eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully (especially where dates are concerned) to understand exactly what is being asked, so that only relevant information is included in responses.

Good answers were able to display sound factual knowledge of both the Core and Depth Studies, using knowledge to good effect in well organised and developed explanations and argument. Less successful responses, whilst demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to use knowledge effectively to answer the question set.

Candidates should avoid background information and lengthy narratives and focus on explanation, analysis, and, where appropriate, evaluation.

General comments

Part **(a)** answers should focus on specific and 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 **(c)** questions.

Responses to both parts **(b)** and **(c)** need to identify issues and then use contextual knowledge, including specific examples, in order to give a full explanation. Candidates should avoid narrative or long introductions which 'set the scene'.

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 debate and were evaluative. Less successful responses were very descriptive and often included information that was not relevant to the question.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was answered by a high number of candidates.

(a) Many candidates had a good knowledge of The Treaty of Neuilly and most provided good responses. Less successful ones did not know the Treaty or confused it with the Treaties of St Germain, Trianon, Sevres or Versailles. Good answers showed that the Treaty of Neuilly reduced Bulgaria's army to 20,000 and that Bulgaria had to pay reparations of £100 million. Candidates could have stated that Bulgaria lost land to Greece, Romania and Yugoslavia. A few candidates'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

answers were too long. They had gained full marks in the first four lines but went on to write nearly a page. This took time away from parts **(b)** and **(c)**, which required explanation.

(b) In answering this question the focus of the candidates' answer must be on why Lloyd George did not want a harsh treaty imposed on Germany. Strong responses identified two reasons and then went onto explain each of them. For example, before the war Britain and Germany were trading partners, Lloyd George did not want severe reparations or industrial areas lost from Germany because the revival of the German economy was important for the British economy and British jobs, especially as Germany had been Britain's second largest trading partner before the war. Other reasons explained included that Lloyd George wanted Germany to be strong enough to resist communism and he was worried that a harsh treaty may result in Germany seeking revenge in the future. Weaker responses tended to identify the reasons without any explicit explanation. It is important that candidates read the question carefully as some wrote about why Lloyd George was happy with the Treaty or the views of each of Clemenceau and Wilson.

(c) To perform well on this question, candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer by showing how the peace settlements resolved issues, and left important issues unresolved. It was essential for a successful answer to this question that the 'important issues' were defined. Candidates could discuss numerous relevant issues such as disarmament, self-determination, the fate of broken up empires, communism, the League of Nations and the state of Germany. Stronger responses took an issue, such as disarmament, explained that defeated countries were generally disarmed by reducing the size of their army and navy, stopping conscription, limiting the number of arms and warships, and banning tanks and submarines. An explanation such as this was awarded good marks for explaining how an issue had been partly resolved. A strong response may well have continued to state that the issue was only partly resolved because the victorious countries did not disarm, despite the work of the League of Nations and Disarmament conferences, and this led to Hitler ignoring the military clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. The answer would then show that the disarmament issue was not fully resolved. Other answers were characterised by a tendency to write lengthy accounts of the terms of the peace treaties. These responses lacked relevance and balance.

Question 6

This was also answered by a high number of candidates.

(a) There were many candidates who gained full marks for this question by focusing on the problems facing the League of Nations which made it difficult for the League to act quickly. Strong answers focused on the failures of the League's organisation. They highlighted that the Assembly met once a year, votes in the Council had to be unanimous, members of the Council had a veto, and that the League did not have an army. Candidates also gained credit for the self-interest of nations and the fact that the League was slow to impose economic sanctions because they knew that the USA, not being a member of the League, would continue to trade.

(b) Successful responses to this question identified and explained the reasons why the League failed to deal with Japanese aggression following the invasion of Manchuria. Strong responses to this question were characterised by an understanding of how and why the League responded to the Manchuria Crisis including material such as the League taking too long to produce the Lytton Report, Britain's fear that their colonies in South East Asia may become vulnerable to Japanese attack if they applied sanctions, and the League's view that China needed 'sorting out' because of its state of anarchy. One explained reason was that the League did not apply military sanctions as it would have involved the sending of a naval task force to the other side of the world with little chance of success, especially without the military forces of the USA and USSR. Had the USA and USSR been members of the League, their military forces would have been ideally placed to tackle the Japanese. Candidates need to understand that the question is about reasons for the League's failure; background information on why Japan invaded Manchuria and details of the events of the Crisis, with no reference to the question asked, lacked relevance. Common misconceptions were that Japan was needed as an ally against Hitler (not yet in power), and that economic sanctions were actually imposed on Japan, whereas the League did nothing.

(c) There were some well developed responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating a clear and detailed understanding of why the Great Depression brought about the failure of the League on one side of the argument, and then explaining other reasons for the failure on the other side. Good contextual knowledge was a strong feature of these answers. Strong responses explained how the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depression led to people losing their jobs and turning to extremist parties. Extremist nationalism brought with it militarism, and countries were aggressively trying to find new markets and raw materials; many used details of the events in Manchuria as an example. Other well-explained reasons for failure included how the League dealt with the Abyssinian Crisis, where strong responses explained the impact and importance of the Hoare-Laval Pact, as well as the significance of the absence of the USA which reduced the League's effectiveness. If the League imposed sanctions they would be useless as the country, for example Italy in the Abyssinian Crisis, could still trade with the USA. Some candidates argued that it was not the Depression that brought about failure as the League had also failed in the 1920s, using explanations of events in Vilna (1920) and Corfu (1923), which gained them credit. Some candidates wrote about how the Depression affected America and the general effects of the Depression, without linking the points to the failure of the League of Nations. Weaker answers were characterised by a tendency to identify reasons for failure - for example the League had no army or the Assembly and Council needed unanimous decisions - but not to develop these points further. Responses could have been improved by candidates giving examples of the impact of the League having no army. For example, the League lacked a standing army but it could impose military sanctions when member countries would be asked to contribute towards a fighting force. This created uncertainty and most countries including Britain and France were self-interested and were reluctant to send their armies to participate in a dispute in which they were not directly involved.

Question 7

(a) This question was well answered and most candidates were able to gain more than half of the marks available. Most understood the aspect of mutual defence. Simple factual statements were sufficient, as explanation is not needed in part (a) questions. Among the valid responses seen were: it was the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation; it was a reaction to the Berlin Blockade; it included Britain, France and the USA; it was seen as collective security against the USSR.

(b) Answers to this question were variable in quality. Common misconceptions were that it was set up by Stalin (when it was actually established two years after his death), and that it was solely concerned with economy and trade. Stronger responses explained two reasons, including that the USSR and satellite countries feared that Germany may once again become a military power and direct threat. This was because in May 1955 West Germany joined NATO and was allowed to rearm. Britain and the USA pledged to maintain forces in West Germany. Eastern European states such as Poland and East Germany protested because of the remilitarisation of West Germany. As a result, the Warsaw Pact was primarily put in place as a consequence of the rearming of West Germany inside NATO.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained why Stalin was both correct and incorrect to view the Marshall Plan with suspicion. There were some very good responses in which candidates were able to explain why Stalin was right to be suspicious of the Marshall Plan, linking this to Truman's known anti-communist views, the Truman Doctrine and the USA's commercial interests. Strong responses also contained good contextual knowledge, including that Stalin regarded the Marshall Plan as a serious threat to Soviet interests and as a plan to contain communism. He recognised that the programme would require recipients to bring their economies in line with American interests and he saw it as a plan to promote capitalism and undermine his control over Eastern Europe. He directed communist countries not to participate in the plan. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained that Stalin need not be suspicious of the Marshall Plan because the aim was to help European economies recover after the ravages of war. The USA was helping the reconstruction of countries after the war in order to avoid further depression and allow countries to repair the war damage and invest in their industries. Weaker responses were characterised by much descriptive detail on the background to the Marshall Plan and some shifted the focus of the question from the Marshall Plan to the suspicious activities of Stalin during the 1940s, for example the rigged elections in Poland after Potsdam, which lacked relevance.

Question 8

A small number of candidates answered this question.

(a) Most candidates were able to outline four actions taken by the Shah of Iran against the mullahs to suppress opposition. These responses included that the mullahs were imprisoned for provoking opposition, they were banned from preaching, they faced brutal tactics from the SAVAK (the secret police), and some mullahs were forced into exile.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) There were some strong responses to this question and most candidates had good contextual knowledge to support their reasons as to why the people of Iran wanted the Shah to abdicate in 1979. Explanations included that the Shah had done little to help ordinary Iranian peasants - there was great inequality which was most obvious in Tehran where the rich lived in palaces, while the poor were housed in shanty towns without proper roads or basic services. Another explanation was that the Shah was associated with Britain and America and had tried to westernise the country. This was disliked as the people of Iran were, in the main, anti-American, and they wanted a society based on Islamic values. Weaker responses tended to be very descriptive, often giving an account of events, rather than relating the points to the question.

(c) There were some good, well developed answers to this question, with candidates being able to deploy strong, relevant evidence to support both sides of the hypothesis. They identified and explained how Saddam Hussein improved the lives of the people of Iraq, including how he used Iraq's massive oil revenues to carry out an extensive modernisation programme. This modernisation programme included supplying electricity to remote villages and building schools and hospitals. Candidates also had a good understanding of other ways that Saddam was able to hold onto power. These included how he used purges to remove any potential rivals, the image of a father-style leader that he created, and his brutal campaign against the Kurds.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the more widely-answered question in this Depth Study.

(a) There were mixed responses to this question, which required knowledge of German politics from November 1932 to the end of January 1933. Many candidates knew about the key figures in German political life at the time such as von Papen, von Schleicher, Hindenburg and Hitler. Some candidates achieved very high marks by pointing out that Hitler demanded to be Chancellor, that Hindenburg refused, and that von Papen could not form a stable government. Some candidates showed that von Schleicher had to resign and that von Papen persuaded Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor in January 1933 with von Papen as Vice-Chancellor. Less successful responses lacked knowledge of this period and/or wrote how Hitler became a dictator after January 1933 which was not relevant to this question.

(b) There were many good responses to this question and most candidates had a good understanding of the Munich Putsch and its outcomes. Candidates needed to provide two explained reasons to show why the Munich Putsch was not a total failure for Hitler and the Nazis. One explained example given by a good number if candidates was that the failure of the Putsch convinced Hitler that his tactics had been wrong. He realised that it was unlikely that he would gain power by force and now decided in the future to gain power by constitutional means. This meant developing and expanding the organisation of the Nazi Party, contesting seats at general elections and building up a power base in the Reichstag. Weaker responses included lengthy descriptions of the events of the Putsch itself, before brief identifications positive outcomes, such as 'Hitler gained publicity' or 'he wrote "Mein Kampf" in prison', with no explanation.

