HISTORY

<div style="border:1px solid">

Paper 2147/11
Paper 11

</div>

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 historical knowledge and understanding of the question and were characterised by the inclusion of relevant contextual details to support 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 they 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. Other less successful responses included incorrect factual details. Some 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 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. 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.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was the most popular question in the Core Section.

(a)   Many candidates wrote well informed, strong responses to this question. Most mentioned Wilson and the Fourteen Points and were able to define the meaning of 'self-determination' as the right of a people or nation to decide their own form of government. Strong responses identified application of the principle in Central and Eastern Europe, especially with reference to the break-up of the Habsburg Empire, though fewer candidates named the countries created. Some also included how the principle could not be applied to British and French colonies because of the resistance of the respective governments. In a number of other responses candidates struggled with the meaning of 'self-determination' and wrote in very general terms about strength of purpose or resolve, with little relevant information.

(b)   There were mixed responses to this question. In a small number of strong responses candidates were able to explain two reasons for Turkish discontent with the Treaty of Sevres. In these answers candidates homed in on territorial losses and the break-up of the Ottoman Empire, with the establishment of British and French mandates in the Middle East and the much-resented loss of Smyrna to Greece being the provisions most frequently cited. Candidates could also write effectively about the decision to impose Allied control on Turkey's finances. However, in many responses, candidates identified military reductions and territorial losses without adequately explaining their impact. Also, where candidates were uncertain of the provisions of the Treaty, there was a tendency to transfer two German grievances to the Turkish settlement: reparations and war guilt, neither of which were relevant to this question (with reparations never applied and war guilt not a provision of the Treaty of Sevres). Nearly all of the candidates were able to make reference to the harshness of the Treaty. A small number of candidates lacked knowledge of the Treaty of Sevres and often confused it with the treaties that Germany and Hungary received. Less successful responses sometimes included material about the revolt against the Treaty led by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and the resulting Treaty of Lausanne which lacked relevance to this question.

(c)   Overall, this question was answered well. Most candidates were familiar with the main terms of the Treaty of Versailles, though some were unable to explain how these provisions caused bitterness among the Germans. Reference to the war guilt clause, for example, was often explained only with a comment that Germans did not feel that they alone had caused the First World War, when a reference to Russian mobilisation or Austria-Hungary's uncompromising attitude towards Serbia would have secured the explanation. In weaker responses, the coverage of the link between reparations and hyperinflation was either too superficial or unclear. Nevertheless, there were many strong responses which included explanations on both sides of the argument. These responses explained well the impact of reparations on a country whose economy was already in great difficulty and explained how this resulted in the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr and hyperinflation. On the other side of the argument candidates gained credit for explaining the German reaction to the perceived 'Diktat', war guilt, disarmament and territorial losses. Some candidates believed mistakenly that Germany lost the Sudetenland in 1919.

Question 6

This question was also very popular among candidates.

(a)   This question was well answered, responses naming the specific agencies such as 'the Slavery Commission', the 'Health Organisation', the 'Refugee Organisation' and the 'Mandates Commission'. In some strong responses candidates named two organisations but gave descriptions of the work that they carried out. For example, 'The Health Organisation was an agency of the League which worked to eradicate leprosy and malaria.' A number of candidates also included details of the key bodies of the League of Nations such as the Assembly, the Council and the Secretariat. These descriptions were outside the scope of the question. A small number of responses were left blank.

(b)   Many candidates gained credit for identifying features of the Aaland Islands dispute. For example: 'It involved minor countries', 'It was between Sweden and Finland' and 'The League awarded the islands to Finland'. Stronger responses developed these points by including an explanation such as, 'Both Sweden and Finland wanted ownership of the Aaland Islands and took the dispute to the League of Nations. Despite many of the islanders wanting to be ruled by Sweden, the League awarded them to Finland. As they had put safeguards in place to protect Swedish interests on the islands, Sweden accepted the ruling.' A second reason explained revolved around the timing of the dispute, the fact that it was a dispute between minor powers and there was no aggression involved in the conflict, unlike the Japanese and Italian aggression that the League had to deal with in the 1930s. Weaker responses were characterised by incorrect information, often citing the wrong countries, stating the islands were awarded to Sweden or describing the wrong dispute, most commonly the Vilna dispute.

(c)   This question was well answered and there were many strong responses in which candidates showed a good understanding of whether 'Failure to bring about disarmament was the most important problem facing the League in the 1930s.' Successful responses were able to explain the difficulties arising from the 1932 Disarmament Conference in which the victors of the First World War refused to disarm because of their concerns over unemployment and security. It was also important to include the viewpoint of Hitler at this time, who wanted the powers to reduce their arms to the level of Germany or allow Germany to rearm to match the size of the armies of the big powers. As a result of the lack of agreement at the Conference, Hitler left the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations in 1933 and started rearming. In order to give a balanced answer, successful responses identified and explained other problems that faced the League in the 1930s, most commonly the issues caused by Japan's invasion of Manchuria and Italy's invasion of Abyssinia. It was important to identify the exact problem the League faced with these invasions, rather than giving a lengthy description of what happened. The structure of the League was another relevant problem explained in stronger responses, such as the absence of the USA, the fact that the League didn't have an army and League members were usually motivated by self-interest. Weaker responses often included details of disputes in the 1920s, which lacked relevance to this question. Other responses drifted from the focus of the question to give a description of Hitler's Foreign Policy, including the Allies' policy of Appeasement, which was not a policy of the League of Nations.

Question 7

(a)   This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates were able to describe Truman's policy of containment and how he was worried that if South Korea fell to communism, other Asian countries could be next. Stronger responses identified that Truman blamed the Soviet Union for the attack, which was seen as part of Moscow's attempts to gain world domination. Credit was given for responses describing his attitude such as: 'He was suspicious of the Soviet Union's role' or 'He was determined to take action against this aggression by North Korea'. Credit was also given for 'He appealed to the United Nations for support'. Less successful responses drifted from the question by writing generalised accounts of the events of the Korean War.

(b)   There were mixed responses to this question. Most responses were able to identify reasons why North Korea invaded South Korea in 1950, including to spread communism and to unite North and South Korea. The strongest responses were able to explain two reasons. For example: 'Kim Il Sung felt that his forces were stronger than those of South Korea and as he saw himself as the legitimate ruler of Korea, he wanted to remove capitalism from South Korea and unite Korea under communist rule'. Another reason explained included details of the expected support from other

Communist leaders such as Stalin and the fact that Kim Il-Sung thought the US would not get involved. Weaker responses included lengthy details on the events of the Korean War which were not relevant to this question.

