

# HISTORY

---

Paper 2147/12  
Paper 12

## Key messages

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

Successful responses demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the question and were characterised by the inclusion of relevant contextual details to support their arguments.

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

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose. In more extensive responses, they should organise their ideas into distinct paragraphs - otherwise points can become blurred together or, alternatively, candidates can lose focus on the question.

## General comments

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

Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the actual question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts, with no explanation. Some of the weaker responses were very brief and generalised, with few supporting factual details.

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

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

**Part (a)** responses reward recall and description. There is no need for background information. Explanation is not required. Most candidates realised that responses to **(a)** questions can be short and concise. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

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

**Part (c)** requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should avoid repeating points already made in the essay and should try to explain and analyse

how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions just asserted 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other.

Less successful responses often focused only on one side of the argument. These answers could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

### **Comments on specific questions**

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

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

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

#### **Question 5**

This was the most popular question in the Core Section.

- (a) This question was very well answered and most candidates were able to identify valid hopes that Wilson had when entering the peace negotiations. Strong responses identified four of Wilson's hopes, such as 'He did not want Germany to be treated too harshly', 'He wanted the acceptance of his Fourteen Points', 'He wanted self-determination for the people in Europe' and 'the setting up of a League of Nations'. Weaker responses included references to the aims of Clemenceau and Lloyd George, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) This question was also answered well by many candidates who realised that the Treaty of Sevres was made with Turkey and were then able to explain its importance in relation to the break-up of the Ottoman Empire, the loss of territory, the benefit gained by other states, including Britain and France, and the response within Turkey, leading to the nationalist uprising of Mustapha Kemal and the Treaty of Lausanne (1923). Two explained reasons were provided in the strongest answers - most commonly explained were the harshness of the Treaty and the subsequent unrest, and how it was revised in 1923 in the Treaty of Lausanne. Weaker responses could often describe the terms of the Treaty of Sevres but lacked the contextual knowledge support required to explain the 'importance'. A small number of candidates had no knowledge of the Treaty of Sevres and often confused it with the treaties that Germany and Hungary received.
- (c) Strong responses gained high marks for demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of how far Clemenceau achieved what he wanted in the Treaty of Versailles. The best responses were well structured, linking an aim of Clemenceau to a term in the Treaty. For example: 'Clemenceau wanted to ensure French security. France had been invaded by Germany twice in the last 50 years and he did not want it to happen again. In the Treaty the German army was limited to 100,000 men, conscription was banned, they were not allowed armoured vehicles, submarines or aircraft and only 6 battleships. The Rhineland was also demilitarised. Clemenceau was happy because the German armed forces had been greatly reduced in strength.' To produce a balanced response, explained examples of what Clemenceau did not achieve were included. For example: 'Clemenceau did not get all he wanted as, in order for France to be safe from future attack, he demanded that the USA and Britain give a guarantee that they would come to France's aid if it was attacked by Germany. Britain and the USA refused to give him promises of support over future German aggression, so Clemenceau had not achieved what he wanted'. Less successful responses often focused on his aims and why he wanted to achieve them, without relating them to any terms in the Treaty. Responses such as this did not develop arguments. For example, many candidates were aware that Clemenceau wanted Alsace-Lorraine returned and that he did get it back in the Treaty but they were unable to explain why this was so important to him. To develop this point, they needed reference to the 1870 Franco-Prussian War. In addition, a significant number of responses argued that Clemenceau wanted Germany to be divided into smaller states, whereas this was Poincaré's desire, or that the Rhineland should become part of France, whereas Clemenceau really wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state. Such arguments were incorrect. Some candidates strayed from the challenge set out in the question by including sometimes extensive details on the personalities and aims of Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson, which lacked relevance.