(c) Candidates needed to produce a well - balanced answer by explaining, on one side, how control over the Reichstag helped Hitler to become a dictator and then, on the other side, any other reasons why Hitler was able to become a dictator. The best responses addressed the specific question and restricted their answers to the time period from January 1933 to August 1934. They were able to explain how Hitler controlled the Reichstag by banning the Communist Party by using the Emergency Powers granted by Hindenburg after the Reichstag Fire, and then by using the Enabling Act to pass laws for four years, without consulting the Reichstag. The responses then went on to discuss the 'other reasons' by explaining how Hitler removed the threat of Rohm and the SA and how the death of Hindenburg meant that Hitler could unite the posts of Chancellor and President and become Fuhrer. Other responses gave a one-sided answer explaining either Hitler's control of the Reichstag or the 'other reasons'. Hitler was fully a dictator by August 1934 but some candidates extended their answers up to the outbreak of the Second World War.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 12

(a) The focus of this question was on large businesses and how they benefited from Nazi rule. Candidates who realised this achieved high marks by including: they were given contracts to produce armaments and explosives, the Nazis abolished trade unions and removed Jewish businesses, reducing competition. The responses of weaker candidates consisted of generalised comments on the lives of the workers.

(b) Strong responses included two explanations of why the lives of most Germans were changed by the war. Candidates were able to explain how the German economy was put on a war footing in 1939 and how, because of conscription, most adult males were called up to the army. This meant that women, who had previously been encouraged to stay at home and look after the family, now had to go and work in the factories producing armaments or on the farms because all the adult males were away fighting. Weaker responses were characterised by identification of reasons, for example that food rationing was introduced or there were more widows, with no further explanation It is important for candidates to read the question carefully as some included information on how the lives of most Germans were changed by the Nazis, omitting to mention war at all.

(c) Strong responses contained good contextual knowledge on the reasons why the Nazis were popular with Germany's industrial workers, usually explaining the drastic reduction in unemployment, the benefits given to the workers such as the 'Strength Through Joy' organisation and the 'Beauty of Labour' movement. Such responses then gave a balanced account by explaining reasons why the Nazis were unpopular with Germany's industrial workers. These reasons included the impact of the ban on trade unions, and the fact that they had to join the German Labour Front. Weaker answers did not adequately address the question and rather than giving a balanced answer, these responses contained generalised information regarding why the Nazis were unpopular, with no reference to industrial workers. Some candidates discussed Germany's farmers which was not relevant to this question.

Question 13

(a) Some candidates had very good knowledge of Kornilov's attempt to impose order in Petrograd in September 1917 and gained very high marks for descriptions such as: Kornilov decided that action was needed against the Petrograd Soviet and mobilised his troops; he then marched on the capital which worried Kerensky as he thought he may go further than his demands and set up a military dictatorship; Kerensky released Bolsheviks from prison to stop Kornilov's advance. Weaker candidates wrote generally about what happened.

(b) There were some very good responses to this question. The most well-explained reason was that Russia's problems were not solved by the abdication of the Tsar, as the Provisional Government did not remove Russia from the war, which allowed Russia's problems to continue. The war effort was failing. Kerensky had rallied the army for a great offensive in June, but this was a disaster and the Russian army began to fall apart as the Germans counter attacked. This led to massive casualties and many desertions. Successful responses went on to explain a second reason, that the war caused shortages at home and the people lacked the basics to live, the food shortages threatening famine. This situation gave the Bolsheviks a chance to gain popularity by continuing to promise the people what they wanted most (bread, peace and land). Less successful responses were characterised by generalisations such as Russia was losing the war. Such responses would have been improved by explaining why they were losing the war and the impact this was having at home.

(c) Answers to this question were variable, with most responses lacking in detailed explanation on both sides of the argument. It should also be highlighted that some candidates did not take into account the date in the question, November 1917, and wrote about the Civil War, which was not r4elevant. Most candidates could identify reasons why both Lenin and Trotsky were key to the Bolshevik success in November 1917 but contextual knowledge of specific events was lacking in a number of responses. Candidates could have included how Lenin was important for the timing of the Revolution and realised immediately after the collapse of Kornilov that the time for action had come. He also dealt with internal divisions within the Bolshevik party and the opposition to the timing of the revolution of Kamanev and Zinoviev.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 14

(a) Most of the small number of candidates who attempted this question performed well, as they understood the term 'Stakhanovites'. They gained credit for the origin of the term and for including the fact that they were very hard workers who set production records, and who, with the piece-rate system, earned more money.

(b) Candidates who performed well on this question demonstrated a good understanding of why Stalin's first Five-Year Plan had ambitious targets. They included that he wanted to modernise Russia as they were 50 to 100 years behind industrially advanced countries, so Stalin wanted to set ambitious targets to try to catch up with Germany, Britain and the USA, and make Russia as industrially strong as they were. It is important for candidates to read the question carefully, as some wrote a description of the First-Five Year Plan, rather than emphasising why the Plan had ambitious targets. Others described the first three plans, which lacked relevance.

(c) The quality of the answers to this question was variable and although most candidates could identify reasons for the successfulness of Stalin's first Five-Year Plan, many did not display the contextual knowledge to support their argument. Most used the production figures to identify success but neglected to further develop the point. Answers could have been improved by including that whole cities were built to create huge steel mills, such as at Magnitogorsk and Sverdlovsk, to emphasise the impact of increased production. To balance the argument most identified that the Plan came at a human cost but did not develop the point any further, for example by including the strict factory discipline and the fines imposed if production targets were not met. It is important for candidates to focus on the question which was just about the first-Five year Plan. Candidates who wrote generally about all three plans or collectivisation struggled with this question.

Question 15

(a) Most candidates had a good understanding of the developments in popular music during the 1920s and performed very strongly by mentioning the different types of music, including jazz and country music, in addition to mentioning famous musicians and the growth of night clubs, such as the Cotton Club of Harlem. A small number of candidates discussed the high number of radios being sold and the increasing number of radio stations appearing, without making any link to the developments in music.

(b) There were many successful responses to this question, which contained two explained reasons. Explained reasons included that, during the 1920s, Hollywood was producing a large number of films, including some starring Charlie Chaplin and Buster Keaton which made audiences laugh. Tickets were cheap and by the end of the 1920s there were 100 million tickets sold each week. Others discussed the change in attitudes towards sex which, in the pre-war years, had been a taboo subject. Women now emulated the dress and make up of film stars such as Clara Bow.

(c) There were a few well-developed responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed understanding of the reasons why Prohibition was repealed. Strong responses explained how the Depression led to repeal, including details such as the effect of the Wall Street Crash in the early 1930s, and how legalising the manufacture, sale and transportation of alcohol would create jobs, raise tax revenue and free up the resources tied up in the impossible task of enforcement. They then went on to discuss other reasons for the repeal, most often explaining the activities of gangsters like Al Capone and the violence and corruption associated with breaking Prohibition. Contextual knowledge on the link between the Depression and repeal was weaker than the other reasons for repeal and less successful responses tended to be one-sided explanations with no mention of the Depression.

Question 16

(a) A small number of candidates chose this question and most gained high marks by describing the ways that the Wall Street Crash affected the American economy. Marks were awarded for stating that businesses went bankrupt, over 11,000 banks stopped trading, unemployment increased and people could not afford to buy goods.

(b) Strong responses understood how the activities of speculators could be blamed for the Wall Street Crash, most often explaining the fact that speculators had little interest in the company that they

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

were buying shares in and really only wanted to make a quick profit. Speculators were gamblers who had no intention of keeping the shares for long. They had often borrowed huge sums from the banks and sold the shares as soon as the price had risen. Weaker responses were characterised by general descriptions of the events of the Wall Street Crash, and in the least successful responses, there was no evidence that the term 'speculator' was understood.

(c) A common misconception in answering this question was that to produce a balanced answer, a comparison of the actions of Hoover and Roosevelt towards helping the American people during the Depression, had to be made. Thus it was unusual to find a response that addressed both sides of the hypothesis. The focus of this question was not about Roosevelt but about how much help Hoover gave to the American people during the Depression. Candidates were more knowledgeable about what Hoover did not do, rather than what he did, giving examples such as his policy of 'rugged individualism' or his saying of 'prosperity is just around the corner', in addition to a detailed explanation of his treatment of the Bonus Marchers. Those candidates who did realise that the positive actions of Hoover's policies needed to be discussed often limited their answers to description rather than explanation. For example, he set up soup kitchens or he provided money to finance a building programme to create more jobs. To improve these answers, examples needed to be given, such as the projects on the Hoover Dam or Colorado River.

Questions 17 to 22

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are focused and relevant. It is also important that dates given in a question are duly noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. Part **(a)** questions require recall and description. Part **(b)** questions require recall and explanation, and part **(c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

In part **(c)** questions the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond what has already been stated in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important', 'how successful' or 'to what extent', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

A significant number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, struggled to use their knowledge effectively to answer the question set. In parts **(b)** and **(c)** of the questions, some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but were unable to develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In part **(c)** answers, candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced responses. Candidates need to ensure that they use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make; some candidates set out a clear argument and needed to then support this argument with relevant factual knowledge. Candidates need to focus carefully upon the actual question set; in some instances, candidates wrote in considerable depth about the topic given in the question, but without a clear focus on the actual question.

On the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with most completing the paper. A small number of candidates wrote extended answers to a part **(a)** questions; this is not required, and it appeared to impact upon the time then available to answer the remaining questions on the paper.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

(a) Answers to this question usually gave at least two relevant points, mainly focused upon the Black Hand being comprised of Serbian nationalists, Gavrilo Princip being a member, and the Black Hand being responsible for the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie. A small number of responses gave some relevant points and then wrote at some length about the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

events on the day of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, rather than focusing throughout on the question.

(b) Candidates demonstrated an awareness of reasons why Austria-Hungary issued an ultimatum to Serbia, identifying points such as Austria-Hungary blaming Serbia for the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, Austria-Hungary's desire to deal with the threat from Serbia and also that Germany had told Austria-Hungary it would provide support. Developing these points into explanations would have improved some responses.

(c) Answers to this question were often generalised in nature, stating that the Alliance System set countries against each other, without any accompanying detail being given. Similarly, points made about colonial rivalry stated that countries clashed about overseas colonies, but did not give historical details supporting this. A small number of answers described which countries were in the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. More answers could, for example, have explained the quarrel between Germany and France over Morocco and the ensuing increase in tension, Kaiser Wilhelm's jealousy over the extent of the British Empire, Germany's fears of encirclement by the Triple Entente, and the way in which a dispute between one member of the Triple Alliance and one member of the Triple Entente could easily escalate to involve all members of both alliances.

Question 5

(a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates giving four concisely expressed and focused details relating to decisions made in the Treaty of Versailles about the Saar and Danzig. These usually focused upon the Saar being run by the League of Nations initially, with a plebiscite to be held in the Saar after fifteen years to decide its future. Some candidates also referred to coal profits from the Saar being given to France for fifteen years. With reference to Danzig, answers focused upon Danzig becoming a free city and being run by the League of Nations, and also Poland being allowed to use the port of Danzig. A small number of responses contained a long list of terms from the Treaty of Versailles, without any reference being made to the Saar or to Danzig.

(b) A number of candidates gave a clear explanation that the Allies excluded Germany from the peace negotiations as Germany would have argued against any proposed punishments. A small number of responses also explained that Europe was in turmoil after the First World War and therefore decisions needed to be made quickly, which would not have been possible had Germany attended the peace negotiations. Some responses were lists of the aims of the Big Three and/or lists of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and therefore lacked focus on the question set.

