

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 1

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon reading the questions carefully to ensure that responses are focused and relevant. It is essential that candidates read the dates in the question to ensure that they are writing about the correct period.

Candidates should avoid lengthy narratives and focus on explanation, analysis and evaluation.

General comments

Part (a) answers should focus on relevant details. Explanation is not required. A small number of candidates wrote lengthy responses to part (a) which resulted in them not having enough time to fully develop their responses to part (b) questions.

Both parts (b) and (c) require explanation. Narrative descriptions or long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

In part (c) candidates need to give a balanced answer in which they argue both for and against the issue in the question in order to reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should not be a summary of points made earlier but should address 'how far' or 'to what extent'. The stronger responses were well organised, included detailed arguments on either side of the hypothesis and were evaluative. Less successful responses were very descriptive and sometimes included information that was inaccurate and/or lacking relevance to the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 5

This was one of the most widely answered questions in the Core section.

- (a) This question requires simple recall and description and, therefore, can be a short answer. Many candidates had a good knowledge of the ways in which the Treaty of Versailles restricted Germany's ability to fight a war in the future. Good answers showed that the German Army was limited to 100 000, that conscription was banned, and that the German Army were not allowed tanks, or submarines. Answers which included generalisations such as the 'the armed forces were reduced' needed to go further to gain credit. Some candidates included all the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, rather than selecting the terms relevant to the question, resulting in a long answer which appeared to take time away from parts (b) and (c), which require explanation.

- (b) In answering this question, the focus of the candidates' answers must be the reasons why Lloyd George was unhappy with Wilson's Fourteen Points. Weaker responses wrote about what Lloyd George, George Clemenceau and Woodrow Wilson wanted from the Treaty of Versailles, which was not the focus of the question. It is important that candidates read the question carefully to realise the focus of the question. The most successful responses identified specific points of disagreement, most commonly the principle of self-determination and the free navigation of the seas, and then went on to explain why Lloyd George was unhappy with each of these. Some candidates confused the Fourteen Points with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.
- (c) To achieve high marks in this question, candidates need to produce a well-balanced answer explaining why the German reaction to the Treaty of Versailles was justified and not justified. Overall, candidates were well versed on the German reaction to the Treaty of Versailles and produced some strong responses, with explanations on both sides of the argument. Candidates could explain that the German response was not justified because they had treated Russia more harshly in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Under the terms of this treaty, Russia lost 32 per cent of their agricultural land and 54 per cent of their industry in addition to paying a fine of 300 million roubles. It is thought that, had the Germans won the war, they would have treated the allies equally as harshly. Explanations on the other side of the argument, that the Germans were justified in their response, could have included an explanation on their views on the disarmament terms. For example, the German reaction was justified because Germany was forced to disarm to an extent that was required of no other country. Their army - previously a source of pride - was reduced to just 100 000 men, a very small number for a country of Germany's size, which the Germans felt would leave them vulnerable to attack. Weaker responses included the views of Lloyd George, George Clemenceau and Woodrow Wilson, and some discussed the economic effects of the treaty in the 1920s, including details of the French invasion of the Ruhr. It is vital that candidates read the question carefully and assess what is needed to produce a relevant answer to the question.

Question 6

- (a) This question requires simple recall and description and therefore only a short answer is needed. Most candidates realised the question was solely on the role of the Permanent Court of Justice and gained good marks with brief, relevant answers such as: 'The Court advised the Council and the Assembly', 'the Court advised in border disputes' and 'the Court interpreted international treaties'. A number of candidates mixed up the Court with the Council or the Assembly. Some candidates strayed away from the focus of the question and wrote at length on various aspects of the League.
- (b) Two well explained reasons were needed for this question. There were many good responses, especially when explaining why the USA did not become a member of the League. Many candidates explained at length the USA's policy of isolationism and the reasons behind it, meaning that the USA would not join the League. The explanations for the lack of Germany and the USSR were not so thorough, but many were sufficient to gain very high marks. Many candidates explained how Germany was a defeated country and was held responsible for starting the war and, therefore, not invited to join the League until it could demonstrate its peaceful intentions. Weaker responses explained the impact of the USA not being in the League, which was not relevant to this question.
- (c) Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Most candidates found that there was ample evidence of the League both failing and succeeding in its peacekeeping role. Successful responses explained at least one successful peacekeeping role, often including the Åland Islands and at least one unsuccessful role such as the Manchurian Crisis. Some candidates included in their answers nearly every possible success and failure of the League as a peacekeeper, but only briefly mentioned each incident without fully explaining the role of the League. Answers such as this usually were long and largely descriptive and thus were limited in the credit they could gain. Some candidates included some of the roles of the League apart from peacekeeping, such as its humanitarian role, which lacked relevance. Others wrote at length as to why the League failed, with no reference to specific events.