(c) Generally, most candidates were familiar with the main events of the Korean War. Strong responses were aware that the American government had been empowered by the UN to select a commander and had chosen General MacArthur. They highlighted his role and explained his initial success in driving the North Korean Forces over the 38th parallel. They further explained that he made a controversial move when he continued to push the North Koreans further north and suggested bombing cities in China that were thought to be aiding the North Korean troops, leading to his dismissal. These responses argued that it was more a victory for the US because although the UN included forces from 16 different nations, they were largely made up of Americans. The United Nations was therefore dominated by the Americans, which made the United Nations look weak. Few responses could present a case about the United Nations in combatting communism, rather than being an organisation to secure and maintain peace. They did gain credit for explaining the armistice and the fact that South Korea remained capitalist.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) This question was very well answered, and most candidates were familiar with and could describe the main features of a trench. Marks were awarded for features such as, 'trenches were dug into the ground', 'they were protected by barbed wire and sandbags' and 'duckboards were often used to prevent soldiers getting their feet wet'. Other points credited included the use of parapets and the existence of specific dugouts for resting.

(b) Most responses identified reasons why an attack on the Somme was launched in July 1916. They were rewarded for stating, 'to relieve the French troops at Verdun', 'to divide the German troops between two battle sites' and 'to weaken German morale.' Some responses would have been improved by developing these identifications into explanations. These less successful responses often tended to give a description of what happened at the Somme, rather than explain why the attack on the Somme was launched, which was the focus of the question. They also tended to confuse who was fighting where. Strong responses were able to explain the historical importance of Verdun to the French, placing emphasis on the tactics of the Germans and the increasing number of French casualties - therefore the attack was launched on the Somme to take pressure off the French, because Germany would have to switch some of its troops to the Somme. A second explanation was developed around achieving a decisive breakthrough on the Western Front and subsequently winning the war.

(c) The best responses used specific examples of the defensive strategy on the Western Front, most commonly the workings of the trench system. They used the British attack on the Somme to show how, because the enemy was so well dug in, it meant that huge numbers of troops were killed as they left their trenches and tried to advance across No Man's Land. This meant that for many years there was little progress made on the Western Front. They also evaluated the impact of the introduction of new weapons on the Western Front, such as tanks and machine guns. In order to produce a balanced argument, strong responses then explained successful attacks, for example how in the Ludendorff Offensive the German army advanced over 35 miles in the first three weeks; however, once the land was taken, it had to be defended and this caused problems for the German army. Weaker responses were characterised by general accounts of warfare, including conditions in the trenches, without any reference to either attack or defence, and often information such as details from the War at Sea and the Eastern Front, which lacked relevance here.

Question 10

There were too few responses to this question for any 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 Reichstag Fire. Among the responses were, 'the fire took place in 1933', 'the accused was a Dutchman, Van der Lubbe', 'he was a communist' and 'Hitler claimed that it was part of a communist plot to overthrow the government'. Candidates also gained credit for stating that, 'Hindenburg issued an emergency decree' and 'many thought that the Nazis had started the fire on purpose to discredit the Communists'. A very small number of candidates confused the Reichstag Fire with Kristallnacht.

(b) Most candidates were familiar with the events of the Night of Long Knives and were able to outline events. The focus of the question was why it took place. Many responses identified that Rohm was a threat to Hitler, but weaker ones neglected to explain why. Strong responses cited Rohm's leadership of the SA, with up to 4 million supporters, and pointed out that his views were different as he wanted a second revolution, which was considered by Hitler and industrialists to be too much like communism. Hitler needed the support of the industrialists, so Rohm had to be removed. Other reasons explained included Rohm's aim to merge with the army and that the SA's continued violence was becoming an embarrassment to Hitler. A small number of responses confused the SA with the SS and also again confused the Night of Long Knives with the Night of Broken Glass. Some drifted from the focus of the question and included the results of the Night of Long Knives.

(c) There were some mixed responses to this question, some being one-sided as a number of candidates were unfamiliar with how the support of wealthy industrialists helped Hitler to become Chancellor. Strong responses identified how they funded the Nazi Party to promote their campaigns, and also how they shared Hitler's anti-communist views, and developed explanations using contextual details to support these two points. Candidates were much more confident explaining other reasons why Hitler became Chancellor, including his extensive use of propaganda, his promise to create jobs to solve the unemployment problem and his determination to destroy the Treaty of Versailles. The best responses also demonstrated a good understanding of the political turmoil in the early 1930s, of which Hitler took advantage. They cited the failures of von Papen and von Schleicher to deal with the problems caused by the Depression. They explained that eventually von Papen persuaded Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor, with him as Vice Chancellor, so that they could control Hitler and use the popular support for the Nazis to benefit the government. The key focus of this question was why Hitler became Chancellor, which was in January 1933. The chronology used by some candidates was incorrect and they included details of both the Reichstag Fire and the Night of Long Knives, which happened after he became Chancellor. Other responses appeared to be discussing how he maintained his power.

Question 12

(a) Many candidates were unfamiliar with the term 'justice system' and wrote generally about the changes Hitler made in Germany, most commonly changes to the school curriculum and the role of women. This lacked relevance to the question. Credit was given for, 'the Nazis took control of the courts', 'all magistrates and judges had to take an oath of loyalty to Hitler', 'Jewish judges were sacked' and 'crimes carried out by Nazi agents were ignored'. The special courts set up for political crimes and the death penalty for telling anti-Nazi jokes could have been mentioned by more candidates.

(b) Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of one reason why the Nazis persecuted racial minorities in Germany by explaining that they believed in the Master Race theory. Stronger responses included a second explanation which often emphasised how Hitler blamed the Jews for the problems facing Germany, for example, he blamed Jewish businessmen and bankers for Germany's defeat in the First World War, as he thought that they had forced the surrender of the German Army in 1918.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with some one-sided answers seen. These responses included general details on the opposition from the churches. Stronger responses included specific supporting detail, such as the activities of Pope Pius XI, Bishop Galen, Pastors Niemoller and Bonhoeffer. Candidates were more confident in explaining the other side of the argument, including opposition from Youth Groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement. Others explained the activities of the White Rose Group and details of the July bomb

plot. Strong responses needed to develop a balanced argument by explaining specific opposition from the churches and other opposition. A small number of responses included opposition to the Weimar Government in the 1920s such as the Spartacists, which lacked relevance to this question.