(c) Effective answers to this question gave clearly developed explanations of the ways in which Austria suffered from the Paris peace settlement on one side of the argument, and explanations usually focused on Germany and/or Turkey on the other side. Explanations relating to Austria focused upon the economic problems suffered as a result of the peace settlement, with detailed reference to the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the resultant loss of important industrial resources and farmland. On the other side of the argument, answers argued that Germany suffered far more than Austria due to military restrictions leaving it defenceless, and being compelled to pay reparations when some of its economic assets were removed from its control. Some responses were long lists of terms of the various treaties drawn up at the Paris peace settlement. Such responses needed to be developed into explanations by demonstrating how this made each country suffer, or by a direct and explained comparison between a particular term of treaties, such as military terms, and how these affected each individual country.

Question 6

(a) There were a number of effective responses to this question. With reference to the Assembly, answers focused upon the Assembly meeting only once a year, decisions having to be unanimous and the Assembly being slow in making decisions. With reference to the Council, answers focused upon the limited number of meetings, the use of the veto and the Council being slow to make decisions. Some responses did not differentiate between the Assembly and the Council; lists of points were given, but there was no indication of which point applied to the Assembly and which to the Council.

(b) There were a number of very clearly explained responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating a detailed understanding of why the absence of the USA was significant for the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

League of Nations in the 1930s. Answers focused upon the absence of the USA making it difficult for the League to deal with aggressive nations as economic sanctions were ineffectual as sanctioned nations could still trade with the USA. Reference was also made to the USA having the military resources to remove the Japanese from Manchuria. Some responses described events in Manchuria and Abyssinia, without reference to the question asked. There were a number of generalised responses, stating only that the USA was a powerful country.

(c) Effective responses to this question gave clearly stated aims of the League of Nations, and then explained with reference to specific events how successful the League was in achieving these aims. Answers detailed the success and failure of the League in achieving the aim of discouraging aggression and dealing with disputes through negotiation, with reference to success in the Aaland Islands, in the Greece and Bulgaria dispute, and in the dispute over Upper Silesia. Failure to achieve this aim focused upon events in Vilna and in Corfu. Answers also focused upon the League's aim of improving living and working conditions around the world, with successes in the repatriation of prisoners of war, dealing with refugees in Turkey and attempts made to prevent leprosy and malaria all being detailed. Some answers gave detailed accounts of the League's work in a variety of places, but made no mention of the aims of the League, and therefore did not actually explain whether or not the League was successful in achieving these aims. A number of responses focused entirely upon events in the 1930s; the question asked about the 1920s, so such responses lacked relevance.

Question 7

(a) Most responses included at least one relevant point, usually focused upon free elections being held in Poland. Some responses also included details regarding the establishment of a provisional government in Poland, comprising of Lublin Poles and London Poles. A small number of candidates wrote about decisions made about Poland after the First World War.

(b) A number of candidates gave one clear explanation focused upon Roosevelt trying to work positively with Stalin and Roosevelt's successor Truman being far more anti-communist. Many responses identified points only; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations. A small number of responses listed the outcomes from the Potsdam Conference, rather than explaining why the death of Roosevelt made a difference to the Conference.

(c) Effective responses to this question focused closely on the reasons for the beginning of the Cold War. Agreement with the hypothesis focused upon Stalin's actions in rigging elections in Eastern Europe, his actions in the Berlin Blockade and the formation of Cominform and Comecon. On the other side of the argument, there were careful explanations of Truman's anti-communist stance, the introduction of the Marshall Plan, the actions of the west in Greece and Churchill's Iron Curtain speech. Some answers gave identified points only, whilst others wrote in generalised terms only, rather than giving specific examples of actions contributing to the start of the Cold War. A number of responses were focused primarily upon events in Vietnam and the Cuban Missile Crisis; these were not relevant to a question asking about the beginning of the Cold War.

Question 8

(a) Some responses gave at least two relevant points, usually stating that the Berlin Wall was a barrier built in 1961, that it was a barrier dividing East and West Berlin, that it was a wall built to prevent the movement of people from East to West, that it separated families, and also stating some details regarding the wall being protected by armed guards and barbed wire. A number of responses were focused on the Berlin Blockade rather than the Berlin Wall.

(b) Explanations in response to this question were focused upon Solidarity showing that a Communist government could be resisted and that this served as an inspiration to other Communist controlled countries in Eastern Europe. Further explanation focused upon Solidarity undermining the claims of communism to be a system which benefited ordinary people, and Solidarity gaining support from the West. A number of candidates wrote about who was involved in Solidarity and what happened in Poland; to make these responses relevant to the question there needed to be a consideration of why Solidarity was important in the decline of Soviet power in Eastern Europe. Some candidates wrote about solidarity between countries within an alliance system, without any focus upon the question. Candidates are expected to have a detailed understanding of what Solidarity was, and why it was important in the decline of Soviet power in Eastern Europe.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) There were some effective responses to this question, with clear explanations on both sides of the argument. Explanations in agreement with the hypothesis were focused upon reduction of Soviet defence spending, meaning that the Red Army would not be sent to restore order in Eastern bloc countries, should disturbances occur, and that the Soviet Union could no longer afford to maintain a military presence in communist Eastern bloc countries. On the other side of the argument, explanations were focused on the role of Solidarity, and the contribution of Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and perestroika to the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe. Some responses described Gorbachev's defence spending cuts and his policies of glasnost and perestroika, without referring to how these contributed to the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) A number of responses gave at least two relevant points in response to this question. Points made included the date when the Germans first used poison gas, and the date when mustard gas was first used, the effects of poison gas such as causing burns and blisters, breathing problems, causing blindness and, in some cases, killing people. Some responses also detailed that the use of poison gas took both sides by surprise, and caused panic and confusion amongst the troops.

(b) Some responses gave one explanation focused either upon the Germans having dugouts deep underground or the Allies having poor quality shells. Some candidates wrote in general terms only, stating that the Germans were protected, or that the Germans were resilient, and gave no further development.

(c) Some candidates identified that French troops were very much outnumbered and still held out against the attack from the Germans, and also identified that both attackers and defenders suffered large numbers of casualties at Verdun. Other responses to this question were of a generalised nature only, with no reference made to the specific details of events at the Battle of Verdun. For stronger responses, candidates needed to explain, with specific reference to the Battle of Verdun, whether or not defenders would always prevail over attackers.

Question 10

(a) Effective responses to this question detailed relevant points such as where the Allied landings were actually made, troops being faced with barbed wire on the beaches, and high cliffs ahead of them, confusion caused by the use of out of date maps, the Turkish troops being ready and waiting for the Allied troops and many of the Allied troops being killed. Less effective responses made just one relevant point, stating that many of the Allied troops were killed.

(b) Answers to this question tended to be identified points, such as the use of out of date maps, the strength of the Turkish army being underestimated, and the advice about how many men would need to be deployed for a successful campaign being ignored. These points needed to be developed into explanations in many responses.

(c) Some responses gave several identified points, stating, for example, that Britain maintained its control of the North Sea after the Battle of Jutland, that Britain successfully carried out a naval blockade of Germany and that German submarine warfare was very successful. In part **(c)** questions, candidates need to explain such factors.

Question 11

(a) Many very successful responses were seen, giving four clearly identified and relevant points of factual detail. These included Stresemann ending passive resistance in the Ruhr, getting rid of the old worthless mark and replacing it with the Rentenmark, and halting hyperinflation. Less effective responses missed the date in the question, and made reference to Dawes Plan and the Young Plan, both of which occurred beyond the date parameters in the question.

(b) A number of responses gave a clearly argued explanation detailing that German economic recovery had relied heavily upon American loans, and that, when the American stock market crashed, America recalled these loans, leaving Germany to pay back these loans and also to continue to pay reparations. Some responses gave a further explanation based on the effects of the stock market crash on German trade. A number of responses were based solely upon events of

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

1923 in the Ruhr and the problem of hyperinflation in Germany; clearly these events lacked relevance to a question asking about the effects of the stock market crash of 1929.

(c) Effective responses to this question displayed a clear understanding of who the left-wing opponents and right-wing opponents were, and explained how each group was a threat to the Weimar Republic up to 1923. Explanations of left-wing opponents focused upon the Spartacist uprising and communist agitation in the Ruhr. For right-wing opponents, explanations focused upon the Kapp Putsch, the assassination of Rathenau by a right-wing group and the Munich Putsch. Some responses gave detailed descriptions of who was involved in the various uprisings against the Weimar Republic, but they needed to do on to explain how these were a threat. A small number of responses confused the left-wing and right-wing groups; for example, some responses stated that the Munich Putsch was carried out by communists.

Question 12

(a) Many responses displayed a detailed knowledge of the actions taken by the Nazis against religious opponents. Points made included opponents being arrested, placed in concentration camps and some being killed. Some religious opponents were named, such as Niemöller and Bonhoeffer, and the actions taken against them detailed. Some responses also included that, although Galen spoke out against the Nazis, no action was taken against him. Other responses included the Nazis attempting to deal with opposition by setting up a single Reich Church under a Nazi bishop.

(b) Most responses gave at least one clear explanation. Some responses gave two clear explanations, usually focused on the Nuremberg rallies being an opportunity to reinforce the personality cult of Hitler, and the rallies being used as a propaganda opportunity, emphasising that Germany was well-ordered and powerful, and thus encouraging support and loyalty for the Nazis. A small number of candidates wrote about the Nuremberg Laws, rather than the Nuremberg rallies.

(c) Responses demonstrated clearly that many candidates understood the concept of a totalitarian state. Explanations were focused upon Nazi Germany being a one-party state, the effectiveness of the Nazi police state, the control over schools and youth, and the censorship of the mass media and culture. On the other side of the argument, explanations were given demonstrating that Nazi Germany in some ways was not a totalitarian state, as there was not total control over society. Explanation focused upon groups such as the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates refusing to conform, and also that the Catholic Church was not totally controlled by the Nazis. Responses tended to be more effective in explaining that Nazi Germany was a totalitarian state; on the other side of the argument, some responses simply listed opposition to the Nazi state, without explaining how this showed that Nazi Germany was not a totalitarian state.

Question 13

(a) Some candidates were able to give at least two relevant points, stating that the Petrograd Soviet controlled the railways, postal and telegraph services and the troops, and also had the support of the workers. Other answers to this question Struggled state any ways in which the Petrograd Soviet undermined the Provisional Government.

(b) Some responses showed awareness that Kornilov wanted to seize power, that Kerensky had to ask the Bolsheviks for help, and that the Bolsheviks emerged as heroes. These points needed to be developed into explanations. Some responses contained only a brief generalised statement, saying that the Kornilov Affair showed that Kerensky was weak.

(c) Effective responses to this question explained the ways in which the New Economic Policy and War Communism were successful and the ways in which they failed. Explanations focused mainly on the success of the NEP in improving industrial production and food distribution, and that the NEP was a success for Lenin as he gained support from both the peasantry and industrial workers. Explanations of the failure of the NEP focused upon the policy being seen as a retreat from the true ideals of communism. Explanations of the success of War Communism were focused upon the policy providing an economy to meet the needs of a war, whilst explanations of failure focused upon the terrible hardships caused by the policy, leading to food shortages and ultimately contributing to a famine, with millions of people losing their lives. Many responses to this question consisted of identified points only; these points needed to be developed into explanations.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 14

(a) Most responses to this question gave at least two relevant points, detailing that the 'show trials' were useful for Stalin as he could place old Bolsheviks on trial, leading Bolsheviks could be made to confess to their crimes, the 'show trials' could be used for propaganda purposes and to strike fear into the Russian people, so they would be too frightened to oppose Stalin.

