

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/11  
Paper 11

## Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully before they begin, in order to understand exactly what is being asked and to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced answers. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help to ensure that their responses only include relevant details.

In more extensive responses candidates should be encouraged to organise their points into distinct paragraphs, otherwise points can become blurred together or alternatively candidates can lose focus on the question set.

In **part (c)** responses candidates should try to write evaluative, rather than purely summative, conclusions.

## General comments

Successful responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study questions. These responses included 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. Less successful responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts lacking in explanation.

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

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

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

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

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

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Core Content**

#### **Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4**

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

### Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most frequently answered questions in the Core Content section.

#### Question 5

- (a) This question was well answered and saw some very strong responses. These responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of Clemenceau's aims at Versailles and included four relevant, concisely expressed points. Points made included: 'Clemenceau wanted Germany to pay for the damage caused to France during the war'. 'He wanted security for France and thus wanted to reduce Germany's armed forces'. 'He wanted Alsace Lorraine back from Germany'. Some weaker responses drifted away from the central focus of Clemenceau's aims to discuss what Clemenceau achieved at Versailles. Other less successful responses included incorrect details.
- (b) Some responses misunderstood the term 'self-determination' and interpreted the term as a personal quality or something to do with the League of Nations, rather than one referring to peoples of a colony or area of land wanting the right to rule over themselves. The most successful responses explained two reasons as to why Wilson's belief in self-determination was important. They explained that self-determination was one of Wilson's Fourteen Points, and that it meant that different peoples should have the right to rule themselves. It led to the formation of countries such as Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland. A second reason often explained was that Wilson's idea of self-determination caused conflict with the British and French representatives as both Britain and France ruled over large empires and if Wilson's plans were adopted this would threaten their control over their empires.
- (c) This question was well answered. There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses which discussed the extent to which loss of territory was the most serious consequence of the Versailles Settlement for Germany. Stronger responses identified the territory taken away from Germany and most commonly explained the economic impact this had on Germany. Examples of territory often included the loss of Alsace Lorraine and the temporary loss of the Saar Basin which both included valuable iron ore deposits and rich coal mines, the profits from which would have helped the Germans to pay the reparations. These strong responses then recognised other consequences for Germany and most commonly explained the impact of reparations, the War Guilt Clause and demilitarisation on Germany. Some weaker responses contained detailed knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles but lacked an assessment of the impact of these terms on Germany. Others did not identify any territories and wrote in general terms about the consequences. These responses could have been improved by explaining why the terms led to hardship for the German citizens.

#### Question 6

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates, who were able to identify occasions on which Hitler broke the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. Rearmament and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland were the two instances most commonly mentioned. Other ways cited included Hitler refusing to pay anymore reparations and his Anschluss with Austria in 1938. Some weaker responses described Hitler's aims without mentioning specific events. It is important that candidates read the question carefully. Other less successful responses included inaccurate information. Common misconceptions included the reunification of Germany and Austria through Anschluss (when the two had never been united) and the retaking of the Sudetenland in 1938 (which had never been part of Germany).
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses identified the reasons for appeasement - usually the British desire to maintain peace, the need to buy time to prepare for war and the feeling in Britain that Germany had been harshly treated at Versailles. However, these responses were usually rather general and did not refer to specific examples of the policy of appeasement. Other responses made the argument that appeasement was all about trade, possibly confusing with Lloyd George's concerns at Versailles in 1919. Stronger responses were characterised by two explanations. Most commonly they considered the impact of the Great Depression on Britain and the threat of communism. The rationale behind the threat of communism was clearly explained. The spread of communism was considered a great threat after the First

World War. British politicians feared the power of the Soviet Union in helping spread communism to Western Europe. Hitler was known as an enemy of communism and he was acting as a buffer against the spread of Soviet communism. British politicians decided to appease Hitler to help strengthen his position against the Soviet Union and reduce the risk of communism spreading.

- (c) Stronger responses included contextual examples on how the increase in aggression from some states in the 1930s was caused by economic factors. They highlighted the effects of the Great Depression on usually Japan and Italy and explained their economic motivation to invade Manchuria and Abyssinia respectively. To produce a balanced response this was then contrasted with non-economic factors for the increase of aggression from some states such as the weakness of the League of Nations, Hitler's territorial ambitions, the counter-productive effects of appeasement and the political/nationalistic motives of aggressive powers. Some weaker responses did not restrict their answers to the 1930s and included events from the 1920s, such as the Corfu incident, to explain Italian aggression. They also sometimes included narrative on the reasons for the Great Depression. It is important to register the time limits in the question. Other less successful responses appeared uncertain of what the question meant by 'aggression'. These responses often included details on the unrest in Germany in the early 1930s and limited themselves to German domestic policies with no reference to the question.

### Question 7

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates lacked knowledge of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and either did not answer the question or included incorrect information. Successful responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the incident. Credit was given for: American warships in the Gulf of Tonkin were attacked by North Vietnamese gunboats. As a result of this attack, the US Congress passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which gave President Johnson the authority to do what he thought necessary. Other relevant details most commonly cited were that the incident took place in August 1964 and that as a result of the attack, ground troops were sent to Vietnam in 1965.
- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why US public opinion turned against the war. The two most common reasons identified were that the war was reported on American TV which had not happened before and the war was considered to be a waste of money and resources. The first identification was explained by developing the idea that American people were seeing the devastating effects of the USA's use of chemical weapons such as agent orange and napalm on Vietnamese civilians, as in the My Lai Massacre. This shocked the American people and resulted in massive protest against the Vietnam War. Other reasons identified and explained included the fact that the war had become unwinnable and thousands of young American soldiers were being killed. Weaker responses usually readily identified reasons but these needed to be fully developed into explanations.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer to explain reasons why the US failed to contain the spread of communism and then provide examples to demonstrate the other side of the argument. Strong responses commonly used the war in Vietnam as an example of the US failing to contain the spread of communism. These responses included details from the war to explain how the US failed to defeat the Vietcong in South Vietnam and after the evacuation of US troops the South was overrun. As a result of Vietnam becoming communist the domino effect occurred whereby Laos and Cambodia also fell to communism. On the other side of the argument stronger responses then produced evidence and explanations from events in Cuba and/or Korea to prove US success in containing communism. Some weaker responses contained detailed accounts of events in Vietnam, Korea or Cuba without assessing of the impact of the actions towards containing communism. It is important to link points made to the question.

### Question 8

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates who had a good understanding of the events in Hungary in 1956. Successful responses included a number of concise and relevant events including: demonstrations resulted in Stalin's statue being removed, Nagy was announced as Prime Minister, he announced that Hungary was to leave the Warsaw Pact and on 4 November Soviet tanks invaded Budapest. Weaker responses included events after 1956.

- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses were characterised by the explanation of two reasons why Czechoslovakia was invaded in 1968. The most common reason explained was that the Soviets were afraid that Dubcek's ideas would spread to other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. His reforms included a free press, freedom of speech and reducing government control over industry. If these reforms were allowed in Czechoslovakia there was a worry that people in other communist countries would demand the same freedoms. Other factors identified and explained included the fact that the USSR would look weak if they did not take decisive action and they were worried this would weaken the Communist Bloc in the Cold War against the USA. Weaker responses shifted the focus of the question and described Dubcek's reforms, rather than emphasising why Czechoslovakia was invaded.
- (c) Stronger responses were characterised by demonstrating a good understanding of Gorbachev's policy in the Soviet Union from 1985 to 1991. Successful responses explained how Gorbachev made little effort to defend Soviet power in Eastern Europe. He was a new type of leader in the Soviet Union who realised that the Soviet Union was in economic trouble and spending too much on arms in the unwinnable war in Afghanistan. He believed in different policies such as Glasnost and Perestroika. He made it clear that he would not oppose attempts at democracy in Warsaw Pact countries and he would not send Red Army troops into these countries to stay tied to the Soviet Union. He would let Eastern European countries decide their futures. These responses then produced a balanced argument by identifying and explaining other reasons for the collapse of Soviet power in Eastern Europe, most commonly the rise and impact of Solidarity. Weaker responses were characterised by a narrative of Gorbachev's reforms, with no reference to the collapse of Soviet power.

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

#### **Questions 9 and 10**

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

#### **Question 11**

This question received the most responses from candidates in the Depth Studies section.

