eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

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

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

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

General comments

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

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

Parts (b) and (c) of the questions require understanding and explanation, **part (c)** also requiring analysis. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative or 'listing' approach.

Most **part (b)** questions ask 'why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, usually using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative or long introductions are not required.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 5

This was the most popular question in ***Section A***.

(a) This question was answered well, with many answers secure in their knowledge of Clemenceau's demands at the beginning of the peace negotiations. Some candidates approached the question by considering Clemenceau's overall demands such as punishing Germany or achieving security for France, whereas an alternative approach was to list some specific demands such as the return of Alsace-Lorraine. Both approaches were valid, and many answers contained both. Few errors were seen, although some answers were confused about the Rhineland and weaker answers made general points, such as Clemenceau's demand for land, without providing any examples.

(b) The responses to this question were mixed, with some candidates able to explain why the Treaty of Saint Germain was important, but with other responses unclear about which treaty it was, or unable to explain the importance of it. Stronger responses were able to provide at least one explanation, often using their knowledge of the territorial changes, such as the loss of land to Poland and Czechoslovakia, to show how Austria went from a powerful Empire to a small and much weaker country. Weaker responses were able to identify aspects of importance, such as the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but were unable to explain the importance of this. There was also some confusion as to which country the Treaty of Saint Germain was imposed on, with some responses centred around Turkey.

(c) Some excellent answers were seen to this question, with candidates able to provide balanced arguments as to whether Wilson gained what he wanted in the peace negotiations. Candidates were secure in their knowledge and understanding of Wilson's aims and were then able to link this to what was or was not achieved in the negotiations. One common argument was that he was successful, since his desire to achieve lasting peace was achieved through the establishment of the League of Nations, which would settle future conflicts through collective security and negotiation between conflicting nations. A common argument to provide balance was that Wilson was unsuccessful in ensuring future trade with Germany since Clemenceau's excessive demands for reparations and the loss of important industrial territory weakened Germany financially. A few excellent answers were seen that were able to not only provide explanations on both sides to create a balanced argument but were also able to construct an evaluation through specific consideration of how significant these achievements were, and whether they outweighed the elements that Wilson did not achieve. Less assured answers were sometimes confident in their knowledge either of Wilson's aims, such as self-determination, or what was achieved or not in the negotiations, such as the failure to achieve independence for Germany's colonies, but they were unable to link these together to create an explanation.

Question 6

(a) Some excellent answers to this question were seen, with candidates able to demonstrate very good knowledge of the work of the League of Nations in dealing with slavery. Such responses were able to show how the League tried to deal with slavery through the establishment of the Slavery Commission, and the writing of reports. They were also able to show the impact of the changes, for example through the freeing of 200 000 slaves in Sierra Leone. Candidates were also often able state the other countries where slavery was abolished. Weaker responses were able to identify that the League aimed to abolish slavery but were less secure in how or where this was attempted. Other answers confused the Slavery Commission with the International Labour Organisation.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question, with some responses able to provide an explanation as to why there was a crisis in Upper Silesia in 1921, but very few responses able to provide two explanations. The most common explanation provided was that it was an area claimed by both Germany and Poland due to its economic importance as an industrially rich area. Another, less common approach, was to explain the background to the situation to show why both Germany and Poland claimed the area. Less successful responses were able to identify that it was an area that Germany and Poland wanted, or recognised that a plebiscite was held, but would have been improved by developing these identifications into explanations. Some responses confused Upper Silesia with the Saarland or the Rhineland.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Some good answers to this question were seen that were focused on the issue of whether it was the behaviour or the structure of the League of Nations that was responsible for its failure. When examining the behaviour of the member states candidates were able to consider both the aggressive behaviour of countries such as Italy and Japan, or the weaknesses of the reaction to such aggression from Britain and France. Some strong responses were seen that considered both, through the invasions of Manchuria and Abyssinia and the Hoare-Laval Pact, for example. Responses were less assured in providing balance in the answer, with answers tending to be more descriptive about the problems in the structure, rather than explaining the impact that these weaknesses had. A successful approach adopted by some candidates was to identify that that the structure of the League led to slow responses, as can be seen by the Lytton report. Weaker answers often provided a generic description of the League, rather than addressing the particular focus of the question.