Questions 13

(a) Descriptions of events around Bloody Sunday, on which most candidates were knowledgeable, featured in responses, while the establishment of the St. Petersburg Soviet and the Potemkin mutiny were rarely mentioned. There was a tendency to give reasons for the revolutionary activity (for example poverty, bad living and working conditions), rather than details of the activity itself.

(b) This question was well answered. Most responses included a good explanation of the impact on Russia resulting from its defeat in the Russo-Japanese War. Other explanations emphasised the difficult conditions faced by industrial workers in the cities and by Russian peasants in the countryside, including unequal land distribution and food shortages. Most had a good understanding of the privileged position enjoyed by the nobility and the Church, as well as the oppressive nature of the tsarist regime. Weaker responses often described factors which applied to the revolution of February/March 1917, rather than 1905.

(c) There were some sound answers to this question. Strong responses usually firstly explained why there was hatred of the Tsarina and how this contributed to the downfall of the Tsar in 1917. The association of the Tsarina with Rasputin was well known and well explained in many instances, often with reference to rumours about the extent of their involvement with each other and the consequent hostile publicity. A second explanation that was used by a few candidates on this side of the argument usually made reference to her German origins and perceived disloyalty or the nature of the appointments and decisions made in conjunction with Rasputin. Though these reasons were missed by some candidates, most could identify other reasons for the downfall of the Tsar, especially his decision to go to the Front and subsequently taking the blame for Russia's defeats, food shortages and the growing dissatisfaction among Russian soldiers. Strong responses developed these identifications into explanations. In a very small number of responses there was some confusion with events leading to the Bolshevik Revolution later in 1917, so that the activities of Lenin and his followers were explained.

Question 14

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

Question 15

(a) Many candidates were well informed on the technical innovations which helped industry to develop in the 1920s. Most mentioned the assembly line used by Henry Ford to mass produce cars. Strong answers identified that the widespread use of electricity meant that homes and businesses had an efficient source of power. The advances made in chemicals, which brought new products such as Bakelite and cellophane, could have been included in more responses.

(b) Candidates were very familiar with the reasons why more Americans were able to buy consumer goods in the 1920s and there were many successful responses containing two explanations. The best responses identified and then explained the point. For example: 'In the 1920s hire purchase was introduced. This meant that workers could buy a new appliance, such as a car or vacuum cleaner and pay for it in instalments. They didn't have to pay the full price up front, and this made it easier to buy an expensive item, resulting in many more people buying household goods'. Many other reasons were put forward including high employment, rising wages and cheaper prices as a result of mass production, the use of advertising and the low taxation policy of the Republican government. Other responses identified reasons but would have been improved by the inclusion of supporting contextual detail.

(c) Answers here were variable in quality, some being one-sided. Strong responses demonstrated understanding and explained the impact of the tariff system on farming. They understood why America had introduced the tariffs and emphasised that the impact of this policy was that foreign countries could not afford to buy US farm produce and, as the US after the First World War was overproducing anyway, this meant that farm prices in the US dropped and therefore farmers became poor. On the other side of the argument, they explained other issues that were facing

farmers at this time, most commonly the competition from Canada and Argentina, and the fact that farmers had borrowed money from banks and that, with lower prices, they could not pay their debts. Less successful responses were characterised by a lack of understanding of American tariffs and the inclusion of details from the 1930s, for example the dust bowl, which lacked relevance to this question.

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

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

HISTORY

Key messages

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

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

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

General comments

Candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions. Many candidates communicate their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. There were few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

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

Parts (b) and (c) of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative or 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, usually using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative accounts or long introductions are not required.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

(a)   **Question 5** was the most popular question of the Core Content, and many candidates were able to provide at least two ways that Turkey was treated in the peace settlement. Most were able to identify that Turkey had been treated harshly and were then able to provide specific examples of that treatment. Most commonly candidates stated that the Ottoman Empire had been broken up, and that land had been lost to countries such as Britain and Greece. Aside from the territorial losses, candidates were also aware that Turkey's finances were run by the Allies, and that there were military restrictions such as the army being reduced to 50,700 men, and that conscription was banned. Whilst most answers concentrated on the Treaty of Sevres, some answers also recognised that the Treaty of Lausanne had a different treatment of Turkey, and this was also a valid approach to the question. Few errors were seen, although weaker answers tended to be generalised, with references to land loss or military restrictions, without specifying what these were.

(b)   This question was answered well, with many candidates able to provide at least one explanation of why Wilson and Clemenceau wanted different things from the peace settlement. Stronger answers approached the question by identifying the differences in motivation before explaining how this impacted on the differing demands in the peace conferences. Such answers considered motivations such as public sentiment, experiences during the war, or the overall approach to the peace conferences. These motivations were explained, for example by comparing the experiences during the war to approaches to reparations. Another approach adopted by some candidates was to consider Wilson and Clemenceau's demands separately, and then to provide an explanation for this at the end, although this resulted in one explanation, rather than two. Few errors were seen, although some candidates described what Wilson and Clemenceau wanted, rather than focusing their response on the reasons for this.

(c)   This question was generally answered well, with most candidates able to provide an explanation on at least one side of whether Lloyd George wanted Germany to be treated harshly in the peace settlement. The most common approach was to argue that he wanted to treat Germany harshly since British public opinion supported this, and as an elected politician he had to be aware of this sentiment. Stronger responses were also able to argue that he saw the peace settlements as an opportunity to strengthen Britain's position, for example through the acquisition of Germany's colonies, or through military restrictions to ensure Britain's naval supremacy. On the other side of the argument, answers were often centred around Lloyd-George's aim to ensure that Germany was able to recover financially, since Germany had previously been Britain's second largest trading partner. This argument was often supported with knowledge about limiting territorial losses and reparations. Stronger answers were able to consider the issue of 'how far', often through an evaluation of Lloyd-George's personal wishes, as compared to his political needs. Weaker answers compared Lloyd-George's aims to those of Wilson and Clemenceau, which was not the focus of the question.

