people hope, it was Hoover who had the biggest impact on the election result. The effects of the Depression were so bad, and he did so little to help people, that it would have been difficult for Roosevelt to lose the election. Hoover's actions over the Bonus Army seemed to underline the impressions people had of a man who did not care and did not have a way forward. Roosevelt's campaign helped, but he was bound to win because of Hoover.

### Question 16

Candidates knew a great deal about the Tennessee Valley Authority in **part (a)** and were able to describe many features of its work, including the provision of jobs, electricity and flood alleviation as part of a contribution to better land usage.

On **part (b)** many candidates wrote generally about discrimination and lack of civil rights without establishing specific links to the New Deal. For example, a better possible approach would be to explain that much of the way the New Deal harmed black Americans was not intentional. The National Industrial Recovery Act made it illegal for unskilled workers to be employed and this hit unskilled black workers. The TVA flooded land that had been farmed by black tenant farmers and they lost the land. Roosevelt was not racist, but the New Deal had unexpected consequences for black Americans.

Answers to **part (c)** were characterised by some good attempts to arrive at a balanced judgement about opposition to the New Deal. On the one hand, arguments focussed on those groups who thought the New Deal did too little for the poor while, on the other side of the analysis, it was recognised that some felt that the government should not be interfering so much – it was seen as anti-American. Some of the best responses took the view that critics like Huey Long agreed that Roosevelt was going in the right direction but not enough, while the Republicans wanted to go in the opposite direction. So, they were much further away from Roosevelt and opposed him much more strongly than Huey Long and others. They disagreed fundamentally with Roosevelt about the role of government in America.

### Question 17

**Part (a)** was answered well by the small number of candidates attempting it. They typically mentioned that Vichy governed the southern part of France after 1940, following the defeat of France, and that it was led by Marshal Petain and Pierre Laval, who collaborated with the Nazis, notably over the deportation of Jews.

For **part (b)**, valid identified points included the Battle of Britain, that the German navy did not have control over the Channel, and that it did not have enough ships or barges. Candidates who went on to develop and

explain these factors in relation to the question achieved good marks. For example, 'This was due to the Battle of Britain. For the invasion to be a success, Germany needed its air force to have control of the skies. Otherwise, any invading forces would be under heavy attack by British aircraft. However, in the Battle of Britain in the summer of 1940, the RAF won control of the skies by defeating the Luftwaffe. Once this happened, an invasion was impossible.'

Answers to **part (c)** about France's defeat in 1940 were sometimes general and descriptive. Candidates should try to begin the question by explaining the impact of the stated factor. For example, regarding poor leadership, one argument claimed that while the French army had plenty of men and equipment, its commanders were too old fashioned in their approach and that 'they were still fighting the First World War, rather than thinking about the actual war that the Germans were fighting. Their plans were based on the Maginot Line, which they assumed would stop the Germans for a long time. This meant they were too defensive. They simply waited for the Germans to attack when they should have gone on the offensive, when Germany attacked Poland. Even when the Germans invaded Belgium, the French commanders were slow to react.' Candidates found it easier to offer alternative factors which included divisions amongst the French government, and that the German army had more advanced weapons and more sophisticated Blitzkrieg tactics. Whereas the French army had not been modernised, the Germans used Stuka dive bombers and were willing to take risks. More candidates could have attempted a judgement. For example, it could be argued that the German victory was partly due to innovative German tactics, but it was mainly the fault of the French military leaders. They played into German hands by being so defensive. If they had taken the initiative when Germany invaded Poland, this would have surprised the Germans and defeated their tactics, but they stayed behind the Maginot line and allowed the Germans to take all the initiatives.

### Question 18

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

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/21</b> <b>Document Questions</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

Candidates should read through the sources carefully before thinking about the questions. They need to understand what each one is saying, and what this means, particularly given who the author is. Knowledge of the topic should help candidates to think about the nature of the claims being made in each source, and how the sources might relate to each other.

Some of the questions will involve the issue of how far what the sources say can be believed. Some may ask directly about this (for example, can this account be trusted?). Others will leave it up to candidates to decide whether or not to raise the issue (for example, is what this source says surprising?). The best way of analysing the credibility of a source is by assessing the possible purposes the author might have had in representing events in a particular way. Did the author have a motive to mislead the audience? This is where knowledge of the topic will be of most help in thinking about what a source really means, rather than just what it says.

Sometimes answers struggle to address the question that has been asked, with candidates not constructing the answer as a valid response. For example, if the question asks why a source was produced at a particular time, then the answer must provide reasons. Some answers tend to write about the source, perhaps even interpreting it or evaluating it, without giving a reason why it was produced. Similarly, if candidates are asked whether a source is surprising, the answer must deal with the issue of surprise. Giving a direct answer to the question, rather than writing about the sources without a proper focus, is always the best approach.

## **General comments**

Many good responses to the nineteenth and twentieth century options were seen, showing a good level of comprehension of the sources, sound contextual knowledge, and positive answers to each of the questions. Some less successful responses, particularly on the nineteenth century option, were variously incomplete, answered questions from both options, very brief or repeated the content of the sources.

The questions that candidates answered particularly well were those where the use of source content taken at face value could achieve a good level of reward. So, comparison of source content, for example, was done effectively. Most candidates produced a sound response to the final question, part (e), where source content has to be related to a given hypothesis. However, for many candidates, source evaluation, and the whole idea of how a source can be used as evidence, rather than just as information, could be improved.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Option A: Nineteenth century topic***

#### **Question 1**

- (a) The sources offered several points both of agreement and disagreement, and most candidates were able to spot at least one, perhaps the agreement that Moltke was undermining Bethmann's efforts to avoid war, or the disagreement over whether or not Germany needed to fear Russia. There was also an overall summative disagreement between the two sources which a few answers noted, with Russia being seen as the threat or aggressor in Source A, but Germany being portrayed in this way in Source B.

- (b) For most candidates, the issue of whether Sukhomlinov could be trusted was determined on the basis of whether Sources C and D agreed with each other (i.e. over Sukhomlinov not wanting war) or disagreed (i.e. over Russia wanting war in Source C but not in Source D). In the first instance, the agreement meant he could be trusted, and in the second, the contradiction meant he could not. What these answers missed were the very good reasons both Sukhomlinov and Sazonov had for not telling the truth. Both sources came from accounts written after the war, and both authors had the possible purpose of wanting to exonerate themselves from any responsibility for helping to cause it. The provenance details given with Source C invited a questioning of Sukhomlinov's account, but only a small number of candidates used this approach.
- (c) This question was answered well by many candidates, whose contextual knowledge helped them make sense of the elements of the cartoon. Indeed, without contextual knowledge answers tended to be descriptions of what the cartoon showed. Some answers based on valid interpretation were limited to comments about Russia wanting to take advantage of the dispute between Austria and Serbia, but better ones brought in Germany too as an element to be explained. The cartoonist's critical view of Russia as a greedy opportunist likely to cause a wider conflict was picked up on by a small number of candidates.
- (d) Most answers were limited to a judgement based on the provenance of Source F alone, or on the information stated in the source. A small number of stronger responses questioned the accuracy of the information - the source being a transparent attempt to justify both German and Austrian actions. In these responses, attempts were made to explain the utility of the source as evidence, as opposed to information.
- (e) Candidates who understood the sources did not have difficulty in using them to test the idea of whether or not Russia was to blame for the First World War. The task was to identify particular aspects of the sources that suggested Russia was, or was not, to blame; that is, there had to be use of source content to explain the answer. Better candidates could show that there was some evidence in the sources both to support and to question the hypothesis, or indeed that some individual sources contained material that could be used both as confirmation and disconfirmation, when taken at face value or if evaluated. With weaker responses, it was sometimes difficult to ascertain which side of the hypothesis was being tested, as the source use lacked focus, with the inclusion of material that was not directly relevant to the requirements of the question.