Question 7

(a) Candidates were very confident in their knowledge and understanding of what was agreed at the Yalta Conference about the future of Germany, with many showing that both Germany and Berlin were split into four areas which were to be split amongst the USA, the USSR, Britain and France. Other responses identified that Germany was to be de-Nazified and war criminals punished, or that the USSR demanded reparations. Few errors were seen, but some candidates identified more general points about the Yalta Conference, such as Stalin's promise to hold free elections in Poland, rather than the focus on Germany as stated in the question.

(b) Many candidates were able to provide a general reason as to why communist countries agreed to form the Warsaw Pact in 1955 but were less successful in developing these identifications into explanations. Most responses recognised that the Warsaw Pact was formed in response to the creation of NATO but did not explain why the creation of NATO threatened the communist countries, which meant that they would need the collective security offered by the Warsaw Pact. Some stronger answers were able to explain this and were also able to explain that they were under Soviet control, and therefore not in a position to refuse to join. Weaker responses described what the Warsaw Pact was, or just provided explanations as to why the USSR wanted to set it up, which was not the focus of the question.

(c) Candidates seemed to lack the knowledge and understanding required to consider whether the USSR had used the same methods to take control of Czechoslovakia and Poland. Many responses seen were unsure about the takeover of the countries, focussing instead on how the USSR maintained control after the takeover. In some instances, such as the use of force, these could be credited as identifications but needed specific examples, such as the death of Jan Masaryk, in order to help it progress to an explanation. Some good responses were seen which were rooted in the correct historical context, and these were able to show similarities and differences between the methods, for example through the use of elections, or by explaining that Soviet troops remained in Poland after the end of the war. Weaker answers lacked this context and were more about later uprisings, such as the Prague Spring or Solidarity.

Question 8

(a) This was a well answered question, with many candidates able to identify several of the reforms that Dubcek proposed for Czechoslovakia in 1968. Common responses were that he wanted a new form of communism, including changes such as freedom of speech and less censorship. Very few errors were seen, although some answers did not provide four different identifications.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question, with answers able to identify or describe reasons, but lacking the explanation necessary to achieve a higher-level response. Most candidates were able to show that there was an uprising in Hungary since Hungarians were not allowed freedom of speech. Most answers were also able to identify particular aspects of Soviet control that were unpopular, such as hatred of the secret police. Stronger responses went further and were able to provide explanations of how these particular aspects led to an overall hatred of Soviet control. Weaker responses, sometimes lengthy, described the uprising in Hungary, rather than the reasons for it occurring.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Some good answers to this question were seen, with most candidates able to provide explanations on at least one side of the argument to explain why Soviet control over Eastern Europe collapsed. Many such answers focused on the impact of Gorbachev's policies of Perestroika and Glasnost, which resulted in increased criticism of the government in Eastern European countries. Another argument seen on the side of problems in the USSR was that the economic problems facing the USSR meant that they were unable to afford to keep control of the countries through the use of the military. Fewer answers were seen which were able to explain other reasons for the loss of control, but those seen often examined the role of protests such as in Berlin and Poland through Solidarity. Weaker answers were able to show understanding of the problems in the USSR but were unable to link this to the collapse of control in Eastern Europe, instead concentrating on the effect within the USSR itself.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

(a) This question was answered very well, with many candidates able to describe Hitler's actions during the Munich Putsch. Common responses were that he wanted to overthrow the Weimar Republic, and that he started it in a meeting in a beer hall in Munich. Most candidates also recognised that he marched through the streets, was shot and later arrested. Very few errors were seen, although some candidates went outside the timeframe stated in the question which stated 'during' and concentrated on the aftermath of the Putsch, such as Hitler's trial and imprisonment.