- (a) The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of what happened on the Night of Long Knives, demonstrating their knowledge of the involvement of the SS, Hitler's granting of a period of leave to the SA and the fate of Rohm and leading SA figures, as well as the murder of former Chancellor von Schleicher. Some responses sought to explain the nature of Hitler's anxieties about Rohm and the SA and the position of the German army at this time. This was obviously relevant to Hitler's course of action but it was not central to the thrust of the question which required an account of the events. Other responses confused the Night of Long Knives with Kristallnacht.
- (b) There were many strong responses to this question in which the success of the Weimar Governments in the 1920s and the lack of appeal of extremist parties were identified and explained as reasons why the Nazi Party had little success before 1930. Responses tended to be stronger on the strength of German industry and culture in the Stresemann years. They often included evidence of the successes of Stresemann in economic and foreign affairs, resulting in the German population seeing little reason to change to an untested, extreme right-wing party. Less successful responses were weaker on the Nazi side, limiting their response to identifications such as, 'they were an extreme party' and 'the Munich Putsch was a failure'. These identifications needed to be explained by emphasising the violent nature of the Nazis and the resulting lack of appeal. A minority of candidates drifted away from the question by outlining the factors that propelled Hitler into power between 1930 and 1933 and arguing that they were absent in the 1920s.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Most candidates were secure on the events surrounding the Reichstag Fire and explained how Hitler exploited this event to attack and effectively destroy the communists as political rivals, arresting and imprisoning many of them. More could have referred to how this impacted on the elections of March 1933 which would have supported this side of the argument. On the other side of this question stronger responses appreciated that the time span was limited to 1933 and explained the impact of the passing of the Enabling Act as an important event in Hitler's consolidation of power in 1933. They detailed the terms of the Act and how he used the act to consolidate his power providing examples such as:

creating a one-party state, destroying the power of the trade unions and purging the civil service. Weaker responses saw the Enabling Act and the Decree for the Protection of People and State as the same thing, following on immediately in the aftermath of the Reichstag Fire. These responses therefore asserted or implied that the crackdown on the communists immediately after the Fire was carried out under the Enabling Act when in fact this was still to come. Other weaker responses included details of Hitler's rise to power which lacked relevance to this question, for example ignoring the limits of the question which was solely concerned with 1933. There were knowledgeable explanations of the Night of Long Knives, the death of Hindenburg, the army oath and the increasingly hostile anti-Jewish policies and actions. It is important that candidates read the question carefully to ensure the correct time span and note the key words in the question, in this case 'events' which led to Hitler's consolidation of power in 1933.

### Question 12

- (a) A significant number of responses included details on the events of Kristallnacht when Jews suffered personal attacks by the Nazis and attacks on synagogues, shops and private houses. However, Kristallnacht happened in 1938. Successful responses included details of actions taken by the Nazis against Jewish businesses in 1933. Credit was awarded for non-violent methods such as 'the boycott of Jewish businesses', 'Jewish businesses were identified with the Star of David', 'posters on shop windows told people to stay away' and 'SA men stood outside the shops deterring entry'. Other responses drifted from the focus of the question to explain why Hitler hated the Jews.
- (b) Strong responses identified and explained two reasons why mass rallies were important. The most common explanation was that it was an excellent propaganda opportunity to show the power and strength of the regime, with leading Nazis such as Goebbels and Hitler making persuasive speeches whilst emphasising Nazi ideals. These reinforced the personality of Hitler and encouraged support for the Nazi regime. Successful responses also explained that the rallies associated with the Nazis brought excitement to the Germans, such as those at Nuremberg with military bands, marching and displays often at night by torchlight, to create interest, support and loyalty. A small number of candidates struggled to understand the term 'mass rallies'.
- (c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. In agreement with the hypothesis, responses explained the control that the Nazis had over German society. They commonly explained this in terms of the terror and force used to suppress any opposition, discussing the Gestapo who had unlimited powers to search houses, arrest people on suspicion and send them to concentration camps without trial or explanation. Many Germans were frightened to speak out against the regime even if they wanted to. Control was also exercised through the media, and evident in the control over women and education. The strongest responses fully explained how and why this control took place and the resultant impact. These strong responses also gave consideration to ways in which the Nazis were not in control of all German people. They explained how many young people believed in freedom of expression and values which conflicted with those of the Nazis. They used the Edelweiss Pirates as an example and showed how they shared a strong distaste of the strict regimentation and sexual segregation of the Hitler Youth, so they often beat them up. During the war they carried out acts of sabotage, helped army deserters and even assassinated a Gestapo chief. The activities of the Swing Movement, the Kreisau Circle and members of the Church were also often used as examples of areas where the Nazis faced challenges to their ability to control German society. Weaker responses often adopted a narrative approach on the control exercised by the Nazis. It is important that reasons are identified and then supporting information linked to the question is given in answers. Other responses were one-sided and would have benefitted from identifying and explaining the few areas which the Nazis did not fully control.

### Questions 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/12  
Paper 12

## 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. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help ensure that responses only include relevant details.

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

In **Part (c)** responses it is a good idea to encourage candidates to practice writing evaluative, rather than purely summative conclusions, in which they make a judgement.

## General comments

Candidates used 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 but most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

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

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

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

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

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Core Content**

#### **Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4**

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

### Question 5

- (a) This question was answered well, with many candidates able to recall specific terms that applied to Austria in the peace settlement. Good knowledge of the territorial changes was shown, as well as the limitations placed on the Austrian armed forces such as the limitation of the army to 30 000. Less successful answers confused Austria with Germany, or occasionally thought that Austria had gained from the peace settlements.
- (b) Candidates were less assured on this question, and many answers displayed a lack of understanding about what Danzig was, and therefore why it was important in the peace settlement. Some answers also concentrated on what happened to Danzig, rather than considering why it was important in the negotiations. Stronger answers were able to explain why Danzig was important as a sea port and trading centre to both Germany and Poland, and therefore both countries would want control of it. Some answers were also able to explain that the Big Three also disagreed about what should happen to Danzig, with Clemenceau and Wilson arguing that it should be given to Poland, and Lloyd George believing that it should remain with Germany.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with the more successful answers able to explain what the specific aims of Lloyd George or Wilson were, and why they found it difficult to achieve particular aims. Strong responses were able to explain, for example, the difficulty that Lloyd George faced in achieving his aim of not destroying Germany, so as to allow it to remain as a trading partner, when compared with the demands of the British public to treat Germany harshly, and his need to satisfy these demands. When considering the difficulties that Wilson faced, candidates often focused on either the Fourteen Points as a whole, or specific ideas within the Fourteen Points. Explanations were often based around a consideration of the idealistic nature of Wilson's ideas, when compared with the demands from Clemenceau and Lloyd George whose countries had suffered more than America during the war. When explaining the difficulty of achieving self-determination, for example, candidates were able to explain that this conflicted with Britain and France who were determined to preserve and potentially increase their empires. Less assured answers described the aims of Wilson and Lloyd George, without explaining why they found it difficult to achieve these. Some answers did try to explain why they found it hard to achieve their aims, but lacked the contextual support or produced generalised answers based on disagreements between the Big Three.

### Question 6

- (a) Most candidates were aware that the Anglo-German Naval Agreement allowed Germany to increase its navy, often accurately identifying up to 35 per cent of Britain's navy, and that it broke the Treaty and France was unhappy at not being consulted. Fewer mentioned submarines or their 45 per cent limit. Weaker answers lacked knowledge. Some answers also confused it with the reduction of Germany's navy in the Treaty of Versailles.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify or describe at least two aspects of Anschluss, most commonly that Hitler wanted a Greater Germany, that it broke the Treaty or that he wanted the Austrian resources and army. More answers could have been developed into an explanation by showing why this would be important. Some responses referred to Austrians as Germans rather than German speakers, or stated that Austria was needed to fulfil Lebensraum.
- (c) This question was answered well, and many strong responses were seen on the importance for Hitler of Germany's involvement in the Spanish Civil War. Many sound answers provided an explanation of why Hitler needed to test his new weapons. Many then went on to explain the importance of how his new alliance or friendship with Mussolini led to the successful completion of Anschluss in March 1938. There were a number of unbalanced responses, primarily because candidates were not able to bring the same insightfulness on the importance of the takeover of Czechoslovakia for Hitler as they did on the Spanish Civil War. Many responses gave detailed descriptions of both the Sudeten Crisis and of March 1939, without explaining their importance for Hitler. Weaker responses often described Hitler's involvement in the two events, rather than arguing the importance of the involvement, or incorrectly stated that the Sudetenland was taken from Germany in the Treaty of Versailles. Some candidates, who did try to explain the importance of the takeover of Czechoslovakia, concentrated on its importance for Britain, France or the USSR, rather than for Hitler.

### Question 7

- (a) This question was answered well. Different approaches to the question were seen, with some candidates concentrating on Stalin's motivation and actions during the Blockade, such as the blocking of roads, while other answers concentrated on the response to the Blockade by France, Britain and the USA, such as the airlift. These were both valid approaches. Less successful responses confused the Berlin Blockade with the Berlin Wall, or East Berlin with West Berlin.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question, with many answers able to identify or describe reasons, but lacking in explanation. Most candidates were able to show that Stalin wanted control over the government of Poland to increase his sphere of influence, or to spread communism. Most answers were also able to identify the geographical significance of Poland. Stronger responses went further and included explanations of Stalin's expectations after the wartime conferences, the USSR's previous history with Germany, or the context of the Cold War in the late 1940s. Other responses, sometimes lengthy, described the post-war situation without linking it to why this would mean that Stalin wanted control over the Polish government, or made assertions such as the need for resources.
- (c) Some good answers to this question were seen, with most candidates able to provide explanations on at least one side of the argument. Many such answers focused on the American desire to stop communism as their main point and were able to explain this with solid contextual support. Other arguments seen on the side of America benefitting from the Marshall Plan also explained the propaganda impact of Marshall Aid in the USA and were also able to explain this within the Cold War context. Fewer answers were seen which were able to explain how Europe benefited, as arguments on this side were often generalised statements about improvements to the economy of European countries, rather than exploring the specific impact, or considering European countries individually. Such answers could have been strengthened by referring to the details of the Plan such as the provision of raw materials, goods and machines to stimulate the economy, for example, nets provided for Norwegian fishermen, or tractors for French farmers, to explain the benefits gained. Other answers believed that Marshall Aid was accepted by Eastern Europe or confused the Marshall Plan with Containment.