Question 6

(a)   This question was generally answered fairly well, with many candidates able to identify at least some of the League's reactions to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. Strong responses took a chronological approach, detailing the steps that the League took, such as sending a Commission under Lord Lytton to investigate, and that the League concluded that Japan was in the wrong. Stronger answers went further and were able to show that the League voted on the issue, but that Japan voted against. Weaker responses were able to display contextual understanding of the Manchurian crisis, but these answers were not always focused on the League's response. They were often descriptions of the crisis as a whole, for example the reasons for the invasion, or how Japan completed the conquest of Manchuria.

(b)   Some good responses were seen to this question, with many candidates able to provide at least one explanation for why the League failed to give effective support to Haile Selassie. The most common approach was to argue that the failure was due to the self-interest of Britain and France, or that the Great Depression meant that countries were reluctant to impose widespread sanctions due to the existing problems in their economies. Stronger candidates recognised the term 'effective' in the question, and argued that whilst sanctions were imposed, the US actually increased the sale of oil to Italy, negating the effects of the League's sanctions. Less successful responses were often able to describe the relevant events but did not link these to reasons for the League's failure. Some candidates were unable to link Haile Selassie to the Italian

invasion of Abyssinia, and others argued that Britain and France wanted Italy as an ally against communism.

(c)   Candidates were secure in their knowledge and understanding of whether the League was a success in the 1920s, and some very good responses were seen to this question. When arguing that the League was a success, candidates were not only able to explain the territorial successes such as the Aaland Islands and Upper Silesia but were able to support these explanations with specific details. Many candidates were also able to explain the success of the League's agencies such as the Slavery Commission or the Health Committee. Balance was often provided by explanations of the failures in Corfu or in Vilna in stronger responses. Few successful evaluations were seen, with those attempted tending to repeat arguments made earlier in the response, rather than providing a genuine argument of 'how far'. Weaker responses were sometimes lengthy and tended to be descriptive of the issues or conflicts, rather than analysing what made the events a success or failure. In attempted explanations of Corfu, some candidates were not confident of the role of the Conference of Ambassadors, and some went outside of the specified date to consider events in Manchuria and Abyssinia.

Question 7

(a)   This was a well answered question, with many candidates able to provide at least two methods that Stalin used to gain control over Eastern European states by 1948. The most common reasons offered were that Stalin rigged elections or that the Red Army remained in countries after liberating them, although very few candidates were able to provide specific examples of these. Stronger answers also recognised that Stalin replaced the leadership of some Eastern European states, and were able to name these countries, or identified the introduction of Cominform. The most common error was to provide methods outside of the date provided in the question. Such answers would write about the response to NATO being the Warsaw Pact, or identified Comecon, both of which were outside the specified timeframe of the question.

(b)   This question provided candidates with the opportunity to explain several ways in which Berlin was a cause of tension between the Allied powers. Many candidates were able to provide one explanation, most usually through a consideration of the tensions created by the Berlin Blockade. These responses were also able to be developed by considering the tensions which caused Stalin to introduce the Blockade, and also those created as a result of the decision to start the Airlift. Other explanations explained tensions created by the division of Berlin or the building of the Berlin Wall. Some confusion was seen between the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall, with candidates segueing between the two issues. Some weaker answers also described the Blockade or the building of the Wall, but this did not explain why they caused tension.

(c)   Some good answers were seen to this question, with many candidates able to provide at least one explanation of the reason for Stalin's policy towards Eastern Europe. **T**he most common approach was to consider Stalin's aim of spreading communism, and that this required a policy of expansion into Eastern Europe. Other arguments that included 'other reasons' for Stalin's policy considered the economic benefits that he would gain through expansion, particularly set in the post-war context. Stronger responses were also able to consider the given factor, through a consideration of the prior invasions through Poland, and the need to therefore create a buffer zone. Many such answers also considered the Cold War context, which also made Stalin keen to have protection from the West. Some responses would have been improved by focusing solely on Stalin's motives, rather than over-emphasising the role of the US, or explaining events after Stalin's death, for example the treatment of Solidarity in the 1980s.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a)   Some good responses to this question were seen, with candidates able to identify at least two things that happened as a result of Germany invading Belgium in August 1914. The most common response was that Belgian resistance was strong, and that this slowed down the Schlieffen Plan.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Other responses were able to identify that Britain entered the war as a result of the invasion. Few candidates were able to provide details of the battles that took place, and weaker responses described events that happened after August 1914.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question, with some candidates able to provide an explanation of why the race to the sea was important, but others providing descriptions. Stronger responses were able to recognise and explain that it caused the emergence of trench warfare, or that it turned a mobile war into a war of attrition. Weaker responses either described the start of the war generally, without focussing on the 'race to the sea', or confused it with the war at sea. Very few errors were seen, but understanding of the question was sometimes limited.

(c) Some candidates were able to provide explanations on at least one side of the argument, with many attempting to argue that The Battle of Mons was the most important battle on the Western Front in 1914. Such responses often argued the importance of the Battle of the Mons since the fighting by the BEF held up the German army and slowed them down. Stronger candidates then attempted to provide a balanced argument by arguing the importance of other battles in 1914. This was not always successful. Responses showed awareness of the Battle of the Marne but were often unable to explain why it was important, and very few responses referenced the First Battle of Ypres. Weaker responses explained the importance of events outside of the time period of 1914, for example the Battle of the Somme.

Question 10

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

Question 11

(a) Most candidates were able to achieve reasonable marks on this question, with responses displaying very good knowledge of what the SA were. Many candidates stated that they were a paramilitary force of the early Nazi Party, and that their role was to defend Nazi meetings and disrupt the meetings of their opponents. Other common statements were that they were called the Brownshirts, and that they were led by Rohm. Some weaker responses confused the SA with the SS or the Gestapo

(b) Some good responses to this question were seen, with many candidates able to provide one explanation of why the Munich Putsch took place. A smaller number were able to provide two separate explanations. Stronger answers were able to show that it was an attempt by Hitler to overthrow the Weimar government and were able to support this either through exploring reasons for Hitler's hatred of the government, or through the historical context of the problems facing the government in 1923. Such explanations were often well focused and supported by examples such as Hitler's criticisms of the November Criminals, or how hyper-inflation led Hitler to believe his Putsch would be supported. Many responses were unable to provide a second valid reason, instead considering the effects of the Putsch, which was not the focus of the question.