(b) Candidates were confident in their knowledge of the Night of the Long Knives and were able to use this to provide two explanations of why it happened. The most common response was to explain how and why Hitler felt threatened by the power of the SA and Rohm. Other valid explanations were centred around wanting to gain the support of the army, or the ideological differences between Hitler and Rohm. Some excellent answers were seen that were able to explain how it was aimed to gain greater control of Germany, since the fact that Hitler would do this even to members of his own party demonstrated how he would react to any opposition. Few weak answers were seen, but less successful answers often described the events of the Night of the Long Knives, rather than the causation or confused it with Kristallnacht.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with some excellent and well-constructed answers seen, but also weaker responses which described the events, rather than focusing on the consequences of the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act. Strong and balanced arguments were seen which explained that the Reichstag Fire resulted in the Reichstag Fire Decree, and that these greater powers enabled Hitler to gain greater control, for example through the loss of civil liberties. Most commonly, the Reichstag Fire was also used to explain the impact that resulted for the opposition, particularly the Communists. On the other side of the argument candidates were able to show that the Enabling Act allowed Hitler to pass laws without needing to have them approved by the Reichstag, effectively turning into a dictatorship. Some responses went further to show how Hitler used these powers, for example through the creation of a one-party state. Weaker responses often described the events, or stated the consequences, rather than showing the impact.

Question 12

(a) **Question 12** was the most popular question of ***Section B***. The **part (a)** question had mixed responses, with many answers describing how the Jews were treated, rather than other minorities, as was stated in the question. Most candidates were able to provide at least one example of their treatment, such as the concentration camps, or the understanding that some groups were sterilised. A different approach was also valid, which was to identify the minorities that were targeted. Very few answers were seen that were able to link specific minority groups to how they were treated.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) This question was generally answered well, with many candidates able to identify of reasons why young people were important to the Nazis. Candidates were able to go beyond these identifications to provide at least one explanation, for example by showing that young people were seen as the future of Germany and therefore had to be indoctrinated from a young age in schools and youth groups in order to become loyal Nazis. Other explanations considered the roles that the young people were expected to adopt as they grew up, and how these would contribute to Nazi Germany, for example through women as mothers, and men as soldiers. Very few misunderstandings were seen, as candidates were confident in their knowledge and understanding.

(c) This question was not answered well, with many responses describing life in Germany generally, rather than showing what changed and what stayed the same in Germany after the start of the Second World War. Most answers were able to describe aspects of life in Nazi Germany such as the treatment of the Jews, or the control imposed through the Gestapo, but very few responses were able to develop these answers through a consideration of how the start of the war affected these aspects. Those responses which did provide an explanation normally focused on the role of women to show that before the war they were expected to not work and were instead expected to concentrate on the three Ks, but that during the war they were needed to work, as well as to carry out their roles as housewives.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) Some very good answers to this question were seen, with candidates confident in their knowledge of the impact of hire purchase. Most were able to identify that it led to greater spending, and to provide examples of the type of goods that were purchased. Many were also able to identify that it led to the growth of consumerism and that this boosted the economy as a whole. Some answers were also able to consider the negative impacts such as the debt resulting from the use of credit. Very few errors were seen.

(b) Answers to this question were mixed, with stronger responses able to explain at least one reason for the decline of manufacturing industries, but with weaker responses focusing on other sectors such as farming, which lacked relevance to the question. The valid explanations that were seen most commonly considered the impact of new fashions on the textile industry since shorter skirts and dresses required less material. Other reasons included that some older industries were unable to adapt to the new methods of production, such as the assembly line.

(c) Mixed responses to this question were seen, with many able to provide explanations on one side, but fewer providing a balanced answer. When considering whether over-production was the cause of the problems in American agriculture during the 1920s, many candidates were able to show that the end of the war reduced demand for American agricultural products, and that this led to a fall in the price, causing farmers to struggle to make a profit. For balance, responses often considered competition from other countries such as Canda, or the impact of policies such as tariffs, which also reduced demand. Some excellent evaluations were seen that were able to show the links between these other reasons and the over-arching result, which was over-production. Weaker responses often described the results of the troubles, rather than the causation, or went outside the timeframe of the question by including details of the dustbowl in the1930s.

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

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

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

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

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

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

General comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was the most popular question in the Core Section.

(a) This question was very well answered and most candidates were able to identify valid hopes that Wilson had when entering the peace negotiations. Strong responses identified four of Wilson's hopes, such as 'He did not want Germany to be treated too harshly', 'He wanted the acceptance of his Fourteen Points', 'He wanted self-determination for the people in Europe' and 'the setting up of a League of Nations'. Weaker responses included references to the aims of Clemenceau and Lloyd George, which lacked relevance to this question.