Question 7

- (a) Most candidates showed a good understanding of what happened at the United Nations Security Council meetings in June and July 1950. Stronger responses mentioned actions such as: passing a resolution to demand that hostilities cease and that North Korea withdraw to the 38th parallel. The resolution was passed because of the absence of the Soviet representative who, it was thought,

would have used his veto. Weaker responses included irrelevant details such as the background to the invasion of South Korea.

- (b) The strong responses revealed that this question had been clearly understood. The majority of candidates were able to explain in detail the USA's policy of containment. This usually included specific details such as, if Communism spread to South Korea it would encourage the Chinese to attack Formosa and if South Korea and Formosa fell to the Communists, Japan would come under threat. The second explanation usually revolved around the fact that the actions of North Korea were seen as Moscow's attempt to gain world domination.
- (c) Effective responses respected the dates in the question and produced a balanced answer which addressed both sides of the hypothesis. These answers usually included explanations of events in Korea, Cuba and Vietnam to substantiate their argument. Candidates were knowledgeable about the failure of American foreign policy in Vietnam and were able to give detailed explanation as to why the policy was a disaster. Stronger candidates could argue both sides for the Cuban and Korean crises. For example, at the end of the Cuban crisis the USA had managed to contain Communism in Cuba; however, Castro still remained in power and was allied to the USSR, and many Americans criticised Kennedy as they did not want to see Communism in 'Uncle Sam's backyard'. Some answers would have been improved by less description of events and more explanation of why the policy was a success or failure.

Question 8

The limited number of responses to this question prevents useful comment.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 11

- (a) Good responses understood the separate roles of the Chancellor and the President under the Weimar Constitution and included simple statements such as: the Chancellor was responsible for the day to day running of politics and establishing government policy, the President was Head of State and appointed the Chancellor. Some candidates wrote how they were elected, which lacked relevance.
- (b) A small number of candidates confused the left and right-wing threats to the Weimar Republic in 1919–20 but overall this question was very well answered, with many very high marks. The strongest responses tended to explain how and why Ebert used the Freikorps to defeat the left-wing threats, including the Spartacists, and then went on to explain how the Kapp Putsch was defeated as a result of the industrial workers of Berlin declaring a general strike. Candidates should be reminded to be aware of the dates in the question, in this case 1919–1920, as some candidates included the Munich Putsch which was not relevant.
- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the Weimar Republic. Effective responses discussed the positive role played by Stresemann in both domestic and foreign policy to discount the hypothesis. These responses included explanations on how he led the economic recovery by introducing a permanent currency (the Reichsmark), and how he secured American loans through the Dawes Plan, emphasising the positive impact of these loans on German industry. These responses then went on to explain ways in which the Weimar Republic was a disaster for Germany, usually including the precarious position of Germany as their recovery was based on foreign loans which could be recalled at any time, which actually happened in 1929, leading to depression and disaster for the Weimar Republic. This led to support for extreme parties, including the Nazis, who offered solutions to Germany's problems. Some candidates gave extensive details on the reasons and events of the French occupation of the Ruhr, which was not necessary. It is important that candidates read the dates in the question. Less successful answers tended to describe the actions Stresemann took to improve Germany, which although correct, needed to be explained by emphasising their impact on Germany, which would have gained them more credit.

Question 12

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Candidates who performed very well were able to describe in what ways agriculture was affected by Nazi rule. These ways included: subsidising agriculture, setting up the Reich Food Estate, making it so that banks could not seize their land if they could not pay their loans, and passing the Reich Entailed Farm Law. Weaker response wrote generally about agriculture, often with no specific examples.
- (b) The role of women under the Nazis was well known by the majority of candidates, who explained that Hitler's views on the roles of men and women were very traditional - usually that of women being the homemaker and the men going out to work, thus the Nazis were very much a male-dominated organisation. Most found it a challenge to add a second explanation, for example, an explanation of the lack of women involved in the party and politics in the 1920s and 1930. Less successful responses lost sight of the question and wrote lengthy answers on the role of women, including the awards for having lots of children, without linking the points made to the question.
- (c) Good responses were characterised by explaining reasons why not all young people in Germany supported the Nazi regime; these usually included the support for, and activities of, the 'Swing' movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Both of these movements were well understood by candidates. These responses then went on to explain how it was surprising that all young people didn't support the Nazi regime because at school young people were indoctrinated with Nazi ideas and racial beliefs and were instilled with a sense of loyalty to Hitler. Strong responses often also included that being a member of the Hitler Youth was fun, as there were opportunities to be involved in lots of exciting activities including camping and hiking. Weaker responses tended just to include one side of the argument and the response was usually limited to the 'Swing' movement and Edelweiss Pirates. A few candidates misread the question and wrote about 'people' not supporting the regime rather than 'young people', as the question asked.