(b) Some responses gave one clear explanation, focused upon Stalin wanting art and culture to always show him in a positive light. Most responses identified that art and culture could be used for propaganda purposes, and that it was an important part of the cult of Stalin; these identified points needed to be developed into explanations.

(c) Effective responses to this question explained that Trotsky's mistakes included his arrogance, his persistence with the policy of world revolution and his failure to build up support in the ranks of the Party. Explanations of Stalin's strengths included his appearance as chief mourner at Lenin's funeral, and his use of the numerous roles he held to place his supporters in key positions. Some responses gave a number of relevant identified points and would have benefited from developing these into explanations.

Question 15

(a) Most candidates were able to give four relevant points, citing that cars, refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners and radios became widely available during the boom years. A small number of responses lacked awareness of the meaning of 'consumer goods'.

(b) Effective responses to this question explained clearly that mass-production techniques were crucial to the economic boom because they meant that consumer goods could be produced more quickly and therefore more cheaply, and this in turn meant that many ordinary Americans could afford to purchase them. Some responses identified that mass-production techniques meant a greater range of consumer goods became available; this point needed to be developed into explanation. A few responses described mass-production techniques, rather than explaining why they were crucial to the economic boom. A small number of responses showed a misunderstanding of the term 'mass-production techniques', and wrote instead about advertising techniques.

(c) On the whole, explanations of disagreement with the hypothesis in the question were more effective than those in agreement. Explanation of disagreement focused upon how overproduction meant that ultimately farmers could not afford to pay their rents or mortgages, and that this then resulted in farm labourers losing their jobs. Explanation was also given of the plight of the sharecroppers. Some responses also explained how workers in traditional industries such as the coal industry suffered wage cuts and job losses. Many responses only identified points about the traditional (older) industries, stating that jobs were lost, without any further development of this point. A number of responses were a list of reasons why agriculture faced problems in the 1920s; these points needed to be developed into explanations of why this meant that workers suffered. Other responses would have benefited from keeping in mind the word 'workers' in the question, to ensure that their answers were relevant to the question set.

Question 16

(a) Most responses to this question demonstrated a detailed understanding of the ways in which Roosevelt helped American industry during the First Hundred Days of his Presidency. Details were given of various alphabet agencies, such as the Emergency Banking Act, the Public Works Administration, the National Industry Recovery Act and the National Recovery Administration. A significant number of responses gained very high marks for this question.

(b) Some responses gave a clear explanation of the Tennessee Valley Authority becoming a showcase for the New Deal as it introduced projects to revive agriculture in a very depressed area and, in doing so, created thousands of jobs. Most responses stated several relevant identified points; better ones developed these points into explanations.

(c) Effective responses to this question explained that the New Deal helped to restore the faith of the American people in their government as it showed that the government was going to help people when they needed it most, by introducing schemes that provided employment, by helping people to keep their homes and by restoring confidence in the banking system. On the other side of the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

argument, explanations focused on the fact that black Americans still suffered great discrimination and still found it very difficult to find work, and that unemployment still remained high across America generally. Some responses gave a list of various alphabet agencies, without explaining how these restored the faith of the American people in their government.

Questions 17 to 22

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

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.

General comments

Generally, answers reflected sound understanding and knowledge. Candidates expressed themselves clearly, provided a great deal of information and were able to put this to good use in the part **(a)** questions which require recall and description. Most candidates answered these questions in the appropriate form of a short paragraph and realised that explanation is not required here.

The best answers to part **(b)** questions, which require recall and explanation, and to part **(c)** questions, which require recall, explanation and analysis, applied knowledge precisely to what the questions were asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information which was lacking relevance. Candidates receive credit for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but the best responses go further and develop each factor fully. In other responses, candidates clearly possessed accurate knowledge but struggled to use it to answer the question set.

A significant number of responses to part **(c)** questions not only tried to argue on both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given hypothesis), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should avoid repeating points already made in the answer but, instead, should explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions were limited to just asserting 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

Strong responses to part **(a)** recognised that land was lost to Italy and (named) new states and listed specific territories, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina to Yugoslavia. In part **(b)**, the reasons why Germany's reaction to the Treaty of Versailles was regarded as unreasonable attracted some good explanations about Russia's treatment at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and why the disarmament clauses were justified to lessen the threat from German militarism in the future. Part **(c)** required knowledge about the treatment of Turkey at the peace settlement. Better answers balanced Turkish resentment at the loss of land in Palestine, the disarmament clauses and the establishment of the Dardanelles as an international waterway, with the loss of Smyrna. The best responses explained the history of ethnic and religious violence between Turks and Greeks, as well as the impact on Turkish pride of ceding part of the Turkish mainland to a long-standing enemy.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 6

In part **(a)**, candidates were able to draw on their knowledge of Haile Selassie's appeal to the League of Nations and his attempts to mobilise and lead Abyssinian forces against Italy. Many knew why sanctions failed to restrain Italy in part **(b)**, explaining the lack of co-operation from the US and the failure to close the Suez Canal or stop oil imports which meant that Italian forces were able to complete the conquest of Abyssinia. In part **(c)** there was evidence that candidates were striving hard to create arguments which balanced the impact on the League of the Depression with increasing militarism in the 1930s. One effective approach explained how economic problems made members reluctant to impose sanctions on the one hand, with increased militarism on the part of Japan, Italy and Germany encouraging aggressive expansion on the other. Stronger responses tended to make specific references to events in the 1930s, such as Abyssinia and Manchuria.

Question 7

Candidates wrote in some detail about US attitudes to the invasion of South Korea in part **(a)**, gaining credit for references to containment, suspicion of Communist expansion including Soviet intentions and American efforts to seek UN support. Responses to part **(b)** attracted some general descriptions of the threat posed by Soviet missiles on Cuba, so close to the American mainland, and of Kennedy's aim to avoid appearing weak throughout the crisis. Developing each point into explanations which directly answered the question would have attracted improved a number of answers. In part **(c)** candidates provided arguments balancing the view that neither side was the winner following the Cuban Missile Crisis with support for the view that Kennedy's reputation was enhanced at the expense of Khrushchev. There was good knowledge that while both US and Soviet sides were withdrawing missiles from Turkey and Cuba respectively, the levels of publicity surrounding these events allowed the US to claim an advantage. Answers could have gone further by advancing the view that the Test Ban Treaty and 'Hot-line' enabled both sides to emerge with some credibility.

Question 8

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

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Part **(a)** posed few problems and there was good knowledge of the limitations of the first aircraft used in the First World War. This ranged from their vulnerability to their limited capability in supporting offensive operations. Focusing on 'importance' was helpful in drawing answers away from description and towards explaining impact in part **(b)**, which asked about the role of artillery in trench warfare. The best answers focused on why shelling could both support and hinder attacks on enemy trenches. In part **(c)**, some candidates understood that description needed to be accompanied by analysis too; in this case the impact of mud on armed forces when compared to other features of trench warfare such as shell shock, boredom, disease and climate. The best answers linked their impact to how morale and fighting strength were undermined.

Question 10

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

Question 11

Candidates had sound knowledge about the Enabling Act in part **(a)** and were able to show how it contributed to Hitler's dictatorship. Two developed points were provided by many candidates. In part **(b)**, candidate responses would have benefited from a greater understanding of Hindenburg's mistrust of Hitler and the Nazis, as well as the President's preference for von Papen and Schleicher. Part **(c)** answers were often well argued, although sometimes needed more detail. A balance was achieved by those candidates who recognised why the generals felt threatened by the leaders of the SA on the one hand, while Hitler feared a coup against him, on the other.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 12

It was rare to see a poor answer to part **(a)**. Candidates knew a great deal about anti-Semitic discrimination, including deprivation of citizenship and jobs, violence and deportation to concentration camps. The ways in which the Nazi regime effectively used radio in part **(b)** were well known. Two developed points in answers often included how the Nazi message could be taken to the streets and into homes, as well as the cheapness of radios, their accessibility and the ease with which foreign stations could be blocked. Part **(c)** responses could have been better argued if they had dealt with economics and terror in a more balanced way. The best answers explained how powerful the police state was in exercising control, while also recognising that Nazi economic policies benefited specific groups such as the unemployed, businessmen and farmers.

Question 13

The key to good answers in part **(a)** was to recognise that the question was about the difficulties of ruling Russia, rather than just describing the dreadful living and working conditions experienced by ordinary people. Part **(b)** found weaker answers describing agriculture during the reign of Nicholas II; these could have been improved by explaining why reforms were needed to deal with poor techniques, lack of modernisation and problems associated with the Kulaks. Part **(c)** required balanced arguments about political repression and alternative factors (such as Rasputin, harsh social conditions and the impact of war) to explain the March Revolution of 1917. Less successful responses described these features, whereas better answers linked them more precisely to the downfall of the Tsar.

Question 14

Candidates knew what was meant by collectivisation in part **(a)**. Part **(b)** tended to produce generalised, identified factors; responses would have been improved by developing two explanations such as the impact of boosting production to feed the cities and to earn foreign currency, as well as destroying the Kulaks and the NEP. Answers to part **(c)** tended to be unbalanced, as they focused on the negatives such as the destruction of the Kulaks and famine in 1932 and 1933; better balance could have been achieved by explaining benefits such as the boost to grain production which financed social programmes, as well as industrialisation.

Question 15

Many candidates were able to recall four points to describe how the car industry contributed to the 'Roaring Twenties' in part **(a)**. These included employment in road construction and supply industries, as well as the ease of travel to shopping malls, entertainment and to the expanding suburbs. Part **(b)** answers tended to be descriptions of new forms of entertainment, rather than explanations of why they became more popular. For example, references to the Jazz Age would have been improved by explaining that jazz appealed to young white Americans because they thought it was exciting and modern, and opportunities to visit jazz clubs increased as a result of more leisure time and prosperity. Unbalanced answers characterised part **(c)** because of a tendency to write much more about intolerance (such as the Red Scare and the Ku Klux Klan) at the expense of features which showed a more open society, for example the changing position of women.

Question 16

In part **(a)**, many candidates successfully described precisely what happened to the Bonus Marchers. Part **(b)** found weaker answers describing agriculture after the Depression; these answers could have been improved by explaining impact, such as why farmers faced evictions. Part **(c)** required an explanation of the part played by the banks in causing the Wall Street Crash, analysed in the context of alternative factors. Responses were unbalanced and could have been improved by more emphasis on not just the banks which contributed to speculation, but also the underlying weaknesses in the US economy during the 1920s.