### Question 6

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the term 'collective security'. They tended to provide four relevant points, such as: 'It was Article 10 of the League's covenant', 'It meant that an attack on one was an attack on all', 'The aggressive country would be morally condemned by other countries' and 'Economic sanctions could be used against aggressive countries'. There was a tendency for some responses to be vague, especially where candidates did not refer to the range of sanctions available to members of the League. Some candidates made reference to acting together in the event of an attack or trying to ensure peace, without mentioning sanctions. Weaker responses lacked a proper understanding of the concept of collective security. A common misconception was that it was a firm alliance in which an attack on one country would immediately trigger the military involvement of the other league members. A few responses were left blank.
- (b) Most responses demonstrated some knowledge of the work of the League's agencies for refugees and health. The fact that the Refugee Commission facilitated the return of prisoners of war and refugees after the First World War were common identifications. Similarly, the fact that help and advice was given to people about public health and the amount of leprosy was reduced were common identifications of the importance of the Health Committee. Statistics on the number of refugees helped by the Refugees Commission varied greatly between the scripts. Good explanations required supporting detail, for example by mentioning the countries most affected by the increase of refugees and the use of the Nansen Passports. On the Health Commission, weaker responses did not include any explanations. They could usually identify a disease (though not often its geographical location) but could not show how the Commission's work was important. Stronger responses highlighted the importance of the work of the agency for health by explaining that this commission became the basis for the World Health Organisation. A significant number of responses included details about the work of the ILO (or attributed this to the Health Commission) and that of the Slavery Commission. These descriptions were outside the scope of the question.
- (c) This question was well answered and there were many strong responses in which candidates showed a good understanding of whether 'the successes of the League in handling international disputes during the 1920s demonstrated that it had real power'. Candidates were able to provide examples of both the successes and failures of the League in the 1920s. The disputes over the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia, and the Greco- Bulgarian border were the most frequently explained on the positive side of the argument, with the dispute over Vilna and the Italian attack on Corfu on the other side. The disputes over Mosul, Teschen and Memel were mentioned rarely, but usually effectively when they were highlighted. Weaker responses, although often secure on the successes of the League in the 1920s, were often not as focused on the failures of the League and wrote in detail about the League's failures in the 1930s (notably in Manchuria and Abyssinia). Other less successful responses included details on the success of the commissions which also lacked relevance to this question, which focused on their 'handling of international disputes'. A small number confused the chronology of the events in Corfu, and their explanation of events there was sometimes superficial or inaccurate. Some simply wrote that the League did not stand up to Mussolini, without making sufficiently accurate reference to the considerations and chain of events by which Mussolini appeared to get the better of the League in this dispute.

### Question 7

- (a) Stronger responses gave a clear description of how the Soviet Union consolidated its hold over Poland from 1945. They gained credit for four relevant points including: 'After the war Soviet troops, instead of returning home, stayed in Poland', 'The free elections agreed at Yalta did not happen, instead the 1947 election was rigged', 'Non-communist leaders were arrested or murdered' and 'As a result, the communists won a huge victory in the 1947 election'. Many other valid examples of consolidation were used, such as the formation of Cominform, Comecon and the Warsaw Pact. Weaker responses drifted away from the question by writing detailed accounts of the Yalta conference and the planned border changes, without mentioning consolidation of Soviet control over Poland.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Many responses included lengthy sections on why Stalin blockaded West Berlin and the details of the Berlin airlift, which lacked relevance to this question. It is really important to read the question carefully and consider what relevant information is required before starting the response. Most responses were able to identify reasons why the Allies were determined to defeat the Berlin Blockade, including taking a stand against communism

and highlighting that West Berlin represented a sign of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. The strongest responses were able to explain two reasons why the Allies were determined to defeat the Berlin Blockade. For example: 'They were determined to defeat the Berlin Blockade because the alternative was that the USA, Britain and France would have to leave West Berlin. This would be disastrous because it would mean handing over control of West Berlin to Stalin, which would be a big sign of weakness, and encourage him to go further and possibly move on to the western zones of Germany'. The best responses also highlighted that Berlin was regarded as the international capital of espionage and if the Allies were forced out of West Berlin, they would be at a serious disadvantage. Other responses muddled East and West Berlin and some confused the setting up of the Berlin Blockade with the building of the Berlin Wall.

