

HISTORY (MODERN WORLD AFFAIRS)

Paper 2134/01

Modern World Affairs

Key Messages

Successful candidates planned their time and read the questions carefully, noting the key words. These responses also tended to avoid lengthy introductions, and kept the answers relevant to the demands of the question.

General Comments

Many candidates displayed good, detailed knowledge on a broad range of topics. All candidates met the requirement to answer at least one question from Section A: International Relations and Developments. Few selected questions where they could only answer one part of the selected question effectively. A very small number of candidates were unable to complete their last answer. A number of candidates wrote lengthy narratives, and more time planning evaluative part (b) answers would have improved such responses. Candidates should always read questions carefully. Some candidates misread questions, for example, missing the 'agencies' of the League of Nations (**Question 2**), and writing about Stalin's post-war leadership priorities as being about the period post-World War I instead of post-World War II (**Question 17**).

Part (a) questions require candidates to construct historical narratives in answer to a knowledge-based question that requires them demonstrate sound and relevant factual knowledge. Most candidates did this very well, using strong, appropriate, supported information to keep their answers relevant to the question. Less successful candidates attempted to use their knowledge to develop answers, but were unable to keep to the point of the question, and added lengthy descriptions that were not appropriate. Where this happened, it was often the context of the question set lengthily as an introduction. Some candidates responded to the question about the Locarno Treaties with a description of the Treaty of Versailles. These additional details were only worthy of marks where they were used to inform a point supportive of, or critical of, the Treaty of Versailles. Occasionally, candidates selected questions about which they had limited knowledge and offered information not associated in any way with the requirements of the question. For example, some confused space exploration with the Virgin Lands Scheme (**Question 18**), or the terms of the Treaty of Trianon with other treaties of the Paris Peace settlement (**Question 1**).

Part (b) questions require candidates to provide evaluative responses, as they consider the given factor in a question and assess its importance relative to other factors, selected from their knowledge of causes, effects, similarities or differences. Successful answers considered both sides of the argument in a balanced way, with evidence, accepting the given factor and then considering alternatives before reaching a conclusion. Most candidates explained the given factor in the context of the question, many offering evaluative comments that partially answered the question. Some less successful candidates tried to address the question by placing all the factors under the umbrella of the given factor. For example, in **Question 2**, some candidates saw the Italian aggression in its dealings with the League as explaining all the reasons why the League of Nations failed to reach a successful conclusion to the Corfu Crisis. Other candidates set this explanation within a narrative of the subject from which could have been extracted other factors to offer as alternative answers, thus allowing them to achieve a higher level response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This was a popular question which was answered by many candidates.

Part (a): Many candidates were able to offer details of the content of the Treaty of Trianon, achieving good marks. A significant number added the impact of factors such as land loss and the break-up of the Austro-

Hungarian Empire, on the future of Hungary. Some candidates wrote general statements such as 'It was about land loss and the reduction in the strength of the military.' Where this was offered with a specific aim in mind, for example that it left a state, surrounded by new countries, without the military strength to maintain its borders, the point could be rewarded.

Part (b): The best answers saw candidates setting the scene with a brief paragraph about the purpose of the Locarno Treaties in comparison with the causes of the Treaty of Versailles. Candidates then considered German participation at Locarno and what that showed about the success of Versailles. They then took aspects of the Locarno Treaties, and discussed what they showed about attitudes relative to Versailles and expectations at Locarno relative to Versailles. Most candidates described and commented upon aspects of the Locarno Treaties, making assertions about how they related to the Treaty of Versailles.

Question 2

This was also very popular question, answered by many candidates.

Part (a): The strongest answers were seen where candidates accurately focused on the agencies of the League of Nations, showing their specific achievements. These candidates tended to know about refugees and Russia, about leprosy and yellow fever, about the reduction in opium production and about the plebiscite in the Saar. A number of candidates described the work of the League of Nations in the 1920s and 1930s, with a focus on peace-keeping.

Part (b): The most successful responses were those that separated out Italy's pressure on the League of Nations and the Conference of Ambassadors from the actions that the League did in fact take. The former was explained through narrative usually, stronger candidates stressing the ways in which Italy's response could only come about through the awareness of being a Permanent Member of the League. Some good answers focused on the early measures that the League could take - warnings and support for negotiation, or on the impact of the agreement by which each member had to approve the use of their armed forces. Weaker answers tended to just describe the general weaknesses of the League, such as the lack of a standing army.

Question 3

Part (a): Candidates offered a range of answers to this question. Some provided analysis of responses to the different crises to demonstrate what Britain and France thought of the threat of war. Stronger candidates included points such as that wars around Japan and China were too far away to be of concern, or that the requirements to stop Italy in Abyssinia were too much for the state of the economy to contemplate, for example, closing the Suez Canal, thereby indicating that war was of secondary concern. Some candidates took their knowledge of Clemenceau's and Lloyd George's aims at Versailles to form an answer that could achieve some reasonable marks.

