

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

It is very important that candidates read the question carefully before they begin their response, in order to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses. Any given dates in the question should be closely noted to help ensure that their responses only include relevant information.

Successful responses to **parts (b) and (c)** were carefully organised into separate paragraphs for the different issues which were being explained.

When a question asks 'why' a particular event happened it is important that candidates direct their response to address and explain the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened.

General comments

Many candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study Questions for which they had been prepared. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect and communicated their ideas clearly and accurately. They wrote well developed explanations and arguments in answer to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the question set. These responses tended not to be divided up into paragraphs and often consisted of a descriptive list of facts.

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

Part (a) questions required recall and description. Responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. Generally, candidates performed well in giving answers to **(a)** questions that were short and concise, with little unnecessary background information.

Part (b) and (c) questions required understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions but were unable to develop these identification points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative approach. They could identify a factor/reason and then use a link such as 'this means that' which will lead them into an explanation.

Part (b) questions require recall and explanation. Most **(b)** questions ask 'why' a particular issue happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, using a separate paragraph for each different reason that was being explained. Narrative accounts or long introductions which 'set the scene' were not required.

Part (c) questions require recall, explanation and analysis. Most candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure a balanced answer. The most successful responses argued both for and against the focus of the question and reached a supported judgement. A valid conclusion will go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated in the response by addressing, 'how far', 'how successful' or 'how important', depending on the actual question set. Weaker responses were characterised either by a 'listing' narrative approach with few attempts to link the points made to the question or a concentration on only 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 to 3

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

Question 4

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates wrote about the second Moroccan Crisis which was in 1911. Other weaker responses included general and inaccurate description. However, there were some good responses which showed an understanding of the events of the Morocco Crisis, 1905 – 06. For example, responses included details such as: the Kaiser's main aim was to prevent France from occupying Morocco. To do this he visited Tangier to give his support to the Sultan and a conference was called at Algeciras in 1906 to discuss the situation.
- (b) Strong responses understood that this was a friendship alliance between Britain and France and identified and explained the reasons why the Entente Cordiale was agreed. The most common reasons explained were the increasing threat from Germany and the protection of each other's colonial interests. Less successful tended to be inaccurate by including Russia in the Entente and assuming that it was an aggressive military alliance.
- (c) This question produced some good responses which included well balanced, supported explanations on both sides of the argument. Candidates wrote confidently about the role played by Austria in causing the war. They understood the long-standing rivalry with Serbia and the impact of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The other approach most commonly used to counter-balance the argument was the actions of Germany. Candidates were well informed on Germany's military and naval expansion prior to the outbreak of war, the formulation of the Schlieffen Plan and the 'blank cheque' given to Austria. Others included the role of Russia and Serbia as well. These responses often made references to the Alliance System and imperialism to support their argument. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive lists of the causes of the First World War. These responses could have been improved by linking each identified point to the question.

Questions 5

This was the most popular question in this section.

- (a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of the use of plebiscites in the peace settlement, 1919 – 1920. The strongest responses included four specific details about the use of plebiscites, for example, plebiscites were when people voted, often to do with to which country they wanted to belong. There was a plebiscite in Upper Silesia in 1921 which resulted in the area being divided between Germany and Poland. Candidates could have used other examples, including that a plebiscite was held in 1920 which saw Schleswig divided between Germany and Denmark. A small number gave no response. Weaker responses included general details, usually on the Treaty of Versailles, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. The most successful responses explained an aim of the French at the peace conference and linked it to a specific term in the Treaty of Versailles to illustrate their dissatisfaction. For example, Clemenceau wanted Germany to be disarmed because France had been invaded twice by Germany in the last fifty years and they did not want to be invaded again. They were very dissatisfied because Germany was not completely disarmed - they could have 100,000 men in their army and this could be a future threat to France. Other common reasons for dissatisfaction often included in stronger responses was the fact that Germany was not broken up into separate states as Clemenceau wished, nor were the reparations high enough. Weaker responses were characterised by descriptions of the aims of French delegation going into the peace conference with no specific reason as to why they were dissatisfied. Others compared the aims of the 'Big Three' which lacked relevance to this question.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses to this question which discussed the extent to which political turmoil was the most serious consequence of the Treaty of Versailles for Germany up to 1923. Strong responses explained the political turmoil in terms of accepting the



Treaty made the government look weak and many Germans thought that 'Germany had been stabbed in the back' and referred to the politicians who accepted the Treaty as 'the November Criminals'. They explained the threats to the government from the Kapp Putsch of 1921 and Munich Putsch of 1923 and their determination to overthrow the Weimar Government and abolish the Treaty of Versailles. Such responses produced a balanced answer by then explaining other serious consequences of the Treaty of Versailles, not least the terms of the Treaty, the most common being the economic and military terms and their effects on Germany. They showed how the terms of the Treaty seriously affected the German economy because of the failure to pay reparations which resulted in the French and Belgian invasion of the Ruhr and subsequent hyperinflation. It is important that candidates read the question carefully as some responses included details from 1924 onwards which were not relevant. Weaker responses included descriptions of the terms of the treaty with no direct linkage to the question. A small number of candidates misunderstood the term 'political turmoil' and wrote generally about why the Weimar Republic was weak.

Question 6

- (a) Strong responses were familiar with the Anti-Comintern Pact and gained credit by identifying the Pact's signatories, the year or years in which they joined and its anti-Soviet intention. A number of candidates gave no response or included incorrect Pact members and reasons as to why it was formed. These responses would have benefited from accurate knowledge of the Pact.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most candidates were able to identify one or two reasons why the British-French guarantees to Poland failed to prevent war in 1939. Strong responses gave two good explanations. The most commonly cited reason was that of the British-French policy of appeasement in 1938 and 1939 and then examples were given to enhance the explanation, most notably the Munich Agreement and their reaction to Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. This boosted Hitler's confidence to the extent that he believed Britain and France would not follow their guarantees through, were he to invade Poland. Successful responses then explained the importance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939 to Hitler and how this ruled out the danger of Soviet intervention against Germany should Hitler invade Poland. Other responses often only included one explanation, usually omitting the Nazi-Soviet Pact, or missed the phrase 'British-French guarantees to Poland' in the question and wrote generally about why war had broken out in 1939.
- (c) This question produced some good answers. Strong responses examined both sides of the argument, giving evidence in support of the hypothesis and then explaining that Britain and France did have a choice and did not need to allow Hitler to remilitarise the Rhineland. Most candidates were able to identify at least two factors to support the argument for non-action on the part of Britain and France. These most commonly included the impact of the Great Depression on the two countries, the Rhineland as Germany's backyard, the perceived severity of the Versailles Treaty, elections in France and the greater importance that seemed to be accorded to the Abyssinian crisis. Some of these strong responses also referred to the Anglo-German Naval Treaty of 1935 to show that, in effect, Britain had already embarked on a conciliatory attitude towards Germany and the restrictions of the Versailles Treaty. Arguments in favour of Anglo-French action were less numerous and less well supported, and less successful responses were one sided. However, strong responses explained with confidence that Britain did have a choice to try and stop the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. These responses explained that Hitler's move into the Rhineland was a gamble and that Britain and France missed an opportunity and that they would have succeeded easily in resisting his army. Many made the point that this was a breach of both the Versailles settlement and the Locarno Treaty and that the two powers were therefore bound to enforce it. Weaker responses were often characterised by the inclusion of less relevant information, including reasons why Hitler invaded the Rhineland which was not the focus of the question.

Question 7

This was the second most popular question in this section.

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and they displayed a good understanding of Marshall Aid. Many very strong answers identified key features, such as: It was introduced by General George Marshall in June 1947, the aim being to stabilise the economies of Western Europe after the damage caused by World War Two. This was done to prevent the spread of communism.

- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses contained two detailed explanations of why Stalin wanted control over the governments of the states in Eastern Europe. Most responses identified the same two reasons, the desire to spread communism and the need to create a buffer state between the USSR and the West. Strong responses went on to explain why Russia wanted to create a buffer zone, by including that Russia had been invaded twice by the West in both the First and Second World Wars, had suffered heavy casualties and Stalin did not want this to happen again. He wanted neighbouring states such as Poland to be under his control for protection. Weaker responses often identified reasons, for example, to spread communism but gave no explanation.
- (c) This question invited candidates to say how far they agreed with the statement, 'Truman was the main cause of tension at Potsdam.' Successful responses explained Truman's attitude and stance at Potsdam, usually comparing it to that of Stalin. Credit was awarded for the explanation of Truman's anti-communist attitude and his feelings of mistrust towards Stalin, resulting in differences of opinion, including on whether reparations should be imposed on Germany. Truman also raised tension at the meeting by telling Stalin that America had successfully tested an atomic bomb in a desert in New Mexico. Stalin saw this as a threat. A common misconception was that Truman told Stalin at the meeting that he had dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima; this was after the meeting at Potsdam. Well balanced responses also examined Stalin's contribution to the tension, most commonly explaining that he had not carried out the promises he made at Yalta, to organise free elections in Poland. He had liberated Poland, yet the Red Army remained there. Some candidates misread the assertion and included details after Potsdam which lacked relevance to this question. Some responses also confused the agreements made at Potsdam with those of Yalta a few months earlier. It is important for candidates to read the questions carefully to ascertain the focus of the question. Weaker responses, whilst identifying causes of tension, needed to put them into context using supporting details.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9