Questions 17 to 20

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

Question 21

The problems faced by Britain in Palestine when the Second World War ended produced some strong responses in part **(a)**. The best answers referred to the effects of the Holocaust which had created sympathy for the Jews, the fact that British resources were exhausted after the war (so they could not afford to keep

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

troops and police in Palestine), and the pressure from Irgun. Responses to part **(b)** were generalised and would have been improved in many cases by two developed explanations; better answers included the impact of Haganah's operations (with examples), and the effects of receiving training and weaponry from the British. In part **(c)**, candidates were asked to consider the reasons why Britain withdrew from Palestine. They applied their knowledge extremely strongly, explaining the impact of American pressure compared to the strains of continuing military action against Jewish guerrillas, given the context of Second World War debt and post-war reform in Britain.

Question 22

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

Candidates should give a direct answer to the question. Time should not be spent on repeating what the source says, or describing what it shows. The content of the sources must be used, which means using it to explain answers.
When using quotations, the full quote should be given.
Candidates should try to read and interpret sources as whole. In many questions what matters most is the overall message that the artist or author is trying to give, rather than isolated details in a source.
Sources should be read and interpreted in context. Knowing and understanding what was happening at the time of the creation or publication of a source will enable candidates to understand and evaluate it more effectively. Contextual knowledge should be used to analyse and evaluate the sources.
Answers to **Question 6** must be based on the sources.
Sources must be read carefully and answers should be planned. Candidates should only write their answers when they know what they are going to say.
Answers should start by directly addressing the question, for example, when answering **Question 2** in this examination session, a good way to start is 'The message of this source is'.

General comments

The twentieth century option was more popular, although a significant number of candidates attempted the nineteenth century option. Most candidates demonstrated that they understood the written sources and most appeared to be able to clearly explain their answers. The general impression of most candidates was that they knew how to use historical sources and were familiar with the tricky issues involved when using them.

Many candidates had good contextual knowledge, although the need to use this in a relevant and concise way to analyse and interpret the sources, and to support answers to the questions, is still a challenge for some. Their use of the sources and their contextual knowledge often remain separate.

Some candidates treat sources as blocks of information, rather than as sources of evidence. For example, they used Source C (twentieth century option) as information about why Germany had certain attitudes towards Italy, rather than as evidence about the views attitudes, and purpose of the author of the source.

Finally, candidates should attempt all the questions. A small number of candidates missed out one or more questions. They should also leave enough time to answer **Question 6** comprehensively.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

This question produced a wide range of marks. A number of candidates, appropriately, read the sources holistically and were therefore able to explain that Source A is defending and justifying the Boxers, while Source B is critical of them. Most candidates were able to at least compare points of detail, for example both sources say that the Boxers were against Christianity and foreigners, and Source A claims that the Empress did not really support the Boxers, while Source B says that she did support them. These answers achieved reasonable marks. There were few very poor answers, although some candidates did produce general summaries of both sources without comparing them point by point.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

Most candidates answered impressively on Source C. Many were able to explain the point of view of the cartoonist about the hypocrisy of westerners. Even if they did not get as far as the hypocrisy, they usually understood that the cartoonist was saying that foreigners and the Chinese were as bad as each other. They made good use of the words 'Barbarie' and 'Civilisation' in the cartoon in their explanations. Only a few candidates misunderstood and thought that the message was that westerners were civilised.

Question 3

Many answers to this question went no further than everyday empathy, and made claims that, for example, the Kaiser would want to support his troops. Candidates were not expected to know anything in particular about the Kaiser (although a few did), but rather to place his comments and attitude in the context of what was happening in China at the time. Better answers managed to make use of contextual knowledge or other sources on the paper to explain no surprise at the Kaiser's attitude, for example Sources E and G.

Question 4

This question required candidates to explain why Source E was published in Britain in July 1900. 'Purpose' questions such as this one require candidates to do several things. Firstly, the purpose of the source needs to be explained, although to be able to do this, candidates also need to interpret the message of the source. This extract from an article in an English newspaper creates a clear impression of the heroism, bravery and courage of the British, and the cruelty and barbarism of the Boxers. A reasonable number of candidates were able to infer a valid purpose from this message, for example to persuade the British government to punish the Chinese or to make the British people put pressure on the military authorities to take revenge on the Chinese. It is important, in questions like this one, that candidates show awareness that purpose involves having an intended impact on the audience. This intended impact should be explained in the answer. Secondly, a valid purpose needs to be placed in the context of events in China at this time (beyond the particular events described in Source E). Less strong answers either explained the context without exploring the message and purpose of the source, or just explained the message without getting to purpose.

Question 5

Comparison questions like this one require candidates to compare directly and explicitly. Sources F and G can be compared on points of detail and some candidates did this. However, for stronger responses it was necessary for answers to go beyond claims that, for example, there is violence in both. The question asks candidates to use their comparisons of the sources to suggest whether the two artists would have agreed about events in China, for example, they would have agreed that events in China at this time were very violent. However, some candidates were able to go further and produce some excellent answers by considering the points of view of the artists towards what was happening in China. The artist of Source F clearly sees westerners (Europeans) as barbarians and to blame for the violence, while the artist of Source G clearly sees the Chinese as the barbarians, with the westerners (Americans) as heroes fighting for liberty.

Question 6

Candidates generally coped well with this question. They used sources that focused on Boxer barbarism as evidence to support the hypothesis, while sources that focused on western barbarity were used to question it. It is important that sources are properly used as evidence to pass judgement on the hypothesis and there were a number of candidates whose answers could have been improved by doing this. It was not enough just to point out injustice and violence in the sources by one side or the other. Explanations of how far such examples support the hypothesis were required.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to explain impressions that Source A gives of the relationship between Hitler and Mussolini. There are several key words in the question. Firstly, 'impression' in this context means what the content of source suggests about the relationship, without actually saying it. Giving an impression involves going further than simply paraphrasing parts of the source. It involves making an inference from the source. For example, Source A suggests that the relationship was a complicated one and that it was not based on trust. It also suggests that the relationship was one-sided and that Mussolini was proud of it.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Impressions (and there are several) needed to be valid and had to be supported or explained using the content of Source A. Secondly, the question states 'the relationship between Hitler and Mussolini', making it important that answers focused on this particular relationship and not on that between German and Italy or on other aspects of the source.

Overall, this question was answered well, with many candidates explaining at one valid inference and achieving good marks. The best answers were based on a careful reading of Source A and on thought and planning. They stated a valid impression and then supported it with a direct reference to part of the source. Some candidates found that the most effective way to give two distinct impressions was to focus on the changing nature of the relationship. Source A begins by explaining how pleased Mussolini was with the relationship but then goes on to explain his change of attitude and Hitler's rather different view. Weaker answers described what Mussolini and Hitler did and did not make an inference about their relationship, while others used contextual knowledge, rather than the source, to write about the relationship.

Question 2

A good way to begin an answer to this question is 'The message of this source is'. This avoids focusing on lengthy descriptions of the cartoon or detailed accounts of the historical background (some candidates wrote at length about the battle of Adwa in 1896 or about the role of the League of Nations in the crisis over Abyssinia).

There were two distinct parts to this cartoon. Reaching the 'big message' (the overall point the cartoonist is trying to make) involved putting the two parts together. In the cartoon, Mussolini is heading for Abyssinia (the actual Italian invasion did not take place until October). However, he does not appear to be entirely convinced that this is a good idea and details in the cartoon suggest that such an adventure was not going to be trouble-free. He also appears to be concerned about what Germany will get up to while he is away. The second part of the cartoon shows Hitler encouraging Mussolini to go, leaving him free to pursue his ambitions in central Europe. To sum up: David Low is suggesting that Italy will get bogged down in Abyssinia and this will allow Germany to begin its plan to advance into central Europe.

Most candidates managed to explain at least part of the message (a sub-message), and a good number did understand and did explain the big message. It was clear that their knowledge and understanding of the context of 1935 helped them to do this. They did not write at length about this context, but made concise and relevant references to it to support their interpretation. The best answers focused on 'cartoonist's' and explained that he was warning everyone about what Germany was up to. Less successful answers misinterpreted the cartoon, for example, some suggested that Germany was genuinely supporting Italy out of good will.

Question 3

This question asked candidates whether they were surprised by Source C. Good answers involved candidates using the source as a whole and explaining whether or not they were surprised by Eden's wish to keep friendly relations with Italy. This wish of Eden needed to be clearly stated. Candidates then needed to use other sources or their contextual knowledge to support being surprised, or not surprised, by Eden's attitude. The best answers were not surprised because they fitted the context of the period better. Some candidates neglected to read the source as a whole and focused on checking isolated details, for example, Germany looking for friendly relations with Italy because of the latter's success. If other sources or contextual knowledge was used appropriately in these answers, then reasonable marks could be achieved. There were, however, a number of ways in which candidates struggled. Some did not state whether they were surprised or not, some chose details in the source that surprised them but did not explain why, while others provided general assertions about support that lacked specific contextual knowledge or clear reference to other sources. The best answers were helped by starting with an announcement about whether they were surprised or not, and by basing their answers on a clear statement of what it was in the source that they were, or were not, surprised by.

Question 4

This question required candidates to compare the big messages of two cartoons. Careful thinking and planning beforehand allowed strong candidates to begin by stating that the two cartoons largely disagree. Source D is claiming that Mussolini was the senior partner and that he was clearly warning Hitler away from a move on Austria. On the other hand, Source E shows the two to be much closer to being equal partners (or Mussolini having no choice in the matter), with Hitler getting away with Anschluss (which took place in the following month), while Mussolini appeared not to be bothered by it. Although very few candidates

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

misunderstood the cartoons, many only managed to explain part of their messages. A good number compared sub-messages, for example Source D shows Mussolini to be against Anschluss, while in Source E he is either supporting it, or happy to acquiesce in it. To achieve a strong response, it is necessary for candidates to make comparisons explicit. Explaining the message of one source and then explaining the other source, without a direct comparison, is not going far enough. In a question such as this one, candidates' contextual knowledge and understanding have enabling roles. They help them to interpret the cartoons. However, it is not necessary to write about the context at length. Some candidates spent much time writing about Mussolini's support for Austrian independence in 1934 and the events of 1937-8.

Question 5

Good responses to this question demonstrated an understanding that it is necessary to go beyond any differences or similarities of detail between the two sources to understand whether Mussolini was likely to be lying. These responses considered the possible purpose of Mussolini's speech or letter, or used their contextual knowledge to explore the significance of the dates of the two sources. This led some to argue that in Source F Mussolini was trying to sell the Rome-Berlin Axis to the Italian people, while others considered the changed context of August 1939, compared to 1936. Many candidates simply compared details within the two sources, for example Source F claims there were no elements of dispute between Germany and Italy, while Source G tells us that Mussolini was refusing Hitler military support under certain circumstances, or in Source F Mussolini claims that the Axis will bring about peace while Source G says that it could lead to an attack on Poland. The weakest answers summarised the sources without any explicit comparison.