Part (b): Competent answers to this question addressed the significance of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, in terms of both German intent and as part of the planning for rearmament. Stronger answers then went on to consider, both that it was not seen as aggression because of the perceived unfairness of the Treaty of Versailles, and that it was different from later aggressive events, for example, concerning Czechoslovakia. Some answers were restricted to a description of events up to the Second World War.

Question 4

Part (a): This was a well-answered question. The strongest answers were detailed ones about NATO's connection to the Berlin Blockade, about the need for mutual protection and about its membership. Some candidates went on to give an example of when it was effective.

Part (b): Candidates provided good answers in justifying the arms race as a matter of prestige. Many detailed the developments in the race and then showed how they were about prestige. There were few higher level answers, as candidates grouped all their arguments under the umbrella of 'prestige'. They could have drawn out the issue of security around the Cuban Crisis, or even Russian animosity towards America, caused by the secret development of the atom bomb by their ally.

Question 5

Part (a): This was well known to those who answered it. Details about Lumumba's weaknesses and inexperience, and the role of Tshombe, were clear. The role of the UN was usually well explained.

Part **(b)**: Candidates wrote some reasonable answers to this question on the UN, citing its aims as ‘to maintain international peace and security.’ A small number of competent answers addressed the work done to develop friendly relations between nations around social, humanitarian and cultural needs, but knowledge here was weaker.

Section B

Question 6

Part **(a)**: There were many competent answers on groups of people in Germany that supported the Nazis, for example, old soldiers who hated the Weimar Government for signing the armistice when the war was still being fought; businessmen who feared the rise of Communism.

Part **(b)**: An unwillingness to challenge the question led many candidates to introduce their answer with the effects of the Depression in America and its impact on the status of loans to Germany. They then considered how employment, opportunity and pride in Germany were damaged by the Depression, going on to show how failure to handle the Depression in Germany caused political difficulties that led the Nazis to power. Stronger answers went on to consider ways in which the death of Stresemann or the will of Hindenburg were also responsible.

Question 7

Part **(a)**: Starting with Mussolini’s vision of Italy’s future, candidates offered strong narratives of his ‘battles’ and moves on Abyssinia.

Part **(b)**: The strongest answers took each of several factors such as the control of the media, the support from Italians who felt that the economy supported them, favourable responses to the reinstatement of law and order and the support from the monarchy and the church, as all contributing to Mussolini’s unopposed rule. Some candidates dealt with all the issues under the heading of the press, showing how the media told Italians of the support from the church and similar arguments, limiting the credit that could be awarded.

Questions 8, 9 and 10

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Section C

Question 11

Part **(a)**: Most candidates who attempted this question showed understanding of rural life, especially the lack of equality and the violence of the Ku Klux Klan. Stronger answers also discussed the lack of availability of the things that were making the 1920s ‘roaring’ in cities, such as electricity, new jobs, machinery in the home and a lively social life. A small number went on to show that not all black Americans were living the same lives, discussing the changes to lives of jazz musicians.

Part **(b)**: Many candidates knew about speculation but would have benefited from being able to more link it more strongly to the Wall Street Crash. Those who could do this usually found little difficulty in explaining the role of isolationism or the role of a low-wage economy and/or of overproduction also, as causal factors.

Question 12

Part **(a)**: This was a well answered question. Rugged individualism and its expected impact were well known. Some candidates also knew about the support given to banks, farms and businesses to promote support through work during the early stages of the Depression.

Part **(b)**: This was one of the few questions where the given factor did not produce most of the reasonable answers which were seen. Candidates tended to know about the role and impact of the Alphabet Agencies and the support/ regulation of banking. Candidates explained that fireside chats were often established as a pleasant innovation or as a two-way conversation, rather than as a policy requirement to help calm Americans down so that investment could begin again.

Questions 13, 14 and 15

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Section D

Question 16

Part (a): This was a very well answered question, with candidates able to offer detailed knowledge of the contenders and how they were manipulated by Stalin.

Part (b): Candidates answered this question well on the whole, though some struggled to find explanations for positive outcomes - the movement of people to industrial towns, the drive to feed town-dwellers and to export. The negative impacts of collectives on freedom, on farmers and on production, were well known. Some candidates introduced their argument with a narrative of the demise of Kulaks without using their knowledge to address the question, thus leaving this factor as description.

Question 17

Part (a): The strongest answers saw candidates identify what young people learned and then explain how they did so, for example that Stalin was a developer of the post-Revolutionary era alongside Lenin, through posters that were produced, films that were shown and textbooks that were re-written.

Part (b): Many candidates did not think that Stalin was leader after the First World War and dwelt upon early measures to develop industry. Most did not write about as post-1945, but did not apply them as an argument for developing the USSR post-Second World War. As a result, many candidates struggled with the given factor - the economy - their responses improving when considering the Cult of Personality or internal security. Some good answers were able to explain industrial and agrarian developments post-war, and also the need to develop security from the new European enemies.

Question 18

Part (a): The majority of candidates who attempted this question misinterpreted 'space' as meaning 'land' and offered detail of Khrushchev's Virgin Lands Scheme as an answer. Those who had knowledge of the race with America to put a man in space/to go around Earth were able to provide strong answers.