(c) Some good responses to this question were seen, with candidates able to analyse both the role of Goebbels in increasing the popularity of the Nazi Party before 1933 and explain at least one other cause of the increasing popularity. A common approach was to consider Goebbel's extensive propaganda techniques, such as the use of posters, to target particular groups who were suffering during the Great Depression, in order to gain their votes. In order to provide a balanced argument, responses then often considered the role of Hitler himself, or the role of the Great Depression in creating the perfect conditions for the rise of the Nazis. The strongest responses were able to link the conditions created by the Great Depression to the ability of the Nazis to exploit this dissatisfaction through the use of Goebbel's propaganda techniques. Less successful responses often included lengthy descriptions of Goebbel's use of propaganda, but either did not consider the impact that the propaganda had or confused it with propaganda after the Nazis came to power, with much detail provided about cheap radios, and speakers in the street.

Question 12

(a) **Question 12** was the most answered Depth Study choice, with most candidates able to give some ways in which Kristallnacht impacted on the Jews. Responses usually considered the physical destruction caused such as the damage to businesses and synagogues, and also the human impact through the killing or arrest of Jews or the sending of thousands to concentration camps.

Some were also able to recognise that this event led to many becoming so fearful that they left Germany. Few errors were seen. Weaker answers provided very generalised comments such as that Jews were killed, rather than showing specific knowledge of Kristallnacht.

(b) This question was generally answered well, with most candidates able to at least identify reasons why the Nazis wanted the support of young people. The most common approaches seen were either based around the susceptibility of young people to indoctrination, or the importance of the future role within the Nazi state that young people were to hold. Stronger responses were able to explain both of these, supported by specific knowledge such as the need for a large army, leading to boys being given military training through the Hitler Youth, and girls being prepared for a future as mothers and housewives. Other responses were able to describe the experiences of young people, for example describing the changes to education, or the nature of the youth groups, but would have benefited from being able to link this to why these changes were made.

(c) Some very good answers to this question were seen, with candidates able to consider both the role of terror and propaganda in controlling the German people. Other responses were very descriptive, rather than analytical. Candidates were secure in their understanding of the nature of the Nazi police state, with many focussing on the role of the SS and the Gestapo. Strong responses were able to explain that the fear created, for example through the use of informers and the concentration camp system, meant that people were reluctant to speak out or resist. Fewer candidates were able to produce good explanations of the role of propaganda in controlling the German people, but some answers were seen that contained explanations of the extensive nature of the propaganda achieving control, even in the Germans' own homes, through the use of the radio. Weaker responses were descriptive, or considered other factors not stated in the question which therefore lacked relevance.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) This question was answered very well, with many candidates confident in their knowledge and understanding of how the motor car industry developed in the 1920s. Stronger responses were able to describe the changes in the production of cars, for example the introduction of the assembly line by Henry Ford and provided statistics to support statements about the increased speed of production. An alternative but equally valid approach was to show the effect that this growth had, with candidates referring to the number of cars owned, or the growth of the suburbs and road building. Many candidates provided descriptions of both aspects of the motor car development.

(b) Many very good responses were seen to this question, with most candidates able to provide at least one explanation of why hire purchase and mass-marketing helped to drive the economic boom. Stronger responses were able to examine the issues separately and were therefore able to provide two explanations. Such answers often explained that hire purchase enabled consumers to buy products whilst paying later, therefore increasing demand. The role of mass-marketing would then be explored, with explanations centred around how the new methods of advertising such as billboards and adverts in cinemas also increased demand, often for the new products available. Stronger answers were also able to provide examples of successful mass-marketing, such as Coca-Cola. Some confusion between mass-marketing and mass production was seen in weaker responses.

(c) Many candidates were able to explain at least one side of the argument as to whether traditional industries did not benefit from the boom. A common approach was to argue that they did not benefit since products such as coal and cotton were replaced with alternative products such as electricity and rayon. Candidates were also confident in explaining problems facing the farming industry, such as the reasons and effects of over-production. Stronger responses were able to go further and explain the other side of the argument, often with detailed explanations of the role of the car industry in boosting traditional industries, for example steel production, construction and the leather industry. Weaker responses, whilst having some relevant knowledge, would have been improved by considering the word 'traditional' in the question. Missing this aspect meant that they produced more generalised responses about the boom.

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

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

HISTORY

Key messages

Answers to **Question 6** should be based on what the sources say, which should be used to test the hypothesis.

When comparing sources, it is important that candidates do this point by point, rather than by summarising each source in turn.

It is important to decide which questions require the sources to be evaluated.

When evaluating sources, it normally helps to consider the purpose of the author or artist. The provenance of sources can often be useful for this, but it needs to be used in conjunction with what the sources say.

For each question, candidates need to read the sources, think carefully about the question, and only start writing their answers when they know exactly what they want to say.

It is important that candidates consider all the parts of a cartoon when trying to interpret it.

When asked is a source is surprising, or if it can be trusted, it is important that candidates clearly state whether or not they think it is surprising or to be trusted.

General comments

The overall quality of responses was variable. A number of candidates struggled with **Question 6,** making no, or little, use of the sources in their answers to this question or not using the correct hypothesis. There were also a number of candidates who used the surface meaning of sources uncritically and did not recognise when it was necessary to carry out some evaluation. However, many good answers were seen, demonstrating skills such as interpretation, cross-referencing and evaluation, as well as the ability to use sources in their historical context.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth-century topic

Question 1

Many candidates found it straightforward to find valid agreements between the two sources, and there were many, for example Germany sent the Panther, Germany was given land, and there was tension between the British and French navies. Fewer candidates found disagreements. The most commonly used one was over whether the crisis came close to causing war. Disagreements require more explanation than agreements. It is necessary to state both sides of the disagreement, rather than just identify what the disagreement was about, for example 'Source A states that Britain knew what German intentions were, but Source B states that Britain did not know German intentions.' Some candidates paraphrased each source in turn and asserted that they agreed, when what was required was a point-by-point comparison of the two sources.