**Option B: Twentieth century topic**

**Question 2**

- (a) There was much material in the two sources that could be matched for agreement and disagreement, and most answers included examples of both. The one area that caused difficulties was in comparing what the sources said about the impact of the Tet Offensive on domestic opinion in the USA. On this the sources disagreed, with Source A suggesting that it destroyed support for the war, and Source B saying it had little impact, if anything increasing support. Some less successful answers thought that Source B reached the same judgement as Source A.
- (b) The key to providing a plausible reason for the publication of the cartoon was to successfully interpret it first. There were misinterpretations, based either on the idea that the cartoon was genuinely showing a victory for the US, or that it was a cartoon favourable to the US government and was trying to win support for the war. Valid responses appreciated that the cartoon was about Tet and was critical about what had happened. This could be understanding the absurdity of the claim being made by the US official, but better was to see that the cartoon was accusing the US government of not telling the truth and engaging in a cover-up. These kinds of messages could provide valid reasons for publication. Other reasons could be based on context, but this needed to be specific to the situation in early 1968, or on the cartoonist's intended impact on the audience, such as encouraging support for the emerging anti-war movement.
- (c) Sources D and E contained both agreements and disagreements, and for most candidates, surprise was judged on the basis that disagreement was surprising and agreement not. However, there was another way to view these comparisons, and to provide a logical explanation. For example, the successes of the Communists described in Source D might make it unsurprising that Johnson would seek peace in Source E or decide not to stand for re-election. Similarly, the failures of the Communists in Source D would make it surprising that Johnson should be choosing not to fight on determinedly. Much the same argument could be made on the basis of Source E alone,

since this contained the internal contradiction of Johnson claiming victory in Tet whilst seeking peace, but this would have ignored the demand of the question to use both sources in the answer. The best answers sought to cast some light on the apparent contradictions by evaluating one or other of the sources. Here, Johnson putting a positive spin on Tet could be seen as a way of trying to reassure or placate the American people whilst trying to extricate himself and the United States from the Vietnam conflict, thereby rendering Source E less surprising.

- (d) Few answers saw the source as historical evidence, rather than simply as information. Most answers said that Source F was useful for what it said about the impact of Tet, and very often these answers added that the utility of this was heightened by the fact that Westmoreland had been in Vietnam, so had first-hand information. A slightly better approach from candidates was to doubt the source on the basis of the provenance. Westmoreland had been removed from command after Tet. Was it likely, then, that he would be a neutral observer of events, and in particular neutral in his opinions of the man who removed him? Alternatively, since he was in command at the time of Tet, would he be critical of the army, or indeed of himself? Candidates who had these kinds of doubts were often able to take them a little further and speculate about Westmoreland's purpose in representing Tet as a failure for the Communists, and for being critical of President Johnson, thereby reaching an informed judgement about the source's utility.
- (e) A small number of answers misunderstood the hypothesis as meaning a failure for the United States and struggled to use the sources effectively. Otherwise, most answers successfully used the sources to both support and question the hypothesis. This was a set of sources in which almost all could be used individually both as confirmation and disconfirmation, which many answers did. It is also acceptable both to use a source at face value, and then to question it through evaluating its reliability. Some answers would have been improved by keeping a strong focus on the process of stating the source content that is seen as offering support or challenge. There were some responses that grouped sources together and made claims about them as a group. These claims needed to be valid about all the sources in the group. Better responses tended to deal with the sources singly.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/22</b> <b>Document Questions</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- Candidates should not write their answers before they are properly ready. They need to take time to think about the source – what point is it trying to make, who wrote or drew it and why? They should only move to the question once they think they understand the source. They should then spend some time thinking about the question and deciding what the answer is going to be. They should start writing the answer once they have decided what it is going to say.
- Candidates need to directly address the question in the opening sentence of the answer. They should be able to do this if they have thought carefully about the source and the question. This is particularly important in questions that ask if sources are surprising or wrong. Doing this will also help to give a shape and direction to the rest of the answer.
- When using a quotation from a source, it should be written out in full, and not abbreviated. Often, abbreviated quotations do not make the point that the candidate wanted to make.
- When comparing sources, candidates need to ensure that they produce clear and specific comparisons. They should not just summarise each source.
- Sources should not be used simply as straightforward and simple providers of information. Many of the sources need to be thought about carefully – what is the author or artist's purpose? What is the main point they are trying to make? What is their audience? Do they have reason to mislead this audience? But it is worth remembering that, if they do have a purpose or if they are biased, what they have to say will still be of use to the historian (and to the candidate).
- When answering **Question (e)**, it is important to use the content of the sources to support the answer and to test the hypothesis in the question, rather than a variant of it.

## General comments

A large majority of candidates answered the questions on the twentieth century option. Across the options there were significant numbers of answers where candidates provided mainly contextual knowledge, simplistic readings of sources and little interrogation and evaluation of sources. However, there were also many outstanding answers, particularly in the twentieth century option, where candidates showed a mature understanding of sources, an ability to evaluate them and use them to produce clear and direct answers to the questions.

The contextual knowledge of candidates on both options was strong, although a few confused the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban Missile Crisis. The contextual knowledge of some candidates proved a hindrance when it dominated answers and pushed them away from the main thrust of the question. The correct roles of contextual knowledge are to help candidates make sense of, and evaluate sources, and to support arguments being made in answers.

An important factor that distinguished weak answers from better ones was their tendency to be based on straightforward and simple readings of sources. Better answers read sources more subtly. Instead of reading sources at a surface level, they made inferences. They also made more use of purpose to evaluate sources. Whether it be a cartoon, a speech or a newspaper article, it is always worth considering the following question: 'What was the author or artist up to?'

The other key characteristic of better answers was that they provided a clear answer to the question. For example, if a question asked about whether or not a source is surprising, they reached and supported a clear conclusion about that issue. If a question asked about whether two cartoons agreed or not, they produced

clear comparisons using the two sources together, all the way through the answer. Finally, in **Question (e)**, they tested the hypothesis named in the question, rather than a variant of it.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Option A: Nineteenth century topic***

##### **Question 1**

- (a) Most candidates were able to find and explain some agreements and disagreements. Agreements can be stated simply, for example 'Both sources state that a larger German navy was seen as a threat by Britain.' Disagreements need to be explained more fully, for example 'In Source A William wanted Britain as a friend and thought that building a large navy would help, but in Source B he wanted a large navy to make Germany a great power.' The weakest answers wrote about the two sources but neglected to make any point-by-point comparison. The strongest answers went beyond the details in the sources and compared the overall messages of the two sources. Source A clearly blames Britain for the rivalry between the two countries, while Source B puts most of the blame on Germany. Top level answers needed to be supported from the sources. The candidates also needed to make clear that they were writing about the overall messages and not just making another comparison. This can be done by either clearly stating that the comparison being made was of the big or overall messages, or by only making this overall comparison and not attempting any comparisons of detail.
- (b) A good number of candidates were able to make valid comparisons of the messages of the two cartoons, for example many suggested that in both sources Britain considered that it ruled the seas. A few candidates went beyond this by comparing the points of view of the two cartoonists. Source C approves of the fact that Britain is in control, whereas Source D does not approve and regards Britain as arrogant. Whichever of these types of answers candidates gave, it was important that they used details in the cartoons to support their answers, for example 'In Source C the cartoonist seems to support the idea that Britain should continue to rule the oceans by saying that money was no object. This suggests it was so important that Britain was ready to spend any amount. But in Source D, Britain is shown as selfish, smug and arrogant, and greedily claiming that the ocean belongs only to Britain. This means that the cartoonist does not think Britain has a right to own the seas.' Less successful answers demonstrated some understanding of one or both cartoons but were unable to make any valid comparison. A very small number of candidates struggled to make any sense of the cartoons.
- (c) A number of candidates struggled with this question and were only able to give a sub-message of the source as a reason why it was published, for example 'It was published to tell people that Germany was against disarmament.' Other candidates explained the context of the naval race and suggested this as the reason for publication, without any further explanation. Both types of answers missed the fact that the source is about the Hague Conference. Better answers did focus on the Conference and stated that the report was blaming Germany for its failure. A very small number of candidates considered purpose. If more candidates had considered purpose they could, for example, have suggested that it was published to justify Britain building more warships (Britain had begun building dreadnoughts in the previous year).
- (d) These two sources show different attitudes from William. In Source F, he demonstrates an aggressive attitude towards Britain and appears to be ready to go to war while in Source G, he claims he wants to be on good terms with Britain and in favour of peace. They also agree about some important points, for example William does want to expand the German navy. A good number of candidates managed to provide reasonable answers by using the differences in attitude as a reason for F making G surprising. More could have gone on to explain how the sources also agree. It was rare to find candidates who realised that evaluation could be used to develop their answers. Knowledge of the international context could have been used to consider whether any of the attitudes attributed to William were surprising, while William's purpose in Source G could also have been used. A number of candidates demonstrated some understanding of the sources but did not make any statement about whether they were surprised by Source G.
- (e) A reasonable number of candidates were able to find some sources that supported the hypothesis and others that disagreed with it. These candidates were not all able to use the content of the sources as support. To answer **Question (e)** successfully, candidates need to do the following