- (c) Candidates generally had a good knowledge of the importance of the Marshall Plan to western Europe and the USA. Stronger responses were able to identify and explain similar reasons that were important to both western Europe and the USA, for example: the fear of communism spreading and helping Europe out of a desperate economic situation by providing them with money to rebuild Europe's war-ravaged economy and infrastructure. To balance the argument, the best responses considered the USA's ulterior motives of gaining economic control of western Europe and making them dependent on the US dollar. It was also a way of containing communism, as it was proven that communism tended to spread in poor countries and thus a way of establishing control over western Europe, drawing them into a capitalist system. Weaker responses spent much time describing the background to the Plan, including the Truman Doctrine and the visit of General George Marshall to assess the state of Europe.

### Question 8

- (a) Candidates struggled with this question or, in some case, left it blank. Most responses lacked knowledge of the Paris Peace Accords of 1973. A common misconception was that it was between the USA and USSR, regarding the reduction of nuclear weapons. A small number of strong responses understood that 'They ended the Vietnam War', 'They were to establish peace in Vietnam', 'The US troops would leave Vietnam' and 'A ceasefire was established in South Vietnam'.
- (b) Most responses included accurate and detailed contextual knowledge of the reasons why President Kennedy was humiliated by the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. Good responses explained how: 'Kennedy was humiliated because he had got involved in an invasion previously planned by Eisenhower. He supplied 1400 anti-Castro exiles with arms, equipment and transport and gave them air support. They were met with 20,000 Cuban troops armed with tanks and modern weapons. Within days Castro had captured or defeated them all. This was a disaster for a new President and made him look weak.' Weaker responses often included a good description of the Bay of Pigs invasion but omitted to highlight why President Kennedy was humiliated. Some muddled the chronology of events and thought the Bay of Pigs was after the American spy plane had flown over Cuba and spotted the missile sites.
- (c) This was generally well answered by the candidates. Strong responses demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of whether placing missiles in Cuba achieved Khrushchev's aims. It was important that candidates understood and outlined Khrushchev's specific aims, such as closing the missile gap, strengthening his position at home and defending Cuba. The best responses were well structured, explaining a reason why he placed the missiles on Cuba and discussing whether the outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis achieved his aim. For example: 'From the Bay of Pigs invasion, it was clear that the US wanted to overthrow Castro. Soviet arms flooded into Cuba because Khrushchev was anxious to defend Cuba. It was the only communist state in the Western hemisphere, and it had willingly become communist. It was important to him to have a communist state off the coast of America. Although at the end of the crisis the Soviet missiles were removed from Cuba, the crisis did achieve Khrushchev's aim of defending Cuba and keeping it safe. Cuba was a valuable ally to Russia and proved a useful base to support communists in South America.' This was then balanced with explanations of why he did not achieve his aims, most using the fact that he was unable to strengthen his position at home. This was because they thought he had been forced to back down and remove the missiles in Cuba. The US had removed their missiles from Turkey but that had been kept secret from the public, so he was unable to use it for propaganda purposes. Other responses would have been improved by the inclusion of less narrative and description of the events of the Crisis and by properly addressing the question set.

## Section B: Depth Studies

### Questions 9 and 10

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

### Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was very well answered, and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the reactions of France and Belgium when Germany failed to pay the reparations in 1922. Many were able to identify four reactions such as: 'France and Belgium were angry that reparations had not been paid', 'Their troops invaded the Ruhr', 'To take raw materials such as coal in place of the unpaid reparations' and 'The French expelled thousands of Germans from the Ruhr'. A minority of responses thought that the troops invaded the Rhineland instead of the Ruhr, which was incorrect. Weaker responses also included details on the German reactions which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) There were some mixed responses to this question. Most candidates could identify why the Weimar Republic faced threats to its existence in 1919 – 20 such as: 'They did not like the terms of the Versailles Treaty', 'Some wanted a communist government' and 'Some wanted the Kaiser and the monarchy back'. The best responses used the Spartacist Revolt and the Kapp Putsch to explain the threat. It was essential to explain that the Republic needed the help of the Freikorps to defeat the Spartacists and that a general strike was needed to defeat the Kapp Putsch, otherwise the Weimar Republic could have failed very early on in its existence. Some responses included details on the Munich Putsch, which was in 1923, so outside the time limits of this question. A small number confused the left and right-wing groups.
- (c) There were some strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the achievements of the Weimar Republic. The best responses explained the importance of the recovery from hyperinflation. They explained that Stresemann's economic policies helped Germany to recover from the hyperinflation, which had occurred as a result of the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr. His actions included: ending passive resistance in the Ruhr and resuming reparation payments, calling in the old currency, which had become worthless, and replacing it with a new temporary currency, the Rentenmark, and then a permanent currency, the Reichmark. Some strong responses referred to the 'double-edged sword' of the 1924 Dawes Plan, whereby Stresemann negotiated to receive American loans, which were invested into German industry and helped to sort out Germany's economic chaos and meant by 1928 German industrial production had reached pre-war levels. The downside was the economic boom in West Germany was precarious, as the US loans could be recalled at short notice, which they were in 1929. Strong responses developed a balanced argument by explaining at least two other achievements of the Weimar Republic, most commonly the foreign policy successes over the Locarno Pact and the subsequent acceptance into the League of Nations and the cultural advances. Less successful responses tended to identify achievements without including supporting contextual knowledge to develop the identification into an explanation.