Question 2

A reasonable number of candidates were able to explain the big message of Source C– the tension between Germany and France, while many were able to explain sub-messages such as large navies were bringing

war closer. In a number of less successful responses, candidates did not engage with the cartoon at all and wrote a narrative of the Moroccan Crisis, while others thought that Britain was represented in the cartoon and based their answers on that misunderstanding. Some candidates used the text at the bottom of the cartoon literally and claimed that both Germany and France genuinely wanted peace.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to find key disagreements between Source D and Source E and use them to argue that Source E does make Source D surprising. Source D shows concerns about a possible German naval attack and worries about the lack of preparedness of British ships, while in Source E a British admiral boasts about the strength of the British navy and dismisses any possibility of war. However, whether or not Source E does make Source D surprising depends on whether either or both of these sources can be trusted. In stronger responses candidates realised this and attempted to evaluate. There are many possibilities for this, for example in Source G Tirpitz claims that Germany did not want to go to war, thus questioning the claims made by the British newspaper in Source D, or the candidates' contextual knowledge of Britain's programme of Dreadnought building would give them a reason for supporting Source E. Weaker answers either made assertions based on the provenance of the sources and without relating it to the content of the sources, or compared the sources perfectly adequately but made no attempt to address the issue of surprise.

Question 4

One way of explaining why Heydebrand made this speech in November 1911 is to refer to the political context. The provenance of the source mentions the Franco-German agreement of that time, but a good number of candidates were able to add that the agreement was a disappointment to the Germans, thus explaining Heydebrand's tone. Another approach adopted by some candidates involved explaining Heydebrand's message. The better answers showed understanding of his threat of war aimed at Britain. Weaker answers paraphrased the source and lacked an understanding of what he wanted to say. This is a 'purpose' question and the best answers attempted to explain what Heydebrand was trying to achieve in this speech. In other words, what impact did he want to have on his audience? A small number of candidates suggested valid possible purposes, for example to persuade the German government to take a more aggressive position against Britain, or to persuade the Reichstag to oppose the Franco-German agreement or put pressure on the German government to act against Britain.

Question 5

The better answers to this question attempted to evaluate Tirpitz's account. This was best done by considering Tirpitz's possible purpose, for example to distance himself from German actions and to try and protect his own reputation. This needed to be supported by reference to the contents of the source. Some candidates cross-referenced to other sources to check his claims. However, some candidates struggled to answer this question well because they just paraphrased the source and then asserted that its account of events in 1911 was accurate. To make this approach work, it is necessary to use clear and specific contextual knowledge to check what Source G says. Some candidates referred to the information in the provenance of the source but would have benefited from going on to use it in conjunction with what Tirpitz says.

Question 6

A number of candidates struggled with this question. It is important that candidates test the hypothesis exactly as it is stated in the question. Some answers contained no use of the sources. The question asked candidates how far the sources support the hypothesis. This means that the question is about the sources and that answers must be based on them. When sources were used by candidates, they were sometimes not used properly. Candidates need to explain how a source supports or does not support the hypothesis, rather than, for example, assert that it does. The following example demonstrates the proper way to use the sources: 'Source D supports the idea that Europe was very close to war in 1911 because it claims that German destroyers planned a night torpedo attack on Portland and the German main fleet planned to attack the British fleet. This would have caused a European war. On the other hand, Tirpitz in Source G says that Germany, 'did not want to go to war' and backed down. This shows that it was determined to avoid war.'

The most straightforward, and effective, way of answering **Question 6** is to explain the sources that support the hypothesis, one by one, and then to do the same with the sources that do not support it. It is important that for each source use candidates make clear which source they are using and on which side of the argument the source lies. Often a well-chosen quotation from the relevant source will be enough to make the

point, but sometimes there needs to be a brief explanation of how the source supports or does not support the hypothesis.

Option B: Twentieth-century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered very well. Most candidates attempted a point-by-point comparison. They found agreements easier to find than disagreements. The most common agreements to be found in answers included: the Soviets were worried by Nagy, Khrushchev did not want to appear as weak and the Soviets sent tanks into Hungary on 4 November. Disagreements included: Source A claims that the Soviet decision was made over a number of days, while Source B says that the Soviets changed their minds suddenly, and Source A says that the use of force was inevitable, while Source B says it was a surprise. When writing about an agreement, it is sufficient to say, for example, 'Both sources say that the Soviets were worried by Nagy's actions.' Disagreements require rather more explanation, for example, 'In Source A the Soviets were worried that demands for independence would spread to Eastern Europe, but Source B says that the Soviets were mainly worried about counter-revolutionaries. It is not sufficient to simply identify what the sources disagree about. A small number of candidates summarised each source in turn and did not focus on particular points while others just wrote about the events. It is important that candidates read both sources carefully and identify the main points of agreement and disagreement before starting to write their answers.

Question 2

When answering a 'message' question about a cartoon it is important that candidates use all the details in the cartoon to help form and reach their interpretation. They must go beyond the details of the cartoon and explain what overall point the cartoonist was trying to make. The cartoon (Source C) has two parts – Khrushchev dealing with Hungary, and the UN dealing with the crisis over Suez. Reaching the big message of the cartoonist involves putting these two parts together to explain that the UN is punishing those countries involved in Suez, while ignoring Soviet actions in Hungary. Candidates needed to go further and explain the cartoonist's point of view – criticising the UN. Most candidates were able to explain a valid sub-message of the cartoon, for example the UN is punishing Israel, Britain and France, and Hungary is suffering from Soviet violence. Fewer explained the big message, and only a small number demonstrated an understanding of the point of view of the cartoonist. A number of responses were limited to descriptions of the cartoon, for example a man is holding Hungary down or/and Israel, Britain and France had to write lines.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to find disagreements between Sources D and E and use them to explain how Source E makes Source D surprising, for example in Source D Khrushchev's main concern was helping the Hungarian working class, while in Source E it was to prevent the USSR from looking weak. An good number of candidates explained that in Source D Khrushchev was claiming that he wanted to help the Hungarians, while in Source E he was acting for the good of the Soviet Union. This led some of them to use both the content and the provenance of the sources to produce some evaluation, for example in Source D he was writing in his memoirs and wanted to create a good impression of himself for posterity, in Source E he was speaking to the leaders of the Soviet Union and wanted to impress them with his concern for the USSR. Both of these points cast some doubt over whether Khrushchev can be trusted in one of both of the sources. It is important that, having carried out this evaluation, candidates use it to answer the question – does Source E make Source D surprising? Weaker answers either used the provenance of the sources but neglected to use their content, or analysed or evaluated the sources but did not state whether they thought that Source E made Source D surprising.