things: (i) make it clear which side of the argument they are using a source for, (ii) make it clear by source letter which source they are referring to, (iii) support their answer by using either a quotation that in itself does the job required and relates exactly to the hypothesis, for example 'Source A supports the idea that Britain was to blame because it says that it 'worsened relations with Germany by starting to build the first dreadnought' ', or by providing some explanation of how a source does or does not support the hypothesis, for example 'Source E disagrees. It suggests Germany was to blame because it explains how it had argued against disarmament at the Hague Conference and had encouraged countries to start building up their forces and prepare for war.' Other responses either neglected to refer to the sources at all or grouped them into two groups but then made general assertions about each group, without referring to individual sources.

**Option B: Twentieth century topic**

**Question 2**

- (a) Sources A and B gave candidates a good number of agreements and disagreements to use in their answers. For example, the sources agree that the whole episode was a fiasco, that Kennedy wanted to hide US involvement and that cancelling the second air strike was an error. On the other hand, the sources disagree about the effectiveness of the air strike, the reasons for the cancellation of the second air strike and the numbers killed. Most candidates were able to explain both agreements and disagreements.

It is important that candidates know how to organise and present comparisons. A number of candidates summarised one source and then the other one. This left their answers with no specific comparisons. Other answers appeared to be the result of candidates writing their answers before they were sure of what they wanted to say. This resulted in confused answers often trying to compare parts of the sources that were not matches. Better answers were the result of candidates carefully going through the sources and identifying agreements and disagreements before they started writing. For agreements, it was enough to identify the agreement, for example 'Both of these sources say that newspapers were reporting the planned invasion before it took place.' Disagreements need to be explained in rather more detail, for example 'Source A claims that Cuba controlled the skies but Source B says that it only had 8 planes left and so this was unlikely.' The best answers went beyond the details in the sources and compared the overall messages of the two sources. Although Source A does mention mistakes by Kennedy, its main message is that the CIA was to blame for the failure of the invasion. Source B, in contrast, clearly points the finger of blame at Kennedy. Top level answers needed to be supported from the sources. The candidates also needed to make clear that they were writing about the overall messages and not just making another comparison. This can be done by either clearly stating that the comparison being made was of the big or overall messages, or by only making this overall comparison and not attempting any comparisons of detail.

- (b) Most candidates managed to explain valid sub-messages of the cartoon, and a reasonable number went on to explain the point of view of the cartoonist. When explaining cartoons, it is important that candidates start with a detail in the cartoon. This cartoon contains many details that could be used, such as the Soviet tanks, the US planes and ships and the imprisonment of 'liberty'. It is crucial that candidates make inferences from these details and do not use them literally. Often, use of contextual knowledge can help to make these inferences, for example a good number of candidates knew that by 1961 relations between Cuba and the USSR were becoming closer or that there was a lot of criticism in the US about the regime in Cuba and about communist regimes more generally. Candidates needed to use these different elements to suggest what points the cartoonist wanted to make. For example, many candidates suggested that the inclusion of Soviet tanks was done to suggest that Cuba was under the control of the Soviet Union or dependent on it or was becoming a communist state, and therefore a danger to the US. Many candidates also focused on the imprisoned woman and explained that this represented a lack of freedom in Castro's Cuba or in communist countries more generally. Better answers managed to use the quotation from Kennedy and the pictorial elements in the cartoon together and explained that the cartoonist was claiming that although the invasion had not succeeded, the Cuban people would continue in their fight for freedom. The best answers made explicit statements about the point of view of the cartoon – either that it is critical of Castro and his regime or that it is supportive of the attempted invasion. These statements had to be clear and explicit. The weakest answers either misinterpreted the cartoon, for example by seeing it as pro-Castro, or described its surface features.

- (c) The starting point for a good answer to this question is the understanding that Source D is clearly placing the blame for the disaster with the CIA, while Source E blames Kennedy and his government. This requires a comparison of the two sources, including some reference to the final sentence of Source E, which is the only part of the source which focuses on the failure of the invasion. Answers that explained this disagreement and concluded that either Source D or Source E was therefore wrong, achieved good marks. Better answers realised that something more was required to properly establish whether Source D or Source E could be believed. In other words, one or both of the sources, needs to be evaluated. This consisted of making use of the many problematic elements of the nature of either of the sources, for example the role of Robert Kennedy, the promotion of Taylor, the fact that Source E was written by the CIA's official historian, the claims made about the committee and the report in Source E, or using other sources in the paper or contextual knowledge. Answers that made appropriate use of comparison of the sources and evaluated at least one of them were able to achieve higher marks. However, a good number of responses were unable to make the comparison between Sources D and E. Good points were often made about the two sources, but they needed to be brought together. Other candidates compared the sources in regard to issues about the committee but would have been improved by making the essential move of comparing what the two sources have to say about who was to blame for the failure of the Bay of Pigs. A small number of candidates carried out some relevant analysis of the sources but neglected to conclude on whether D was wrong.
- (d) Most candidates were able to at least use the context to explain why Kennedy made the speech. They referred to the fact that the speech was made while the attempted invasion was proceeding but failing, or explained that Kennedy was justifying his actions, criticising Castro or even communism more widely, or arguing that the struggle against communism should continue. These answers were completed competently. Better answers dug more deeply. They demonstrated an understanding that Kennedy's purpose was to distance himself from the disaster of the Bay of Pigs. This is made particularly clear when the date of the speech is taken into account – by 20 April it was clear that the attempted invasion had failed, and Kennedy was desperate not to be associated with it. A few candidates further improved their answers by suggesting a valid reason why Kennedy's audience was a group of newspaper editors.
- (e) The majority of candidates managed to use the sources to explain how they either supported or disagreed with the hypothesis. A substantial number of these went on to achieve better answers by doing both elements. However, a number of candidates were unable to do either support or disagreement. Some candidates understood what they had to do and made a choice of sources that could have led to good answers. The weakness of these answers is that they did not use the sources properly – they did not explain how they supported or did not support the hypothesis. Some just asserted that sources were on one side or another, while others produced very general explanations that did not relate to specific sources, for example 'Source E proves that Kennedy was to blame because it says he did not do his job properly and did not want to be blamed.' If done appropriately, this explanation would read as something closer to: 'Source E proves that Kennedy was to blame because it says 'the major causes for the failure were the actions, or inactions, of the Kennedy Administration, including the President.' ' To answer **Question (e)** successfully candidates need to do the following things: (i) make it clear which side of the argument they are using a source for, (ii) make it clear by source letter which source they are referring to, (iii) support their answer by using either a quotation that in itself does the job required and relates exactly to the hypothesis (as the quote above from Source E does), or by providing some explanation of how a source does or does not support the hypothesis, for example 'Source C does not show that Kennedy was to blame because it shows a Soviet tank which suggests that Cuba was able to defend itself because it had strong military support from the Soviet Union.' Other responses either neglected to refer to the sources at all or grouped them into two groups but then made general assertions about each group, without referring to individual sources.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/23</b> <b>Document Questions</b></p>
---