Questions 13 and 14

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 15

- (a) This question was well answered. Many candidates had a detailed knowledge of the impact of the economic boom on the American people and gained very high marks for this question. The significance of the labour saving devices was understood, as was the impact of the motor car. Many candidates also acknowledged that not all Americans benefited from the boom, including black Americans and native Americans.
- (b) The focus of this question was the impact of the First World War on the developing American economy in the 1920s. Weaker responses contained information on how the First World War benefited America but without reference to the impact on the developing American economy of the 1920s. Good responses explained reasons, for example, as a result of the War, when the USA lent money to the allies and sold arms and foodstuffs to Britain and France, American industry and agriculture was given a real boost which continued into the 1920s, creating employment.
- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed understanding of the impact of the boom on the economy. Effective responses to the question explained the positive effects of the boom, for example, the steel industry prospered because of the boom in the construction and the car industries. As these industries expanded, the number of jobs increased and the US economy seemed strong and secure. Candidates scoring high marks then went on to explain the adverse effects of the boom, for example, that the boom was based on consumer spending on new products such as washing machines, radios and cars. Once those who could afford them had bought them, the demand fell. In addition, exports were poor as a result of tariff retaliation; this led to a fall in the share price and a collapse of the economy, with the Wall Street Crash leading to depression.

Questions 16–22

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 2

Key messages

One of the skills this paper tests is candidates' abilities in using contextual knowledge to interpret, evaluate and use historical sources. Although contextual knowledge is not the main focus of the paper, it is still important. However, it needs to be used relevantly. Candidates should not insert large sections of knowledge into their answers but should refer to it when this helps them write a better answer about the sources.

When candidates are required to compare two sources, they should try to remember the following points. First, a common criterion needs to be used, for example, do Sources A and B (twentieth century option) agree about Germany? Only when such a common criterion is used can valid comparisons be made. Stating that Source B talks about the *Deutschland*, while Source A does not mention it, is not a comparison. Secondly, when explaining disagreements, candidates need to do more than to simply identify the area of disagreement, for example, 'the sources disagree about Germany'. How they disagree over Germany needs to be explained, for example, 'Source A is hostile towards Germany, while Source B is more sympathetic', and needs to be supported from the sources. Thirdly, candidates should try and move beyond the details in the sources and consider the overall or big messages of the two sources. These will often be points of view. They need to explain whether the sources agree or disagree in their overall points of view or arguments.

Questions will sometimes ask candidates why a source was published at a particular time. In responding to these questions, it is important that candidates make clear when they write about the historical context of the source, or its message or purpose, that they are doing so as an explanation of why it was published. Some candidates wrote in detail about the context or the message without mentioning that this helps explain why the source was published.

The 'surprise' question (**Question 2**) caused some candidates difficulties. Answering this type of question rests on candidates understanding the source and using their knowledge of the context. The overall message of Source C is to criticise the fascist powers such as Germany and perhaps to try and persuade powers such as Britain and France to intervene. Knowledge and understanding of Europe at the time makes this unsurprising.

Candidates should try to avoid writing long summaries of the source(s) at the beginning of each answer. These sections often lead the answer too far away from the question. It is good practice to directly address the question in the first sentence, for example, 'This source was published at that time because...' and 'These two cartoons are similar because they both...' Being able to use this approach depends on the candidate thinking carefully about the source(s) and the question and planning an answer.

Some candidates used shortened versions of quotations from sources when answering **Question 6**. If candidates wish to use a quotation to support or illustrate a point they are making, they should give the quotation in full. This also applies to using quotations when answering other questions.