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

Question 10

- (a) Most candidates were familiar with the contribution of the US forces to the Allied war effort. Successful responses gained full credit by describing the number of troops arriving on the Western Front from March 1918 onwards, the provision of destroyers and merchant ships and the morale boosting effect for the allies of the US intervention. Candidates could also have included that the US troops were fresh and not tired of fighting and their intervention devastated German morale. Some responses could have been improved by including more specific details than just statements such as 'they provided more resources'.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses just identified reasons for Germany's surrender, such as the high casualty rate, unstable conditions at home and the fact that they were war weary. Contextual knowledge could have been used to develop these reasons into explanations. For example, the Germans agreed to surrender because they could not fight any longer. The Ludendorff Offensive had made progress in March and April 1918 but a counterattack by Allied forces drove the Germans back, resulting in 400 000 casualties. In August, another 400 000 Germans were taken prisoner. Faced with such severe losses the Germans could not fight for much longer.
- (c) A number of well-developed and balanced responses to this question were seen, with candidates explaining that the German people were starving as a result of the blockade of the German ports and the resulting severe shortage of food. Strong responses then went on to explain other reasons for the outbreak of revolution in Germany in October 1918. Most commonly, responses stated that the stresses of the war had led to mutinies at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven, both of which were well



understood by most candidates. Other responses could have been improved by supporting their identification of reasons with more detailed explanations. Some candidates included events after October 1918, for example the events of November 1918.

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was well-answered. Strong responses included a variety of details including the re-grouping of the Nazi Party after the failure of the Munich Putsch and the realisation that violence would not work and they would have to gain power legally to gain popularity. Others included details on the improved organisation of the party, such as Goebbels being put in charge of propaganda and Hitler's speaking talents. Credit was also given for the foundation of the SS in 1925 and the Hitler Youth in 1926. Some also noted that the Nazi Party made limited progress during this time and often made reference to Stresemann's success in the period as a reason for this. Strong responses commented on how relatively poorly the Nazis performed in the Reichstag elections of 1924 and 1928. Weaker responses included details outside the time period of the question.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Successful responses contained two detailed explanations for the Nazi failure in the Munich Putsch. The most common reasons identified and explained were the inadequate planning and Hitler's over optimism about the level of popular support he could gain. Weaker responses were characterised by simply identifying reasons for failure without explanation or they included detailed accounts of the Putsch but made no reference to why it failed. Some responses revealed uncertainty about the course of events.
- (c) There were many one-sided responses to this question, as candidates found it easier to explain reasons other than creating jobs as part of why the Nazis gained support. These responses cited the popularity of the NSDAP, including Hitler's oratory skills, Goebbels' use of propaganda and their widespread opposition to communism. Strong responses were well-balanced and also explained the severity of the high levels of unemployment in Germany in the 1930s after the Great Depression. They showed how the Nazis gained support from the unemployed as they proposed to tackle unemployment through public works and military regeneration. Less successful responses often misunderstood the scope of the question and discussed how the Nazis maintained power, rather than explaining the reasons for their appeal, which enabled them to get into power. In these responses there was a concentration on Hitler's ruthlessness in 1933 – 1934 (his reaction to the Reichstag Fire and the Night of Long Knives) and on the coercive methods the Nazis used through the 1930s to ensure compliance rather than support (for example, the use of the Gestapo) which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 12

- (a) This question was well answered and there were many very strong responses. These responses included descriptions such as: that it was expected that culture would praise Hitler, the Nazi regime and show pro-Nazi attitudes. They described how paintings had to show images of the ideal Aryan family. Credit was also given for the Nazi use of censorship and what was banned; for example, the works of Jewish artists and writers were banned, whilst any books considered 'undesirable' were burnt.
- (b) Good understanding was shown of one reason why the Nazis wanted to gain control of the Churches, usually how they wanted their support because they had a considerable influence over a large part of the German population. Many candidates found it a challenge to find a second reason and weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons but not going on to provide explanation, such as the Church had a lot of power or the Churches were a possible source of opposition. Strong responses included the Concordat signed by Hitler and the Catholic Church as a relevant explanation. These responses explained that the agreement was significant for Hitler in that the Catholic Church agreed to keep out of political affairs, therefore not criticising the Nazis and reducing the possibility of serious opposition, while the Church would be left to concentrate on religious and pastoral duties.
- (c) Successful responses were well balanced by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Candidates needed to identify and then explain which persecutions were racially motivated and which persecutions were for other reasons. Good understanding was shown of the persecution of

the Jews, both because of racial and other reasons. Explanations included that Hitler hated the Jews for racial reasons because during his years of poverty in Vienna he was obsessed by the fact that Jews ran many of the most successful German businesses and this did not fit in with his idea of the superiority of the Aryan Race. He also blamed them for other reasons, including Germany's defeat in the First World War. He thought that Jewish businessmen and bankers had forced the surrender of the German army. It is important to read the question carefully because the emphasis in this question is on 'why' rather than on 'how'. Weaker responses often included extensive details about Nazi policies against the Jews and details of the conditions and deaths in the concentration camps. Strong responses also included explanations on the non-racial persecution of other groups such as the disabled, homosexuals and drug addicts – the persecution occurring largely because Hitler thought they were a drain on the resources of the German state.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

- (a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of the problems facing American farmers in the 1920s. Maximum credit was achieved for identifying the following features: falling demand from Europe, competition from Canada, which was much more efficient at producing wheat, and overproduction, which resulted in falling prices. Many responses also stressed that a big problem was that some farmers went bankrupt and were evicted from their land.
- (b) There were many strong responses which contained two detailed explanations as to why Republican policies encouraged economic growth. The most common policies explained were the belief in import duties and the policy of laissez faire. For example, strong responses explained that the Republicans believed in tariffs, such as the Fordney-McCumber tariff which made it expensive to import foreign goods. This meant that American businesses were protected from foreign competition and could keep their prices down. This encouraged people to buy products made in the US and allowed American companies to grow rapidly. Weaker responses often correctly identified the policies but encountered challenges explaining them. Others wrote details about what happened, for example the expansion of the car industry, but would have benefited from providing an emphasis on the policies.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question. Strong responses explained both sides of the argument, manufacturing industries which prospered and those that did not. These responses most commonly used the car industry to explain how manufacturing industries prospered. They explained how mass production and advertising had led to the rapid growth of the car industry and, because of the increased demand for cars, other industries such as steel, glass, and rubber also boomed. On the other side of the argument, strong responses addressed which traditional manufacturing industries went into decline and explained examples of such industries, most commonly, cotton textiles. Other responses were usually one-sided, often confining their answers to the car industry.

Questions 16 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Candidates should ensure that their answers for **parts (b) and (c)** are focused on explaining the particular question, rather than on narrating events. For **part (c)**, analysis is also required, and candidates therefore need to argue both for and against the question and reach a substantiated conclusion. The conclusion needs to go further than restating points made earlier in an answer, and instead should address the command words such as 'How far'.

Candidates should pay particular attention to any dates included in a question and restrict their answer to the dates provided. This should mean that their answer is fully relevant and will prevent answers which go beyond what is required.

General comments

Candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding in both the Core Content and Depth Study topics. Many answers contained good supporting evidence which was accurate and detailed, and used in well-developed explanations and arguments in response to their chosen question.

Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it challenging to use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. These candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but they needed to develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers, candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers to these questions. Candidates need to ensure that they then use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make. Candidates do need to focus carefully upon the question set; in some instances they wrote in considerable depth about the main topic of the question, but would have improved their responses with a clear focus on the actual question.

There were some rubric errors seen. The most common was candidates who answered more than the required number of questions, particularly in the Depth Study. Time allocation was generally good, and very few instances were seen of candidates who did not finish or had to shorten their final answers. A small number of candidates wrote extended answers to a **part (a)** question; this is not required.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates were aware that the purpose of the 'war guilt' clause was to blame Germany for starting the war, and many candidates were also able to link this to making Germany pay reparations. Some candidates were also able to state that the purpose was to humiliate Germany or relate it to the amount of damage that had been caused during the war. Some candidates wrote more generally about the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, rather than focusing on the 'war guilt' clause.



- (b) There were some effective answers that were able to identify a reason for plebiscites to be included in the peace settlement, and to support their answer by providing an example of this. These answers were able to explain, for example, that they were used to allow populations to decide which country they should be governed by, for example the Saar. Other reasons explained were linked to Wilson's aim of self-determination, and to settle disputes. Other answers were able to identify reasons for the plebiscites but the answers contained inaccuracies regarding the territories the identification related to.
- (c) Those who approached this question successfully were able to identify one of Clemenceau's aims, explaining why it was important to him, and directly link it to an aspect of the Treaty to explain how it was or was not achieved. For example, they identified that due to the 1870 – 71 war and the German invasion of France during the First World War, Clemenceau wanted to weaken Germany so they would not be able to invade in the future. They then explained that this was achieved through terms of the Treaty such as Germany's disarmament and the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. Better responses managed to achieve a balanced answer, explaining not only which aims were achieved, but also which ones were not. Other candidates, however, listed Clemenceau's aims and then provided a list of the terms of the Treaty, without giving any specific links between the two. Other answers concentrated on the aims of Wilson and Lloyd-George, neither of which were relevant to this question.