## 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 a range of perspectives. This understanding should then help in informing answers and in identifying opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. For example, if an answer did not address the reason why Nixon made the speech at that specific time in **Question 2 (b)**, the issue of agreement in **Question 2 (c)** or whether Source F proves Source G wrong in **Question 2 (d)**, only limited marks could be awarded. The most helpful strategy is for candidates to directly address the question in the very first sentence of their answer, for example, 'Source F does/does not prove that Source G is wrong because' or 'Nixon made this speech at this time because' or 'The cartoonists of Sources D and E would have agreed because they both are of the opinion that'.
- Avoiding descriptions of visual images and paraphrasing written sources is important. There is no requirement for candidates to write summaries of the sources before engaging with the question. It is their interpretation of the sources in the light of the specific question asked that is important.
- There were very few issues with candidates not using the time allowance effectively. All but a very small number of scripts included responses to all five questions. There were some very lengthy answers to **Question 2 (a)** and some rushed, short responses to **Question 2 (e)**.
- On **Question 2 (e)**, candidates must ensure that the sources are used as the basis of the answer. They should not write a general commentary using their own knowledge in response to the question asked. Candidates should engage with the content of each source and make it clear whether they are using it to agree or disagree with the given statement. They must explain **how** the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question. Candidates should also ensure they make it clear which source is under consideration by referring to it by its letter and by explicit reference to its content. This could be, for example, in the form of a quote or by relaying what can be seen in an image. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support **and** challenge the given hypothesis.
- If quotations from the sources are used, 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

The great 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 five questions. There were very few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both options. Candidates were able to effectively use the information provided by the sources, and whilst this was usually understood in context, instances of effective evaluation were uncommon. Candidates need to move away from literal readings of the sources. They should be considered as the product of the people who created them, with all the opinions, purposes, inclusions and omissions this inevitably involves. The level of contextual knowledge demonstrated in candidates' answers was sound. Some questions invite the use of knowledge more than others, and when appropriate many candidates were able to select relevant recalled information to use in their answers. This was particularly apparent on **Question 2 (b)**.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Option A: Nineteenth century topic**

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

**Option B: Twentieth century topic**

**Question 2**

- (a) This question asked candidates how far two sources agree, and most were able to identify agreements between them. For instance, the sources both agree that the size of the ARVN increased, the US troops were withdrawn in 1972 and the South could not be saved or was lost (once the US withdrew). The differences were fewer than the agreements and proved more difficult for candidates to pick out. However, a pleasing number were able to do this successfully, explaining, for example, that Source A suggests that Vietnamisation was a new idea, while Source B states that this was not the case, as it had been tried before in 1967. The best responses were able to compare the overarching 'big messages' of the two sources, that being that the author of Source A believes Vietnamisation could have been successful if given a chance, whereas the author of Source B argues that Vietnamisation was not successful. At this level, the comparison had to be based on the authors' opinions of Vietnamisation, rather than the Easter Offensive. It was also imperative that candidates made it clear that they recognised that this was the key message being relayed by each author (rather than the comparison being presented as one of several differences). Most responses were able to make a valid comparison of some sort and most avoided the time consuming and unnecessary approach of describing of each source in turn before addressing the question.
- (b) Overall, this question was answered well. Candidates were asked to explain why Nixon made this speech at this time, that time being November 1969. Questions such as this, that essentially ask why a source was produced, require three explanatory elements in the response. Firstly, it is necessary to consider the context in which the source was produced. Secondly, the message that the author, in this case Nixon, was trying to convey must be understood and thirdly, the purpose he had in relaying his message must be examined. There were a number of context only answers and these tended to include extensive information about the nature of the opposition to the Vietnam War in the US. Many candidates were also able to explain valid sub-messages or part of the big message; for example, that the US was withdrawing its troops, but this was not a sign of failure or reason for humiliation. Nixon's overall message, that his plan for Vietnamisation is a success, was not recognised by many candidates. However, more understood his purpose in making the speech, that being to win support for his policy of Vietnamisation. Candidates that could explain this in the context of the US opposition to the War, produced the strongest answers.
- (c) **Question 2 (c)** produced a wide range of responses. This question asked how far two cartoonists would have agreed and, in order to arrive at a conclusion about agreement, an understanding of the cartoons was necessary. The cartoons proved a challenge for some candidates, and there was some misinterpretation of the sources, particularly of Source D, where candidates accepted the source at face value and argued that the US was successfully aiding the army of South Vietnam and that it was 'getting better' every day. Some candidates, however, were able to pick out valid messages from one, or both of the sources. For example, in Source D, Vietnamisation is not working, the army of South Vietnam is not getting stronger, and the US is supporting South Vietnam. In Source E, Nixon hopes Vietnamisation will solve his problems over Vietnam. He is also claiming that the situation is under control. While some responses were able to make valid comparisons of the messages of the cartoons, for example they both show that Vietnamisation was not working, the best answers looked towards the cartoonists' opinions and based their answer on a comparison of these. In this case, the cartoonists agree about the failure of Vietnamisation and are critical of it as a policy; few responses recognised this overall comparison of the cartoonists' point of views. In some instances, candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of firstly Source D and then Source E. This approach was not needed. Indeed, a more effective strategy is to begin by looking for a point about which the cartoons agree or disagree and to make this the focus of the answer.
- (d) On **Question 2 (d)**, candidates were asked to consider two written sources and conclude whether the claims made by the Vietcong in Source F prove that what the ARVN officer reports in Source G is wrong. A large majority of candidates could identify points of disagreement between the two sources and use this to support a conclusion about whether Source F proves Source G wrong or not. For example, Source F claims that the ARVN was panicking, beaten and unable to fight, while Source G describes the ARVN as resisting with determination and emerging stronger than ever. Some candidates recognised the one point of agreement, that in both sources, the Offensive was a challenge for the South. What was crucial was that the conclusion was consistent with the agreement or disagreement; if an answer was based on agreements, then Source F was not

proving Source G wrong; if the answer was based on disagreements, then Source F was proving Source G wrong. Some candidates confused this. To produce the strongest answers to this question, candidates needed to evaluate one, or both, sources. This could then lead to a shift in a candidate's overall opinion in answer to the question. Some responses recognised that the provenance of the sources and/or purpose of the authors were relevant, and used this to argue that Source F cannot prove Source G wrong. The use of contextual knowledge or cross referencing to other sources to effectively question the validity of these sources would have improved a number of responses.

- (e) 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, D, E and F) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that Vietnamisation failed, while others (A, C and G) argue that Vietnamisation did not fail. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. In some less successful responses, candidates neglected to make it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question 2 (e)** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement. Candidates can 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. They could do this by selecting an appropriate quote from a written source or by referring to the messages of cartoons. An example of this could be, 'Source B agrees with the view that Vietnamisation failed as it states that 'When the last American combat soldier left Vietnam in 1972, there was little chance that the ARVN would be able to hold on to the South.'" One other feature of responses to mention is the grouping of the sources. It is advisable to always examine the sources on this question one by one, as any comment about a group must be valid for every source in the group. Candidates must also ensure that they use full quotes in their answers. Some used an ellipsis, with the words included not making sense in isolation.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/03</b> <b>Coursework</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

In coursework, candidates are required to assess historical significance. The title used is crucial. It should explicitly require candidates to assess significance, for example 'Assess the significance of Stresemann for Germany.'

It is important that causation titles are not used, for example 'How far was the Depression the most important reason why Hitler came to power?'

Significance needs to be assessed, rather than just described or explained. Candidates should use argument and counterargument and then reach a conclusion. Rather than explaining why other factors were significant, they should keep the focus on the factor named in the title.

A range of criteria should be used to assess significance, for example political, social, short term and long term. It is also useful to consider the significance of a person, event, place or development from different perspectives, for example significance for different groups.

Lengthy introductions or background descriptions that do not contribute to an assessment of significance are not required.

## **General comments**

The overall standard of coursework was high. Most candidates understood what they had to do and managed to focus their work on significance. Only a small number of the titles used did not allow candidates to assess significance in an appropriate way. Candidates generally kept within the word limit. Most of the work was carefully marked. Nearly all centres completed and enclosed the relevant paperwork, with the correct sample of candidates' work.

## **Comments on specific questions**

Most of the titles used were appropriate and were set on one of the Depth Studies from the syllabus, avoiding the Core Content. Germany was by far the most popular Depth Study, followed by Russia and the United States. A few centres set work on a Depth Study they themselves had devised, which allowed them to cover events in their countries.