General comments

Nearly all candidates chose the twentieth century option. The overall standard was very good, with very few weak scripts. There were almost no rubric errors and many candidates responded to the sources and questions confidently. They wrote developed and thoughtful answers to all six questions. It was clear that most candidates had a good understanding of what they had to do. Detailed knowledge and understanding of the main issues about the Spanish Civil War and its significance for Europe were demonstrated, and it was encouraging to see this knowledge and understanding being used to help candidates interpret, evaluate and use the sources in relevant ways.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

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

20th century topic

Question 1

This question produced many good answers. Many candidates focussed on comparisons from the beginning of their answers, often dealing with agreements first. The fact that both Blum and Chamberlain wanted peace was understood by most candidates and many also explained that both men thought European peace was in danger and that there had been intervention. A good number of candidates went on to explain disagreements between the two men. Valid disagreements included Blum thinking that intervention might be desirable, while Chamberlain thought it was not required, and Blum supporting the Spanish government while Chamberlain remained neutral. The very best answers involved candidates summing up the overall attitude of each politician, for example Blum thought that a victory for the Fascists would be an international disaster, while Chamberlain thought that international peace could be saved by everybody keeping out of the conflict in Spain.

Question 2

Given what the Soviet Ambassador is saying in Source C, as well as the context at the time, it is better to be 'not surprised' by this source than to be 'surprised'. There are isolated parts of the source that one can be legitimately surprised about, for example his support for democracy and his criticism of countries breaking the Non-Intervention Agreement when the Soviet Union was doing the same. However, taking the source as a whole, with its anti-fascist statements and its attempt to win over countries like Britain and France, it is more legitimate not to be surprised by what he is saying. Some candidates struggled with this question but most wrote reasonable answers, many going on to gain good marks by explaining in a valid way why they were not surprised. Only a few stronger responses considered the purpose of the Ambassador in making his speech.

Question 3

A small number of candidates explained the context, the message or the purpose of the source without giving it as the reason for publication. It is crucial that the question is directly addressed and that any reasoning in the answer is directed at explaining why the source was published. Some candidates stated that it was published because the Spanish Civil War was going on at the time but more context would have improved a number of responses. However, many candidates did provide good responses by explaining either a valid sub-message of the cartoon or its big message as reasons for publication. The big message is that Britain's non-involvement was wrong. Better answers went on to explain the purpose of publishing this message – to persuade the British public that the British government's policy was wrong; crucially an intended impact on an audience was explained in such answers.

Question 4

There were many very good answers to this question by candidates who realised that the differences between Sources E and F do not mean that Source E makes Source F wrong. In fact, Source F makes Source E wrong. It is clear that many of the claims made by Source E in 1936 do not stand up to scrutiny, for example, that Germany wanted no further involvement in Spain or that the Spanish Civil War was coming to an end. Answers that used points like these from Source E to claim that Source F was wrong were limited in the credit they could achieve. In stronger responses, candidates explained how Source F made Source E wrong. Many used the presence in Spain of German pilots in 1938 as evidence that the claim by Source E, that Germany wanted no further involvement, was wrong. The best answers used their contextual knowledge to further develop the argument that Source F shows that Source E was wrong.

Question 5

Some candidates spent much time describing the two cartoons in detail before beginning to interpret them. Some were unable to move beyond description and did not provide any interpretation. However, many candidates were able to explain how sub-messages of the two cartoons differed, for example, the USA or the world as a whole is under threat in Source G, but only Britain is threatened in Source H. A good number of candidates managed to compare the big messages – the cartoons agree that non-intervention was a mistake. The most common weakness in answers was to explain the message of each cartoon but then not go on to compare them.

Question 6

Most candidates had a clear understanding of what was required for question and it was generally answered very well. When answering **Question 6**, it is crucial to focus on the hypothesis in the question. Some candidates weakened their answers by explaining whether or not the sources showed Hitler's intervention in Spain to be dangerous. This is different from the hypothesis in the question. Most candidates did manage to explain how some sources support, and some disagree, with the hypothesis – that people understood the danger posed by Hitler's intervention. This needs to be done carefully so that source use and explanation are both focused on the hypothesis, with answers making clear which source is being used, for example, 'Source B does not support the idea that people understood the danger posed by Hitler's intervention. It shows that Chamberlain did not understand this danger because he says that Germany was withdrawing its ships and acting with restraint. He clearly did not think that Hitler's actions were dangerous because he did not think it was necessary to intervene.' Some candidates realised that some sources could be used both ways, depending on whether the attitudes of the cartoonist or of the people the cartoonist was commenting on were considered, for example in Source D, the cartoonist was aware of the danger but Eden was not. When answering this question it is advisable to focus on one source at a time. General claims about a group of sources were often problematic either because nothing was said about particular sources in the group or because the claim did not apply to all the sources in the group. It is also important that, if candidates want to use a quotation from the sources, they write the quotation out in full and not in abbreviated form.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages and general comments