Question 4

Most candidates understood Source G and explained that it was pro-Hungarian and critical of the Soviets. However, Source F proved to be more challenging for some candidates, with many thinking that the figures under the coat were Soviet soldiers or agents. A small number of candidates realised that Source F is pro-Soviet and critical of the Hungarians and argued that they were not genuinely interested in 'democracy, freedom and independence'. A reasonable number of candidates were able to compare sub-messages of the two sources, for example the Soviets are in control in both, but few compared the big messages, because of the difficulties they had with Source F.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Question 5

The key to producing a good answer to this question was to realise that it required Source H to be evaluated. Kovacs had very good reasons for expressing anti-Soviet and pro-revolution ideas in the interview. The US newspaper also had clear motives for reporting the interview in the way it did. Good answers were based on candidates asking themselves, what was their purpose and does this affect the usefulness of the source? Many candidates, however, took an uncritical approach towards the source and used its contents to simply demonstrate how it was useful. Some of these answers used any information in Source H, but the better ones focused on the key point that Kovacs was making about the revolution – that it was not a counter-revolution. The weaker answers just made assertions based on claims that, for example, Kovacs was anti-communist or that the newspaper was American and therefore could not be trusted. If candidates are going to use the provenance of the source to evaluate, they need to do so in conjunction with what the source says. This will take them to a possible motive or purpose.

Question 6

A number of candidates found this question challenging. Some did not read the question closely enough and only used the first part of the hypothesis. This meant that they were testing whether or not the Soviets used military force in Hungary, whereas the full hypothesis was that the reason why the Soviets used military force was to put down counter-revolution. Some answers contained no use of the sources. The question asks candidates how far the sources support the hypothesis. This means that the question is about the sources and that answers must be based on them. When sources were used by candidates, they were sometimes not used properly. The candidates needed to explain how a source supports or does not support the hypothesis, rather than just asserting that, for example, it does support it. The following example demonstrates the proper way to use the sources: 'Source B supports the idea that the reason the Soviets used military force was to put down counter-revolution because it says that the Soviets decided to end the revolution violently because, 'Hungary could fall to counter-revolutionaries'. Source E, on the other hand, does not support it because it says that the Soviets used military force because they would have given the Americans a great boost if they had withdrawn their troops.'

The most straightforward, and effective, way of answering **Question 6** is to first explain the sources that support the hypothesis, one by one, and then do the same with the sources that do not support it. It is important that for each source use candidates make clear which source they are using and on which side of the argument the source lies. Often a well-chosen quotation from the relevant source will be enough to make the point, but sometimes there needs to be a brief explanation of how the source supports/does not support the hypothesis.

HISTORY

Paper 2147/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Before answering any of the questions, candidates carefully read through all of the sources, making sure they familiarise themselves with what they say and show, and how they relate to the overarching question posed at the start of the paper. Although each question instructs candidates to look at and use particular sources, there is nothing to prevent them using any source on any question if they think it relevant, particularly in using cross-reference from one source to another to test reliability. So being aware, before starting writing, of the claims made in all the sources, is important.

Candidates must answer all the questions on their chosen option. This means that they need to plan how you use the time available. They should keep sufficient time available to answer **Question 6** fully, as it carries the most marks.

Candidates' answers should directly address the question being asked. If a question asks how surprised they are by what a source says, they must clearly state whether or not they are surprised, and then explain why. If a question asks why a source was published at a given time, candidates need to give a clear reason for publication, and then explain how the source leads them to this conclusion. A good technique to use is to reflect the question in the first sentence of the answer: *'Yes, the source is useful because', 'The source was published because'* and so on. This should help in producing a direct and focused response and in avoiding simply repeating what the source says.

General comments

Answers were strongest on questions that were based on the comprehension and interpretation of material in the sources and were weaker where evaluation of the sources was required. When the reliability of a source was an issue, the technique used most often to test this was cross-reference to another source. Whilst this is a reasonable approach, the nature of the source to which cross-reference is made must be kept in mind. If it is itself unreliable, then reference to it canny prove anything. A more effective approach to evaluation is to analyse, using contextual knowledge, the possible purposes that the author of a source might have had in saying what s/he did. This was less often seen in candidates' answers.

The overall quality of responses was at a good level. Most scripts were complete, contextual knowledge was sound, and there was little evidence of misunderstanding of sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth-century topic

Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to compare two sources to determine how far they agreed. Most were able to find at least one agreement and one disagreement. For example, the sources agreed that Germany wanted to avoid a war on two fronts, and that Germany planned to defeat France first. They disagreed in that Source A said mobilisation meant war, whilst Source B said this was not true. There were several more valid comparisons available.

Question 2

The answer most often seen was that the source was useful in that it showed that the reason why Britain went to war was to protect Belgium. Based on what the source showed, this was a reasonable response, but was uncritical. Better answers were more sceptical. Other sources on the paper questioned whether or not Belgium was the real issue which took Britain to war, and some candidates used cross-reference to these sources to doubt the utility of Source C. The best answers looked at the nature of the source, and used the fact that it was a recruitment poster, using an emotive issue to persuade men to join up, to doubt its reliability and therefore question its utility.

Question 3

There were clear contradictions between Sources D and E – over whether Britain had obligations to support France, and whether it would protect Belgium's neutrality – and for some candidates this meant that Grey had to be lying. Few turned the logic on its head and concluded that Bethmann was the one not telling the truth. Better answers noted the contradictions but explained them in relation to the author's purposes. Grey was speaking in Parliament on the eve of war, justifying his policy of supporting France against Germany. Similarly, Bethmann was justifying why Germany went to war, and was seeking to shift the blame onto Britain. Awareness of these issues was then used to inform the conclusion on who was lying.

Question 4

Less successful answers could identify what it was about Source F that they found surprising (or not), but could not provide any plausible reasoning to explain why. Most responses included the checking of claims made in the source against contextual knowledge or what other sources said. For example, Grey says that Britain would not give any promise of support to France at that time, but in Source D he gives such a promise, which, on the face of it, is surprising. On the other hand, he also says that preserving Belgium's neutrality might be an important factor, which is confirmed in Source D, where he admits that Britain has treaty obligations to Belgium. So, Source F could be seen as both surprising and not surprising, dependent on what aspect of it was being checked. It was possible to answer on the basis of Grey's possible purposes, particularly in not revealing too much to Bertie for fear that it would be passed on to the French, but few took such possibilities into account.