The titles that worked best were worded in such a way that candidates were given opportunities to assess significance. It is important that the word 'significant' appears in the title. This increases the chance that candidates will focus on it. It also helped when titles were worded in a way that made clear that assessment of significance, and not just explanation, was required. This was usually achieved by the use of terms in the title such as 'assess' and 'how significant'.

The choice of topic was important. What might be called 'medium' sized topics worked best, such as Stresemann or the NEP. Larger topics such as Hitler or Stalin sometimes overwhelmed candidates and made it difficult for them to organise and manage their answers. It is also rather difficult to generate a debate about whether a figure like Hitler was significant.

Titles that pushed candidates towards causation answers did not work as well. A title such as 'How far was the Tsar the most important cause of his downfall?' encourages candidates to examine and compare a range of causes, rather than produce a rounded assessment of the historical significance of one factor. It is also

important to use the wording of the title to keep it open. A title such as 'Assess the significance of corruption in the failure of Prohibition' is too narrow and will probably lead to candidates examining a range of reasons for the failure. A title such as 'Assess the significance of Prohibition for the USA' would work much better. Using the words 'for the USA' at the end of the title leaves it open and allows candidates to consider significance in different ways and from different perspectives.

Titles that worked well included:

Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch for Germany

To what extent were Stalin's Purges significant?

Assess the significance of the 1932 American presidential election.

The best answers were those that focused on the assessment of significance all the way through. These answers avoided long and detailed introductions. They also avoided descriptive and chronological accounts of events. The very best answers kept their focus on the assessment of significance, rather than on just explanation. This was done in a number of different ways, but these answers had one thing in common – they not only explained the impact of the event, development or individual – they also assessed how much this impact mattered in different ways and for different groups. In some answers this was achieved by considering the situation before and after, for example an event or an individual, and by assessing how much change it brought about and how far this change mattered at the time and later. This allowed candidates to consider how this change impacted on different groups or in different ways, for example social, political or economic.

Some candidates started by setting out clear criteria, which they then used to make a series of assessments of their chosen subject. This enabled them to reach conclusions about how far their subject was more significant in some ways than in others, or more significant in one part of the country than another, or more significant at one time than another. Many of the most successful answers used argument and counterargument. This ensured that they did not just explain why their subject was significant, but went further, and assessed its significance.

There was tendency for some candidates to assume that success and significance were the same thing. This sometimes led them to simply explain how a policy or individual was successful and then assert that it was therefore significant. Better answers considered whether the success mattered and for whom. Some centres used the interesting approach of directly tackling this issue by using a title that asked candidates to assess the significance of a failure.

The best answers all shared one key characteristic – they focused on the assessment of significance from the start to the end. Slightly less strong answers tended to spend much time explaining significance well, but they left the assessment to their conclusions at the end. A feature of some of the very good answers seen was that a conclusion was not needed because the views of the candidate were already clear, well-argued and well-supported before the end of the answer.

Nealy all coursework was marked in detail and with care. Many centres supplied marginal comments, as well as useful summative comments. The latter can be very useful when they sum up the overall qualities of the work, with references to the generic mark scheme. The marginal comments can be useful if they identify where in the answer the candidate is focusing on explaining or assessing significance. Most of the marking was completed with careful attention to the mark scheme. This should be used with a 'best-fit' approach. Candidates do not have to meet all the requirements of a level before an answer can be placed in that level. If an answer displays performance at a range of levels, the important question to ask is: which level does the candidate's coursework, taken as a whole, best match? Judgements about whether or not an answer has reached a certain level can only be made by considering the whole answer.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/41</b> <b>Alternative to Coursework</b></p>
--

## Key messages

Most candidates showed good understanding of the requirements of the examination. **Part (a)** questions gave candidates the opportunity to achieve marks through the recall and deployment of knowledge. To succeed it is important to note the precise dates and focus of the question. Candidates should construct a logical structure which, depending on the question, could be thematic or chronological, and provide accurate and detailed knowledge within this.

**Part (b)** questions were also generally well attempted. Many candidates were able to provide and support the different facets relating to the focus of the question. Some were also able to explain these impacts and come to a judgement as to which was the most important. Others wrote more generally and missed the focus of the question. It is therefore extremely important that candidates read the question carefully and take note of the start and end dates.

Some candidates struggled with time management. Writing very long answers to **part (a)** is not necessary, and in some cases appeared to lead to candidates having insufficient time to answer **part (b)** properly. Some candidates started with **part (b)** but then did not complete **part (a)**. Others did not follow the rubric and answered more than one question or mixed and matched answers from more than one question. Candidates must answer both **parts (a)** and **(b)** from the same one question.

## General comments

The most popular Depth Studies were Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45, Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41 and Depth Study D: The United States, 1919-41. There were a limited number of responses for Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18. Only a very small number of candidates attempted Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939-c. 1945. Most candidates demonstrated strong knowledge of their chosen study.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **Question 1**

- (a) This question required candidates to write an account of the battle of Jutland. Successful responses were able to provide a logical chronological structure outlining the most important events, including actions of Admiral Scheer in wanting to lure the Royal Navy from its base and ending with Britain retaining control of the North Sea and blockading German ports.
- (b) This question focused on the war at sea and its different impacts. Successful responses were able to show how the war at sea had economic impacts, as it caused both Britain and Germany to suffer food shortages; military impacts, as new forms of warfare such as Q ships and the convoy system were developed; social impacts, for example non-combatants being targeted from the sea, and strategic impacts, as the USA is drawn closer to the Allies through incidents such as the sinking of the Lusitania. Some candidates saw the Lusitania incident as the cause of the USA's entry into the war, even though it happened in 1915 and the USA did not enter the war until years later. Some also went on to outline other reasons for the US entry, which lacked focus on the question.

**Question 2** produced too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.



### Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

#### Question 3

- (a) This was a popular question. Successful responses were able to outline with some detail Germany's economy from 1919 to 1923. The focus had to be specifically on the economy. Successful responses referred to war debt and the development of first inflation and then hyperinflation during the period, as well as the loss of industry to other countries. A logical finish was to point out how Stresemann ended hyperinflation in 1923 by burning the useless marks and introducing the Rentenmark. Some candidates included material from after 1923, which lacked relevance to the question. It is important that the chronological parameters of the question are adhered to.
- (b) The focus of this part (b) question was on the impact of the occupation of the Ruhr in 1923. It was the impact of this specific event which needed to be addressed. Successful responses were able to identify different facets, for example: the economic impact as more money was printed, leading to hyperinflation; the social impact, as many Germans began to resent the government because of the conditions they now found themselves in; and the political impact, as the government began to lose the support of the people, who began to turn to more extreme parties. Such accounts might also mention the attempts at revolution by groups from the right and left wing. Less successful responses confused the occupation of the Ruhr with the later occupation of the Rhineland by Hitler. A number of candidates wrote long descriptions of the Munich Putsch, which did not add anything to their answers.

#### Question 4

- (a) This question required candidates to write specifically about the Hitler Youth. Successful accounts included reference to the different roles of boys and girls within the Hitler Youth Groups and the different activities they took part in. General references to Nazi treatment of women and lengthy descriptions of life in Nazi schools did not fully address the question.
- (b) Successful responses were able to choose different facets which showed the importance of young people Nazi Germany. Examples included showing their importance as the future army for Nazi Germany and their importance to Nazi racial ideology, as the continuation of the Third Reich. More general descriptions of life in Nazi Germany neglected to fully address the question.

### Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

#### Question 5

- (a) This question asked candidates to write about Stalin's rise to power. The end date was 1929, which is when he achieved control in Russia. The expectation was for the material on Stalin's rise to be drawn from 1924 (death of Lenin) to 1929. Some candidates wrote about Lenin in power before 1924, often outlining his role in introducing the NEP, or continued beyond 1929 and discussed the Purges and introduction of the Five-Year Plans. Successful responses were able to give an account which included the methods by which Stalin was able to remove Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, and so was able take control.
- (b) In answer to this question many candidates provided a lot of background material outlining Lenin's achievements, rather than showing the impact of his death, for example on the development of the Communist Party. Some also went forward in time and wrote about Stalin's actions in introducing Collectivisation and the Five-Year Plans. More focused discussions showed how Lenin's death was important in different ways, for example in the emergence of factions, and to the Party leaders, as it allowed Stalin to eventually remove them from the Party.