### Question 12

- (a) Some candidates were unfamiliar with the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Whilst often realising they were antisemitic, they wrote at length about the different ways in which Jews were persecuted in Nazi Germany such as segregation, being forced to wear the 'Star of David', 'Boycotting of Jewish shops' and being dismissed from various professions. In contrast, successful responses tended to identify four valid points, such as: 'They were created during the annual Nuremberg Rally of the Nazi Party', 'Jews could not be German citizens', 'Marriages between Jews and Germans were forbidden' and 'People who broke the marriage laws were imprisoned'.
- (b) This question was well answered. The importance of the Olympic Games to Hitler was understood by many candidates. The two most common reasons identified and explained were firstly, how they were used to showcase Germany and secondly, how Hitler wanted to show the superiority of the Aryan race. Other responses would have benefited from more specific knowledge to support their identifications. For example: 'Hitler wanted to show how modern, strong and successful Germany was. The brand-new stadium held up to 100,000 spectators, it was lit by the most modern electric

lighting and had the largest stop clock ever built. Television cameras were brought in for the first time.' Successful responses explained two reasons for importance.

- (c) There were several well developed and balanced responses to this question. Strong responses included carefully selected detail and explanation of the ways in which the Nazis were able to maintain control over the German people between 1933 and 1945. There were numerous methods of control they could have included. Many wrote confidently about the fear produced by the police state created by Hitler and the role of the Gestapo and the SS. They considered the control of the youth through education and the Hitler Youth. The continuous propaganda and control of the media was emphasised as an effective form of control. Stronger responses considered the fact that many Germans genuinely admired Hitler because he had improved the economy and given them benefits through the Strength Through Joy and Beauty of Labour Schemes, so his control came through improved conditions. Good understanding was also demonstrated on the other side of the argument. The attitude of the Church, the activities of the Edelweiss Pirates, the Swing Movement and the White Rose were most commonly used as examples of lack of control.

### Questions 13 and 14

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

### Question 15

- (a) Good understanding was demonstrated on the meaning of speakeasies and many candidates gained high marks this question, providing four valid points such as: 'They appeared during Prohibition', 'They were illegal', 'They were often run by gangsters and linked to organised crime' and 'They operated in secret'. Some responses also focused on why Prohibition was introduced, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) Candidates were very familiar with the development of the motor car in the USA in the 1920s and there were many successful responses. The best responses emphasised the importance by explaining the impact of the assembly line both on the production of the car and the resulting effect on other industries supplying parts to the car such as glass, leather and rubber. Other explanations included the impact on the American way of life, including the building of roads and suburbs. The growth of the car industry also led to increased travel for leisure activities such as to the cinema, sporting fixtures and holiday resorts. Less successful responses were characterised by undeveloped points such as: 'They were cheap to produce' or 'They provided lots of jobs', without mentioning why or how. Often these undeveloped points were all put together in one paragraph, without any explanation. Some spent a long time on describing how the production line worked.
- (c) This question was well answered. Responses demonstrated a variety of ways where intolerance was shown towards black Americans. Racism, the Ku Klux Klan, segregation, job and wage discrimination were all well known. Strong responses had a good understanding of the intolerance of black Americans during the 1920s and were able to explain the problems with clarity and precision. They most commonly explained the activities of the Ku Klux Klan and their use of violence against black Americans, especially in the southern states. They equally had a wide-reaching knowledge of the intolerance of immigrants in the 1920s, illustrated by the Emergency Quota Acts, the Red Scare, race riots and the Sacco and Vanzetti case. They used in-depth contextual knowledge to support their argument and develop their analysis of how each factor demonstrated intolerance to the two different groups. Weaker responses tended to be stronger on the intolerance of black Americans and less confident on the problems caused by intolerance of immigrants, resulting in a one-sided response.