(b) This question was also answered well by many candidates who realised that the Treaty of Sevres was made with Turkey and were then able to explain its importance in relation to the break-up of the Ottoman Empire, the loss of territory, the benefit gained by other states, including Britain and France, and the response within Turkey, leading to the nationalist uprising of Mustapha Kemal and the Treaty of Lausanne (1923). Two explained reasons were provided in the strongest answers - most commonly explained were the harshness of the Treaty and the subsequent unrest, and how it was revised in 1923 in the Treaty of Lausanne. Weaker responses could often describe the terms of the Treaty of Sevres but lacked the contextual knowledge support required to explain the 'importance'. A small number of candidates had no knowledge of the Treaty of Sevres and often confused it with the treaties that Germany and Hungary received.

(c) Strong responses gained high marks for demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of how far Clemenceau achieved what he wanted in the Treaty of Versailles. The best responses were well structured, linking an aim of Clemenceau to a term in the Treaty. For example: 'Clemenceau wanted to ensure French security. France had been invaded by Germany twice in the last 50 years and he did not want it to happen again. In the Treaty the German army was limited to 100,000 men, conscription was banned, they were not allowed armoured vehicles, submarines or aircraft and only 6 battleships. The Rhineland was also demilitarised. Clemenceau was happy because the German armed forces had been greatly reduced in strength.' To produce a balanced response, explained examples of what Clemenceau did not achieve were included. For example: 'Clemenceau did not get all he wanted as, in order for France to be safe from future attack, he demanded that the USA and Britain give a guarantee that they would come to France's aid if it was attacked by Germany. Britain and the USA refused to give him promises of support over future German aggression, so Clemenceau had not achieved what he wanted'. Less successful responses often focused on his aims and why he wanted to achieve them, without relating them to any terms in the Treaty. Responses such as this did not develop arguments. For example, many candidates were aware that Clemenceau wanted Alsace–Lorraine returned and that he did get it back in the Treaty but they were unable to explain why this was so important to him. To develop this point, they needed reference to the 1870 Franco- Prussian War. In addition, a significant number of responses argued that Clemenceau wanted Germany to be divided into smaller states, whereas this was Poincare's desire, or that the Rhineland should become part of France, whereas Clemenceau really wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state. Such arguments were incorrect. Some candidates strayed from the challenge set out in the question by including sometimes extensive details on the personalities and aims of Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson, which lacked relevance.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 6

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the term 'collective security'. They tended to provide four relevant points, such as: 'It was Article 10 of the League's covenant', 'It meant that an attack on one was an attack on all', 'The aggressive country would be morally condemned by other countries' and 'Economic sanctions could be used against aggressive countries'. There was a tendency for some responses to be vague, especially where candidates did not refer to the range of sanctions available to members of the League. Some candidates made reference to acting together in the event of an attack or trying to ensure peace, without mentioning sanctions. Weaker responses lacked a proper understanding of the concept of collective security. A common misconception was that it was a firm alliance in which an attack on one country would immediately trigger the military involvement of the other league members. A few responses were left blank.

(b) Most responses demonstrated some knowledge of the work of the League's agencies for refugees and health. The fact that the Refugee Commission facilitated the return of prisoners of war and refugees after the First World War were common identifications. Similarly, the fact that help and advice was given to people about public health and the amount of leprosy was reduced were common identifications of the importance of the Health Committee. Statistics on the number of refugees helped by the Refugees Commission varied greatly between the scripts. Good explanations required supporting detail, for example by mentioning the countries most affected by the increase of refugees and the use of the Nansen Passports. On the Health Commission, weaker responses did not include any explanations. They could usually identify a disease (though not often its geographical location) but could not show how the Commission's work was important. Stronger responses highlighted the importance of the work of the agency for health by explaining that this commission became the basis for the World Health Organisation. A significant number of responses included details about the work of the ILO (or attributed this to the Health Commission) and that of the Slavery Commission. These descriptions were outside the scope of the question.