Question 6 produced too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.

### Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

#### Question 7

- (a) There were some very good responses to this question, including such policies as low taxation, laissez-faire and protectionism in the account. However, some candidates would have benefited

from a greater understanding of the term 'policies'. These candidates tended to write more general responses focusing more on the economic boom. Prohibition was often seen as an economic policy, with some descriptions of its general impact on society.

- (b) Many responses to this question took the form of narratives of the period. These responses would have been improved by identifying some specific facets. Some believed that the car assembly line did not require people to carry out tasks and created unemployment, whereas in reality it provided employment for many unskilled workers. Successful responses were able to show different impacts such as the economic impact, as the assembly line improved efficiency and increased profits, and the social impact, as more people were employed, helping to spread the boom.

#### Question 8

- (a) There were many very good accounts of the case of Sacco and Vanzetti, with many candidates displaying in-depth knowledge of the case. Some candidates were confused about the politics surrounding the case; they were anarchists rather than communists, and some thought that the men were guilty of the crime they were accused of.
- (b) This question required candidates to look at the different impacts of immigration on the USA during the 1920s. The answer needed to be focused specifically on immigration rather than addressing other factors. Successful candidates were able to show the political impact of immigration and how this encouraged repressive laws setting limits on people arriving from certain countries; the social impact, and the rising intolerance of Americans to new immigrants and the growing fear of communism from Eastern Europe; the economic impact, as immigrants took low paid jobs, for example. Some candidates showed a good knowledge of the period but wrote about causes of immigration, rather than its impact on the USA. There was also some confusion over which groups could be seen as immigrants and black Americans were included in some responses, with some candidates writing about their treatment during the period.

#### Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939–c. 1945

Questions 9 and 10 produced too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/42</b> <b>Alternative to Coursework</b></p>
--

## Key messages

Responses to **part (a)** require a logically sequenced account of a specific event, development or time period and **part (b)** responses require an extended answer that explains the importance or impact of multiple facets of a discussion. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

## General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. A significant number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia – Pacific, 1939–c.1945 for any meaningful comments to be made.

Good responses to **part (a)** of the question gave logically sequenced accounts with in-depth contextual knowledge and precise examples to support the descriptions. The very best answers tended to be thematic or chronological in approach. Less successful answers often lacked specific contextual knowledge of the event, development or time period or missed the chronological parameters of the question. Good responses to **part (b)** questions explored more than one facet of the discussion and used well-selected examples to support explanations and judgements. Less successful answers often provided only general material on the topic or struggled to fully focus on the discussion posed in the question. Many candidates were able to provide more than one facet of the given discussion but would have improved their responses by properly explaining the impact or importance in sufficient depth or detail. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both of the questions from the Depth Study choices or multiple Depth Studies. Candidates must read the questions carefully before answering and ensure that responses keep within the time period.

## Comments on specific questions

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

**Question 1** was the more popular choice this session, although a number of candidates opted for **Question 2**.

**Question 1** was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates were generally able to provide a well sequenced account of the race to the sea. Most candidates understood that this began after Germany's retreat at the Battle of the Marne and the subsequent digging in of both sides, which resulted in the creation of a trench system in the Western theatre of the war. The best answers gave an in-depth chronological account up to the First Battle of Ypres and the resulting stalemate. Weaker responses either misinterpreted the meaning of the term 'race to the sea' and examined aspects of the war at sea or wrote accounts that went outside of the chronological parameters of the question.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to identify and describe more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of the Battle of the Marne in 1914. Most candidates were able to provide accurate material about the battle and its outcome and consider military and strategic facets of the discussion, such as the resulting trench system which was created due to the German retreat, and the subsequent race to the sea. A small number of good responses also considered the importance of the Battle to Allied morale or the importance it had on German tactics on the Western Front as the Schlieffen Plan failed in its aims. Weaker responses sometimes confused the Battle of the Marne with the Battle of Mons or had little knowledge of the Battle of the Marne, and often included a narrative of the early stages of the war on the Western Front instead.

**Question 2** produced mixed responses. In **part (a)**, some candidates were able to give reasonably detailed accounts of the development of unrestricted submarine warfare. Many logically started by examining the first wave of this tactic in 1915, its pause in 1916 after the sinking of the *Lusitania* and the fears of a US entry into the war, and the relaunching of the tactic in 1917 after the German failure to secure victory on the Western Front. The best responses also finished their accounts by considering some of the impacts of unrestricted submarine warfare on Britain, which was close to starvation by April 1917 and introduced rationing in 1918. Some accounts also included valid material on attempts by the Allies to counter the policy of unrestricted submarine warfare by introducing new tactics in the war at sea such as Q-ships and later the convoy system. Less successful responses would have benefited from a clearer chronology of events or more knowledge about the policy in order to give enough detail in their accounts.

In **part (b)**, a few candidates were able to engage with the question which wanted the discussion to consider the extent to which the introduction of the convoy system was a turning point in the war at sea. Good responses considered the argument that it was because the convoy system effectively minimised the impact of the attempts by the Germans to starve the Allies out of the war and led to the failure of the unrestricted submarine warfare policy. A few candidates also mentioned that the convoy system was also used to protect the 'sea lanes' in other bodies of water other than the Atlantic Ocean. Many candidates then considered alternative arguments about which events or tactics were a more significant turning point such as the Battle of Jutland or the sinking of the *Lusitania* which increased US support for the Allies in the Atlantic 'sea lanes'. This style of discussion which considers the extent to which a particular event is a turning point requires a different structure of answer and more closely resembles questions in the legacy paper. However, it is vitally important that candidates remain focused on the war at sea and not the war in general which was a mistake made by a number of candidates this session.

### **Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45**

Both **Question 3** and **Question 4** proved popular choices among candidates.

**Question 3** was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates often gave very detailed and well sequenced, chronological accounts of the Spartacist Uprising, with many answers providing great detail. The best answers considered the starting point and background to the attempted coup, its leadership and ideological aims, a few mentioning the catalyst of the protest being the dismissal of Berlin's chief of police. This was then followed by details of the violence, the seizing of newspaper buildings and printing companies and Ebert's subsequent deal with the army and Freikorps to crush the uprising, resulting in the deaths of its leaders in extrajudicial executions. Accounts were then completed by mentioning how the National Assembly elections were then able to take place later in January and also by how other far left uprisings took place in Bavaria in April 1919 and the Ruhr in 1920, having been inspired by the Spartacists. Weaker responses often confused the Spartacists with other groups including the Freikorps, confused left and right-wing coups or believed the Spartacists were protesting the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, which was not signed until June 1919.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one or more facet of the impact of political disorder in Weimar Germany between 1919 and 1923. Most commonly, candidates discussed the social and political impacts of disorder and explained how it led to attempted uprisings of both the far left and the far right, saw an increase in popular antisemitism, resentment towards the Weimar government and its politicians, and highlighted to some how many in the establishment gave passive support to the uprisings, especially those on the right. A few candidates also considered the military impact, particularly how the military supported the suppression of left-wing coups but failed to support the crushing of the Kapp Putsch in 1920. The best answers explained arguments and reached valid conclusions and judgements about which facet of the discussion had the greatest impact on Weimar Germany. Weaker responses tended to discuss the causes of political disorder, rather than discussing its impact. This included many detailed accounts of the causes of the different putsches and the causes of hyperinflation, which was not what the question was asking candidates to discuss.

**Question 4** was also generally well answered by candidates. In **part (a)**, the stronger accounts organised their descriptions either chronologically or thematically and included some good knowledge of Himmler's role in Nazi Germany. Many candidates were able to give detailed accounts of his leadership of the SS and later all German police and his role in events such as the Night of the Long Knives, the drafting of racial, antisemitic and eugenics laws in Germany, the running of the concentration camp system, the crushing of political enemies of the Nazi regime and the role of the SS and Einsatzgruppen in the persecution and extermination of Nazi racial enemies during the Final Solution. Weaker responses confused Himmler with

Goebbels and gave accounts on the use of propaganda in Nazi Germany. Some candidates examined Himmler's role during the Weimar period more than during Nazi rule, which often led to a lack of detail.