### Question 8

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

### *Section B: Depth Studies*

#### Questions 9 and 10

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

#### Question 11

- (a) Excellent responses to this question were seen, with most candidates displaying very strong factual recall. Strong answers stated the aims of the Spartacist uprising, providing details of the leadership and uprising itself, or wrote about the use of the Freikorps and the execution of Liebknecht and Luxemburg to show how it ended. Errors were rare, but such answers generally confused the Spartacist uprising with the Kapp Putsch.
- (b) Mixed responses to this question were seen. Candidates were very confident in their knowledge of why there was a crisis in the Ruhr but were less able to provide two separate explanations. Stronger answers were able to explain that the failure of Germany to pay reparations resulted in the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr and provide two separate consequences of this. These answers were able to explain the immediate impact of passive resistance and the French response to this with violence and the expulsion of Germans from the Ruhr. They were then able to provide a separate explanation often based around the resulting hyperinflation. Other answers provided lengthy and accurate descriptions of what happened, but they would have been improved by addressing the question set or supporting more than just one explanation.
- (c) Some good responses to this question were seen, mainly on one side, although some candidates were able to go further and produce a balanced argument. Most answers were confident in

explaining how Stresemann restored Germany's strength between 1924 and 1929, and were able to provide at least two explanations, often based around the improvements he made to the economy, and the improvements he made for Germany's international relations. These answers were supported by a good level of contextual knowledge, for example of the impact of the Dawes Plan, with candidates able to explain the impact of the loans on German infrastructure. Responses were less assured when examining the other side of the argument. Stronger answers were able to explain the potential structural weakness of relying on American loans or explained that not all sectors of the Germany economy benefited, for example farmers. Less successful responses did not focus on the specific question and tried to show how Germany was weakened after the Depression or included details of Hitler's actions. Other responses tried to explain the problems caused by cultural changes such as Bauhaus, but these were not as a result of Stresemann's actions.

### Question 12

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and were able to display detailed knowledge about how the Nazis used the radio. Many answers were able to show not only what was allowed to be broadcast on the radio, but also how the Nazis made radios accessible to Germans by making them cheaper or putting up loudspeakers in the streets.
- (b) There were some very good answers seen to this question, with most candidates able to explain at least one reason why the Gestapo was feared by Germans. Such answers were able to show that the overarching powers of the Gestapo, such as the ability to arrest people or send them to concentration camps, made Germans scared as they feared for the lives of themselves and their families. Other responses explained that the use of informers meant that Germans were scared to speak out as they did not know whether they would be overheard. Other answers often had a good knowledge of the Gestapo, but described what they did rather than linking it to the question by showing the consequences of their activities on the German people.
- (c) Responses to this question were mixed. Stronger answers were able to explain that Hitler's policies towards the Jews did appear to have popular support, perhaps due to the indoctrination that young people experienced in schools, or other anti-Semitic propaganda. Balanced answers were also achieved, often through an explanation that, although there was not necessarily resistance to Hitler's policies, this was a result of the fear the Germans experienced, resulting in tacit acceptance rather than active support. Other responses were able to provide examples of individuals such as Galen and groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates who did actually oppose the policies. Less successful answers did not address the issue of popular support, tending to produce lengthy description of the policies, often expanding outside the dates given in the question, to include the Holocaust.

### 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 mentioned the assembly line or conveyer belt and most often followed this with recognition that the workers were static and that the 'parts' moved to them. Some also mentioned how quicker processes and greater volumes meant cheaper products.
- (b) Some very good responses to this question were seen, with candidates clearly displaying a good level of knowledge about the importance of the development of advertising to the boom. Many candidates were able to identify or describe at least two aspects of advertising, with common responses identifying that advertising encouraged consumers to purchase a particular product, or that advertising was effective across many industries, including the entertainment industry. A number of answers would have benefited from providing a link or explanation as to how advertising impacted on, and was therefore important to, the boom.
- (c) Nearly all responses showed a clear understanding of groups who did and did not benefit from the boom. A number of answers included an explanation of the impact of new consumer goods, such as cars and domestic appliances, and how these had changed lives for the better. Many candidates were able to achieve a balanced answer by explaining which groups did not benefit from the boom. Such answers were able to explain how and why the coal industry declined

because of the advent of electricity, and thus the subsequent effects on coal miners. There were also some good explanations of how agricultural overproduction and Canadian competition had affected farmers and why this had led to reduced income and increased farm evictions. Less successful answers would have been improved by a focus on the specific issue in the question, rather than writing generalised answers about society in the 1920s. These answers tended to focus on the social, rather than the specific economic impact, of discrimination during the boom.

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

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

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/13  
Paper 13

## Key messages

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

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

## General comments

Many answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and had a great deal of information at their disposal. They were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions which reward recall and description. Many candidates answered these questions very effectively 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 including information which was lacking in relevance. Responses to **part (b)** gained some credit for the identification of relevant 'why' factors, but the best answers went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

A large number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given hypothesis) but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. These answers attempted to explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions just asserted 'how far' rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Core Content**

#### **Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4**

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

#### **Question 5**

This was a widely answered question. Many candidates were able to state that, for example, 'the Bulgarian army was reduced' and then add precise detail, such as 'to 20 000 men'. **Part (b)** was answered well; candidates identified Lloyd George's disagreements with Clemenceau and Wilson, as well the issues of trade and attitudes amongst British voters. Many went on to explain why each factor presented difficulties for Lloyd George, for example 'Lloyd George had to juggle different priorities. He did not want Germany to be punished so harshly that its economy could not recover. In the years before the war Germany was Britain's

biggest trading partner. He realised the prosperity of Britain depended on an economically strong Europe.’ The best answers provided a second valid explanation. Most candidates showed good knowledge in **part (c)** of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, describing Germany’s losses. Better answers included an explanation as to why these losses might be regarded as harsh or lenient and candidates drew on their understanding of the severity of the terms imposed on both countries at the Peace Settlement as a point of comparison. Knowledge of the impact on Turkey was less secure, but good responses included the argument that Turkey was treated less harshly because the Treaty of Sevres was later renegotiated. In these instances, the argument was explained by reference to selected contextual detail.

### Question 6

Relevant points in **part (a)** included the encouragement of Austrian Nazis to stir up trouble in Austria, Hitler’s efforts to intimidate Schuschnigg, and the unopposed crossing of German troops into Austria. While not all candidates were clear about the chronology, many knew that a poll then took place to confirm the Anschluss. Candidates knew a great deal about the reasons for Hitler’s reoccupation of the Rhineland in **part (b)** and answers included identified factors such as the strategic need to strengthen Germany’s western frontier and/or that Hitler thought he could get away with it because many people in Britain thought it was ‘his own back yard’. Some candidates went on to develop these statements and explained how they related to Hitler’s motives. For example, ‘One of Hitler’s foreign policy aims was to pursue an aggressive policy in the east, taking over Poland and the west of the USSR. However, Germany was vulnerable to attack from the west. To achieve his aims against the east he first had to secure the western border, and this meant making the Rhineland secure.’ The arguments both for and against pursuing the policy of appeasement were well expressed in answers to **part (c)**. Better responses were able to contextualise each factor provided and relate appeasement to specific events and crises. For example, candidates used the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1939 to argue that appeasement was not sensible as it encouraged Hitler to be more confident and aggressive; he could not be trusted. On the other hand, the Depression, which weakened Britain and France’s armed forces, was often cited as part of the argument that appeasement was sensible as it allowed time for rearmament.

### Question 7

There were some good answers to **part (a)**; many responses showed knowledge of the division of Germany and Berlin into four areas of occupation, the promise of free elections in liberated countries and Stalin’s promise to intervene in the war against Japan. The best responses to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question which focussed on why the Soviet Union opposed the Marshall Plan. Identified factors at included the mistrust between Truman and Stalin, the Soviet view that it promoted the capitalist system and/or that the Plan was a bribe to prevent countries falling to communism. Candidates who then developed and explained each factor fully provided the strongest responses. The aim in **part (c)** was to write a balanced answer which looked at disagreements over Germany, comparing them to other causes of the Cold War. As it was, responses tended to focus on the former at the expense of the latter. More candidates could have provided some focus on the problems caused by the division of Germany and of Berlin, leading to an explanation of the Berlin Blockade. Some candidates did do this and were also able to explain Soviet resentment caused by the USA’s testing of the atomic bomb and/or the ideological differences between the two sides.

### Question 8

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

## Section B: Depth Studies

### Question 9

The best answers to **part (a)** gained credit for knowing that the BEF was Britain’s standing army which was made up of around 90 000 men. Candidates knew that it was quickly sent to France in 1914 and fought at the battle of Mons. There were detailed narratives of the Schlieffen Plan in **part (b)**, although the best answers met the specific demands of the question focussing precisely on what it was about the Plan which led the Germans to think it would succeed. In **part (c)** a comparison of the development of trench warfare with alternative factors (such as the failure of the Schlieffen Plan) to explain why the war was not over by Christmas 1914 was required. Although some good answers were seen, other candidates were unable to develop their responses beyond description. These responses could have been improved by candidates thinking in terms of ‘impact’, and so relating their knowledge to what the question required.

### Question 10

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

### Question 11

Candidates in **part (a)** were able to describe the details of the 1923 Ruhr crisis, ranging from the occupation by French and Belgian troops to German passive resistance and inflation. Answers to **part (b)** tended to reflect generalised knowledge about the reasons why the Spartacists failed, focussing on the murder of the Spartacist leaders and the fact that Ebert used the Freikorps to suppress the rising. These points were offered as statements, briefly identifying the relevant factor. The best responses developed each statement to directly meet the demands of the question. For example, some considered the advantages the Freikorps had which enabled it to defeat the Spartacists. **Part (c)** enabled candidates to write at length about the 'golden age' of the Weimar Republic on the one hand, and a range of factors on the other to explain why this interpretation may be undeserved. Candidates clearly knew a great deal about the topic, referencing foreign agreements, economic support and cultural developments to make a case for the 'golden age'. The opposing argument was supported by knowledge of the problems of the Weimar Constitution and a strong undercurrent of people who shared traditional values and a distaste for the decadence of post-war Germany. However, sometimes the links between this knowledge and the question could have been made more explicit.