(c) This question was well answered and there were many strong responses in which candidates showed a good understanding of whether 'the successes of the League in handling international disputes during the 1920s demonstrated that it had real power'. Candidates were able to provide examples of both the successes and failures of the League in the 1920s. The disputes over the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia, and the Greco- Bulgarian border were the most frequently explained on the positive side of the argument, with the dispute over Vilna and the Italian attack on Corfu on the other side. The disputes over Mosul, Teschen and Memel were mentioned rarely, but usually effectively when they were highlighted. Weaker responses, although often secure on the successes of the League in the 1920s, were often not as focused on the failures of the League and wrote in detail about the League's failures in the 1930s (notably in Manchuria and Abyssinia). Other less successful responses included details on the success of the commissions which also lacked relevance to this question, which focused on their 'handling of international disputes'. A small number confused the chronology of the events in Corfu, and their explanation of events there was sometimes superficial or inaccurate. Some simply wrote that the League did not stand up to Mussolini, without making sufficiently accurate reference to the considerations and chain of events by which Mussolini appeared to get the better of the League in this dispute.

Question 7

(a) Stronger responses gave a clear description of how the Soviet Union consolidated its hold over Poland from 1945. They gained credit for four relevant points including: 'After the war Soviet troops, instead of returning home, stayed in Poland', 'The free elections agreed at Yalta did not happen, instead the 1947 election was rigged', 'Non-communist leaders were arrested or murdered' and 'As a result, the communists won a huge victory in the 1947 election'. Many other valid examples of consolidation were used, such as the formation of Cominform, Comecon and the Warsaw Pact. Weaker responses drifted away from the question by writing detailed accounts of the Yalta conference and the planned border changes, without mentioning consolidation of Soviet control over Poland.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. Many responses included lengthy sections on why Stalin blockaded West Berlin and the details of the Berlin airlift, which lacked relevance to this question. It is really important to read the question carefully and consider what relevant information is required before starting the response. Most responses were able to identify reasons why the Allies were determined to defeat the Berlin Blockade, including taking a stand against communism

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

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

Question 8

(a) Candidates struggled with this question or, in some case, left it blank. Most responses lacked knowledge of the Paris Peace Accords of 1973. A common misconception was that it was between the USA and USSR, regarding the reduction of nuclear weapons. A small number of strong responses understood that 'They ended the Vietnam War', 'They were to establish peace in Vietnam', 'The US troops would leave Vietnam' and 'A ceasefire was established in South Vietnam'.

(b) Most responses included accurate and detailed contextual knowledge of the reasons why President Kennedy was humiliated by the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. Good responses explained how: 'Kennedy was humiliated because he had got involved in an invasion previously planned by Eisenhower. He supplied 1400 anti-Castro exiles with arms, equipment and transport and gave them air support. They were met with 20,000 Cuban troops armed with tanks and modern weapons. Within days Castro had captured or defeated them all. This was a disaster for a new President and made him look weak.' Weaker responses often included a good description of the Bay of Pigs invasion but omitted to highlight why President Kennedy was humiliated. Some muddled the chronology of events and thought the Bay of Pigs was after the American spy plane had flown over Cuba and spotted the missile sites.

(c) This was generally well answered by the candidates. Strong responses demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of whether placing missiles in Cuba achieved Khrushchev's aims. It was important that candidates understood and outlined Khrushchev's specific aims, such as closing the missile gap, strengthening his position at home and defending Cuba. The best responses were well structured, explaining a reason why he placed the missiles on Cuba and discussing whether the outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis achieved his aim. For example: 'From the Bay of Pigs invasion, it was clear that the US wanted to overthrow Castro. Soviet arms flooded into Cuba because Khrushchev was anxious to defend Cuba. It was the only communist state in the Western hemisphere, and it had willingly become communist. It was important to him to have a communist state off the coast of America. Although at the end of the crisis the Soviet missiles were removed from Cuba, the crisis did achieve Khrushchev's aim of defending Cuba and keeping it safe. Cuba was a valuable ally to Russia and proved a useful base to support communists in South America.' This was then balanced with explanations of why he did not achieve his aims, most using the fact that he was unable to strengthen his position at home. This was because they thought he had been forced to back down and remove the missiles in Cuba. The US had removed their missiles from Turkey but that had been kept secret from the public, so he was unable to use it for propaganda purposes. Other responses would have been improved by the inclusion of less narrative and description of the events of the Crisis and by properly addressing the question set.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

(a) This question was very well answered, and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the reactions of France and Belgium when Germany failed to pay the reparations in 1922. Many were able identify four reactions such as: 'France and Belgium were angry that reparations had not been paid', 'Their troops invaded the Ruhr', 'To take raw materials such as coal in place of the unpaid reparations' and 'The French expelled thousands of Germans from the Ruhr'. A minority of responses thought that the troops invaded the Rhineland instead of the Ruhr, which was incorrect. Weaker responses also included details on the German reactions which lacked relevance to this question.