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

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

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 2147/13**  
**Paper 13**

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 2147/22  
Paper 22

## Key messages

It is important that candidates provide direct answers to the questions. This is best achieved by spending a few minutes working out the answer before putting pen to paper. Then, starting the answer with a sentence that directly responds to the question, for example, 'This source is useful because...' or 'I do not find this source surprising because...'. Such an approach should help to prevent candidates from producing excellent evaluations of sources but not actually stating whether a source is, for example, useful, trustworthy or surprising.

When using and analysing a source, it is important to interpret and use what a source says, rather than evaluation that rests on commenting only on its provenance. Evaluation of a historical source should rest on using what the source says, its provenance and on the candidate's contextual knowledge.

Some questions require comparison of written sources for similarities and differences. It is important that this comparison is carried out point by point and not by summarising one source and then the other. Some questions require cartoons to be compared. Candidates should not just interpret the message of each cartoon but should directly compare these messages.

Cartoons do not need to be described, nor does every detail in a cartoon have to be analysed and discussed at length. For example, if the message of a cartoon is asked for, candidates should try to infer and explain a valid message, support it from details in the cartoon, and then move on.

When answering **Question 6**, it is important to directly respond to the hypothesis given in the question. When writing about each source, a clear statement needs to be made, making it clear whether the source supports or disagrees with the hypothesis.

When quoting from a source it is important to provide the quotation in full. Candidates should not use ellipses and leave out crucial parts of the quotation.

## General comments

A large majority of the scripts were on the twentieth century option. Among the small number of nineteenth century scripts were a number of really interesting and excellent ones. The overall standard of candidates' answers across both options was high. There was a good number of outstandingly good scripts and few very poor scripts. Most candidates understood the sources and what was required by the questions. There were few instances of questions not being attempted, and very few examples of candidates appearing to run out of time. Most candidates demonstrated that they could interpret historical sources, cross-reference between them, and evaluate them.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **Question 1**

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates matched the two sources point by point. They identified, for example, that both sources claim that Africa benefited from education, medicine and railways. Britain's fight against slavery was also frequently mentioned. The best answers also explained one or two disagreements, for example Source A claims that British indirect rule failed to benefit African leaders,

while Source B claims that they did benefit. It is important that disagreements are properly explained. It is not sufficient, for example, for candidates to state that the sources disagree over British indirect rule. It is also important that candidates adopt a point-by-point approach to comparisons, and do not just summarise each source in turn.

## Question 2

This question was generally answered well, with some excellent readings of Source C. Very few candidates used the advertisement for its surface information or rejected it because it is only an advertisement about soap. Some used it as evidence that the West was bringing civilisation to ‘the dark corners of the earth’ and used their contextual knowledge to test this claim. Better answers used the advertisement as evidence of Western attitudes towards imperialism and towards Africa. They explained how these attitudes were racist and then demonstrated how the advertisement is reliable evidence about such attitudes.

## Question 3

The weakest answers either wrote about the two sources separately and failed to make any comparison or only compared surface details. A number made some very good inferences from one or both sources but did not compare. The better answers made inferences from the sources, compared them and then reached a conclusion about usefulness. The best answers used contextual knowledge or evidence in other sources to evaluate these sources and used this evaluation to reach a judgement about usefulness. Some candidates analysed the sources well but did not reach a conclusion about usefulness.