### Question 12

It was rare to see weak answers to **part (a)** which explored Goebbels' role in Nazi Germany. Candidates wrote in detail about his propaganda work, book burnings and the staging of mass rallies. **Part (b)** provided an opportunity to explain the boycott of Jewish businesses in April 1933. Good answers included developed explanations, which reflected economic imperatives directed at driving the Jewish people out of business and out of the country 'for the benefit' of Aryans. On occasions, responses were generalised accounts of antisemitic policies not specific to the context of the question. In **part (c)** candidates were asked to compare the effectiveness of economic policies with the activities of the Gestapo in limiting opposition to the Nazis. Those who used their knowledge to go beyond description and thereby explain impact were able to provide good answers. A number of these candidates tried to create an argument. For example, they contrasted the fear of arbitrary arrest by the Gestapo with economic policies which were important because many people felt they were better off under the Nazi regime. Efforts to deal with unemployment, as well as benefits provided by the 'Strength Through Joy' movement, were cited by candidates.

### Questions 13 and 14

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

### Question 15

In **part (a)**, candidates knew many of the activities of gangsters in the USA in the 1920s. Better answers focussed on smuggling illegal alcohol, gang related violence, bribing the agencies of law enforcement and protection rackets. **Part (b)** attracted many good explanations about the importance of Sacco and Vanzetti which often focussed on the presence of racism, even at the highest level of the judicial system in the United States. For example, taking this as an identified factor, a candidate might develop the argument that 'Sacco and Vanzetti were Italian Americans and anarchists. They were arrested on suspicion of armed robbery and murder. The evidence against them was thin but the prosecution in the court case focused on their radical ideas. The judge said that they might not be guilty of the offence but were morally to blame because they were enemies of the US's institutions. They were found guilty and executed.' **Part (c)** responses showed that candidates were endeavouring to construct balanced arguments, presenting evidence both for and against the interpretation in the question. When narratives were linked to the demands of the question, i.e., discussing what might be meant by 'more freedom for American women' in the 1920s, stronger responses were seen. The best answers drew on knowledge of increasing employment as well as political rights and social freedom to support the proposition. On the other hand, candidates were able to explain that the changes which were evidenced by, for example, 'flappers' did not affect all women, and/or that women in small communities and rural areas tended to continue their traditional roles, without the benefit of labour-saving devices, such as washing machines.

### Question 16

Answers to this question tended to offer generalised, descriptive knowledge. **Part (a)** proved straightforward for most as candidates knew what happened on Wall Street in October 1929, referencing the Crash, panic selling and bankruptcies. **Part (b)** proved more challenging to some; the best answers included developed explanations of overproduction's contribution to the problems facing the American economy because 'more products were being made than could be sold'. For example, 'mass production meant that goods could be produced quickly and in large amounts. Soon the market became saturated as Americans had all the consumer goods they needed and demand for these items fell. Factories cut back production which meant reduced workforces and fewer people to buy consumer goods.' A further explanatory point might have discussed the impact of declining foreign trade or employment on the rest of the economy. Reaching a judgement about the relative consequences of the Depression was the objective of **part (c)**. Responses tended to be generalised narratives about unemployment, social distress and the banking crisis. Other answers included the decline in foreign trade and how the slump showed the failure of Republican policies. When each relevant identified factor was developed and explained in terms of 'impact', it was then possible for candidates to produce good answers.

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

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

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/21  
Paper 21

## Key messages

- Candidates should avoid describing or summarising the source at the beginning of an answer. They should try to provide a direct answer to the question in the first sentence. The rest of the answer should be used to explain and support.
- Contextual knowledge should only be used to improve the quality of the answer – to explain and support it.
- When answering **Question 6**, the sources must be used. This question is primarily about the sources.
- When quoting from a source, the quotation in full should be given.
- Impressions and inferences from sources should always be supported with detail from the sources.
- When asked about the message of cartoons, candidates should try to focus on the point of view of the cartoonist.

## General comments

The majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option, although a number of responses to the nineteenth century topic were seen. The overall quality was mixed but this included many strong scripts. Candidates' contextual knowledge was often sound but some candidates were unsure how to address some of the questions. This was particularly true of **Questions 3** and **6** in the twentieth century option. A number of candidates did not attempt **Question 3**, and **Question 6** proved challenging for some.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Option A: Nineteenth century topic*

#### **Question 1**

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates just paraphrased the source and kept to description and surface detail, without forming any impressions about the relationship. A small number provided impressions but they were not about the relationship between William and Bismarck. Valid impressions that candidates suggested included: Bismarck needed William, Bismarck usually got what he wanted from William and the relationship was volatile. It is important to remember that impressions need to be supported from the source. A small number of candidates managed to explain the overall impression which is that the relationship was one of mutual dependency.

#### **Question 2**

The first step in answering this question is to identify agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources, for example Bismarck gets his way in both sources, while the sources disagree over William's attitude towards Austria. A reasonable number of candidates managed to use these agreements or disagreements as reasons for finding Source C not surprising or surprising. The best responses evaluated one of the sources. Weaker answers were based on the provenances of the sources and did not use the content.

#### **Question 3**

Many candidates paraphrased the source and in effect repeated the surface information contained within it. Candidates would have improved their responses by making inferences from the source, for example about

the relationship between Bismarck and William in the decision-making process. The best answers evaluated Source D either by cross reference to their knowledge or by considering the provenance of the source.

#### Question 4

The best answers brought together the big message of the cartoon, its context, and its purpose. A good number of candidates managed to do this. Their answers greatly benefited from their contextual knowledge. They were aware of the importance of the Austrian defeat in 1866 and the following annexation of some north German states by Prussia. This knowledge enabled them to explain how the cartoon's purpose may have been to warn the French about the threat from Prussia. These answers were supported by references to details in the cartoon. Most candidates were able to explain either a sub-message of the cartoon, for example Prussia is aggressive, or explain the context. This question is about the reasons why the cartoon was published. It is important that candidates, whether they are writing about the message, context or purpose of the cartoon, make it clear that they are suggesting reasons for publication.

#### Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. The best showed an understanding that the cartoonist's big message is that William grabbed all the glory for the achievement of unification but it was Bismarck who was actually the architect of it. Big messages are based on putting all the main details in the cartoon together, using it as a whole, and asking oneself, what is the big point that the cartoonist wants to get across? The sub-messages that many candidates gave were based on just one part of the cartoon, for example William was conceited, William was a fool and Bismarck was responsible for creating a united Germany. All of these valid answers were informed, even if implicitly, by contextual knowledge. Misinterpretations offered by some candidates, for example Bismarck was insignificant, William was responsible for unification, and William had lost his crown, were made when candidates were unable to bring knowledge to their reading of the cartoon.

#### Question 6

This question was answered reasonably well. Most candidates were able to explain how some sources support the hypothesis, for example Source B explains how Bismarck managed to persuade William not to attend the conference in Frankfurt. Better answers also showed how other sources disagree with the hypothesis, for example Source C shows how Bismarck failed to win William over and had to depend on the Crown Prince doing this for him. When sources are being used in response to this question it is important to explain, with a clear and direct reference to the relevant part of the source, how the source supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. It is also important to use each source separately. Sources may be grouped, for and against the hypothesis, but then each source in each group needs to be used by itself.

#### *Option B: Twentieth century topic*

#### Question 1

This question was generally answered well. There are many agreements between the two sources, for example they both claim that US failure to join the League weakened it, that Britain and France acting together was important for the League and that the League was popular. Disagreements are also there, for example Source A claims that Britain and France were to blame for the League's problems, while Source B blames the USA. A number of candidates summarised both sources first but most then went on to produce proper comparisons. Only a very small number neglected to make any kind of meaningful comparison. Agreements and disagreements were identified and explained carefully but only a few candidates managed to compare the big messages of the two sources – Source A argues the League had little chance of succeeding, while Source B claims that it could have worked but for the events of the 1930s which destroyed it. It is important to remember that disagreements need more explanation than agreements. With agreements it is enough to state, for example 'Both sources state that the Depression harmed the League.' Disagreements, however, need to be unpacked a little more, for example 'Source A states that the League never had a chance, while Source B states that it did have a chance of succeeding.' It is not enough to state, for example, 'The sources disagree over whether or not the League of Nations ever stood a chance of succeeding.'

#### Question 2

There were three valid approaches to this 'purpose' question and this made a wide range of answers possible. Candidates could focus on the context, the message of the cartoon, or its purpose. Many combined

these approaches to produce very strong answers. Most candidates started their answers by using a contextual approach. They used their contextual knowledge to explain one reason why the cartoon was published in December 1917 was the fact that the US Senate had rejected the Treaty of Versailles (and therefore membership of the League) in the previous month. Many of these candidates also used the message of the cartoon as a reason for publication. For example, the cartoon suggests the League was going to be weak because the USA was not a member. Better answers considered the possible purpose of the cartoon as a reason for publication. Answers included: to criticise the USA for not joining and to put pressure on the USA to join. In the very best answers candidates either explained the big message of the cartoon or combined purpose, big message and context. The big message was taken as the League will fail because the USA refuses to join the League. It is important that candidates remember they are being asked for reasons why the cartoon was published. This makes it crucial that they do not just interpret the cartoon or explain its context or purpose, but that they use such analyses as reasons for publication of the cartoon. To help themselves do this, they should try to begin their answers with 'This cartoon was published then because...'. Answers that did not provide a reason for publication could not achieve higher marks, no matter how good the analysis of the cartoon was. It is essential to answer the question set.