**Part (b)** responses were generally strong and saw candidates able to identify more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of the SS to Nazi rule. Most candidates were able to discuss the SS's importance in crushing political opposition in Germany and how they oversaw the running of the concentration camp system. Some candidates also explored the importance of the SS militarily, by discussing the Waffen-SS military units or considering the importance of specific parts of the SS, such as the Gestapo or SD, in maintaining security in the Third Reich. A few of the best answers also discussed how the SS were important from an ideological viewpoint in carrying out the racial aims of the Nazi Party leadership, such as the Lebensborn Programme. These candidates were able to draw together valid judgements on which facet was the most important to Nazi rule. Other responses often confused the SS and SA which, by 1933–34, were often competing organisations of the Nazi Party, albeit that the SS was officially part of the SA. This led to material in responses which was lacking in accuracy and relevance.

### Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Both questions were attempted, although **Question 5** was answered by the greater number of candidates.

**Question 5** was sometimes well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a sequenced account of the revolution of March 1917 by examining the background causes such as the military defeats in the war and the socio-economic issues faced by Russia by the end of 1916 and then examining the details of the revolution, as it grew in the major cities. Most candidates opted to then complete the account by detailing the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II and the establishment of Dual Power in Petrograd. The best accounts were full of well selected examples and often included detailed figures and precise dates. Weaker responses sometimes confused the March Revolution with either the Revolution in 1905 or the November seizure of power by Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

In **part (b)**, responses were generally stronger. Most candidates were able to cite one or more facets of the discussion and provide some explanation or detailed description of how military defeats in the first World War were important to Russia. Most good responses opted to discuss the political impact these defeats had and considered how they led to the eventual abdication of the Tsar and increase in support for either liberal or left-wing political parties. Some candidates also considered the impact the defeats had on morale and others discussed the socio-economic impact by examining how the defeats led to increased demands for weapons, supplies and clothing on the frontlines, which fuelled inflation on the home front. Other responses often struggled to properly engage in the discussion and examined the problems in Russia during the First World War in general, rather than specifically the military defeats.

**Question 6** produced some very thorough accounts from some candidates for **part (a)**. The best accounts were able to give many details of the Russian Civil War, often approaching the account chronologically. These responses began by examining the origins of the conflict as the anti-Bolshevik forces opposed the Bolshevik government after the closing of the Constituent Assembly. This was then followed by some details on the forming of the Red Army by Trotsky, the positioning of the different White armies surrounding Bolshevik Russia, the use of propaganda and War Communism by Lenin, the defeats, one by one, of the White armies and finally the Kronstadt Rebellion and the implementation of the NEP. Weaker responses lacked detail and organisation and sometimes confused terms such as Reds and Whites, but on the whole, accounts tended to be good.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers, where candidates had discussed multiple facets of the impact of Lenin's Decrees. Most candidates considered the decrees on land, peace, workers and women. Some also discussed War Communism and the NEP. Whilst War Communism and the NEP did contain decrees as part of the policies, the policies as a whole were not decrees, as recognised by some candidates. Most candidates considered the social and economic impact of the decrees in their discussions and also the military and political impact of the decrees on peace, which led to the signing of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918. Less successful responses tended to be confused over the term 'decree' or spent more time than they needed to in discussing Lenin's April Theses.

### Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular topic. Both questions were chosen by candidates, but **Question 7** received more responses.

**Question 7** was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account which contained some of the most important details of the problems faced by farmers in the 1920s. The best accounts tended to sequence their accounts by theme and examined the problems caused by the end of the war and overproduction, the mechanisation of agriculture, the implementation of national Prohibition in the United States, foreign competition from Canada and Argentina and Republican tariffs. These accounts were detailed and often contained precise facts and figures to support. Weaker accounts lacked detail and were often very generalised and some spent much time considering the plight of the farmers in the 1930s and the Dust Bowls.

In **part (b)**, candidates were often able to give a multi-faceted response to the discussion on the impact of overproduction in agriculture in the 1920s. Good responses considered the economic impact it had on farmers by lowering prices, which led to foreclosures of farms, as well as the social impact such as unemployment and migration, with many candidates focusing on the black American sharecroppers in particular. A few candidates also considered the environmental impact on the soil which led to the Dust Bowl conditions of the 1930s, and even the political impact it had, with increased calls for interventionism from the government. Other responses lacked precision and often gave accounts of all the problems facing farmers, without engaging in the discussion on overproduction. Many cited causes of the overproduction, rather than its impact on the USA.

**Question 8** produced in **part (a)** many sequenced accounts of the measures taken by Roosevelt to help the unemployed. Some candidates took a chronological approach and examined the First, then the Second New Deal, whilst a few took a more thematic approach and considered the use of alphabet agencies and social reforms. The best accounts were able to provide detailed descriptions of the different work creation agencies such as the CCC, PWA, CWA and WPA, with a few mentioning the TVA and FERA as well. This was then followed by some detail on the Social Security Act, which provided unemployment insurance for a short period of time. Other responses tended to cite other, non-work creation agencies in their responses, such as the NRA or AAA and also the Emergency Banking Act, none of which were explicitly created to help the unemployed.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to give some very strong multi-faceted discussions about the impact of the Second New Deal. Most candidates opted to discuss the economic impact it had, particularly the job creation agency, the WPA, as well as the pensions introduced by the Social Security Act. Many also examined the social impact it had, with the recognition of trade unions in the Wagner Act. Some of the best answers also considered the political impact it had, particularly the increased scrutiny from conservatives, big business and the Supreme Court. Less successful responses tended to focus their discussion too much on aspects of the First New Deal, sometimes confusing agencies and reforms introduced between the First and Second New Deals. Other responses would have been improved by providing explanations of the impact it had, rather than detailed accounts of the reforms themselves.

#### **Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939–c.1945**

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

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/43</b> <b>Alternative to Coursework</b></p>
--

## Key messages

Responses to **part (a)** require a logically sequenced account of a specific event, development or time period and **part (b)** responses require an extended answer that explains the importance or impact of multiple facets of a discussion. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

## General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. A good number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia – Pacific, 1939–c.1945 for any meaningful comments to be made.

Good responses to **part (a)** of the question gave logically sequenced accounts with in-depth contextual knowledge and precise examples to support the descriptions. The very best answers tended to be thematic or chronological in approach. Less successful answers often lacked specific contextual knowledge of the event, development or time period or missed the chronological parameters of the question. Good responses to **part (b)** questions explored more than one facet of the discussion and used well-selected examples to support explanations and judgements. Less successful answers often provided only general material on the topic or struggled to fully focus on the discussion posed in the question. Many candidates were able to provide more than one facet of the given discussion but would have improved their responses by properly explaining the impact or importance in sufficient depth or detail. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both of the questions from the Depth Study choices or multiple Depth Studies. Candidates must read the questions carefully before answering and ensure that responses keep within the time period.

## Comments on specific questions

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

**Question 1** and **Question 2** received a number of responses.

**Question 1** responses varied in quality. In **part (a)**, some candidates were generally able to provide a well sequenced account of how countries recruited men into their armed forces in the First World War. The strongest accounts were able to provide a chronological description of how recruitment changed in Britain by examining the early volunteer army through to the introduction of conscription in 1916. Many also cited the use of propaganda and the White Feather campaign in their accounts as well. A few accounts also examined recruitment in other countries, notably Russia, Germany and France. Weaker accounts would have been improved by more specific knowledge on recruitment. These responses tended to be very generalised descriptions, and there was some confusion about when conscription was introduced in Britain.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to identify and describe more than one facet of the discussion on the impact of the war on women. Most candidates tended to focus on the impact on women on the British Home Front, although a few took a more generalised approach to the discussion. The best discussions considered the social impact of the war, including the changing attitudes towards women, and the economic impact of the war, particularly women's war work - especially in the munitions' factories. Some discussions also examined the political impact and explained how some women won the vote in 1918, as well as the military impact, such as the creation of various non-combat military organisations like the VAD. Less successful responses tended to be very generalised, lacking specific detail to engage fully in the discussion.