Question 6

- (a) This question was answered well by many candidates who were able to identify four ways in which Germany was involved in the Spanish Civil War. Commonly responses included that Germany supported General Franco, the involvement of the Condor Legion, and that the Civil War was used to test out Germany's new tactics. Other successful answers identified the effect of these, describing the effect of the carpet bombing in Guernica.
- (b) There were some good answers to this question, with candidates able to explain reasons for the importance of Czechoslovakia to Hitler. Some candidates were able to identify that the Sudetenland contained important resources and the Skoda armaments factory, and to explain that these were important for Hitler's future conquests. Others identified that there were three and a half million Germans living in the Sudetenland and linked that to Hitler's foreign policy aim of uniting all German speaking people. A number of responses erroneously stated that Hitler wanted to reclaim the Sudetenland since it had been taken from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles, or that it was achieving Hitler's aim of Lebensraum. Other candidates described the negotiations at the Munich Conference without relating these to the importance of Czechoslovakia to Hitler.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates able to assess how surprising it was that Britain and France pursued a policy of appeasement. Some successful explanations considered the importance placed on the demilitarisation of the Rhineland for French security during the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles, arguing that this made the French lack of action in 1936 surprising, particularly given the German order to retreat if they encountered resistance. Answers on the other side of the argument often considered the relative military weakness of Britain compared to Germany within the context of the Great Depression, particularly given the lack of support from the colonies and the USA's policy of isolation at the time. Weaker responses would have been improved by keeping their focus on the command words of 'how surprising'. Some weaker responses instead argued whether appeasement was successful, or why Britain and France carried out appeasement. In these cases, whilst the knowledge and understanding shown was often relevant for the general topic, answers would have benefited from a focus on the requirement of the question.

Question 7

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question, with candidates either providing four relevant and focused points, or misinterpreting the question to state what happened during the Prague Spring, having missed the date of 1948 in the question. Successful answers often knew that the communist takeover of Czechoslovakia meant that non-communists were arrested and were forced out, and that elections were rigged. Many such answers were also aware of Jan Masaryk's fate. Benes was rarely mentioned, and the two most common mistakes were stating that the Soviet army invaded and the confusion with the events of the Prague Spring alluded to above.



- (b) Many answers were able to provide several reasons why the Berlin Blockade was lifted in 1949, although these were sometimes not explained. The most frequently seen arguments were the consequences of the Berlin airlift, and Stalin's fear of using force. Candidates displayed a good level of knowledge but some did not explain how the identified point actually led to, in this case, the lifting of the Blockade. Some weaker responses confused the Berlin Blockade with the Berlin Wall or thought that the airlift aided East Berlin.
- (c) This question was often answered well, with many candidates able to provide arguments on both sides as to whether Truman was to blame for the Cold War. Good answers explained how Truman's anti-communism and his introduction of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan led to an increase in tension between the USA and the Soviet Union because of how they were perceived by Stalin. Many then went on to provide a balanced argument by explaining how Stalin's creation of the satellite states was seen by Truman as aggressive expansion, rather than security or protection. Some weaker answers gave a detailed description of ideological differences instead of an explanation of how these differences led to the start of the Cold War.

Question 8

- (a) Some good answers were seen, with candidates able to provide several examples of the impact of the Iran-Iraq War on civilians. These answers often referred to the number of deaths and casualties, or the damage caused to buildings or food shortages. Weaker answers were those not focused on 'civilians' and mentioning instead the impact on Saddam Hussein or the state.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. More candidates could have provided two explanations for why Saddam Hussein's regime survived the First Gulf War. Some candidates were able to explain that the prospect of Saddam Hussein remaining in power was better than the possible alternative of an Iran inspired Islamic revolution. A few answers were also able to demonstrate how he used the Iraqi National Guard to crush attempts to overthrow him by the Kurds and Shi'ites. Some responses focused on the wrong war, usually the Iran-Iraq war mentioned in **part (a)**.
- (c) There were some good answers to this question, with some responses able to provide several explanations as to the causes of the dispute between Iraq and Kuwait. These responses were also often able to provide a balanced answer, on the one side expanding the role of oil to include Saddam Hussein's accusations of 'slant drilling'. Arguments on the other side often considered his need to secure his position within Iraq through a successful war, and occasionally using Iraq's historical claim to Kuwait. Weaker responses needed to include more knowledge and understanding in identifying reasons for the dispute or answered about the USA's involvement in the area being due to oil.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Not all candidates were able to describe events on 1 July 1916. Those who were able to do this described the fighting and also the high numbers of deaths and casualties. Some responses described the Battle of the Marne or the race to the sea in error.
- (b) This question was answered well, with candidates able to explain at least two ways in which conditions in the trenches were unhealthy for soldiers. Explanations included the effect of the trenches being waterlogged, leading to trench foot, and also the prevalence of lice, leading to the spread of disease such as trench fever. Some candidates also explained the psychological effects of living in the trenches, resulting in shell shock. Weaker responses provided detailed descriptions of the conditions in the trenches but did not explain the effect that these had on the soldiers.
- (c) This question was answered well, with candidates confident in their knowledge and understanding of how effectively new technology was used in the First World War. Answers were often balanced, with at least two explanations. The most common approach was to describe the new technology, and then provide examples of when it was used effectively and when it was not, often related to specific battles. Tanks, poison gas and aircraft were explained most frequently, and detailed knowledge was often displayed. Weaker responses would have benefited from moving beyond the description of the new technology, to an evaluation of whether such technology was used effectively.



Question 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was answered well, with the majority of candidates able to provide several distinct points about the 25 Points Programme. Most recognised it as being the Nazi programme and having been composed by Hitler and they provided aspects of it such as the opposition to the Versailles Treaty. Very few mistakes were seen, but these were often related to help being provided for the unemployed.
- (b) Very good understanding was shown of at least one reason why Goebbels and his propaganda was important to Hitler, and these points were often well supported and explained. The most common approach was firstly to explain his role in increasing support for Hitler during his rise to power, and then also explaining how he helped in maintaining that support and control once Hitler was in power. These explanations were supported by very good levels of knowledge and understanding, with candidates often able to show how particular groups were targeted by Goebbels' propaganda and how it was successful. Some answers tended to describe the propaganda, without explaining the impact that it had and thus its importance to Hitler. Some answers contained inaccuracies such as stating that Goebbels controlled the radios before the Nazis came to power.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question and more balanced responses would have improved may answers. Responses often showed understanding of the events leading up to Hitler becoming Chancellor but would have benefited from arguing how these events resulted in Hitler becoming Chancellor. Some good answers were seen, and these often argued that the electoral success of the Nazis meant that alternative coalition governments were unstable, leading to Hindenburg's appointment of Hitler as the only alternative. Arguments on the other side considered factors such as the political manoeuvrings of Hindenburg and Von Papen and the effects of the Great Depression on Weimar politics. A small number of candidates were also able to explain how the failure of the Munich Putsch resulted in the reorganisation of the Nazi Party and explained how the creation of local organisations led to electoral success.

Question 12

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and displayed a good level of knowledge about the Nazis' views of the role of women in society. Most candidates stated that women were expected to stay at home and have children and referred to the 'three Ks'. Other answers were also aware that this changed during the war and women were expected to work in factories or mentioned the Lebensborn programme.
- (b) This question proved challenging for some candidates, although some were able to provide two explanations of why the Nazis aimed to achieve autarky. Candidates who understood the nature of autarky often provided an explanation linking the need for self-sufficiency to Hitler's long-term foreign policy aims and the possibility of a future war, but would have improved their responses by providing a second distinct explanation. Some candidates made incorrect statements such as that autarky was trying to destroy the Treaty of Versailles or was part of the Nazi Jewish policy.
- (c) Some responses to this question were one-sided, with few answers considering the impact of Total War on German civilians. Some provided limited explanations of the impact of the allied bombing of German cities such as Dresden, or the impact of the naval blockade, leading to shortages, but there was often a lack of supporting detail. Explanations about the impact of Total War were either not attempted or limited to general statements about women working, which lacked consideration of the impact that this had. Other answers did not focus on civilians, but instead provided descriptions of the impact of the war on German soldiers.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates displayed a good general level of knowledge and understanding on this question. Most responses were able to identify that life for Russian peasants in 1905 was hard due to famine and starvation. Other identifications were also that their lives were controlled by the Communes, and that disease was common. Some answers neglected to concentrate on peasants, and instead concentrated their answers on conditions in the towns and cities.
- (b) This question was answered well, with many candidates providing at least one explanation why the October Manifesto was introduced. Most commonly candidates explained how the events of Bloody Sunday resulted in the Tsar needing to calm the situation by making concessions, or how the extent of the unrest meant that the Tsar had to take action. Other candidates provided good explanations as to how the October Manifesto divided the opposition, enabling the Tsar to regain control.
- (c) Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer explaining ways in which the Tsar was firmly in control of Russia at the start of 1914, and ways in which he was not. There were many good explanations agreeing with the hypothesis, with answers examining the Fundamental Laws and the role of Stolypin in establishing the Tsar's control. Answers were less assured in their explanations of the other side of the argument, with a tendency to make generalised comments about the existence of opposition. The unpopularity of Rasputin was a valid argument on this side, with some candidates explaining that this caused dissatisfaction amongst some of the nobility. Often, however, the timeframe given in the question was missed, and answers referred to Rasputin helping the Tsarina rule Russia during the First World War, or how the First World War impacted the popularity of the Tsar.