### Question 3

Candidates struggled with this question. Some found it a challenge to find agreements or disagreements between the two sources. The essential agreements and disagreements are over Britain. They agree that Britain was trying to avoid its obligations but also disagree because of Baldwin's claim that Britain was loyal to the League. A reasonable number of candidates found valid but less satisfactory agreements/disagreements, for example both sources suggest the League was weak, and Source D sees Britain as being to blame for the failure of the League, while Source E places the blame on the USA. Such agreements and disagreements could be used as the reason for arguing that Source D makes Source E surprising or not surprising. Few candidates went on to evaluate one or both sources. Less successful answers were based on the provenance of each source without making proper use of the content of the sources.

### Question 4

Most candidates were more successful with this question. Only a small number limited their answers to describing surface details and there was much valid interpretation of the cartoons. Many candidates explained that both cartoons show the League to be failing. They were less successful on the disagreements but a reasonable number pointed out that in Source F the League is doing nothing, while in Source G, it is at least trying to get the USA to help. The best answers were from those candidates who focused on the opinions of the cartoonists and explained that they both were criticising the League for failing to act over Japan's aggression in Manchuria.

### Question 5

This question produced a wide range of responses. A small number of candidates struggled with producing impressions from Source H. Impressions are based on inferences from the source and give us something that the source does not directly state. These candidates tended to paraphrase the source and just described the actions of the USA. Better answers managed to produce impressions, for example that the USA was keen to be involved in international affairs but did not always go on to explain the overall impression from Source H – that the USA was keen to be involved in international affairs and that this was mainly from economic motives. The best answers went one step further and explained that the main impression we get from the source about the USA's attitude towards international affairs is a good or a positive one (this had to be supported).

### Question 6

It is crucial that candidates make careful use of the sources when answering this question. A number of candidates would have improved their responses by making use of the sources, rather than just writing about the failures of the League. The most common type of answer was where candidates used some of the sources to support the idea that the League's failure was because the USA was not a member but they did not go on to also explain that other sources suggest other reasons for the failure. There were also a number of answers that referred to the sources very generally. When sources are being used in response to this question it is important to explain, with a clear and direct reference to the relevant part of the source, how the source supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. It is also important to use each source separately. Sources may be grouped, for and against the hypothesis, but then each source in each group needs to be used by itself.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/22  
Paper 22

## Key messages

- Candidates should answer the question that has been asked. If the question asks whether a source proves someone was lying, then the issue of lying must be addressed. If the question asks why a source was published, then a reason for publication must be given. Questions should be answered in a direct and explicit manner, which goes beyond just writing about a source.
- Every question asks for an explanation of the answer. This means using the source and knowledge of the topic to make clear how and why conclusions have been reached. Explanations must make sense and so sources need to be used in a way that is consistent with any conclusions reached.
- There is no need for candidates to copy out or describe the source before addressing the question.

## General comments

There were insufficient scripts on the nineteenth century option for any meaningful comments to be made. This report therefore applies to the twentieth-century option. Candidates sometimes struggled to apply historical skills in answering the questions. There were, of course, many scripts of high quality. Many candidates clearly had a good level of historical knowledge on the topic. Nonetheless, some candidates appeared less sure of how to answer the questions effectively. For example, in **Question 1**, where two sources had to be compared, some candidates did not succeed in finding both agreements and disagreements, and some seemed unsure of what would count as valid dis/agreements. In **Question 6**, where candidates should be aware that the sources will always offer material both to support and question the hypothesis, a number of candidates just agreed with the hypothesis and answered on just the one side. Where they arose, opportunities to evaluate the sources were missed by some, or attempts to cross-refer between sources were limited by a lack of clarity on what the cross-reference achieved. Some responses would have been improved by starting with a focused engagement with the question, rather than with simple description or repetition of a source.

## 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 1**

The sources offered plenty of opportunities for valid comparisons, both of agreements and disagreements. It was, though, important to make sure that what was claimed of a source was indeed accurate. For example, a common attempt at noting a disagreement was to say that the two sources differed in the reasons given for Hoare's support for the Hoare-Laval Pact – in Source B because he was afraid of a clash with Italy, and in Source A because he was concerned about the German menace. Yet Source A gave as another reason that he was concerned to retain Italian friendship, which actually suggested much the same as Source B. The best answers were able to look at the sources as a whole and saw that there was an overall disagreement on who the authors blamed for the failure of the League in the Abyssinian crisis. In Source A this was claimed to be Britain ('did not think the League could enforce international law...the result was failure for the League.'). whilst in Source B both Britain and France were seen as culpable ('neither wanted to alienate Mussolini...the League was fatally damaged.'). Some responses would have benefitted from more precision and awareness about exactly what the sources were claiming. Many saw that Source A blamed Britain, but

then stated that the difference was that Source B blamed France, but using another part of Source B that was not about attributing overall blame, such as France pressurising Britain not to apply sanctions. A number of candidates wrote out the sources before answering the questions. In some answers a couple of sides of writing, first summarising Source A, then Source B, was followed by a brief conclusion in which one or two comparisons would be attempted.

## Question 2

This question and **Question 4** raised similar issues. Both questions were set on cartoons about the developing crisis in the period before the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. However, in both instances, many candidates answered as if the invasion had already occurred, which produced a variety of misinterpretations of the cartoons. There were several elements to Source C: the central figure of Mussolini, Britain and France as bystanders to the events, and the figure representing Western civilisation. Many candidates could provide valid sub-messages on some or all of these: that Britain and France were pretending not to see Mussolini's bullying, that Italy was strong and domineering, that the League of Nations was weak. There was also an overall message that brought the elements together: that the League was doomed to fail over Abyssinia. Better candidates spotted this. However, the best answers detected the cartoonist's opinion: that Italy's hypocrisy was being condemned, as indicated by the words uttered by Western civilisation.

## Question 3

Questions that ask whether a source is lying are generally answered well, and this was no exception. Many answers spotted the obvious contradictions between Sources D and E, and concluded that these proved Laval was lying in Source D. A smaller number saw that there were ways in which Source E confirmed aspects of Source D, and reached the conclusion that this proved Laval was not lying in Source D. Both of these approaches would have been improved by an awareness of the need to evaluate either or both sources in relation to their audience/purpose in order to cast further light on the content comparisons. Given that candidates were told that Laval had made a secret agreement with Britain in September, it should have been apparent that Laval had an ulterior motive in trying to reassure the League's Assembly of France's commitment to the Covenant. Similarly, given the uproar that greeted the exposure of the Hoare-Laval Pact, Laval was surely engaging in a face-saving exercise in his speech to the French Parliament in December 1935. Better answers explored these kinds of issues in determining whether the content comparisons were a valid indicator of lying or not.

## Question 4

Candidates who thought the cartoon was commenting on an invasion of Abyssinia that had already occurred were very likely to give an invalid reason for its publication. In fact, the cartoon was predicting the likely consequences of failing to stand firm against Mussolini's increasingly aggressive approach towards the Abyssinian issue. With this kind of question, possible reasons for publication could fall into three broad categories: reasons based on context (what was happening at that time), reasons based on message (what the cartoonist wished to tell the audience), and reasons based on purpose (the impact that the cartoonist hoped for). Most valid answers were based on messages derived from interpreting aspects of the cartoon (for example, the League was weak, Mussolini was aggressive, war was likely etc.), but more candidates could have appreciated the cartoonist's main point – to say that the British/French/League should take a firmer stand against Mussolini. Answers based on a plausible purpose, such as attempting to stir up public opinion in favour of the League, were rarer.

## Question 5

To answer this question effectively candidates needed to make clear exactly what in the source it was that they believed or disbelieved. This was sometimes missed and replaced with a general belief or disbelief of the source as a whole, making it difficult to know what any ensuing explanations applied to. This was particularly the case as the source contained many different claims. The most straightforward way of explaining whether or not Hoare could be believed was to check what he said against contextual knowledge or other sources. In fact, this was what most candidates tried to do, but explicit checking against other sources could have been attempted by more. Instead, some relied on reasoning that varied between simple assertions that something was true or false and detailed examination of Hoare's claims against specific knowledge of the events of the crisis. A possible alternative approach was to look at apparent internal inconsistencies within the source – why, for example, does Hoare claim to be taking military precautions when it is clear that he is doing everything in his power to meet France's desire for peace? The best answers, though, understood exactly what was going on in this speech to the British Parliament. Hoare was being forced to resign because of his part in agreeing the Hoare-Laval Pact and was therefore engaging in

an attempt at self-justification. Whether or not one believed what he said had to be judged in relation to the context and purpose of his speech.