## Question 4

The first move when answering this question should be to compare the two sources for agreements and disagreements. Source F suggests that the countries represented at the Berlin Conference agreed to look after the interests of ‘native tribes’. Source G, on the other hand, shows that this is certainly not happening in Leopold’s Congo Free State. Some candidates were able to explain the disagreement between the two sources and use it to argue that Source F does make Source G surprising. Better answers went further. A reasonable number of candidates realised that at least one of the sources needs to be evaluated. Most took the route of explaining about Leopold and what is known of his rule in the Congo Free State. They argued that this does not make Source G at all surprising, no matter what Source F says. A small number of less successful responses focused on the provenance of the sources and hardly used the content of the sources. What the sources say always matters.

## Question 5

This is a ‘purpose’ question. It is asking what the intentions were in publishing this cartoon at that time. The best answers therefore focused on the intended impact of the cartoon on its audience. The candidates suggested that the cartoon was published to highlight the terrible treatment of Africans in the Congo Free State and to put pressure on Leopold or on other countries to put a stop to it. The best answers put all of this in a context – either Leopold’s treatment of Africans or the international outcry against him. Some candidates still achieved reasonable marks even if they did not get to the purpose of the cartoon. They explained either the big message, or a sub-message, of the cartoon and stated that this was why it was published. Weaker answers focused on the context (for example, the treatment of Africans in the Congo Free State) and used this as the reason for publication. The weakness of these answers was that they did not use the content (the message) of the cartoon. A few candidates wrote about the message and/or the context of the cartoon but they would have improved their answers by going on to explain that this was why the cartoon was published. It is crucially important to state an answer to the question.

## Question 6

Some candidates answered the question well. They carefully explained how some of the sources support the hypothesis that imperialism had a beneficial impact on Africa, for example, ‘Source D supports this idea because it shows Africans being given an education by German missionaries. They are being taught how to read and write. Source E backs this up when it says that Africans were being taught a trade and would therefore be useful members of an industrious community.’ They then explained how other sources do not support the hypothesis, for example, ‘Source G does not show that imperialism benefited Africa. This is because it shows that imperialism has led to Africans being flogged and murdered and taxed very highly. It calls imperial rule ‘despotic control’.’ It should be noted that this answer has certain important qualities. First, it clearly identifies which sources it is based on. Second, it explains how certain content from the sources supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. Third, it clearly relates what is written in the sources to the

hypothesis. Finally, it explains both how some sources support the hypothesis, and how some do not. Other candidates struggled with this question. Some of them wrote about the impact of imperialism on Africa without using the sources, while others used the sources but did not focus on the hypothesis.

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

#### **Question 1**

This question produced many good answers, with candidates finding plenty of agreements and disagreements. Only a small number of candidates summarised the sources without making any point-by-point comparison. For agreements it is enough just to identify the agreement, for example, 'Both sources show that the crowds welcomed the German troops.' However, it is important to note that disagreements need to be explained, for example, 'Source A says that Hitler had the ambition to achieve Anschluss, but Source B says he did not plan to annex Austria.' Many candidates provided good answers, although only a few managed to compare the overall messages of the two sources by explaining that while Source A is confident that the vast majority of Austrians supported Anschluss, the author of Source B makes it clear that it is not possible to be certain about this.

#### **Question 2**

This question produced a wide range of interesting answers. Very few candidates simply accepted the source because it is a photograph or it is from the time of the events. Most answers started by suggesting that the source is useful evidence that Austrians did welcome the German soldiers. Better answers reached top levels in the mark scheme by cross-referencing to sources such as A, B and G to provide support of such a welcome, or to B, D and F to question the welcome. Others took a different route and questioned the usefulness of the photograph because of its limitations. These attempts tended to be general in nature, for example there are no adults and it does not show those who opposed Anschluss. However, some candidates were able to go further and used clues in the photograph to suggest that it might have been staged by the Nazis, for example they all have the same flags, they are all dressed in the same way, they are all acting in the same way or somebody thought it was important to take such a photograph. The best answers showed an understanding that the real value of the photograph to a historian is as evidence of the propaganda methods used by the Nazis to give the impression that they were welcomed by the Austrians. A small number of candidates raised some of the points mentioned above but did not state whether or not the source is useful.