Question 14

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

Question 15

- (a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of what a 'flapper' was, and many achieved high marks. Such responses included details of their clothing and actions, being aware that they were young women who wore shorter clothes and went out in public unchaperoned. Other valid responses included that they were often from the middle and upper classes, and that they came more often from urban areas.
- (b) This question was answered well, with candidates able to explain at least one reason why the 1920s became known as the Jazz Age. Answers displayed a good level of knowledge and understanding of the growth in the popularity of jazz, and often explained how it had started in the south and spread to gain young white audiences throughout the country. Other valid responses included details about specific jazz musicians, or venues such as the Cotton Club, to demonstrate its popularity. A number of responses would have benefited from the inclusion of a second explanation.
- (c) Very good understanding was shown of the reasons for the failure of prohibition, and many strong and well-balanced responses were seen. Candidates were confident in agreeing with the question hypothesis that it failed because it encouraged violence, often using examples such as the growth in violence between the rival gangs, and in particular the St Valentine's Day massacre. Other reasons for the failure were explained well, with responses explaining the role of speakeasies, the inability of the police to enforce it, or the widespread accessibility of alcohol leading to prohibition failing. Some candidates also considered the detrimental economic effect on the government through the loss of taxes, for example. Weaker responses that provided a description of the various reasons, would have benefited from linking these reasons specifically to how this meant that prohibition failed.

Questions 16 to 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' or 'how successful', depending on the actual 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 that they were able to use in the **part (a)** questions. Most candidates answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph and recognised that explanation is not required.

The best answers to **part (b) and (c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information which was lacking in relevance. Candidates gained credit for the identification of relevant factors but the best answers went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the demands of the questions.

A significant number of responses to **part (c)** style questions not only attempted to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation), but also looked to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. The best of these responses avoided the repetition of points already made in the essay and, instead, explained and analysed how far the argument both supported and disagreed with the focus of the question. In other responses, 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 to 4

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

Question 5

This was a popular question.

- (a) Many candidates provided relevant points, for example that 'successor states' were new countries set up under the terms of the Paris Peace Settlement, and relevant supporting details in the examples included.



- (b) **Part (b)** was answered well, as candidates identified demilitarisation, the army of occupation and reparations; the strongest answers went on to explain why each factor made France feel more secure.
- (c) Many candidates showed good knowledge in **part (c)** of the terms of the Treaty of Trianon, describing Hungary's losses. Better answers included an explanation why these losses might be regarded as harsh or lenient. Candidates drew on their understanding of the severity of the terms imposed on different countries at the Peace Settlement as a point of comparison. Most candidates referred to Germany, but Austria and Turkey were also used to analyse the point of the question.

Question 6

- (a) Relevant points in **part (a)** included the Washington Naval Conference and the Disarmament Conference of 1932. Many candidates knew about Germany's withdrawal from the latter and why it happened. Candidates were rewarded for naming each attempt by the League of Nations to bring about disarmament and some also achieved credit for additional points of detail.
- (b) Candidates knew a great deal about the Corfu crisis of 1923 and answers included lengthy narratives of Tellini's murder and its aftermath. The best answers explained Greek dissatisfaction.
- (c) The reasons for the failure of the League of Nations were well documented by candidates and many factors were identified in answers to **part (c)**. Stronger responses went on to contextualise each factor and relate 'effective action' to specific crises. For example, the failure to reach unanimous decisions over arms sales to Japan following the invasion of Manchuria. The best answers were balanced and included an explanation of other failures of the League. These explanations often included Vilna (no army) or Abyssinia (membership).

Question 7

- (a) There were some good answers to **part (a)**, with many responses including the fall of the Berlin Wall and anti-government protests throughout East Germany and Berlin.
- (b) The best answers kept precisely to the demands of the question which focused on why the Polish government allowed the creation of Solidarity. Material from the mid to late 1980s was not relevant to this question. Identified factors included the popularity of Solidarity, the Catholic churches' support for the strikers and the problems which the Polish economy was facing. Candidates who then explained each factor fully and relevantly performed well.
- (c) Better responses were balanced answers which looked at economic factors and compared them to other causes of the 1956 rising in Hungary and the Prague Spring of 1968. Other responses tended to emphasise repression (censorship and secret police activity) at the expense of economic reasons, and some concentrated just on this. Some stronger responses were able to explain resentment against the Soviets because of falling living standards and economic exploitation.

Question 8

This question was not answered by a large number of candidates but those who attempted it displayed good knowledge.

- (a) Responses to **part (a)** concentrated on the strikes and demonstrations which called on the Shah to abdicate, and the return of the Ayatollah Khomeini from exile before declaring an Islamic Revolution.
- (b) Answers to **part (b)** tended to narrate the religious reasons for the Ayatollah's opposition to Saddam Hussein. Candidates could have improved their responses by fully explaining the basis for this religious conflict. For example, the argument that Iraq was a secular state and Iran a religious country run by Shiites and Muslim Clerics; by contrast, the ruling class in Iraq was Sunni even though most of the population was Shiite and largely disadvantaged, which offered further provocation to Iran.
- (c) Candidates drew on detailed knowledge in **part (c)** to produce balanced explanations for the Iranian Revolution. To support the arguments about inequality, candidates evidenced unequal distribution of wealth and poor living conditions in shanty towns, while the Shah spent vast sums of money on his

coronation and on his ruling family. On the other hand, resentment about the repressive nature of the regime and the activities of secret police provided an alternative factor for the Revolution.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) This question was answered strongly, with candidates referencing the impact of gas, bombardment, flooded trenches, rats and the lack of clean drinking water.
- (b) There were detailed narratives of the first day of the Battle of the Somme in **part (b)**, although the best answers went further and provided two relevant explained reasons. Weaker answers tended to make generalised observations about trench warfare which might be applied to any attritional engagement on the Western Front.
- (c) Answers to **part (c)** reflected many details about the use of tanks and aircraft but were less clear about their comparative effectiveness. Analysis of their relative impact was required. This might have included the argument that aircraft made an important contribution to reconnaissance, while tanks were used to good effect on the Western Front during 1918 – at the Battle of Amiens, for instance.

Question 10

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

Question 11

- (a) Candidates in **part (a)** were able to describe the posts Ebert held or discussed the problems he faced. Some strong responses were seen.
- (b) Answers to **part (b)** contained detailed knowledge about the reasons why Germans disliked the ‘war guilt’ clause. Most responses referred to German objections to the clause as the legal basis for reparations and to their resentment for taking sole blame for the outbreak of the First World War.
- (c) **Part (c)** saw candidates writing at length about the ‘golden age’ of the Weimar Republic on the one hand, and a range of alternative factors on the other, to explain why Weimar’s stability might be regarded as temporary. Strong responses linked their information to the demands of the question. Less successful responses did not always make these links sufficiently explicit; in this case the quality of the answers relied on a discussion of ‘stability’ and what it entailed. The best responses made a judgement about the relative importance of the relevant factors in considering how far stability had been achieved between 1924 and 1929.

Question 12

This question was well answered. It explored the idea of ‘control’ as a central feature of Nazi Germany.

- (a) **Part (a)** explored the legal restrictions placed on Jewish people up to 1939. Responses which included the Final Solution were outside the parameters of the question.
- (b) **Part (b)** asked why the Nazis wanted to control culture and the arts; good answers related these facets to indoctrination, the wider dissemination of the Nazi message and the importance of undermining opposition.
- (c) In **part (c)**, candidates were asked to compare the relative effectiveness of terror with the use of informers to establish control over people. Stronger answers were seen from those candidates who used their knowledge to go beyond description to explanation. Many candidates tried to create an argument. For example, they contrasted the fears engendered by local informers compared to the threat of arbitrary arrest by the Gestapo. Developed attempts to interlink the two factors reflected a complex understanding of the topic.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

- (a) Candidates knew many of the developments in popular entertainment in the USA in the 1920s for **part (a)**. Better answers focused on jazz, dance, the first radio stations, movies and sport.
- (b) **Part (b)** produced many quality explanations of the repeal of prohibition which often focused on the economic advantages of repeal and the problems of enforcement, encompassing corruption and the widespread supply of illegal alcohol.
- (c) Some **part (c)** responses would have been improved by greater balance and less descriptive material. When narratives were linked to the demands of the question and produced a discussion of what might be meant by tolerance/intolerance at that time, candidates performed more strongly. The best answers drew on knowledge of the changing perceptions about the role of women in society on the one hand, and racial-immigrant intolerance on the other. Developed arguments tended to be stronger when explaining the latter, often reflecting a lack of balance in the answer.

Question 16

Answers to this question were comparatively rare.

- (a) **Part (a)** generated good responses as candidates knew about the work of numerous alphabet agencies which helped the unemployed such as the CCC, PWA, FERA and TVA.
- (b) **Part (b)** proved more challenging for a number of candidates but some responses showed an understanding that the Wagner Act was introduced because the National Industrial Recovery Act had been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Hence the purpose of the Act was to take over part of the NIRA's role to help support workers' rights.
- (c) Reaching a judgement about the relative success of New Deal measures in dealing with farmers' problems was the objective of **part (c)**. Responses tended to be generalised accounts of the work of the AAA, rather than a discussion about who benefited and who was disadvantaged. Balanced and developed explanations, which compared its impact on large scale farmers with its impact on small farmers, sharecroppers and labourers, provided the basis of the stronger responses.