### Question 6

In this question, candidates are given a hypothesis, and have to check it against the evidence offered by the sources. Many candidates did this well. Another feature of this question is that the sources will always offer opportunities both to confirm and to question the hypothesis; it was noticeable how many candidates answered just on one side of the hypothesis, generally to agree that Britain and France were indeed jointly responsible for the failure of the League. This was so even where the source very clearly offered an alternative. A good example of this was Source C, which was used by almost all candidates as indicating blame on Britain/France, whilst Mussolini was rarely seen as being to blame. Another requirement of this question is that sources have to be used to explain how they relate to the hypothesis. On this question the issue of blame was central, so the task was to show how the content of each source illustrated the issue of blame. Some strong responses achieved this. In others the content used did not do this effectively, so for example on Source A an answer might include 'Source A blames France for the failure of the League because it says its policy was in line with French national interests'. It does say this, but this does not indicate blame. In some responses, candidates agreed with the hypothesis (Britain and France equally to blame) but then only illustrated one of them being to blame.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/23  
Paper 23

## Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and all the sources before attempting to answer the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main focus of the paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding should then inform all their answers and help them to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. For example, answers needed to address the issue of trust in **Question 3**, usefulness in **Question 4** and surprise in **Question 5** in the twentieth century option. A helpful strategy is for candidates to directly address the question in the very first sentence of the answer, for example, 'Source G is surprising/not surprising because...' or 'Source D does/does not mean that source E cannot be trusted because...'.  
On **Question 6** candidates must ensure that the specific hypothesis stated in the question is being examined and that sources are used as the basis of the answer. 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. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support **and** challenge the given hypothesis.
- If quotations from the sources are used, and this can be particularly useful when answering **Question 6**, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of quotation that misses out some of the words and replaces them with ellipsis points. The words that are used must make sense and support the point the candidate wants to make, so giving the quotation in full is crucial.

## General comments

Most candidates completed all six questions. A very small number missed marks by not attempting a question at all. There were a few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both the nineteenth- and twentieth-century options. There were too few responses on the nineteenth century option for meaningful comments to be made on that option.

## 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 1**

This question was generally answered well and most candidates were able to identify agreements between the two sources. For instance, the sources both agree that the League of Nations did nothing or failed in Manchuria, the British did not want to act and that there was some sympathy for Japan. Many candidates were also able to pick out differences between the sources, explaining, for example, that Source A states that Britain did not act because it was militarily weak, whereas Source B disagrees and says the reason for British inaction was due to friendship with Japan. The most commonly cited disagreement was about whether the League could have done more than it did. The author of Source A believes the League could not have done more, whereas the author of Source B believes that the League should have done more. The best answers on this question were from candidates who were able to develop this comparison further and recognise the overarching 'big message', that being, that in Source B, the author is critical of the League's failure to act, while Source A's author is not critical of the inaction.

## Question 2

This question produced many strong responses and the majority of candidates could identify the cartoon's overall message that Japan was violating international treaties by invading Manchuria. When candidates are asked about the message of a source they should always try and consider the author's voice or opinion; in this source, the cartoonist is critical of the Japanese and condemns their actions. The best responses recognised this, supporting their conclusion by reference to the cartoon. There was little misinterpretation seen in responses to this question and, with very few exceptions, candidates were able to move beyond a surface description of the cartoon and explain one or more of the cartoon's numerous sub-messages, for example, that China is being attacked or that Japan is powerful or aggressive.

## Question 3

Some candidates found this comparison question challenging. In **Question 3**, candidates were asked to consider two written sources and conclude whether the content of one means that the other cannot be trusted. Specifically, they were comparing two contradictory extracts from *The Times* newspaper, one written in September 1931 and the other written a month later in October. Many candidates recognised that the two sources disagree with each other, but not could not explain how; in other words, they could not find a valid point of comparison. These candidates tended to make a conclusion about whether Source D means Source E cannot be trusted and based their answer on an undeveloped use of provenance. For example, the two sources were published at different dates, events could have changed so there is no reason why the disagreements between them mean that Source D shows Source E cannot be trusted. Many candidates were able to explain the claims being made in Source D – Japan has been successful in Manchuria, order and stability has replaced chaos and disorder thanks to the Japanese and as a consequence the invasion is justified. Comprehending Source E proved more challenging to some and, as a result, many candidates struggled to make a valid comparison between the sources that could then form the basis of their answer. Source E criticises the Japanese for using 'threats and force', the author believes that violence should not govern relations between states, therefore it can be inferred from Source E that the invasion is not justified. An equally valid interpretation could have been that the view expressed in Source D is supportive of Japan's actions, while in Source E clear disapproval is shown. The best responses were from candidates who could make a valid comparison between the sources and then explain a reason for the disagreement based on an evaluation of at least one of the sources. The conclusion about whether Source E can be trusted had to make sense in the light of the explanation presented.

## Question 4

This question, which focussed on the usefulness of Source F as evidence about the Japanese in Manchuria, produced many good, but few very strong answers. In some responses, candidates dismissed the source as not useful simply because it is Japanese and therefore biased. Many candidates were able to explain how the source is clearly propaganda, but again dismissed it as not useful because of this. It is worth remembering that most sources can be useful in some way and that the bias of a source is often precisely what gives it its usefulness. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that the source tells us that the Mukden incident and Manchukuo were important to the Japanese and that the source is useful as evidence that they wanted to promote their actions there, so that they were perceived as beneficial.

## Question 5

This question asked whether or not Source G is surprising. The crucial thing in a question of this nature is for candidates to make it clear whether or not they are surprised, and by what - only then can their explanations have a proper focus. Most candidates addressed the issue of surprise in their answers and a large majority could identify something within the source that surprised or did not surprise them. What was then needed was an explanation of their reasons for this. Some candidates based their explanations solely on Source G and used undeveloped provenance to explain their surprise or lack of surprise, for example, they were surprised that an American is sympathetic towards the League. To achieve stronger responses, candidates needed to consider the claims being made by Hoover about US support for the League and his view of the reasons for the League's failure, rather than incidental details within it. Once candidates have made it clear what it is they are surprised or not surprised about, they need to look to the other sources on the paper, or relevant contextual knowledge, to support their arguments. The very best answers on this question used the content and provenance of the source to explain a lack of surprise as a result of Hoover's purpose – he is defending either US policy or his own personal record.

## Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved high marks by carefully explaining how some of the sources (A, D and F) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that the League was justified in doing little about the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, while others (B, C, E and G) argue that the League's inaction was wrong and not justified. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supports or disagrees with the given hypothesis. Some less successful candidates did not make it clear whether the source under discussion was being used to support or challenge the given statement or they appeared to answer a slightly different hypothesis from the one set. Other candidates addressed only one side of the hypothesis. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question 6** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement; candidates should use the words from the question to do this. They should then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given; it is not enough to simply summarise each source. Many candidates used direct quotes from the sources as the basis of their explanations and this is a strategy that works well. However, a full quote that makes sense must be used. Little evaluation of the sources was seen. Most candidates did not attempt evaluation, but those that did were successful when they examined the purpose of the writer or cartoonist; attempts at evaluation based on source type, undeveloped provenance or where it is unrelated to the hypothesis were less successful.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- The coursework assignment title being used should allow candidates to **assess** significance.
- Candidates should try to use argument and counter-argument. This will help them focus on the assessment of significance, rather than on just explanation and description.
- Candidates should avoid starting their answers with long descriptive introductions about the background.
- It is important to use a range of criteria so that significance can be measured in different ways.
- The best answers end with a conclusion where the candidate supports a clear overall judgement about significance.

## General comments

The work of candidates was generally of a high standard and some interesting assignments were seen. Most candidates made great efforts to assess significance, although some fell into description in places. Nearly all the titles used were valid and worked well. Much of the marking was detailed and accurate and useful annotations to the work were often provided. The relevant forms were generally correctly completed.

## Comments on specific questions

A range of titles was seen. Examples of the types of title that worked well include:

- How significant was Lenin in Russian history, 1917–30?
- Assess the significance of Nelson Mandela for South Africa.
- Assess the significance of propaganda in Germany from 1930 to 1945.
- How significant was the Treaty of Versailles for the Weimar Republic?
- How far was the New Deal a turning point in US history 1941?

‘Assess the significance of...’ and ‘How significant was...’ are good ways to start the wording of titles. The above titles vary a great deal in their ranges and candidates need to understand the implications of this. Titles covering a long period raise the possibility of long-term significance being considered and although not as much detail would be expected, there is the possibility of answers being too thin in content. Titles covering a short period should display a greater depth of knowledge. Whatever the title, it is important that candidates are able use a range of criteria when assessing significance. In other words, they should be considering different ways in which their subject was significant or not significant. For example, geographical range – was its significance local, national or international? Or was it politically significant, or does its significance lie more in social and economic areas? Candidates can also be given opportunities to produce strong assignments if the title opens up opportunities for them to discuss issues such as can failure be significant, how do judgements about significance change over time or change when a different question is asked about it?

It is also important to make sure the title does not encourage answers about causation, instead of significance. This can happen when an outcome is named in the title. For example, a title such as ‘How significant were President Hoover’s policies in Roosevelt’s victory in the 1932 presidential election?’ can lead to candidates comparing the importance of the different reasons for the victory. On the other hand, a title such as ‘Assess the significance of Roosevelt’s New Deal’ allows candidates to evaluate different ways in

which it may have been significant, different reasons for its significance, different perspectives on its significance, as well as its significance over time and its significance for different groups. Candidates are not expected to cover all of these, but the title does give them opportunities to produce a work that will tackle the issue of significance properly.

The best answers began to assess significance early on. They did not contain long introductory sections. Some listed the criteria they planned to use, while others let the criteria emerge as the answer developed. Less successful answers identified criteria at the beginning but did not go on to use them. Using criteria allows candidates to ask a range of questions about the significance of their individual, development or event, and to consider how far it was significant in different ways and for different reasons. The best answers also considered significance from different perspectives, explaining how an individual or event may have been significant for some groups but not for others.