(b) There were some mixed responses to this question. Most candidates could identify why the Weimar Republic faced threats to its existence in 1919 – 20 such as: 'They did not like the terms of the Versailles Treaty', 'Some wanted a communist government' and 'Some wanted the Kaiser and the monarchy back'. The best responses used the Spartacist Revolt and the Kapp Putsch to explain the threat. It was essential to explain that the Republic needed the help of the Freikorps to defeat the Spartacists and that a general strike was needed to defeat the Kapp Putsch, otherwise the Weimar Republic could have failed very early on in its existence. Some responses included details on the Munich Putsch, which was in 1923, so outside the time limits of this question. A small number confused the left and right-wing groups.

(c) There were some strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the achievements of the Weimar Republic. The best responses explained the importance of the recovery from hyperinflation. They explained that Stresemann's economic policies helped Germany to recover from the hyperinflation, which had occurred as a result of the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr. His actions included: ending passive resistance in the Ruhr and resuming reparation payments, calling in the old currency, which had become worthless, and replacing it with a new temporary currency, the Rentenmark, and then a permanent currency, the Reichmark. Some strong responses referred to the 'double-edged sword' of the 1924 Dawes Plan, whereby Stresemann negotiated to receive American loans, which were invested into German industry and helped to sort out Germany's economic chaos and meant by 1928 German industrial production had reached pre-war levels. The downside was the economic boom in West Germany was precarious, as the US loans could be recalled at short notice, which they were in 1929. Strong responses developed a balanced argument by explaining at least two other achievements of the Weimar Republic, most commonly the foreign policy successes over the Locarno Pact and the subsequent acceptance into the League of Nations and the cultural advances. Less successful responses tended to identify achievements without including supporting contextual knowledge to develop the identification into an explanation.

Question 12

(a) Some candidates were unfamiliar with the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Whilst often realising they were antisemitic, they wrote at length about the different ways in which Jews were persecuted in Nazi Germany such as segregation, being forced to wear the 'Star of David', 'Boycotting of Jewish shops' and being dismissed from various professions. In contrast, successful responses tended to identify four valid points, such as: 'They were created during the annual Nuremberg Rally of the Nazi Party', 'Jews could not be German citizens', 'Marriages between Jews and Germans were forbidden' and 'People who broke the marriage laws were imprisoned'.

(b) This question was well answered. The importance of the Olympic Games to Hitler was understood by many candidates. The two most common reasons identified and explained were firstly, how they were used to showcase Germany and secondly, how Hitler wanted to show the superiority of the Aryan race. Other responses would have benefited from more specific knowledge to support their identifications. For example: 'Hitler wanted to show how modern, strong and successful Germany was. The brand-new stadium held up to 100, 000 spectators, it was lit by the most modern electric

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

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

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) Good understanding was demonstrated on the meaning of speakeasies and many candidates gained high marks this question, providing four valid points such as: 'They appeared during Prohibition', 'They were illegal', 'They were often run by gangsters and linked to organised crime' and 'They operated in secret'. Some responses also focused on why Prohibition was introduced, which lacked relevance to this question.

(b) Candidates were very familiar with the development of the motor car in the USA in the 1920s and there were many successful responses. The best responses emphasised the importance by explaining the impact of the assembly line both on the production of the car and the resulting effect on other industries suppling parts to the car such as glass, leather and rubber. Other explanations included the impact on the American way of life, including the building of roads and suburbs. The growth of the car industry also led to increased travel for leisure activities such as to the cinema, sporting fixtures and holiday resorts. Less successful responses were characterised by undeveloped points such as: 'They were cheap to produce' or 'They provided lots of jobs', without mentioning why or how. Often these undeveloped points were all put together in one paragraph, without any explanation. Some spent a long time on describing how the production line worked.