#### **Question 3**

When using cartoons, it is important that candidates spend a few minutes examining them and thinking about the messages that the cartoonists intended to convey. Only when they are sure they have reached valid interpretations should they begin to write their answers. Not adopting this approach often leads to long, detailed and descriptive accounts of the cartoons, often lacking any valid interpretation. Other weaker answers included ones which did not compare the cartoons and misinterpretations, for example some candidates thought that in Source D Austria was happy with Anschluss. There were also many very good responses. Most candidates at least identified the crucial similarity in the messages of these two cartoons – that Germany was forcing Anschluss on Austria. When asked about the messages of cartoonists, candidates should try to think about their points of view. Both of these cartoonists were criticising German actions over Anschluss. It would also be fair to say that the cartoonist of Source D was criticising German actions over Anschluss, while the cartoonist of Source E was criticising western leaders over Anschluss. Both of these approaches led to very good answers.

#### **Question 4**

In questions like this it is crucial to use the content and the provenance of the sources, as well as contextual knowledge or cross references to other sources. It is also important to work out an answer before starting any writing. Candidates that did not do this wrote about the two sources separately and neglected to answer the question properly. In Source F, Churchill is clearly criticising the actions of Germany over Anschluss. In Source G, Hitler is justifying German actions and claiming that he 'was met by such a stream of love'. The first important move by candidates is to understand how these two sources disagree. This allows them to argue that Source F shows that Hitler cannot be believed. However, it is also important to evaluate the sources. It is possible to find evidence in other sources to support both Churchill's and Hitler's claims. The sources can also be evaluated by considering the purpose of the authors, for example candidates might know that Churchill was a prominent anti-appeaser and could be making this speech to persuade Parliament

to oppose Chamberlain's policies. The best answers, after comparing and evaluating the sources, used this evaluation to directly address the question.

### Question 5

The candidates who answered this question best were those that were able to focus on the crucial parts of Source H. Chamberlain makes some central claims – that Britain was under no obligation to help Austria, that Britain did not give Germany encouragement over Anschluss, that Britain recognised the special interest that Germany had in Austria, that Britain had always made clear to Germany that it disapproved of violent methods, and that nothing but the use of force could have stopped Germany. The best answers focused on one or more of these claims and tested them against other sources or their own knowledge to see if there is anything surprising. Some candidates argued that they were surprised because, for example, the Treaty of Versailles had banned Anschluss and so Chamberlain's statement that Britain had no obligation to act, can be seen as surprising. Better answers argued that it is clear from Source H that Chamberlain is not going to do anything and then used their contextual knowledge to argue why this is not surprising. The best answers got to the heart of the matter – it is not surprising to see Chamberlain trying to find excuses for doing nothing. The candidates who struggled with this question were those who did not first explain which statement(s) in Source H they were testing. This led to vague answers with a lack of clarity about what it was they were, or were not, surprised about. Some candidates wrote perfectly good answers except for the fact that they failed to state whether they were surprised or not.

### Question 6

Many candidates produced excellent answers to this question. They carefully explained how some of the sources support the hypothesis that the Austrian people supported the Anschluss, for example, 'Source G supports the idea that Austrians supported the Anschluss. It says that when Hitler crossed into Austria at the time of the Anschluss he was met with 'a stream of love'. This is supported by Source C, which is a photograph showing Austrians cheering and welcoming the German army march into Austria. Source A confirms all of this when it says that 'the vast majority of Germans supported the Anschluss' and even if the plebiscite was not perfect (99 per cent in favour) it still represented the true feeling of the Austrian people.' They then explained how other sources do not support the hypothesis, for example, 'Some sources do not support the idea that the Austrian people supported the Anschluss. For example, Source D shows Hitler forcing Austria into agreeing to it, while Source F says that Austria had been 'struck down' by the Germans and 'oppressed'. This would not be necessary if the Austrian people had supported the Anschluss.' It should be noted that this answer has certain important qualities. Firstly, it clearly identifies which sources it is referring to. Secondly, it explains how certain content from sources supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. Thirdly, it clearly relates what is written in the sources to the hypothesis. Finally, it clearly explains how some sources support the hypothesis and how some do not. A small number of candidates struggled with this question. Some of them wrote about the Austrian people and Anschluss without using the sources, while others used the sources but would have benefited from an accompanying focus on the hypothesis.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 2147/23**  
**Paper 23**

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.