Question 6

The final question gave candidates a hypothesis to check against the evidence offered by all the sources. Good answers contained three crucial elements. First, their focus was on testing the hypothesis named in the question rather than any other hypothesis, for example Germany benefited more from the relationship. Second, they used the evidence in the sources to carry out this testing. Third, they used this evidence explicitly and effectively. It does not matter whether candidates use the sources in the order they appear in the paper or first write about the sources supporting the hypothesis, and then about those disagreeing with it. It is how well they use the sources that matters. For example, a claim that Source B does not support the hypothesis because it shows Germany using Italy, is not detailed enough. The following contains a more appropriate level of detail: 'Source B does not support the idea that Italy benefited from its relationship with Italy because it suggests that Germany was encouraging Italy to go off on a gamble in Abyssinia where there would be death and destruction. While this was happening Germany would be able to execute its plans in central Europe.' There were a number of candidates who tried to use the sources, but ineffective use of them led to weaker responses. Explanations based on some source detail are required rather than vague answers, or assertions.

Attempts to write about the sources in groups were rarely effective as statements made about groups of sources rarely applied to all the sources in that group. Candidates are better advised to use and analyse each source separately. It is sometimes the case that some sources can be used on both sides of the argument. It is perfectly acceptable for candidates to do this with such sources. Finally, a number of candidates wrote about the hypothesis generally, without explicit reference to the sources. This approach should not be taken by candidates. This question is not just about the hypothesis. It is also about the sources.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

- Candidates should give a direct answer to the question asked. Time should not be spent on simply repeating source content, or describing what it shows. The content of the sources must be used, which means selecting what is relevant and using it to explain the answer.
- The historical context matters. When a source was produced makes a difference to how it can be used. A cartoon drawn in 1938 cannot be explaining why World War II broke out.
- Candidates should use the time allowance appropriately, and ensure that they leave enough time to answer **Question 6** properly.

General comments

Very few responses to the nineteenth century option were seen. Therefore, this report applies to the twentieth century option. The great majority of scripts were complete – that is, answers were written to all six questions – and few showed any misunderstanding, either of the sources, or of the questions. Where questions gave the opportunity of evaluating the source(s), many answers did this, though it was more often on the basis of whether what the source claimed was true or not, rather than in relation to the purpose the author might have had in making the particular claims contained in the source. Although the level of contextual knowledge was generally good, there were occasions when it was not sufficiently specific to answer the questions appropriately. In these cases, inappropriate contextual references were often an indication of lack of understanding and could significantly undermine the quality of the answer.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

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

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to compare two sources. The sources contained several agreements and disagreements, but it was essential for comparisons to be based on common criteria shared by the sources; in other words, candidates had to compare 'like with like'. The issue of whether or not Hitler intended war was something which some candidates struggled with. For example, although it was valid to argue that the sources agreed that Hitler did not want war with Britain and France (at least in the short term), it was not valid to take quotes from the sources to argue that Hitler did not intend war at all. There were, then, rather more attempts to compare than there were valid comparisons, though in the end most candidates were able to spot at least a couple of agreements. Better responses also found disagreements (most of which were a little less obvious), and occasionally were able to take the overall message of the sources as the key difference, with Hitler seen as a planner in Source A, but as an improviser in Source B.

Question 2

This question asked why a cartoon was published. It was essential for the answer to provide a reason, yet some candidates became so focused on interpreting the cartoon that they did not address the question. It is always sound practice to begin an answer with a direct response to the question, and better responses often started with something like *'I think this cartoon was published in July 1938 because'.* The next issue was the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

date of the cartoon. July 1938 was before the September 1938 crisis over the Sudetenland. Even if candidates did not know this from their own contextual knowledge, they could have found the information elsewhere in the sources. Nonetheless, many answers assumed that the Sudetenland/Czechoslovakia had already been taken by Germany. These responses could not, therefore, provide a valid reason for publication of the cartoon. Here, then, was an example of how accurate contextual knowledge makes a real difference to the quality of the answer. However, many candidates understood the cartoon in its true context, and saw it as a warning to its British audience against complacency in the face of the growing German threat to Czechoslovakia, with the underlying intent of pushing the British government to abandon its policy of appeasement.

Question 3

This question asked candidates to decide whether Neville Chamberlain's speech on returning from the Munich Conference made Churchill's repudiation of the Munich Agreement five days later surprising. The two sources gave totally different judgements on the agreement. For many candidates, the difference led them to conclude that they were surprised. What could have improved such answers was contextual awareness. Generally, those candidates with knowledge of the careers of Chamberlain and Churchill during the 1930s, were not surprised by the fact that they disagreed over appeasement. Better responses showed this awareness, and though some were content to explain their lack of surprise simply by commenting on Chamberlain being a champion of appeasement and Churchill being a long-standing opponent, others explored the possible purposes that the two men might have had in making their speeches.

Question 4

This question asked candidates to interpret a cartoon, and as with **Question 2**, the specific context in which it was published was very important. Its date was 25 September 1938. Some candidates showed excellent knowledge of the Sudetenland crisis by recognising that this date placed the cartoon between the first two conferences where Chamberlain met Hitler (at Berchtesgaden and Bad Godesberg) and the final conference at Munich, at which it was finally agreed to give the Sudetenland to Germany. In other words, the cartoon predated the final resolution of the crisis. Indeed, the cartoon showed that the Czech crisis still threatened the world with war, and thus could not be referring to the final agreement. So these candidates were able to see that the cartoonist's message had to relate to the ongoing crisis, and the danger to peace that it posed. Some also saw that the image of Chamberlain, struggling to preserve the peace, indicated the cartoonist's admiration for his efforts. However, those candidates who did not understand the correct context often based their answers on the mistaken assumption that Chamberlain had already secured peace, and that the reference to 'War' in the cartoon referred to the threat of a future war once Hitler had taken the Sudetenland (or Czechoslovakia). Some answers even referred to this as the Second World War.

Question 5

This question asked candidates whether they believed an extract from a book published in 1940, written by Nevile Henderson, British Ambassador to Germany at the time of the Munich Conference. For some candidates, the fact that he was a participant in the events he described made him believable, or alternatively the fact that he was a supporter of Chamberlain made his account unacceptably biased. The account made a variety of different claims about his work and the British policy of appeasement. Almost all candidates responded to the question by checking some of these claims against the facts as they saw them or, less often, against evidence taken from other sources. Some also looked more closely at Henderson's words and detected a willingness to confess to his own errors of judgement which they thought enhanced his credibility. Only a few, however, viewed the source as a whole as an exercise in self-justification, trying to evade responsibility for the failure of the appeasement policy and for the outbreak of war.

Question 6

The final question gave candidates a hypothesis to check against the evidence offered by all the sources. Although not that numerous, a number of candidates did not refer to the sources at all, or at least did not use them effectively, in testing the hypothesis. Source use means identifying something in a source that can either support or refute the hypothesis. For example, an answer to this question could have said 'I think Source G shows that war could not have been avoided because it says Hitler never intended the ultimate end to be anything but war.' Some candidates stated that all the sources either supported or refuted the hypothesis, whereas it is always the case that the sources together will offer evidence on both sides; indeed, there are times when an individual source can be used both for and against the hypothesis. Candidates should be aware that they can be credited for the explicit evaluation of sources. There were many attempts at evaluation but some candidates were unable to tie the evaluation into answering the question. For

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

example, they may have indicated that a particular source cannot be relied upon, but they did not then conclude how this affected its utility in relation to testing the hypothesis.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

This paper, which tests the interpretation and evaluation of sources, requires candidates to address in a valid way the particular skill or concept demanded by each question. Recognising what a question requires, and responding relevantly, is therefore essential. An equally important aspect is in understanding exactly what a source says or shows. Time spent on carefully studying the sources before answering is essential, enabling candidates to assess the precise nature of the claims made by the authors, and to appreciate potential links between different sources.

The most successful answers are planned before the candidate begins to write their response. Candidates should always work out what their answer is and then commence writing by actually answering the question in their opening sentence. A helpful strategy here is to use the words from the question. The rest of the answer should then use both the source/s and relevant knowledge to explain/support the opening statement. Such an approach should mean that candidates answer the specific question being asked. Such a strategy should also help candidates ensure their answers remain focused and free from unnecessary narrative descriptions.

If quotations from the sources are used, and this can be particularly useful when answering **Question 6**, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of a quotation that misses out some of the words. The words that are used must support the point the candidates wants to make, hence the importance of providing the quotation in full.

While many candidates did well in response to **Question 6**, there were still some who did not use the sources as the basis of their answer. Similarly, those who grouped the sources together and made general comments about the statement did not perform as strongly as they could have done, as they did not engage with the content of each source. Candidates must also make sure they make it clear whether they are agreeing or disagreeing with the given statement. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support and disagree with the given statement.

General comments

Overall, candidates responded reasonably well to the demands of the paper. An overwhelming majority of responses were for the twentieth-century topic; very few responses on the nineteenth-century option were seen.

Candidates are advised to read both the background information and all the sources before beginning to respond to any of the questions. This will give them an understanding of the main issue of the paper, and of a range of perspectives. This understanding will feed into all of their answers, as well as helping to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Candidates performed well on this question. The question asked candidates to explain the impression Source A gives of the Non-Intervention Committee and many were able to make valid inferences from the source. Relevant examples included that the Committee was ineffective, lacking in integrity, indecisive and biased. Most candidates could also correctly select relevant information from the source to support their inference. What was crucial was that a clear reference to the source and its content was made and that the information selected actually served to support the inference. The best responses were provided by candidates who could make more than one valid and supported inference. Only a small number of candidates achieved this, as there was a tendency for most candidates to make just one inference - most commonly that the Committee was weak or ineffective - support it by reference to the content of the source, and then repeat the process using the same inference but with different support.

Question 2

In **Question 2**, candidates were asked to consider two written sources and conclude whether the content of one proves the other wrong. Specifically, they were asked whether Source C, written by an English anarchist who supported the Republicans, proves that what Chamberlain said in Source B about intervention was wrong. A number of candidates struggled to find direct points of comparison between the two sources, and consequently there was much mismatching. Candidates must ensure they compare 'like with like' on questions such as this. They could, for example, have commented on how both sources agree that some intervention had taken place, and therefore Source C does not prove Source B wrong. Alternatively, Source C could be said to prove Source B wrong, as there are disagreements between them, for instance, in Source B Chamberlain thinks war has been averted, but in Source C Goldman believes it is likely. To gain the highest marks on this question, candidates needed to evaluate one, or preferably both, sources. Some responses recognised that the provenance of the sources and/or purpose of the two authors was a crucial element in the answer, but they needed to go further than just stating that one being written by the British Prime Minister and the other by an anarchist supporter of the Republicans had led to their conclusion about Source C proving Source B wrong. Another approach was to use the dates of the sources, but a number of answers using this approach needed greater development. Those candidates that were able to make a developed use of the provenance, and/or purpose of the sources, performed very strongly; Chamberlain was attempting to persuade his audience that the British approach had been effective and Goldman's view is entirely consistent with her role and political views.

Question 3

There were many reasonable answers to this question. Questions such as this, that ask why a source was produced, need three explanatory elements in the response. Firstly, it is necessary to consider the context in which the source was produced. Secondly, the message that the author was trying to get across must be understood and, thirdly, the purpose the author had in relaying his message must be examined. Context-only answers tended to include information about the Spanish Civil War in very general terms. The majority of candidates were, however, able to move beyond this and interpret the cartoon at some level by explaining valid sub-messages or part of the big message; that Italy was intervening in Spain or that Britain was deliberately ignoring German and Italian intervention in Spain, for instance. In order to interpret the cartoon's overall message, it was necessary to consider the cartoonist's opinion; in this case, his view is that the British are wrong to turn a blind eye to the obvious intervention by Germany and Italy. His purpose in putting across this opinion was to put pressure on the British government to act or to rally support for the Republican cause. A small number of strongly-performing candidates explained this in the context of 1938 specifically. A few candidates misinterpreted the cartoon and based their answers on the idea that the British had no knowledge of German and Italian intervention.