Question 5

Before a reason for publication could be inferred, the postcard had to be properly interpreted. Most candidates could do this, but some did not recognise the Kaiser, which generally meant invalid reasons were given. Reasons could be categorised as messages, context or purpose. Answers based on message would say, for example, that it was published to tell people that the Kaiser wanted to grab the whole of Europe. This prompted the question of why a British artist would want to show this; that is, what purpose would the artist have? Some suggested that this might be to stir up anti-German feeling. But then, why do this at that particular time? Using the context would lead to the conclusion that the context of the coming of war in 1914 would help to explain both the message and the purpose. A small number of answers, whilst fully understanding the cartoon, neglected to give an explicit reason for publication.

Question 6

A small number of candidates struggled to use the sources properly. This happened in two ways: first, candidates wrote an answer on the given hypothesis ('Britain went to war to keep its commitment to Belgium') and did not use the sources at all, or second, they mentioned the sources but without using them as evidence to test the hypothesis. Almost all candidates recognise that they must find evidence in the sources both to confirm and to question the hypothesis, but this still leaves open the issue of using the source appropriately. In short, the answer must show how the source offers evidence. With some sources this may be almost self-evident: for example, Source C says 'Remember Belgium' - the reason for going to war seems clear. However, Source G would take a little more explaining. It shows the Kaiser wanting to grab Europe, so suggests that the reason Britain went to war was to stop this happening. The reason needs to be inferred; it is not explicit. The best answers made sure that what they wrote about each source was clearly related back to the hypothesis, and to whether it offered support for it or not.

Option B: Twentieth-century topic

Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to compare two sources to determine how far they agreed. Most were able to find at least one agreement and one disagreement. There were, in fact, many points of agreement and disagreement, but some required careful matching. For example, it was often claimed that the sources agreed that East German workers were mistreated in the West. But it was not the sources that thought this, but Ulbricht. Similarly, a disagreement was detected in who was stealing East Germany's wealth, in Source A, the Soviet Union and in Source B, West Germany. But again, it was not the sources that thought this, it was Ulbricht. The sources offered quite dense detail on who wanted the Wall and when, so agreements and disagreements on this had to be carefully constructed.

Question 2

Before a reason for publication could be inferred, the cartoon had to be properly interpreted. Most candidates could do this, but a small number thought it was showing life in the West to be better than in the East, which meany invalid reasons being given. Reasons could be categorised as messages, context or purpose. Answers based on message would say, for example, that it was published to tell people that they would be better off if they stayed in the East. This prompted the question of why an East German artist would want to show this; that is, what purpose would the artist have? Some suggested that this might be to make sure that East German workers stayed in East Berlin. But then, why do this at that particular time? Using the context would lead to the conclusion that the context of the loss of skilled labour from the East to the West, and the imminent construction of the Berlin Wall, would help to explain both the message and the purpose. A small number of answers, whilst fully understanding the cartoon, would have benefited from giving an explicit reason for publication.

Question 3

When asked to compare two cartoons, candidates need to be able to interpret them. In this case, Source D was used more effectively than Source E, but there were valid comparisons of message that were nonetheless possible, even if the irony of Source E was missed. The weakest answers compared on the basis of source detail, rather than on interpretation of the sources, for example claiming that the sources were different because in Source D the Wall was made of stone blocks, whereas in Source E it was made of wire. There were, though, plenty of messages that could be compared: both showed East Berliners wanted to escape, both showed violence would be used to keep them in East Berlin, both showed the Wall was keeping East and West Berliners apart, and so on. The best answers went beyond messages and looked instead at the cartoonists' opinions, understanding that both were criticising the construction of the Wall.

Question 4

Because of the clear contradictions between Sources F and G, most candidates were able to claim that Source G was surprising as it disagreed with Source F. Exploring the idea that the differences did not necessarily mean that either source was surprising was the key to providing a better answer. At its simplest, the difference could be explained by the passage of time, but if this explanation was informed by contextual knowledge of what had actually changed between 1953 and 1961 (or even 1971, when Khrushchev's memoirs were published), then the answer became much more convincing. The best answers analysed Khrushchev's possible purposes in representing events in the way he did. Being complicit in the decision to erect the Wall, he had a clear motive to try and justify it and present the Wall in a positive way, so Source G was therefore unsurprising.

Question 5

Questions asking about the utility of a source as evidence will almost always involve the issue of whether or not the source can be believed. Most candidates were aware of this issue, but more could have explored it sufficiently. Most were happy to accept the information contained within a source, but added a caveat to this, warning of the possibility of bias. So, with Source H, almost all answers accepted that what it had to say about the Wall – that it split East from West, that it had watchtowers, that refugees were risking everything to cross it, and so on – was useful information. Many also noted that the source was produced by the British government, which for obvious reasons would be hostile to East Germany/the USSR, so would therefore be biased, and not useful. These answers could have been improved by more development and explanation.

They would be improved, as some candidates did, by demonstrating and explaining the bias. This could be done through the language in the source, and through the purposes of the British in representing the Wall in this manner. However, concluding that this all means that the source is not useful is still to miss something - that the source is actually useful as evidence of how the West sought to use the Wall for propaganda purposes.

Question 6

A small number of answers struggled to use the sources properly. This happened in two ways: first, candidates wrote an answer on the given hypothesis ('The Berlin Wall was built to protect East Germans') and did not use the sources at all, or second, they mentioned the sources but without using them as evidence to test the hypothesis. Almost all candidates recognise that they must find evidence in the sources both to confirm and to question the hypothesis, but this still leaves open the issue of using the source appropriately. In short, the answer must show how the source offers evidence. This means selecting relevant material from the sources. In Source A, for example, it mentions that Ulbricht believed East German citizens were being mistreated in the West. It would therefore be a reasonable inference that he wanted a Wall to protect them from this. Another part of the same source might give contrasting evidence – that the Wall was not built to protect but for some other reason. Thus, Source A also says Ulbricht was desperate to stem the loss of skilled workers to the West. This process of selection of material is central to the construction of a successful answer. The best answers made sure that what they wrote about each source was clearly related back to the hypothesis, and to whether it offered support for it or not. A frequent weakness in answers is gradually to lose focus on the hypothesis, sometimes to the extent of substituting another hypothesis. In this question, quite a number of answers started on track, looking at the issue of protection, but gradually slipped into a consideration of whether or not the Wall was a benefit to East Germany.