Part (b): De-Stalinisation and the need for continued security in the post- Stalin era were both well understood, and balanced answers were frequent. A small number of candidates went beyond the requirements of the question, considering what future presidents' policies were in relation to the media, to punishment and to economic and political freedom.

Questions 19 and 20

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Section E

Questions 21 and 22

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Question 23

Part (a): Candidates who selected this question knew their subject well and answered with understanding about the Balfour Declaration, its immediate impact and longer term difficulties.

Part (b): This was one of the questions where some candidates tended to narrate the events of the war without using their knowledge to address the question. The strength of the Arabs was stated as a fact, rather than used to demonstrate the potential strength of Israel's opposition. Candidates were usually able to

achieve strong responses by considering the terms of the peace and explaining Israel's security as a success.

Question 24

Part **(a)**: This question produced some responses which were knowledgeable about the events surrounding the Suez Crisis.

Part **(b)**: Competent answers very clearly explained the role of President Sadat in bringing about the achievements at Camp David. Responses were less secure on the roles of others involved. President Carter was the other factor usually considered.

Question 25

There were too few answers to this question for analysis to be helpful.

Section F

Question 26

This question was consistently well-answered by those who chose it.

Part **(a)**: The strongest answers were detailed across the span of the question. Weaker responses concentrated on the Long March, but these were few in number.

Part **(b)**: This was a question in which candidates tended to see the effect of the given factor, i.e. how the Xian incident saved the CCP from a potentially damaging attack. Most found it difficult to find a balanced answer.

Questions 27 and 28

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Question 29

This was a popular question.

Part **(a)**: There were many competent answers in which explanations were strong: the unfair use of profits from Jute production on West Pakistan and the relatively under-developed nature of East Pakistan; the make-up of government and the senior military of people from West Pakistan at the expense of East Pakistan; the language issue and its impact; the Six-Point Programme.

Part **(b)**: There were a few very strong answers that analysed the role of President Yahya Khan from his call for an election, instead of engaging in discussions with the Awami League, through to the beginning of the Civil War. However, some answers saw only one side – that Yahya Khan's actions were the main causes of the conflict. Where candidates did find another factor, it tended to be the role of India in supporting the independence movement and its military capacity.

Question 30

There were too few answers to this question for analysis to be helpful.

HISTORY (MODERN WORLD AFFAIRS)

Paper 2134/02

International Relations and Developments

Key Messages

In better responses, candidates used and analysed and use the sources provided. It is important to use the question stem as part of the answer, and this would have helped some candidates to answer the questions more directly.

General Comments

Some candidates would have benefited from managing their time differently. The time that some candidates spent on the first question meant that they were unable to complete the last question properly.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The best answers responded to the extract by making supported and relevant inferences. They realised that the United States was not really disarming. Weaker responses used contextual knowledge rather than the source material, and wrote about the events surrounding the Washington Naval Conference. The approach candidates should adopt is to quote from the extract in direct support of the inference, and to avoid paraphrasing.

Question 2

Candidates were able to use source content to make contrasts and find similarities. Others could have improved their answers by including specific support from both Sources B and C. The best answers clearly used phrases from the sources. Many candidates were able to show an agreement over the peaceful intentions in both sources and the doubtful nature of success. Candidates were less secure on disagreements, and some would have benefited from fully explaining the conclusions in Source C.

A number of candidates wrote predominantly using contextual knowledge. Weaker answers contained basic comments about similar views.

Question 3

Many basic responses described the 'George Washington' cartoon, explaining what the cartoon might mean or the message, but they needed to then go on and link this to the opinion of the cartoonist, as required by the question. Some wrote about what the cartoonist's opinion might be, although the contextual element was rarely understood. The cartoonist was referring to the lie that George Washington told about cutting down a tree.

Question 4

This was reasonably well answered by some candidates. Others would have improved their responses by remembering to explicitly state whether Source E was useful or not, as demanded by the question. Some candidates did not seem to understand the relevance of the source coming from a Japanese person, and so neglected to use their contextual knowledge with regards to how the Japanese viewed the Washington Conference.

Question 5

The strongest answers used specific phrases, identified which source they were referring to and linked these sources to supporting or not supporting the proposition in the question. Some very good answers used particular sources to both support and not support the proposition, showing excellent interrogation of the sources to achieve high marks.

Less successful answers grouped sources together and made a simple assertion that 'they all support' the proposition. Weaker answers ignored the sources or used them as illustration only. Genuine source evaluation was rarely seen, and more candidates needed to question the reliability of the sources. Some of the weaker answers made assertions of bias, indicating that primary is more reliable than secondary, or that primary is always the best because it is from the time. The best evaluation came from questioning the motives of the author and using contextual knowledge, or understanding the particular circumstances of when the source was written. Generalisations such as 'all cartoonists will lie' and 'newspapers do not tell the truth' were not helpful to responses and could not count as evaluation.