Question 4

This question focused on two written sources that both address the issue of just how secret German involvement in Spain was. The question asked whether Source F makes Source E surprising. Many candidates were able to gain reasonable marks by identifying points of agreement or disagreement between the sources and using these to explain surprise or lack of surprise. For example, many referred to the lengths taken in Source F to maintain the disguise of the German soldiers as a reason to be surprised by the fact that in Source E, 'fat, blond German pilots were consuming vast quantities of Spanish fish' in full view of everyone at the Hotel Cristina. The best responses were ones in which candidates evaluated one, or, even better, both sources. While some responses recognised that the provenance of the sources and/or purpose

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

of the two authors were relevant, such ideas were generally undeveloped. Overall, many more candidates could have improved their responses by attempting evaluation. However, with very few exceptions, candidates answered the question set and clearly stated whether Source F makes Source E surprising or not.

Question 5

This question was answered fairly well. In **Question 5**, candidates were asked to explain the overall message of a cartoon. Many recognised this and were able to explain that the cartoon shows us that Britain (and France) was deliberately ignoring Italian and German involvement in Spain. Those that fell short of this were able to explain valid sub-messages. When candidates are asked about the message of a source they should always try and consider the author's voice or opinion. In this instance, the best answers were from those candidates who could explain that the cartoonist is criticising the British for wilfully ignoring German and Italian involvement in Spain.

Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved high marks by carefully explaining how some of the sources (A, B, D, F and G) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that Hitler was successful in hiding the extent of German involvement in Spain, while others (A, B, C, D, E and G) argue that German involvement was clear and not hidden. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. In other responses, some candidates did not make it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Another weakness was the grouping of the sources. It is advisable to always examine the sources one by one, as any comment about a group must be valid for every source in the group. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question 6** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement. Candidates can then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given. A clear example of this could be; 'Source A shows that Hitler was unsuccessful in hiding the extent of German involvement in Spain as both the Spanish and the British governments knew about it. The source tells us that Spain's foreign minister gave the British Foreign Secretary documents and photographs to prove the extent to which Hitler and Mussolini were violating the agreement'.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

It is crucial that candidates use titles that are appropriate and that provide them with full opportunities to assess significance in its broadest sense.

Candidates need to assess how far their individual, event or development was significant in the broadest sense - in different ways and for different reasons.

Candidates should avoid spending time on lengthy introductions and descriptions. They need to use as many as possible of the 2000 words available in assessing significance.

To state that someone or something is significant because it led to a particular outcome is, in fact, only part of the process. Candidates also need to assess how far the outcome mattered.

It is important that significance is assessed, rather than just explained. Candidates should focus on 'how far' something was significant, rather than on 'how' it was significant.

General comments

Centres' administration of coursework was excellent with all the necessary information and requested samples of work being provided most efficiently. The appropriate forms were correctly completed and samples of work were often accompanied by helpful letters explaining the context in which the coursework was taught and completed.

The overall standard of the work was high, with nearly all candidates using appropriate titles and many demonstrating a good understanding of how to assess significance. A number of centres developed their own Depth Studies for coursework and these led to some interesting questions, usually on an aspect of local history.

Comments on specific questions

Most titles used this year were suitable and effective. Titles such as 'Assess the significance of X' should work well, as long as a suitable subject has been chosen. Titles such as 'Explain how X was significant' can encourage explanation, rather than assessment of significance. It is important to avoid titles that encourage candidates to focus on answers about causation rather than significance. A title such as 'How far was X the most important factor in Hitler's rise to power' is such a title. It encourages candidates to cover a range of reasons for Hitler's rise to power and to compare their importance. The focus will thus be on Hitler's rise to power rather than the broad significance (as explained in the following section of this report) of the given factor. This can be avoided by not including an outcome in the title.

The choice of subject is important. Some can simply be too large for the candidates. Others can be too narrow and fail to offer candidates enough scope for a broad assessment of significance. However, titles about the significance of Martin Luther King, the New Deal and the Depression worked well. These subjects allow candidates to use a range of criteria to examine significance from different angles and perspectives. There were also interesting titles set on Centre-devised depth studies, for example on Brazilian political history in the 1960s and 1970s, and on the New Zealand Expeditionary Force in the First World War.

The best answers often shared a number of key characteristics. First, they focused on assessment of significance, avoided lengthy introductions about the background and contained little description. Secondly,

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

good knowledge and understanding of the historical period was used to support arguments and conclusions. Thirdly, they used a range of criteria to consider how significant their subject was in the broadest sense. These criteria were not used in a mechanical way. They considered the significance of their individual, event or development from different perspectives, as well as examining whether their subject was significant in different ways and for different reasons. Fourthly, they assessed significance, rather than describing, and made good use of argument and counter argument. One key feature of the best work was that it focused as much on reasons why a subject might not be as significant as on reasons why it was significant. Fifthly, they did not just focus on the outcomes of an individual or an event or development. Instead, they reached judgements about how far the outcomes mattered. Finally, they reached supported conclusions about the most important way in which their subject was significant.

The generic markscheme was generally used accurately by Centres. This markscheme should not be adapted in any way. It should be used holistically. Candidates' answers also need to be considered as whole with their overall qualities then matched to the overall demands of one of the levels in the mark scheme. Exact matches are not expected and so a 'best-fit' approach needs to be used. It should be remembered that the skills and understandings identified in the markscheme such as understanding of key features, reasons for change, and beliefs of the time should be used by candidates as tools in reaching and explaining judgements about significance.

The marking was accurate and only a small number of candidates had their marks adjusted. When marks were reduced it was often because candidates' work did not have the complexity and sophistication to merit the level awarded. It should also be remembered that substantial passages of description or narrative in answers should have an impact on judgements about the focus and relevance of answers.

Many centres provided detailed marginal and summative comments on the work of their candidates. Most of these were very helpful. Marginal comments are most useful when they identify significant features of an answer such as passages of description or effective assessment. The summative comments should be used to explain why a certain level has been awarded and direct reference to the features of the level should be made.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41 were the most widely-answered by candidates this session. There were also a good number of attempts at Depth Studies A (The First World War) and C (Russia), with very few candidates choosing to answer on Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians).

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, but many of these would have benefited from supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description, or did not properly address the question that was set. Many candidates wrote all they knew about a particular topic or Depth Study instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. There were also a few rubric errors, the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in several Depth Studies.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of candidate responses for both **Question 1** and **Question 2**, although **Question 1** proved the more popular.

Question 1 required candidates to examine the reasons for Russia leaving the war in 1918. Strong responses gave detailed examples of how military defeats affected morale and led to desertions in the Russian army, as well as how this impacted the Tsarist government and Provisional Government afterwards. This was then balanced against other factors such as the food and fuel shortages, social and economic issues and the Bolshevik seizure of power in November 1917 that ultimately led to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Many good answers contained detailed knowledge and supported explanations. Weaker responses tended to be narratives of either the First World War or Russian history in 1917–18, and lacked a clear focus on the question.

Question 2 responses showed that some candidates had a good understanding of the collapse of the home front in Germany and how it helped lead to the Armistice in 1918. The strongest responses gave in-depth knowledge of the impact of the British Blockade of the German ports, the Kiel Mutiny and the transfer of power from the Kaiser to the Reichstag. This was then balanced by examining other factors such as US entry into the war in 1917, the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive, the impact of key battles such as the Somme and Passchendaele, and the change in Allied tactics and technology. Good responses developed these points with clear and focused explanations, whereas weaker responses tended to be descriptive or went too far back in the history of the First World War to give meaningful assessment. A few candidates attempted to make judgements on the most significant cause of the Armistice, but these were often unsubstantiated and lacked a clinching argument.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3 was the most popular question for this Depth Study. Only a small number of candidates attempted **Question 4**.

Question 3 was generally well-answered. Candidates were able to provide valid examples of Hitler's election promises, such as solving the unemployment problem in Germany, abolishing the Treaty of Versailles and promising a strong military and, with it, reclaiming lost German land. This was then balanced by other factors such as the effects of the Great Depression, effective propaganda, Hitler's leadership qualities and the role of the SA. Strong responses demonstrated a wide-ranging knowledge of the topic and were able to explain the importance of the election promises compared to other factors, to reach a judgement. Weaker responses sometimes gave a narrative of the 1920s or examined factors post–1933.

Question 4 produced a few stronger responses that were able to examine the significance of Nazi policies towards the churches in the development of a totalitarian state Germany, many of which focused on the Concordat with the Catholic Church and the creation of the Reich Church. A few countered their arguments by examining notable church opposition, such as Bishop Galen and Pastor Niemoller. Good answers also examined other significant factors that helped create the totalitarian state, such as the use of terror in the form of the SS and Gestapo, the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act, the Night of the Long Knives and the work of Goebbels. Less successful responses tended to lack specific knowledge of Nazi policies towards the Church or misunderstood the term 'totalitarian state', which resulted in one-sided answers or very light description with no in-depth examples.

Depth Study C: Russia 1905–1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study in near equal proportion.

Question 5 was generally well-answered. Strong responses were able to critically evaluate the relative importance of the October Manifesto and how it weakened the Tsarist government by introducing limited democracy in the form of the Duma and civil rights. The best answers also highlighted and explained how the October Manifesto also strengthened the Tsarist system temporarily by appeasing liberals and moderates which gave the Tsar time to wait for his returning army to crush the riots and strikes. To provide balance, good responses examined other factors that weakened the Tsar such as the Russo-Japanese War, Bloody Sunday and the 1905 Revolution, the peasants' land issue and Russia's entry into the First World War and its massive socio-economic impact. Other responses tended to be one-sided or lacked specific knowledge. A few responses went beyond March 1917 and the Tsar's abdication and began examining the period of the Provisional Government which was outside of the parameters of the question.

Question 6 was generally well-answered. Strong responses were able to examine Stalin's purges and the use of the NKVD in removing political rivals, as well as the political manoeuvring from Stalin before he assumed total control of the Soviet Union. Depth of knowledge was impressive in some responses and specific examples were given to support explanations. To provide balance, other factors such as propaganda and the development of Stalin's 'cult of personality', the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation and discipline and rewards in the workplace were used to compare relative significance. A number of other responses would have been improved by a closer and constant focus on the question. These responses tended to give an overview or narrative of Stalin's government, without focusing on the aspect of totalitarianism.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Both **Question 7** and **Question 8** were answered by many candidates, with more **Question 7** responses seen.