**Question 2** was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, many candidates were able to give strong accounts of the contribution of the United States to the fighting on the Western Front. Many accounts began by examining how the United States broke with isolationist policy in 1914 and stopped selling munitions to Germany and its allies and then, after the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915, the US government sent munitions, war supplies and loans to the Allies. Most accounts then gave some details of US entry into the war in 1917 and detailed their actions on the Western Front, such as the campaigns they fought in during the One Hundred Days Offensive. Chronological accounts were the best structured, with very few opting for a thematic approach with this question. Other responses would have benefited from greater detail and knowledge, in order to provide a strong account. A clearer chronology of events would also have helped.

In **part (b)**, a few candidates were able to engage with the question, which wanted the discussion to consider the importance of the sinking of the *Lusitania*. The best discussions considered more than one facet and explained importance, with some reaching a valid judgement, often in the conclusion. Most commonly, candidates examined the military importance of the sinking of the *Lusitania*, as it signalled the ending of the first wave of German unrestricted warfare and encouraged the Allies to develop stronger anti-submarine warfare tactics. Many candidates then went on to consider its importance in bringing the United States closer diplomatically to the Allies, with eventual US entry into the war in 1917. Some candidates also considered the importance of this event on Allied morale, as it led to increased anti-German feelings. Weaker responses tended to focus on only one facet of the discussion, with some confusing dates and events in overly generalised material.

### Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

**Question 3** was the more popular choice among candidates, with only a small number of candidates opting to answer **Question 4**.

**Question 3** was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates often gave very detailed and well sequenced, chronological accounts of the development of the Nazi Party to 1929. The best accounts were chronological and began with the early years of the Nazi Party, when Hitler first joined in 1919, the development of a 25-Point Programme in 1920 and Hitler's ascension as leader in 1921, along with the creation of the paramilitary SA. Most candidates then continued to give a description of the events of the Munich Putsch and its aftermath, and sometime a brief account of the lean years before the onset of the Depression. Many accounts were of excellent quality, with some impressive detail and examples. Other accounts tended to confuse the chronology of events and others went on to discuss events in the early 1930s, when the Nazi Party rose to power in Germany, which lacked relevance to this question.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and describe at least one facet of the discussion on the impact of the Great Depression on Germany, although many candidates were able to provide two or more, with some convincing explanations and judgements being formed. Good discussions considered the impact the Depression had on the economy, particularly its social impact such as high unemployment, homelessness and falling wages. It was also common to see facets on the impact the Depression had on Nazi Party popularity, as well as other extremist groups like the Communists. Many strong explanations were provided by candidates and some responses were able to reach a valid judgement on relative impact in the conclusion. Less successful responses were often descriptive or a narrative of the Depression era. They needed to try to explain impact convincingly, but often just provided generalised assertions or unsupported conjecture.

**Question 4** saw mixed responses from candidates. In **part (a)**, the stronger accounts generally organised their descriptions thematically and included some good knowledge of how the Nazis dealt with churches in Germany. Most accounts tended to focus on first the Catholic Church and the Concordat, then the Protestant churches, especially the Reich Church under Bishop Müller and finally how the Nazis dealt with some members of the Confessing Church. A few candidates also cited the creation of the German Faith Movement as an alternative to Christianity in Germany. Many other accounts would have benefited from being more detailed, specific and full, and from the inclusion of good contextual knowledge of how the Nazis dealt with the churches during their rule.

**Part (b)** responses generally struggled with focus and detail, but there were some outstanding scripts. The best answers engaged well with the discussion and compared two or more facts in their answers. Most commonly, candidates considered the political importance of the churches in Nazi Germany, particularly in terms of political opposition against the T-4 euthanasia programme and the Confessing Church's opposition to Nazi interference in religion. A small number of candidates also examined the ideological importance of



the churches in Nazi Germany, particularly the use of the Reich Church to promote Nazi values and ideology. Weaker responses were sometimes vague and lacked detail or focus on the question.

### Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Both questions were popular choices among candidates.

**Question 5** was sometimes well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a sequenced account of the events of Bloody Sunday. Most of these accounts began by examining the background causes of the Bloody Sunday incident such as the socio-economic issues faced by worker families, exacerbated by the Russo-Japanese War. Then accounts tended to give some impressive details of the demonstration led by Father Gapon and the resulting dispersion of the protestors by the palace guard. Most accounts ended with some description of how the protest led to further protests across Russia which culminated in the 1905 Revolution. Weaker responses lacked detail or spent much time describing the 1905 Revolution—some candidates viewed the Bloody Sunday incident and the revolution as the same event.

In **part (b)**, responses were generally stronger. Most candidates were able to cite one or more facets of the discussion and provide some explanation or detailed description of the impact of the 1905 Revolution on Russia. The best answers discussed facets such as the political impact on the Russian government and the proclamation of the October Manifesto and the appointment of Stolypin. Some candidates considered the economic impact of the 1905 Revolution and how the strikes incapacitated the economy in the cities and saw peasants seize land in the countryside. Weaker responses were generally accounts, rather than discussions with structured explanations on impact. A number focused on the causes of the 1905 Revolution, rather than its impact.

**Question 6** produced some very thorough accounts for **part (a)**. The best accounts were able to give many details of the issues facing the Provisional Government in a logically sequenced manner, either chronologically or thematically. Most accounts considered the issue of the continuation of the war first, followed by the political issues caused by the system of Dual Power with the Petrograd Soviet. Many candidates also described the land issue, the increasing antiwar sentiment after the failure of Summer Offensive and subsequent July Days. Most candidates finished their account by examining the consequences of the Kornilov Coup and the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in November 1917. Weaker accounts struggled with the chronology in 1917 and some confused the Provisional Government with the Petrograd Soviet.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers, where candidates had discussed multiple facets of the importance of the Petrograd Soviet between March and November 1917. These answers considered the importance politically of Soviet Order Number One and the shared power system with the Provisional Government and other facts, such as the socio-economic importance of the Petrograd Soviet in terms of its push for better wages, and the creation of workers' committees. Less successful responses struggled with the subject matter and chronology in organising their discussions; some of these focused almost entirely on the Bolshevik seizure of power, which, whilst linked to the Soviet, was more accurately a coup planned by Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders.

### Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

Both questions were chosen by candidates, but **Question 8** received a greater number of responses.

**Question 7** proved challenging for many candidates. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account which contained some of the most important details of the measures taken by Hoover to deal with the effects of the Depression. The best answers were able to chronologically sequence the measures from the tax cuts introduced in 1930, along with new tariffs, to the use of the Federal Farm Board to buy up surplus produce, and the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to provide loans to banks and businesses. However, many accounts would have been improved by more detail and examples.

In **part (b)**, candidates were sometimes able to give a multi-faceted response to the discussion on the importance of the Bonus Marchers. Most candidates considered the political impact of the Bonus Marchers on Hoover's presidency and how his decision to allow MacArthur to remove the protestors led to much criticism from the public, media and rival politicians. A few candidates were able to consider other facets, such as how the Bonus Marchers demonstrated how veterans were struggling to survive during the Depression. Many of these facets would have benefited from more development and explanation. Weaker

answers were often descriptive and gave an account of the Bonus Marchers, rather than a discussion of their importance.

**Question 8** saw many candidates in **part (a)** able to give a sequenced account of Roosevelt's reforms to the banking system, beginning with a brief description of the problems banks faced during the Depression. This was then followed by some details of the Emergency Banking Act and the Securities Exchange Commission and how the government supported banks with the setting up of the Federal Deposit Insurance Company. A few candidates also mentioned the fireside chats to encourage savers to redeposit their money in the banks, in order to restore confidence in the banks. Weaker accounts tended to be brief, with some candidates demonstrating only a generalised knowledge of the Emergency Banking Act.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to give some very strong multi-faceted discussions about the impact of the New Deal on agriculture in the 1930s. Good responses focused on the economic impact of alphabet agencies such as the AAA, and how it led to a doubling of farmer income by 1939. Other facets that were considered by candidates were the social impact of the agencies, especially the RA, which helped half a million families relocate to better land and set up camps for migrant workers. Less successful responses lacked explanation and gave detailed accounts instead. Some candidates confused some of the work of the different agencies set up by Roosevelt.

### **Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945**

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