One importance difference between the reasonable answers and the very good ones seen was that the former explained significance, while the latter assessed it. Better answers often involved candidates using argument and counter-argument to evaluate significance. Weaker answers tended to assume that the individual, development or event was significant and explained why. The weakest answers described the event or what the individual did and asserted that this demonstrated significance. Candidates need to explain, for example, why what an individual did mattered either at the time or later. Some candidates confused success with significance and did not realise that a failure can be significant.

Having used argument and counter-argument to explore several ways in which their event, development or individual may have been significant, the best answers contained a conclusion about the most important reason why it was, or was not, significant. Those that were done well were supported by arguments.

Much of the marking of coursework was accurate. Comments alongside parts of answers were sometimes useful to indicate particularly important sections, but they should not be used to identify achievement of a level in the mark scheme. Levels can only be awarded once an answer has been considered as a whole. They should be used in a 'best fit' approach and this involves balancing strengths and weaknesses of an answer. Summative comments by teachers were useful when used to indicate the main characteristics of an answer and to explain how these matched the requirements of a particular level.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/41  
Alternative to Coursework

## Key messages

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance/significance. A good depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

## General comments

A small range of Depth Studies was undertaken in this examination session. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. A number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941. There were too few attempts at Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates missed the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections lacking relevance. Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance/significance.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 1918**

**Question 1** was more widely answered, though a good number of candidates attempted **Question 2**.

**Question 1** was generally well answered. Candidates got to grips with the focus of the question and were deeply knowledgeable about the Schlieffen Plan and the resistance from Britain and France against the German advance in 1914. Most commonly cited were the key battles such as Mons and the Marne and some responses were able to provide a good level of detail in their descriptions and explanations. The main counterarguments seen examined the importance of Belgian resistance in slowing down the initial German advance westwards, as well as the speed of the Russian mobilisation in the East which helped cause a war on two fronts. The best answers provided some explanations, and a few were able to link factors together. Weaker responses tended to lack accurate or precise examples to support their arguments, with some answers getting confused about the exact chronology of the early stages of the war.

**Question 2** was generally less well answered than **Question 1**. The stronger responses focused clearly on the causes of the stalemate on the Western Front and were able to provide reason why the machine gun was a significant weapon that pinned down enemy soldiers in the trenches due to its defensive capabilities. This was most commonly compared against other significant weapons in the early stages of the war that contributed to the stalemate, most notably artillery. Many candidates also examined the significance of the trench system itself and the lack of tactics used by military commanders to overcome the newer defensive style of warfare that was emerging on the Western Front in 1914 – 15. Weaker responses often confused machine guns with artillery, which led to inaccurate assertions about the significance of the weapon. A few candidates also made reference to the use of tanks on the Western Front which were only first used in 1916

in the Somme campaign- by this time the stalemate was well-established and the tank was an attempt to break the stalemate, and so was not a cause, which was the focus of this question.

### **Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945**

**Question 3** and **Question 4** were both popular choices among candidates, though more candidates opted for **Question 3**.

**Question 3** was generally well answered. Candidates tended to have good knowledge and understanding of the importance of the invasion and occupation of the Ruhr, and many were able to describe or explain why this led to social and economic problems in Germany by 1924. Most responses examined the passive resistance, the French reactions to the strike action and the printing of money which led to hyperinflation in their arguments. This was then compared with other factors which led to socio-economic problems in Germany such as the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Many candidates demonstrated an in-depth knowledge in this area and were able to provide some convincing arguments and reach supported conclusions on relative importance. Less successful responses made factual errors, some confusing the Ruhr region with the Rhineland, while a few answers gave inaccurate or partially accurate narratives of the causes of the hyperinflation. Some candidates went beyond the 1924 cut-off point for this question and examined events in the later 1920s. A small number of responses examined political problems such as the nature of the Weimar Constitution. This question asked candidates to focus on social and economic issues only.

**Question 4** was generally less well answered than **Question 3**. Some candidates were able to accurately examine the significance of the Second World War in radicalising Nazi policies towards the Jews and commented on the use of the Einsatzgruppen and the decision taken by leading Nazis at the Wannsee Conference on the Final Solution. This was then balanced by examining the significance of events before the outbreak of war on anti-Semitic policies - most commonly cited were the boycotting of Jewish shops and businesses, the Nuremberg Laws and Kristallnacht. Some responses would have benefited from a deeper knowledge and understanding of anti-Semitic policies in Nazi Germany and Nazi occupied Europe. This would have helped to prevent generalised assertions and unsupported explanations.

### **Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941**

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. **Question 5** attracted more responses, with only a small number attempting **Question 6**.

**Question 5** saw some strong responses where candidates were able to examine a range of factors which weakened the Tsarist system of government by 1914. The best answers explained the importance of the 1905 Revolution in causing widespread riots and strikes across Russia after the Bloody Sunday incident, leading to many opposition groups demanding representation and even revolution. Candidates examined the terms of the October Manifesto and particularly the setting up the Duma and the limited democracy it created in Russia for the first time. This was then balanced against other factors such as the Russo-Japanese War, the policies of Stolypin and the actions and character of Tsar Nicholas II himself. However, many answers lacked detailed examples and tended to provide mostly generalised material, leading to unsupported explanations and limited descriptions. A few weaker responses went beyond the 1914 cut-off point and examined events that occurred later in the First World War, such as the Tsar assuming personal command of the Imperial Russian Army in 1915. It is vital to keep within the chronological parameters of the question.

**Question 6** had fewer responses than **Question 5** and was generally less well answered. Some good responses were able to provide a good range of examples of how policies towards women were significant amongst the social changes in Stalin's Russia after 1928. The best answers recognised how policies towards women progressed and regressed in this period, especially as a possible war against Germany became more likely - most commonly cited was the reversal of laws towards divorce. This was then balanced against other social changes caused by Stalin's policies towards ethnic minorities, religious groups, and young people. A few of the best answers also examined the social changes caused by the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation. Other responses lacked in-depth knowledge and provided only limited descriptions of social changes in Russia under Stalin. Many focused their answers on economic issues or political developments in the period, which was not the focus of this question.

### **Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941**

This was the second most popular choice of Depth Study among candidates.

**Question 7** produced only a small number of strong responses, with many answers lacking examples and a general understanding of the problems faced by farmers in the USA in the 1920s. The best responses clearly identified and explained how the end of the war in Europe saw farmers lose their markets for selling foodstuffs, leading to overproduction and lower prices. Some responses also explained how government tariffs and foreign competition exacerbated this issue further in the 1920s and saw many farmers lose their farms, being unable to pay off their debts. This was then balanced against other factors such as Republican policies, the increasingly mechanised production methods used in agriculture and the changes in demand in the domestic market for fresh fruit and vegetables, which many smaller farmers were unable to meet. Other responses would have been improved by detailed knowledge and the greater breadth and depth necessary to write convincing arguments and explanations, allowing them to reach supported conclusions or judgements on relative importance. A few of the weaker answers refocused their answers on the economic boom or the Roaring Twenties, which was not the question.

**Question 8** was less popular, but well answered in most cases. Candidates had a great deal of contextual knowledge about the significance of the Red Scare in the USA and how it led to intolerance. Many candidates cited the Russian Revolution in 1917 and the US fear of immigrants from Eastern Europe bringing radical ideas such as communism and anarchism with them to the USA. There were many mentions of the Palmer Raids and the Sacco and Vanzetti trial, which helped exemplify the nature of the Red Scare in the 1920s. This was then compared against other factors that led to intolerance such as racism (with the Ku Klux Klan and Jim Crow Laws most commonly cited) and religious fundamentalism. The best answers did manage to reach valid and supported conclusions based on relative significance, though more could have provided a sustained argument throughout their essay. Less successful responses often provided limited narratives of the period and listed events in the 1920s in no particular logical order.

**Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990**

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

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

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

**Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945**

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

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 0470/42**  
**Alternative to Coursework**

## **Key messages**

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance/significance. A good depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

## **General comments**

A small range of Depth Studies was undertaken in this examination session. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. A number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941. There were too few attempts at Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates missed the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections lacking relevance. Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance/significance.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 1918**

**Question 1** was by far the more popular choice, with only a small number of candidates attempting **Question 2**.

**Question 1** was generally well answered. Candidates generally got to grips with the focus of the question and demonstrated a wide and comprehensive knowledge of the importance of artillery as a major cause of high casualties in the First World War on the Western Front. The strongest answers were able to give accurate and detailed descriptions of how artillery was used to bombard enemy trenches even when there was no offensive and often mentioned the fact that reconnaissance aircraft were used to increase accuracy. Some candidates also examined the different types of shells used during the war, such as gas and high explosive shells. This was then compared with other weapons, such as machine-guns, chemical weapons and tanks, and helped some responses to reach convincing and well-supported conclusions. A few, weaker responses inaccurately defined the meaning of artillery. This often led the candidate to describe all weapons, including the machine-gun, as a type of artillery weapon. An in-depth knowledge of the weapons used in the First World War and how they changed the nature of warfare in the trenches is vital.