Question 7 was generally well-answered. Stronger responses were able to examine the impact a range of consumer goods had in changing people's lives in the USA in the 1920s. Most commonly cited were the impacts of the motor car, the radio and domestic appliances. This was developed well in some cases, as candidates explained how some in the USA now had more free time to spend on leisure activities or were able to live in the suburbs as they could drive to work. This was balanced with often a wide range of other factors, such as the impact of Prohibition and the extent of illegal drinking and organised crime, the intolerance caused by religious fundamentalism, immigration and the Red Scare, and the growth in support of the KKK. Good responses started to make supported conclusions about relative importance and a few even noted how consumer goods only impacted the urban middle-classes, and not those in much of rural America. Weaker responses would have benefited from greater knowledge. In particular, some were unable

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

to cite relevant examples of consumer goods. A few less successful answers focused mainly on the economic boom and its causes. While there is some relevance, the question is clearly focused on people's lives, rather than economic growth.

Question 8 produced some strong responses that had a good grasp of temperance movements such as the Anti-Saloon League and the WCTU. They were able to explain how these movements used propaganda and religious arguments to promote Prohibition in the USA. This was then balanced with the close examination of other relevant factors, such as the First World War and how it became unpatriotic to drink beer made by German named breweries in the USA, the role of the protestant churches and conservative politicians, business leaders such as Henry Ford and even the support of the KKK for Prohibition. Weaker responses tended to lack the depth of knowledge needed for this question and gave very thin descriptions, with few specific examples.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45, Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41 were the most widely answered by candidates. There were also many answers on Depth Studies A (The First World War), while very few candidates chose to respond to the questions in Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians).

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, but many of these would have benefited from supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description, or did not properly address the question that was set. Many candidates wrote all they knew about a particular topic or Depth Study instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. There were also a few rubric errors, the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in several Depth Studies.

Comments on specific questions:

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

There were responses to both **Question 1** and **Question 2**, although **Question 1** proved the more popular.

Question 1 could have been better answered by candidates. A few stronger responses were able to examine the impact military leadership had on the high casualties on the Western Front by looking at the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, the role of Haig at the Battle of the Somme and the general lack of tactics involved when it came to fighting trench warfare. Good answers gave specific examples, most notably by focusing on the Battle of the Somme and the high casualties caused by machine guns when the troops advanced into no man's land. This was then balanced by examining other factors such as the new technology like machine guns, artillery and gas weapons, the nature of trench warfare and the conditions in the trenches. A few responses attempted to make judgements on the relative importance of these factors but were more often summative conclusions. Weaker responses showed confusion over the term 'military leadership' and tended to give narratives of the First World War. These responses would have been improved by a greater focus on the demands of the question, which in this case is what factors caused the high casualties.

Question 2 was answered better than **Question 1**. Some candidates had a good knowledge of the actions of Ludendorff and commonly cited Operation Michael and the overall failure of his Spring Offensive, as well as his actions along with Hindenburg in advising the Reichstag to call for an armistice. This was then balanced against other relevant factors such as US entry into the war in 1917, the developments in Allied tactics and the impact of the British blockade of German ports and subsequent socio-economic effects such as the Kiel Mutiny and October Revolution. Answers were often detailed and focused with some good

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

conclusions drawn. Weaker responses tended to lack a detailed knowledge of Ludendorff's actions or gave narratives of the entire First World War.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3 was the most popular question in this Depth Study. A small number of candidates attempted **Question 4**.

Question 3 was generally well-answered. Strong responses were able to give a strong list of the many actions taken by Goebbels in his role as Minister for Propaganda and Enlightenment. Most commonly cited were the use of the People's Receiver, posters, film and rallies. Good answers were able to quote facts and figures and demonstrated a great deal of depth on this topic. This was then balanced by other factors that aided Nazi control such as the SS, Gestapo, the courts, the school curriculum and youth movements, as well as the Nazi economic miracle. A small number of very strong responses drew conclusions about the relative importance of these factors and provided clinching arguments to support their judgements. Less successful responses tended to make chronological errors and gave responses that focused on events pre–1933, despite the requirement for 'after 1933' in the question.

Question 4 was, in general, less well answered than **Question 3**. A few stronger responses were able to examine the significance of the Second World War in creating opposition in Nazi Germany by examining relevant examples such as youth opposition like the Edelweiss Pirates, the Kreisau Circle and the July Bomb Plot. This was then balanced with other causes of opposition, such as underground political movements by trade unionists and communist groups, the role of the churches, as well as general grumbling from the population. Weaker responses misunderstood the question and examined the role played by the Allies in opposing Germany in the Second World War.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Most of those opting for this Depth Study attempted **Question 5**.

Question 5 was generally well-answered. Strong responses were able to critically evaluate the relative importance of the role of the Tsarina in bringing about the downfall of the Tsarist government and compare this with other relevant factors. Good answers examined aspects linked to the Tsarina such as her German heritage, her relationship with Rasputin and the poor decisions made when selecting able ministers, which alienated many in the aristocracy. This was balanced by examining the role played by the Tsar, the impact of the First World War and historic issues such as the land issue and the poor social and economic conditions in Russia. The strongest responses had a wide range of examples to support their explanations and a few drew conclusions on the relative importance of the different factors. Other responses tended to give a narrative of Russia from 1904 to 1917 and a few began examining the period after March 1917 when the Tsar had abdicated and the Romanov dynasty had ended.

Question 6

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

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Both **Question 7** and **Question 8** were answered by good numbers of candidates. However, there were more **Question 7** responses this session.

Question 7 was generally well-answered. Stronger responses were able to examine how the lack of an overseas market affected the prosperity of farmers in the USA in the 1920s. Many good responses looked at the impact of tariffs, the competition from countries like Canada and Argentina and the huge drop in prices for agricultural goods after the First World War. This was balanced effectively by examining the issues of overproduction in the domestic market, the lack of intervention by Republican governments and the changing tastes of US consumers. The strongest answers were able to support their explanations with facts and figures which added depth to their conclusions. Less successful responses were sometimes one-sided and only examined the importance of the lack of an overseas market or lacked detailed knowledge and were often repetitive in nature.

Question 8 was generally well-answered, with some exceptional responses. The strongest answers demonstrated an extensive knowledge of the significance of the role of the Supreme Court in its opposition to the New Deal. There was a high level of detail and specific examples used to substantiate the relative

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

significance of the Supreme Court, such as the closing down of the NRA and AAA when they were declared unconstitutional, and the generally conservative nature of the Supreme Court justices. To provide balance, attention was given to Republican critics and business leaders who formed the Liberty League, and radical critics such as Huey Long, Father Coughlin and Dr Townsend. Explanations tended to be well-developed and focused on addressing the issue of significance. Weaker responses tended to confuse the different critics of the New Deal and a few responses gave a narrative of the New Deal legislation itself.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken with Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45 the most widely answered by candidates. Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-41, also attracted a number of responses. There were fewer attempts at Depth Study A (The First World War), and some candidates answered questions from Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians). Depth Study C (Russia) was also attempted by a small number of candidates. There were very few responses to the other options.

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, but many of these would have benefited from supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description, or did not properly address the question that was set. Many candidates wrote all they knew about a particular topic or Depth Study instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. There were also a few rubric errors, the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in several Depth Studies.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was attempted by most candidates who answered on this Depth Study. Successful answers were able to focus on the Western Front and understood that there were many reasons that warfare changed. Less successful responses tended to write a narrative account of the early stages of the war, sometimes missing the focus on the Western Front. There were also many narrative-style accounts of the whole of the First World War which neglected to focus on the question of how the nature of warfare changed.

Question 2 generated fewer answers, although some showed a good knowledge of the British blockade and its impact on Germany.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most popular Depth Study with responses to **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Question 3 was attempted by a number of candidates. Successful responses knew the differences between the roles in government of the President and Chancellor. There was, however, some confusion over these respective roles and some responses were vague and did not concentrate on government. Less successful answers concentrated on the rise of Hitler to power, rather than considering the roles of Presidents within the democracy. This sometimes led to an extended narrative right through to the Nazis in power. Some candidates chose to focus their answers on the individual characters of Ebert and Hindenburg but tended to describe their mistakes, rather than discuss their roles in the government. There was a lot of focus on the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

role of Stresemann, but not all directed at the precise question. On the whole the role of the Chancellor was not well known.

Question 4 was a more popular choice, with successful answers recognising that the focus of the question was on how Hitler controlled Germany. These answers correctly identified concentration camps as places where opposition such as the Communists were sent. They were then able to write a balanced answer by discussing the other methods used by Hitler to control Germany, including the use of the Gestapo, informers, the Concordat and control over the police and courts. Less successful answers looked only at the factor of the concentration camps and wrote long narratives outlining Nazi Racial Policy, rather than addressing methods of control. There was some confusion over the term 'concentration camps' and opposition was seen as covering a broad spectrum of groups such as the disabled, Jews and gypsies.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Question 5 was answered by more candidates but there were also a number of attempts at **Question 6**.

Question 5 produced some successful answers which demonstrated a good knowledge of what the Cheka was and made links to the Bolshevik consolidation of power and the Red Terror. They were also able to discuss other reasons for consolidation such as Lenin's Decrees, the Treaty of Brest Litovsk and the use of War Communism and the NEP. Other answers wrote more generalised narratives of the Civil War, so that, at best, links to the question of consolidation were implicit.

Question 6 was less popular but successful answers demonstrated a sound knowledge of the events following Lenin's death and the different groups which emerged within the party. They were then able to show how Stalin utilised these differences to eliminate any opposition. These candidates were then able to achieve balance by assessing other factors such as Stalin's role as General Secretary, luck and Trotsky's shortcomings. Less successful answers would have benefited from a greater understanding of what the word 'splits' meant. Some wrote unfocused narratives about Stalin's actions after he took control, such as the purges and the Five-Year Plans. This led to a lack of focus on the correct period.

Depth Study D, The USA, 1919–1941

Question 7 received many responses and successful ones were able to identify many causes of intolerance during the 1920s. They had a clear understanding of the different pressures caused by religion, such as the Fundamentalist Christians and Temperance Movements. Balance was achieved by discussing the role of other factors, such as the Red Scare, racial intolerance and immigration. There was also good focus on the period of the 1920s. Less successful answers showed a lack of understanding of religion in the USA, seeing the country as officially Catholic and controlled by the government.

Question 8 was less popular but it produced some good responses which looked at many factors for the Wall Street Crash, and presented some good economic arguments around the cycle of prosperity which were clearly explained. There were some confused answers which demonstrated a lack of understanding of society in the USA, seeing poor people as investing in shares in order to make money. This made it more difficult to argue any difference between the rich and poor. There was also some confusion about 'goods' and 'shares'. Also some weaker responses only considered the results of the Crash.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

Question 13 saw a number of responses, the most successful of which linked immigration to unrest. They showed a good knowledge of British involvement post - First World War, and were able to show how this led to unrest and terrorism. They compared Palestine before and after the Second World War, showing how the numbers coming into the area created tensions.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2018

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 14 was also answered successfully when candidates concentrated on the impact of the Six-Day War, as well as the impact of other wars in the region. They were able to demonstrate how the Six-Day War created a change in attitude amongst the nations around Israel, and increased Israeli strength and, eventually, attempts at peace. There were, however, a number of narrative responses outlining the history of Palestine, without really addressing the question of relations between countries. Such answers would have benefited from selecting the best information and using it to directly answer the question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2018