A small range of Depth Studies were undertaken. **Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45** was the most widely answered and there were also a few responses for **Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41** and **Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945**.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide-range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments. Less successful answers contained much narrative, description or background information, and often did not properly address the question that was set. Many candidates wrote a lot of information about a particular topic or Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Reading the question carefully before answering, and ensuring that responses focus on importance or significance, would have improved a number of answers. The other key point for candidates is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were too few responses to **Questions 1** and **2** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates though **Question 4** was answered by many more candidates.

Question 3 was generally found challenging by candidates. Good responses contained plenty of examples of how important Ebert and his actions were to the survival of the Weimar Republic. Most commonly cited were Ebert's use of his emergency powers, his signing of the Weimar Constitution, his use of the freikorps to crush opposition from the left and his appeal to the workers of Berlin to stop the Kapp Putsch from succeeding. This was then balanced with other factors that helped the Weimar Republic not collapse, such as the actions of Stresemann after 1923 and the election of Hindenburg. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive or often narrated the story of the early years of the Weimar Republic without directly addressing the question. A few answers went beyond the chronological parameters of the question and cited Germany's acceptance into the League of Nations which was in 1926 and the Young Plan which was 1929.

Question 4 was chosen by many candidates. The strongest answers examined a range of different ways the SA helped bring Hitler into power and then balanced these against alternative reasons. Good responses examined the role of the SA in providing help to the unemployed and hungry in the form of soup kitchens, the way they projected strength and discipline in a time of chaos, the huge membership by 1932 and how they were often used as part of Nazi propaganda. A few responses countered this by mentioning the fact that the SA were seen as violent extremists by some middle-class Germans and actually damaged the Nazi's image, which was valid. Alternative reasons included the effects of the Depression, the targeted Nazi propaganda and negative cohesion, particularly against the communists and the threat of revolution, Hitler's leadership skills and the political manoeuvring of von Papen and Hindenburg. Some explanations were well-developed and a few candidates attempted to draw valid conclusions. Less successful answers tended to narrate a story of the Nazi Party and examine the Munich Putsch in too much detail – this did not help Hitler become Chancellor in 1933; it helped him change tactics, which only started working when the Depression hit Germany. Some candidates went further back to the establishment of the party, which was not addressing the question.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

There were too few responses to **Questions 5** and **6** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

There were some responses to **Question 7** but there were too few responses to **Question 8** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 7 was generally well answered by candidates. The best responses gave a wide variety of examples of how Prohibition changed US society in the 1920s and then balanced this with other factors that changed society. Most commonly cited were the impact of organised crime, the bribery and corruption of officials, bootlegging and the social effects of speakeasies. This was then balanced with lots of other different but relevant alternative factors, depending on the answer. Intolerance was used by many candidates and answers referred to the impact of immigration, the Red Scare, racial prejudice and religious fundamentalism. Some candidates also examined aspects of the Roaring Twenties and referred to the impact that radio, jazz music and the motor car had on US society. A few weaker responses lacked depth or range in the answers and tended to be descriptive or narrative in style. Some of these responses also tended to focus more on economic aspects of the USA in the 1920s for their alternative factors such as the Boom, rather than focusing on society as the question demanded.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

There were too few responses to **Questions 9** and **10** for any meaningful comments to be made.

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

There were too few responses to **Questions 11** and **12** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A small number of responses to **Question 14** were seen, but there were too few responses to **Question 13** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 14 was reasonably well answered by candidates. Knowledge of the different conflicts in 1956, 1967 and 1973 varied but tended to be accurate. Candidates focused on the role played by the Israeli armed forces and noted their air superiority and the financial and military help they received from their allies in the West, particularly the USA. To balance this, candidates examined the lack of unity between Arab states as an alternative factor why Israel was victorious and the role played by other countries in individual victories such as Britain and France in 1956. Other responses would have benefited from greater in-depth knowledge, particularly the ability to give accurate examples from each of the three major conflicts referenced in the question. These answers tended to be generalised and descriptive in style.