**Question 2** had far fewer responses and they were generally weaker than answers for **Question 1**. A few good responses demonstrated a good grasp of the significance of the Kiel Mutiny in 1918 and how it helped lead to further strikes and riots across Germany, leading to the October Revolution and calls for the abdication of the Kaiser and a democratic or soviet-style government in Germany. This was then countered with other factors such as the food and fuel shortages caused by the British blockade of German ports, inflation issues, military losses, and high casualties after the US entry into the war and the role played

by Hindenburg and Ludendorff. Some responses would have been improved by greater knowledge of this period in 1918 and the social, economic, and political problems faced in Germany. This would have helped to reduce the number of limited descriptions and generalised comments from candidates.

### **Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945**

**Question 3** and **Question 4** were both widely answered by candidates.

**Question 3** was generally well answered. Many candidates had a strong knowledge and understanding of the importance Hitler played in the Nazi electoral success by 1932 when the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag. The strongest responses examined Hitler's role in organising the Nazi Party, using Mein Kampf to propagate their ideology and policies after the Munich Putsch and the oratory skills and leadership qualities viewed by the German public as attractive, especially after 1929 and the onset of the Depression. This was then balanced by examining other important factors such as the impact the Wall Street Crash had on Germany, leading to high unemployment, the collapse of trade and the banking system and the increasing fear of a communist uprising from many middle-class and upper-class Germans which played into the hands of the Nazis. Many candidates also demonstrated breadth in their responses by also considering the importance of propaganda, negative cohesion and the role played by the SA in both causing chaos on the streets and portraying the Nazis as organised and disciplined at a time when the Weimar system of democracy looked weak, and the President was ruling by emergency decree. The best answers included detailed examples and statistics which helped candidates provide convincing explanations and reach supported judgements about relative importance. Less successful responses often went beyond 1932 and examined Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in 1933 which was not the focus of this question.

**Question 4** was less well answered than **Question 3** in general, but some candidates managed to provide a balanced and analytical answer. The strongest responses were able to explain how rearmament was a significant aspect of Nazi rule after 1933 and gave some good detail about how it was used to reduce unemployment caused by the Depression, as well as provide the armed forces needed by Hitler to reverse the territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles and start a future war against the East and West. Most candidates then examined a wide variety of other aspects of Nazi rule, such as the propaganda machine created by Goebbels, the police state created by Himmler, as well as the nature of racial policies aimed at German families and young people. Weaker responses often provided material outside of the chronological parameters of the question and examined events before 1933 or during the Second World War. These answers often lacked knowledge of Nazi policies between 1933 and 1939 and contained only generalised material.

### **Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941**

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. Both questions were answered, although **Question 5** was the more popular choice.

**Question 5** was generally answered well. Candidates focused well on addressing the question and provided many different reasons for the collapse of Tsarist rule in March 1917, which included both long-term and short-term issues. Candidates examined different social and economic problems faced by Tsarist Russia by considering aspects both urban and rural in nature. The problems faced by poorer peasants and the lack of good arable land (peasant land issue) was generally well-recognised by candidates, as well as the tensions caused by Stolypin's agrarian reforms and the increased size of the wealthier kulak class. Answers also looked at the living and working conditions of the urban workers and how this led to increased support for radical socialist parties like the Russian Labour Party. This was then balanced against the relative importance of other factors; most commonly cited were the effects of the First World War, the actions of the Tsar and the role of Rasputin. The best answers were able to make valid links between the long-term social and economic problems and how these were exaggerated further by the impact of the war. Other responses lacked contextual knowledge and only gave very generalised material which led to unconvincing explanations and arguments.

**Question 6** was less widely answered than **Question 5**. **Question 6** was also less well answered on the whole but there were some standout responses by candidates, nonetheless. The best answers gave detailed descriptions and explanations of the significance of collectivisation in Stalin's rule over Russia after 1928 and pointed to the massive changes in Soviet agriculture, such as the creation of collective farms, the liquidation of the kulak class of peasants, famine, and peasant resistance but also the significance of the policy in terms of funding the industrialisation and modernisation of the USSR via the Five-Year Plans. Balance was mainly provided by examining a range of other factors in Stalin's rule, such as the use of the NKVD, the purges and show trials, Stalin's cult of personality, propaganda, the policy of Russification and other social policies.

Other responses would have benefited from greater breadth and depth of knowledge to help produce convincing descriptions and explanations, rather than generalised and unsupported assertions.

#### **Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941**

This was the second most popular Depth Study, with **Question 7** attracting many more answers than **Question 8**.

**Question 7** saw some strong responses from candidates. Many candidates were able to provide a detailed and comprehensive set of explanations that focused on the importance of new methods of production in the USA such as the assembly line and mechanisation powered by electrification and how this helped cause the economic boom of the 1920s. Candidates were able to provide many examples, including some detailed statistics, to support their arguments and conclusions. Balance was provided by examining other important causes of the economic boom, most notably Republican policies such as low taxation and tariffs, hire-purchase schemes, advertising, and the wealth accrued due to American trade and loans from the First World War. The best answers were able to reach conclusions and make supported judgements about the most important factor/s that caused the economic boom. Weaker responses often lacked the detailed contextual knowledge needed to address the question fully or only focused on very few factors in their responses.

**Question 8** was less well answered than **Question 7** in general, though there were some strong responses. Many of the best answers demonstrated a good knowledge of Roosevelt's election campaign in 1932 and referred to his campaign trail by train across the USA, his lively and personable speeches which promised action and a New Deal for the American people and his overall optimistic attitude during the Depression. This was then balanced in most cases by considering the failures of President Hoover during the Depression and his perceived failure to deal with the problems in the USA caused by unemployment, such as homelessness and hunger. A small number of candidates also considered the ramifications of the Bonus March on Hoover's popularity. Less successful responses would have benefited from providing examples and being less descriptive or narrative; some focused on the New Deal reforms put into place after Roosevelt was inaugurated President in 1933 which lacked relevance to this question.

#### **Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990**

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

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

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

#### **Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945**

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

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 0470/43**  
**Alternative to Coursework**

## **Key messages**

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance/significance. A good depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

## **General comments**

A range of Depth Studies was undertaken in this examination session, with Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941, the most popular among candidates. There were too few attempts at Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were a number of rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates missed the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections lacking relevance. Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance/significance.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918**

#### **Question 1**

Successful responses were able to show how diseases impacted on the lives of soldiers fighting in the trenches, with reference to poor hygiene, rats and lice. To provide balance, other relevant material included reference to the boredom of life between offensives, flooded trenches and the constant risk of bombardment by machine guns and artillery. There were a number of attempts at this question but many of these would have benefited from more specific knowledge and a greater focus on the wording of the question. More responses could have mentioned the impact of weapons and bombardments and avoided limited descriptions.

#### **Question 2**

The focus of this question was on the reasons for Allied victory in 1918. This question was less popular than **Question 1**. Successful answers were able to show how the USA provided loans, food, munitions and other supplies before finally entering the war and sending troops in large numbers in 1918. Balance was provided by setting out reasons for German problems by this period such as the naval blockade and war weariness in Germany, contrasted with the impact of Allied tactics and technology. Some responses commented more generally on the actions of the USA and would have been improved by greater knowledge of their involvement.

## **Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945**

### **Question 3**

This question focused on the development of the Weimar Republic up to 1929. There were a number of responses to this question, with candidates able to provide a good level of detail about Stresemann's policies such as the introduction of the Rentenmark, Locarno Treaties and the Dawes Plan. Candidates found it more of a challenge to provide balance, although some managed to examine other aspects of the development of the Weimar Republic from its formation onwards. These included the Constitution, the actions of Ebert and the political revolts.

### **Question 4**

In this question some candidates struggled with the concept of Nazification but still managed balanced descriptions of the period. Some of these responses lacked specific detail and provided only generalised knowledge. Youth policy was well known but there was often no distinction between education policy and the role of the Hitler Youth. Most candidates provided some balance by referencing policy for young people as compared to racial and eugenics policies and ones aimed at the workers like Strength through Joy and the creation of the DAF. Some answers wrote with more of a focus on how the Nazis kept control but much of this information was still relevant.

## **Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941**

### **Question 5**

This question focused on the reasons for the weakening of the Provisional Government between March 1917 and November 1917. As such it was important that there was a narrow focus with details provided for events within these dates. Balanced responses were able to show how the Petrograd Soviet undermined the Provisional Government and contrast this with mistakes made by the Provisional Government itself. Some candidates confused the Petrograd Soviet with the Bolsheviks or overstated the Bolshevik influence over them. There were, however, some balanced descriptions with attempts at development, in answering the question.

### **Question 6**

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

## **Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–1941**

### **Question 7**

This was a very popular question among candidates. It focused on the ways in which the lives of black Americans were shaped during the 1920s. Successful responses were those which were able to show how specifically black Americans working in agriculture were affected during the 1920s. However, many responses were much more general, writing about problems in agriculture during this period with very brief references to black Americans. Most candidates were aware of other factors affecting black Americans during the period and were able to provide examples such as intimidation by the Ku Klux Klan and general intolerance as well as the Jim Crow laws and racial segregation in the South. Many referred to the movement of black Americans to the North and the popularity of jazz and black cultural movements. Some missed the time period of the question and wrote more generally about the depression of the 1930s.

### **Question 8**

This question required a focus on how Roosevelt dealt with the problems caused by the Great Depression. Many candidates did not name the Emergency Banking Act specifically but were able to describe it accurately. Some answers were more general and lacked specific knowledge in this area. Knowledge of the Alphabet Agencies was limited, although some were named. Candidates were less successful in showing what these agencies did and how they dealt with the problems of the Depression. Other responses focused more on the reasons for the Depression and did not refer to responses to the problems.

**Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c.1990**

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

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

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

**Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945**

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