Questions 17 to 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 provide a direct answer to the question. For example, if a question asks whether a source proves a certain point to be correct (as in twentieth century option, **Question 5**) it is sensible to begin an answer with, 'Source G does/does not prove'.
- When comparing sources, this should be done point by point and then candidates should try to compare how far they agree in their overall messages.
- Working out which questions require the sources to be evaluated and carrying out such evaluation is important.
- When answering **Question 6**, candidates should base answers on the sources.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered questions on the twentieth century option, although there was a reasonable number of responses to the nineteenth century option. Nearly all candidates answered all six questions but a very small number did not answer **Question 6**. There were many scripts demonstrating a reasonable grasp of the issues raised by the sources and the skills required to tackle these issues. Most candidates could interpret the sources, apply their contextual knowledge to use the sources effectively, and cross reference between sources. The ability to evaluate sources was not so evident. Candidates need to think carefully about whether each question requires the sources to be evaluated. Many candidates demonstrated good contextual knowledge and understanding but it is important that this is used to analyse the sources more effectively rather than take the place of the sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well, with a good number of candidates managing to explain agreements and disagreements between the two sources. Most candidates compared the two sources point by point. Agreements included by candidates were: Brown expected slaves to join him, Brown's force was small, Brown attacked the arsenal and Brown's actions led to the Civil War. The disagreements listed were: Source A says that Brown had 18 men while Source B says 21, and A claims that Brown was hanged in Richmond, while B says Charleston. Only a few candidates summarised each source in turn without making any specific comparisons. A reasonable number of strong answers explained the differences between the overall big messages of the two sources, with Source A focusing on Brown being mad and destructive ('mad visionary', 'Brown's insanity', 'uncoiling a terrible chain of events'), while Source B gave a more positive representation of Brown (fulfilling 'a pledge to God', 'his honest blood', 'moral courage', 'single-hearted devotion').

Question 2

Many candidates would have answered this question better if they had realised that it requires at least one of the sources to be evaluated. The use of the word 'prove' is a strong indicator that evaluation is required. Some candidates thought that because Source D differed in its views from Source C it proved C to be wrong. They based their answers on the fact that Source C praises Brown, while Source D is strongly critical of him. However, both sources are problematic and cannot be trusted. Source C is from a speech by Frederick Douglass and Source D from a newspaper from a Southern slave-holding state that later seceded from the Union. These are issues that needed to be investigated before deciding whether Source D proves that

Source C was wrong. Some very strong responses did this. Some candidates analysed and compared the sources well but did not address the issue of proof in their answers.

Question 3

This question was answered reasonably well. Many candidates were able to go beyond the details of the two illustrations and made inferences about the impressions they were intended to create about Brown. Some excellent comparisons were made, with most focusing on contrasting impressions. Weaker responses tended to focus on small details, while others wrote about the two illustrations separately and did not make any comparisons.

Question 4

Only a small number of responses focused just on the surface information in Source G, constituting an uncritical use of the source. There were a few weaker answers that failed to address the issue of usefulness, simply paraphrasing Source G. Most candidates realised that to judge usefulness they needed to evaluate the source using its content in conjunction with its context and provenance. This realisation opened up different, and more satisfactory, ways of answering the question. Some candidates used the context and provenance to dismiss the source as biased, while others argued that as Brown was speaking after he had been sentenced, he had no reason to lie. Better answers used contextual knowledge or cross-reference to other sources to check the claims being made by Brown. All of these answers rested on the assumption that the source was or was not useful because it was or was not reliable. However, a few candidates were able to go beyond this and explained how the source is useful for showing us how Brown wanted to be remembered, and how he was trying to create a version of himself for posterity.

Question 5

This question required candidates to make use of their contextual knowledge to decide whether or not there were good reasons for being surprised by Source H. This source is somewhat ambivalent about Brown. The author expresses admiration for Brown but at the same time is clear that the North cannot interfere with slavery in the South and that Brown should be punished for his acts. The key to whether one would be surprised by Source H is to be found in the details about the provenance of the source. It comes from a Republican newspaper in the State of Illinois which was a strong supporter of the Union in the Civil War. This led some candidates to be surprised by some parts of Source H and some to be not surprised by other parts of the source. There were also candidates who realised that there were good reasons for being both surprised and not surprised. All of these answers achieved good marks provided that they contained some contextual explanation, for example 'I am surprised by Source H because it supports the execution of Brown. This is surprising because the source is from a Republican Northern newspaper which you would expect to be supporting Brown. This was Lincoln's party which was against slavery.' The best answers went beyond this and demonstrated understanding that there is no inconsistency within the source and no reason to be surprised by any part of it. They explained that many Republicans were willing to admire Brown's anti-slavery principles, but they did not support his actions. They believed that his actions at Harpers Ferry were illegal, could worsen relations with the South and might hasten the end of the Union. Weaker answers would have benefited from the use of contextual knowledge. They either expressed surprise by the apparent contradictions within the source, or they identified what in Source H they were surprised or not surprised by, without producing a valid explanation.

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates attempt to answer this question and that they use the sources when doing so. The question asks whether or not the sources provide convincing evidence that Brown was a hero. The wording of the question makes clear that the question is about the sources rather than the candidates' contextual knowledge of the period. The most straight forward way to answer it is to use the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis given in the question. It is crucial that candidates make clear which source they are referring to, which side of the debate they think each source falls on, and that they then explain why they think this. A number of candidates provided answers such as this: 'Source D certainly does not support the view that John Brown was a hero. It says he was a 'cowardly villain' and that he deserved to be hanged. It also says that the New York Times newspaper should be ashamed of itself for supporting him. Source A agrees he was not a hero and describes him as mad, his actions as 'a ridiculous fantasy' and accuses him of causing war and rebellion.' Candidates that similarly explained sources on the other side of the debate provided the much stronger responses. A good number of candidates did not use the sources or did not use them in a valid way.



Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well. Agreements most commonly identified included: Khrushchev not consulting Castro, Castro being furious, Khrushchev backing down and Soviet-Chinese relations being threatened. The most commonly identified disagreement was Kennedy promising not to invade Cuba in Source A, but not making such a clear promise in Source B. Most candidates made a point by point by comparison and only a small number made unsupported claims about the sources or summarised the two sources without directly comparing them. It is important to remember that disagreements need rather more explanation than agreements. It is not enough to simply state what the disagreement is about, for example 'The sources disagree over Kennedy's promise not to invade Cuba.' Instead, a full explanation is required such as, 'Source A states that Kennedy had promised not to invade Cuba, but Source B claims that Kennedy did not give an 'absolute assurance' that he would not invade.' Although a good number of candidates produced good answers by explaining agreements and disagreements, only a smaller number of stronger ones went on to compare the overall messages of the sources. Source A has a balanced view about how far Khrushchev had been successful, while Source B sees the Crisis as a disaster for him.

Question 2

This question produced many excellent answers. These contained and combined three elements: the exact context of 29 October, the message of the cartoon and the purpose behind publishing the cartoon. Less successful answers contained just one or two of these elements. In other words, when faced with a 'purpose' question like this one, candidates need to consider the intended impact on the audience of sending out this particular message, and why this was being done then. The question asks why the cartoon was published on a certain date – 29 October 1962. This was the day after Khrushchev agreed to take the missiles out of Cuba and Kennedy agreed not to invade Cuba and to remove missiles from Turkey. The message of the cartoon is that the Soviets had been humiliated by the power of the US. Its purpose was to make the American public proud of the US or to get them to despise the weakness of Soviet communism (or something similar). Most candidates focused at first on the context and many referred to the precise context and to the agreements of 28 October. Weaker answers used a more general context. However, many candidates were then able to address the message of the cartoon, and then go on to consider the intended impact on the audience.

Question 3

This question proved challenging for some candidates. Some based their answers only on agreements or disagreements between the two sources. There is some logic to this approach. It is possible, although not very convincing, to argue that Source D makes Source E surprising because it disagrees with it, for example in Source D, Communist actions are not justified but in Source E they are. Stronger responses evaluated either, or both, of the sources. For example, when one considers the fact that Khrushchev was desperately trying to justify his actions to the Supreme Soviet and was fighting for his political career in Source E, then Source D fails to make what is said in Source E surprising.

Question 4

This question was generally answered reasonably well. A small number of candidates did not recognise Khrushchev and thought that the figure on the right was Kennedy. Most candidates were able to explain valid sub-messages, for example that neither Castro nor Khrushchev welcomed the fact that the missiles had to be withdrawn, or that their withdrawal would weaken Cuba, or that it would weaken the Soviet Union. A few candidates managed to get beyond this type of answer. To do this, candidates had to consider whether Khrushchev really meant the words at the top of the cartoon or whether these were just to appease Castro who he had let down badly. In other words, Khrushchev was lying to Castro and the cartoonist's message is that Khrushchev is willing to sacrifice Cuba.

Question 5

This question, like **Question 3**, required candidates to do provide some evaluation. The key word in the question that candidates needed to focus on was 'prove', and the best way to start their answers was by directly referring to the issue of proof in the first sentence, for example 'Source G does not prove that Khrushchev's motive was to protect Cuba because'. Some candidates missed the issue of proof and just showed how Source G does, or does not, suggest that Khrushchev's motive was to protect Cuba. There is

plenty of evidence in Source G for these answers but they missed the crucial issue of whether or not Khrushchev can be trusted. Source G is from a letter to Castro sent immediately after the crisis. In Sources A and B, it was evident that Castro was furious with Khrushchev and that there was a danger he might prefer China to the Soviet Union as an ally. A small number of very strong responses suggested that in Source G Khrushchev was trying to keep Castro on side and therefore we cannot necessarily trust the claims he was making about his motives. Other candidates used their own knowledge or cross-referenced to other sources to identify other possible motives for Khrushchev or to confirm the claims made in Source G.

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates attempt to answer this question and that they use the sources when doing so. This question was about how far the sources provide convincing evidence that the Crisis was a success for Khrushchev. The most straight forward way to answer it is to use the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis given in the question. It is crucial that candidates make clear which source they are referring to, which side of the debate they think each source falls, and that they then explain why they think this. A number of candidates provided answer such as this: 'Source A supports the idea that Khrushchev was successful in the Cuban Missile Crisis because it says that he was able to claim victory because Kennedy had agreed not to invade Cuba. Source E also supports this idea by claiming that the Crisis had 'guaranteed the existence of a Socialist Cuba'.' Candidates that similarly explained sources on the other side of the debate provided the much stronger responses. A good number of candidates did not use the sources or did not use them in a valid way.



HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

- Candidates should take enough time at the start of the examination to read through the sources and only start writing once familiar with them all.
- It is advisable to answer the questions in the order they appear on the question paper. This means that candidates will have dealt separately with all the sources in turn before attempting **Question 6**, which requires the use of all the sources together.
- Candidates should try to use their time effectively, so they can answer every question fully. If candidates experience difficulty answering the questions within the allotted time, it is preferable to provide a brief answer to some questions, rather than to omit a question entirely.
- Better responses tended to provide a direct answer to the question. An effective way of doing this is to start the answer with words from the question. For example, if asked how reliable a source is, candidates could start with 'This source is/is not reliable because'.

General comments

There were too few scripts on the nineteenth-century option for any meaningful comments to be made. On the twentieth-century option the general level of responses was good. The characteristic of the responses that marked out the work of the best candidates was the ability to evaluate sources in relation to the purpose of the author. This paper included four questions where this was a relevant issue.

A feature of the scripts was their length. Many candidates wrote more than they needed to, including much unfocused detail from the sources. These responses would have been improved by an approach of selecting appropriate points to illustrate the argument being made. Some weaker responses paraphrased a whole source before making any direct comment on the question asked. A good example of this was **Question 2**, where many candidates first described what each of the two cartoons showed before attempting any comparisons. Despite this, it was rare to see incomplete scripts, suggesting that candidates could have benefited from spending a little more time planning their answers. Nonetheless, most of the candidates produced responses that showed well developed skills of source handling, and an often impressive depth of contextual knowledge, applied relevantly to their answers.

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 answered well. A large majority of the candidates were able to use contextual knowledge to explain whether or not they were surprised by what Johnson said in Source A. Some of these responses anachronistically used material on events from after the date of the speech, which was clearly weaker than using earlier material, for example on the Truman Doctrine, Containment or the Domino Theory. Some argued that they were surprised because Johnson did not reveal his true motive – to fight communism – but this approach was not totally convincing since that was certainly what Johnson was talking about, even if he did not actually say it. The best answers moved beyond checking the accuracy of Johnson's claims, and explained their lack of surprise in relation to Johnson's purpose in making the speech, which dated from the

time that he was escalating the US presence in South Vietnam. These responses appreciated that it was unsurprising that Johnson was attempting to win over public opinion for his action.

Question 2

The question asked whether two sources agreed. To judge this, it was necessary to interpret both cartoons in a plausible way. Some candidates did this, on one or both cartoons, but then struggled to make a valid comparison. The messages of the cartoons were not totally clear-cut, so considerable latitude was allowed in what comparisons were rewarded. Most candidates could see that the cartoonists agreed that the USA was involved in Southeast Asia, some added that this involvement was a struggle against communism, or that the USA was offering its help. In short, there were some clear agreements. Disagreements were a little less straightforward, though the nature of US involvement was often seen as different – distanced or indirect in Source B, but directly involved in Source C. Whether they showed success or failure was a more nuanced issue – Source B showed a struggle but no immediate outcome, whilst Source C showed danger, but in the future. The essential basis for comparison had to be a common criterion that could be applied to both cartoons; candidates needed to do more than simply describing/interpreting both cartoons, then asserting that they were different. The best answers understood that being asked about the level of agreement was inviting a comparison of the cartoonists' opinions, rather than of details of what the cartoons depicted. They concluded that Source B's cartoonist supported US intervention, whilst Source C's cartoonist opposed it.

Question 3

This question asked about a source's utility and most answers rested on the assumption that the source was useful for the information it provided. However, some responses were hindered by a misreading of the source, leading to inaccurate statements about what it said. Some thought that McNamara had written that without US intervention in Vietnam, communism would have spread further in Southeast Asia. In fact, he wrote that he seriously questioned this idea. Others focused too generically on provenance, with a range of comments about the source being useful/not useful because of who McNamara was, the post he held, the time he was writing, the fact he resigned, and so on. The best, properly developed answers, used the provenance as a way into a discussion about the way in which McNamara's possible purposes in writing his book might affect the credibility of what he was saying. However, the use of provenance was often based on undeveloped assertions – e.g. *He was there at the time so he would know*. A small number of answers argued that McNamara's willingness to admit that he was wrong made what he said more plausible, and therefore useful. This was a sensible idea, but stronger responses provided the insight that a specific purpose might lie behind his apparent candour.

Question 4

The question asked why a cartoon was published at a particular time. The approach candidates need to adopt in questions like this one is to give reasons for publication. There are three broad types of reason: because of what was happening at the time (context), because of what the cartoonist wanted to tell the audience (message), and because of the intended impact of the message on the audience (purpose). However, the cartoon first needs to be interpreted correctly. The cartoon in this question proved challenging for some candidates. Some took it literally, some thought it showed an American soldier talking to a Vietnamese soldier, some thought it supported the idea of sending troops to Vietnam. However, most answers understood that the cartoonist was not in favour of the war. The date of the cartoon was 1970, which offered a background of events such as the anti-war movement, Vietnamisation, and the bombing of Laos and Cambodia. To be successful, answers based on context had to use events like these, specific to the time, rather than being general to the war in Vietnam. The clearest messages of the cartoon were that continuing the war was pointless, or that the US troops should be withdrawn. Many candidates put both context and message together. The best answers added purpose into this, seeing the cartoon as an attempt to put pressure on the government, or to encourage anti-war protest.

Question 5

The best answers to this question could see that there was a possible purpose behind Westmoreland's arguments, such as justifying his own actions during the war, or attempting to shift the blame for failure, and that this purpose would raise questions about Source F's capacity to prove or disprove claims in Source G. In other responses, the issue of proof was resolved simply by whether or not the two sources agreed. These answers attempted to compare the sources for agreements and disagreements. Agreement meant that Source G was right, disagreement meant it was wrong. However, these comparisons sometimes lacked validity. The only valid comparison that some candidates included was that Source F suggested the war could have been won, whilst Source G suggested it could not. Other attempts to compare were hindered by

not comparing 'like with like' (i.e. no common criterion) or on misunderstanding of the sources. It was quite rare to see answers trying to deal with proof in relation to the provenance of the sources, and those that did usually relied just on assertions of Westmoreland's 'bias'.

Question 6

The simplest and most effective way of answering **Question 6** is to work through the sources in turn, using content from the sources to illustrate how they either support or question the given hypothesis. Most candidates did this reasonably effectively. However, although the sources contained evidence on both sides of the hypothesis, a good number of answers worked only on one side. These answers showed that they thought the USA had been right, or wrong, to get involved, so they used only evidence that confirmed their viewpoint. The question is about the sources as evidence, and not directly about the issue in the hypothesis, and better responses appeared to understand this distinction. The best responses also provided genuine source evaluation - evaluation in relation to the purpose of the author of the source (rather than general comments on source provenance), and evaluation which served the purpose of answering the question. Some candidates struggled with the latter, having got as far as establishing the reliability (or unreliability) of the source. These answers would have been improved by commenting on how this affected the utility of the source as evidence in relation to the hypothesis.



HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and the sources before answering any of the questions. This will give them an understanding of the main issue of the paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding will feed into all their answers, as well as helping to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. A helpful strategy is for candidates to directly address the question in the first sentence of the answer, for example, 'Source C does prove that Khrushchev was not telling the truth in Source D because...'
- Some questions ask candidates to use two sources, and this inevitably requires comparison of what they say or show. Candidates must identify similarities and differences, but remember that valid comparisons can only be made on the basis of a criterion that is common to the two sources – for example, do they agree or disagree about a common issue? Direct comparisons of the content of the two sources are what is required, rather than a summary of first one source and then the other. On a similar note, candidates should not be looking to explain that one source says things that the other says nothing about.
- On **Question 6** candidates must ensure that the sources are used as the basis of the answer. Generally, candidates should be advised not to group the sources together but instead to examine them one by one. 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 statement.

General comments

Most candidates responded reasonably well to the demands of the paper. An overwhelming majority of the scripts were on the twentieth-century option. Consequently, there were too few responses on the nineteenth-century option for meaningful comments to be made. Most candidates completed all six questions and there were very few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both the nineteenth and twentieth-century options.

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

Most candidates were able to identify agreements between the two sources. For instance, the sources both agree that placing the missiles in Cuba was about more than protecting Cuba, it gave the Soviets more power internationally, and the Soviet actions were a response to a series of problems. Similarly, they agree that installing missiles in Cuba would help the Soviet position over Berlin and help the Soviets in regard to China. The differences proved more challenging for candidates to pick out. However, some were able to do this successfully, explaining, for example, the authors' views about the importance of Cuba, that in Source A the missiles were not about Cuba, while in Source B, Cuba is an important factor. The best responses were able to explain the overarching 'big message', that being that in Source A, China was the main concern of

the Soviets, whereas in Source B, the Soviets act in response to a whole raft of issues. Many candidates successfully recognised the importance of China in Source A, but struggled to make a direct comparison with Source B.

Question 2

Candidates were asked to consider two written sources and conclude whether the content of one proves the author of the other was not telling the truth. Specifically, they were asked whether Surikov's words in Source C prove that Khrushchev was lying in his memoirs in Source D. Many candidates were able to pick out disagreements between the two sources and use these to conclude that Khrushchev was not telling the truth in Source D. For example, when Khrushchev made the decision to install the missiles in Cuba he was on his estate in the Black Sea according to Surikov, whereas in Source D, Khrushchev reports he was in Bulgaria. If candidates went on to identify an agreement, for instance that both sources state Khrushchev's motive was to equalise the situation with the US, they also needed to change the focus of their answer to reflect that such an agreement suggests Khrushchev was telling the truth. Some less successful responses stated that a difference between the sources was that Source C states the Soviet aim was to equalise the balance of power, while Source D states that the aim was to protect the USSR and/or keep Cuba and/or deter America from starting a war. This comparison did not work as Source D also states that an aim was to equalise the balance of power. In the best responses, candidates made a valid comparison between the sources and then explained a reason for the agreement or disagreement, based on an evaluation of the sources. There could have been more attempts at evaluation on this question; when it was seen, it was more often on Source D, with candidates concluding that Source C proves Khrushchev was not telling the truth as, in his memoirs, he is attempting to justify his actions in Cuba in the context of his fall from power and the widespread condemnation of his handling of the Cuban Crisis.

Question 3

This question produced a wide range of responses. Many candidates produced very strong answers in being correctly surprised that a close Cold War ally of the US would publish a cartoon at this time, criticising the hypocrisy of Kennedy and/or the US. Other responses were based on a lack of surprise, as Britain was not involved or was an outsider or neutral in these events. Most answers did address the issue of surprise, although in some cases the response would have benefited from making links to the observations being made about the cartoon. Some candidates understood the hypocrisy in the cartoon but did not relate this to their reason for being surprised or not surprised.

Question 4

This question highlights the point made earlier about comparison questions. The best answers looked for a major point that both cartoonists were saying something about and used it as the basis of their comparison. In this case, the cartoonists disagree about the Soviet Union. Source F shows approval or support, while G is critical or disapproving. While more responses could have recognised this overall comparison of the cartoonists' points of view, reasonable responses were provided by many candidates by comparing sub-messages. For example, the US is weak and the Soviets are strong in both sources, or the Soviets are helping or working with Cuba in F but in G the Cubans are being dominated or exploited by the Soviets. However, some answers struggled because, although they interpreted the sources, and in some cases wrote lengthy descriptions of Source F and then Source G, they did not make any direct or valid comparisons. Nevertheless, in all but a few instances, the question, that is the issue of agreement between the cartoonists, was directly addressed.

Question 5

This question focused on the usefulness of Source H as evidence about Khrushchev's motives for placing missiles in Cuba. Many were able to use the source in an uncritical way as evidence about Khrushchev's motives, identifying, for example, that the source tells us his motive was to attain nuclear strike capability against the West or to defend Cuba. A smaller number of candidates were able to evaluate the source by reference to other sources, their own knowledge or purpose. There were many opportunities for candidates to cross-reference to other sources on the paper, for instance, there are several examples in Sources A and B of motives that contradict those presented in Source H. These could be used to suggest that Source H is not useful, although a stronger answer would be to explain such differences in the light of Kennedy's, or indeed the Soviet Minister's purpose, that being, in Kennedy's case, to gain support for his stance against the USSR and for the Foreign Minister, to defend Khrushchev and ensure that the USSR is seen as innocent.



Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates performed strongly by carefully explaining how some of the sources (C, D and E) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that Khrushchev placed the missiles in Cuba as a balance to the American missiles surrounding the Soviet Union, while others (A, B, D, F, G and H) argue that Khrushchev had alternative aims. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Some candidates did not make it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Candidates must ensure they refer directly to the content of each source in their explanations of how they support or challenge the hypothesis. On the grouping of the sources, it is advisable to always examine the sources one by one, as any comment about a group must be valid for every source in the group. On this paper it was possible to make the same comment about Sources A and B together and Sources C and D together but in general, the best approach is to go through each source in turn. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question 6** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement. Candidates can then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given. The stronger responses adopted this approach, but a number of answers would have been improved by genuine evaluation of the sources.



HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

- The title used must be appropriate i.e. it focuses candidates on the assessment of significance.
- Candidates should use a range of criteria to assess significance.
- Candidates should focus on assessment, rather than on description or narrative.

General comments

The administration and moderation of coursework worked very efficiently. Nearly all the titles used were appropriate and were based on topics from one of the Depth Studies in the syllabus. Nearly all candidates stayed within the 2000 words limit. The overall standard of work was high, and many candidates demonstrated a good understanding of what was required when assessing significance. A small number of centres had their marks adjusted by the Moderators.

Comments on specific questions

Crucially, most of the coursework titles used by centres were appropriate and allowed candidates to focus on the assessment of significance. Titles that are not about the assessment of significant should not be used, for example 'What was the role of technology in the First World War?' The title also needs to allow candidates to make a broad assessment of the historical significance of their subject. Titles such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression in allowing the Nazis to come to power' are too narrow. They limit candidates to assessing just one aspect of the Depression's significance (as a causal factor in the Nazi rise to power), and encourage them to write about other factors and compare their importance with that of the Depression. This is not what is required. Titles such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' are more open and allow candidates to use a range of criteria to assess different ways in which the Depression may have been significant.

The choice of subject is also important. It must be an individual, group, organisation, development, place or event, and needs to come from one of the Depth Studies in the syllabus or from an approved centre-devised Depth Study. It is not advisable to choose subjects that are so large in historical terms that there is little doubt about their significance. For example, 'Assess the significance of Hitler' would not be easy for candidates to write about in 2000 words. Candidates need to be able to assess significance (not just explain it) through argument and counter-argument, and titles need to allow them to do this. A wide range of titles featured this year but examples of the types of title that worked well are:

- To what extent was propaganda a significant factor in Germany, 1918 to 1945?
- How significant was Lenin in Russian history in the period 1917 to 1930?
- How significant was the Treaty of Versailles for the Weimar Republic?
- Assess the significance of the First World War for the USA, 1918 to 1941.
- Assess the significance of the reparations imposed on Germany.
- Assess the significance of Stresemann for Germany.

The alternative to using key terms such as 'assess' and 'significance' in the title is to ask how far an event was a turning point, for example, 'How far was the New Deal a turning point for the USA?' If this approach is used, it is important that candidates have a good understanding of the concept of 'turning point'. In their answers they should test their subject against the key elements of turning points to make their assessment.

The best responses all shared certain characteristics. First, they went further than just explaining why their subject was significant and assessed its significance using argument and counter-argument. They explained how it was significant in some ways, but not in others or how it was significant from one perspective but not

from another, or how there are perfectly good arguments on both sides of the debate about their subject's significance. They also reached, and supported, a conclusion about the most important way in which their subject was significant. Secondly, they used a range of criteria to assess significance. These were not necessarily listed at the beginning of the response but were integral to the responses all the way through. Candidates should decide for themselves which criteria would be most useful to use with their particular topic. Criteria can range from depth and breadth of impact to economic and political impact to short and long-term to iconic significance. Thirdly, they did not just explain the impact of their subject but assessed how far the impact mattered in different ways and for different reasons. Finally, these responses were carefully organised as a whole, and showed clear signs of an overall argument developing as they unfolded, leading to conclusions that developed naturally from the main body of the responses.

Less successful responses tended to regularly slip into description and narrative. They often described the impact of their subject but did not assess this impact beyond assertions. These responses also spent too long on the 'background' events, before focusing on the subject named in the title. Sometimes they made assertions about significance in the conclusion that were not related to the main body of the answer.

The candidates' responses were marked with care and expertise. Many centres had their marks left unchanged and most of the adjustments that were made were minor. Most centres provided brief and helpful comments at the end of responses that summed up their overall qualities and that clearly related to key parts of the mark scheme. If there were key sections within a response, these were signalled by teacher in the margin. Importantly, the mark scheme was used holistically, and the summative comments provided were very useful for Moderators.



HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This one-hour paper requires candidates 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 or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A small range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. There were also a number of attempts at Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918, Depth Study C: Russia: 1905 – 1941 and Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990. There were too few attempts at Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced answers with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have benefited from providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote lots of information about the topic or Depth Study in general, rather than focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also missed the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response has the appropriate focus.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was the more popular choice, with very few candidates attempting **Question 2**.

Question 1 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to get to grips with the focus of the question and were deeply knowledgeable about the use of gas weapons during the First World War. Candidates were able to give specific examples of the impact gas weapons on the Western Front from 1915 and give details about the number of casualties it caused. This was then balanced by examining the relative importance of other weapons such as machine guns, artillery and underground mines. Many candidates also explained the importance that aircraft, tanks and other technological innovations had on warfare, as well as the development of new tactics such as the creeping barrage and combined arms' offensives. Some explanations and conclusions were well supported and provided convincing evaluations of the relative importance of gas. Weaker responses tended to lack detail or refer too much to events in the early stages of the war and why it was not over by Christmas which, while relevant, was not the main focus of the question this session.

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

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. Many candidates were aware of the economic problems in early Weimar Germany between 1918 and 1923, and provided a good level of detail about the impact of the First World War, the rising unemployment and decreasing living standards for many Germans and the impact of reparations, particularly the Ruhr occupation and the subsequent period of hyperinflation. Balance was provided in most responses by examining other terms of the Treaty of Versailles, such as the military, territorial and war guilt clauses, the increasing political extremism and the weaknesses inherent in the new Weimar Constitution which all contributed to disorder in Germany. The best answers provided detailed explanations which were well supported by accurate and in-depth examples and focused on the relative importance of the different causes of disorder. Other responses tended to be narratives of the period, with a few candidates going beyond the 1923 parameter of the question.

Question 4 was generally less well answered than **Question 3**. Candidates struggled to focus on army opposition during Nazi rule and often cited material pre – 1933 such as the Munich Putsch, which was not relevant to this question. The stronger responses examined the role of the army during the Night of the Long Knives and many also made reference to the July 1944 Bomb Plot, often with a good level of detail and insight. This was then compared with other forms of opposition, such as resistance from youth groups like the Edelweiss Pirates and White Rose movement and Church opposition from the Catholic and Protestant churches. Good answers had breadth and depth in terms of examples and provided some evaluation of how significant the opposition actually was in resisting Nazi rule. Less successful responses tended to lack contextual knowledge of opposition in Nazi Germany and provided few relevant examples; some candidates provided just an overview of Nazi rule after 1933.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941

Question 5 was answered by more candidates than was **Question 6**.

Question 5 had some strong responses, and most candidates were able to address how important political reform was to the survival of the Tsarist regime by 1914. Many candidates were able to cite the importance of the October Manifesto and the creation of the Duma and how this divided the opposition during the 1905 revolution. This was then balanced by examining other reasons for the survival of Tsarism such as Stolypin's economic reforms, the increasing use of repression by the army and Okhrana and the industrial growth that took place in the period. The best answers were analytical and provided convincing evaluations of how important each factor was, using specific examples to support their explanations. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive in their approach and often lacked the depth and breadth required for a balanced and detailed answer. A few candidates neglected the parameters of the question and examined the First World War, which, while relevant in 1914 in terms of the initial patriotism it created in Russia, is irrelevant from 1915 onwards in this 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 strong leadership in the Bolshevik Party that allowed them to seize power in November 1917. Most commonly cited were Lenin's April Theses, his decision to launch the seizure of power and Trotsky's role as Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet and Red Guard. This was then balanced by other factors such as the failures of the Provisional Government to solve the land issue for peasants, its continuation of the war and its inability to fix the fuel and food shortages in the cities. Many would have been improved by greater breadth and depth in fully addressing the question and more responses could have assessed the relative significance of the different factors. Many answers were descriptive or gave a narrative of events, rather than an analysis. A few candidates went beyond November 1917 and examined the period of the Russian Civil War, which was not required.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941

This was another popular Depth Study, with **Question 7** producing more answers than **Question 8**.

Question 7 was the more popular choice with candidates. Many candidates were able to give a wide range of examples of the entertainment industry such as cinema, radio and sports, and explain how it changed the lives of women in the 1920s. Good responses also noted how these changes tended to only affect women in urban, as opposed to rural areas of the USA, which added depth to their evaluations. This was then balanced by examining other important factors such as the winning of the vote, the impact of the First World War on women's employment and the increasing leisure time some women gained from new household appliances, such as vacuum cleaners. Other responses did not focus on women specifically and gave generic answers about the impact of the entertainment industry on US society as a whole.

Question 8 was well answered in most cases. Candidates had a great deal of contextual knowledge about the role and function of the TVA and its impact on the Tennessee Valley area. Strong responses examined how the building of dams and hydroelectric power stations and improvement of irrigation for farmers helped the economy in these states during the Depression and provided cheap power, jobs and services for many Americans. This was then balanced by comparing the TVA with other alphabet agencies, most commonly the CCC, AAA, PWA and FERA, as well as other reforms introduced by the First and Second New Deal during the Depression. The best answers focused on how significant each reform or agency was in dealing with the effects of the Depression, provided well supported explanations and drew convincing conclusions. Some of the weaker responses lacked the contextual knowledge to properly analyse the impact of the TVA and other reforms or confused the aims of the different alphabet agencies.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990

A small number of candidates attempted **Question 9** but too few attempted **Question 10** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 9 was generally well answered. Some candidates had a deep knowledge and understanding of how the USA supported the KMT with financial aid during the Second World War and how this was rarely used to fight the Japanese and instead used to focus on the Communists, which led to its withdrawal by the USA. Explanations focused on how this led to claims of corruption in the Nationalist government and how it impeded their ability to effectively fight the Communists during the Civil War which followed. This was then balanced by examining the tactics and leadership of the Communist Party under Mao, its focus on attracting peasant support in the countryside and its effective use of guerrilla warfare against the KMT. The best answers explained their arguments well and supported these with a good range of accurate examples and remained focused on addressing importance. Other answers tended to lack knowledge on the role of the USA and its financial support to the KMT, though often gave detailed accounts of other factors.

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This one-hour paper requires candidates 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 or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken, with Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 - 1945 and Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941, being the most popular. Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-1941 also attracted a number of responses. There were very few attempts at any the other Depth Studies.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced answers with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have benefited from providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote lots of information about the topic or Depth Study in general, rather than focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also missed the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response has the appropriate focus.

Comments on specific questions

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

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

Depth Study B, Germany: 1918 – 1945

This Depth Study was answered by many candidates, with responses to both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Question 3 focused on how Germany was stabilised by 1929. The best responses to this question were those which distinguished between Stresemann's foreign policy and his domestic policy achievements. Successful responses were able to outline the foreign policy decisions which led to loans from the United States and Germany's acceptance into the international community. Some candidates were then able to explain how these successes helped to stabilise Germany. There were also many descriptions of The Dawes and Young Plans and the Locarno Treaties which were not developed to show how they brought stability to Germany. Most responses were able to show how ending hyperinflation improved life within Germany, although there were some misunderstandings about how this was achieved. Stresemann was quite often credited with introducing cultural changes which were more attributable to the improvements in the economy.

Question 4 was focused on the ways in which Hitler was able to take control of Germany between 1933 and 1934. Successful answers were able to concentrate on this time period and outline how Hitler was able to have full control of Germany by 1934 and outline Hindenburg's role in this. These answers understood the role of the President within the democracy and outlined how Hindenburg was responsible for Hitler's appointment as Chancellor and awarding Emergency powers after the Reichstag Fire. They were then able to explain how this made it possible for Hitler to extend his control by attacking the communists and gaining success in the March elections. Less successful responses showed a limited understanding of the role of the President and how the Reichstag worked. Many responses showed a good knowledge of the impact of the Enabling Act and the removal of other parties and Trade Unions. There were some responses in which the time parameters were missed and events such as the Munich Putsch were described. A few responses confused Hindenburg with Ludendorff.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941

Question 5 focused on why the Tsar's control of Russia had weakened by 1917. There was an opportunity for candidates to go back to the 1905 Revolution and explain how the Tsar's control was weakened over a long period. Successful answers outlined, for example, how attempts at political reforms such as the Dumas were undermined, creating resentment amongst the middle classes, and also how military defeats in Japan and during the First World War further created weakness. They also showed the impact of the First World War on food supplies and the impact of distrust of the Tsarina and Rasputin.

Question 6 focused on the ways in which Stalin was able to extend his control over the USSR. There were fewer responses to this than there were to **Question 5**. Successful responses showed a good knowledge of the Five-Year Plans and were able to outline how these helped Stalin. There was some confusion between the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation.

Depth Study D, The United States, 1919 – 1941

Question 7 had a focus on why Prohibition was introduced. Successful answers were able to restrict material to before Prohibition was introduced and discuss the role of women's groups like the Anti-Saloon League, politicians and the impact of anti-German feeling during the First World War. However, there were many less successful responses which described the impact of Prohibition and outlined the rise of speakeasies and gangsters. There was a general misunderstanding of the link between politicians and the temperance movements.

Question 8 focused on opposition to the New Deal. Successful answers explained the reasons why Republicans objected to the New Deal and showed how this impacted on Roosevelt's implementation of policy. Balance was provided through looking, for example, at the role of other opponents like Huey Long and the Share Our Wealth programme, and Supreme Court opposition. Some responses lacked focus on the period of the question, providing descriptions of the New Deal Agencies. Also, some responses were unclear about who the Republicans were and saw Roosevelt as a Republican or Republicans as the 'left wing'. Other answers would have been improved by the inclusion of less generalised material and more specific knowledge.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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