(c) This question was well answered. Responses demonstrated a variety of ways where intolerance was shown towards black Americans. Racism, the Ku Klux Clan, segregation, job and wage discrimination were all well known. Strong responses had a good understanding of the intolerance of black Americans during the 1920s and were able to explain the problems with clarity and precision. They most commonly explained the activities of the Ku Klux Clan and their use of violence against black Americans, especially in the southern states. They equally had a wide-reaching knowledge of the intolerance of immigrants in the 1920s, illustrated by the Emergency Quota Acts, the Red Scare, race riots and the Sacco and Vanzetti case. They used in-depth contextual knowledge to support their argument and develop their analysis of how each factor demonstrated intolerance to the two different groups. Weaker responses tended to be stronger on the intolerance of black Americans and less confident on the problems caused by intolerance of immigrants, resulting in a one-sided response.

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

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

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.
- 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 restating what has already been written 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 majority of answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and had acquired a great deal of information and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions, which reward recall and description. Many candidates answered these questions appropriately, in the form of a short paragraph. The best answers to **part (b) and (c)** applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or including information which lacked relevance. These responses developed each factor fully. A significant number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. These responses avoided repeating points already made in the essay and instead explained and analysed how far the argument both supported and disagreed with the focus of the question. Less successful conclusions were limited to assertions on 'how far'.

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 a popular question. Responses focused on suspicion of the League of Nations, the Senate's rejection of the Treaty and the US adoption of isolationism. Some answers included the US view that the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh on Germany. This was a stronger response than generalised comments which did not go beyond, for example, 'US politicians were unhappy'.

Part (b) responses were answered well. Two causal factors included explanations of revenge and Clemenceau's efforts to ensure that Germany was so weakened that it would not be capable of attacking France again. Good quality answers followed a familiar pattern of identifying two points, explaining them, and adding supporting evidence. For example, 'Clemenceau wanted a harsh peace because he wanted to make sure that Germany could not invade France again. He wanted to weaken Germany's armed forces and strengthen France's borders. Germany had a bigger population than France and the two countries had a

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

common border, so Clemenceau was worried that there was always the danger of another attack by Germany. France had been invaded in 1914 and in 1870.'

Most candidates showed good knowledge in **part (c)** when they focused on Lloyd George (not the other peacemakers), balancing an explanation of terms which suggest that he achieved his aims and those which suggested he failed to do so. Some less successful responses contained statements of Lloyd George's aims but no comments on success or failure in attaining them. Good answers balanced Lloyd George's success in acquiring colonies, reducing the German navy and checking attempts to destroy the German economy with disappointment, as he feared a future war of revenge, and that German speakers had been put under French and Polish rule.

Question 6

It was rare to read a weak answer to **part (a)** – different types of sanctions were mentioned, i.e., moral, economic, military, as well as attempts to bring together two disputing sides in discussions. References to collective security were accepted.

Candidates displayed great knowledge of the Depression but did not always apply their knowledge to the question asked in **part (b)**. The best answers focused on why the Depression made the work of the League of Nations more difficult. For instance, candidates explained that collapsing economies meant a reluctance to enforce economic sanctions, which in turn led to a reliance on moral condemnation - a weaker method of dealing with aggressive nations. In addition, the Depression was cited as a reason for aggressive militarism in the context of Japan and Germany's threat to the League's Charter.

In **part (c)**, candidates gained credit for comparing the relative successes achieved by the League' agencies on the one hand, with the way it dealt with disputes on the other. The key was to relate knowledge to what might be defined and regarded as successes. This proved more straightforward when writing about disputes, concluding that in the cases of, for example, the Aaland Islands and the Bulgaria Greece quarrel, the League made judgements which were accepted, leading to peaceful settlements. When discussing the work of the agencies, there was a tendency to narrate what they did and assert that this was a success. In higher level analytical explanations, success was related to the scale of the work undertaken or to the magnitude of the problems which the agencies tackled.

Question 7

Candidates knew many detailed points about the decisions made at Yalta concerning Poland in **part (a)**. These included free elections, changes in both western and eastern borders, plus the combination of Lublin and exiled Poles in the government. Reference to Poland being in the Soviet sphere of influence was also credited.

The best responses to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question which focused on why the Marshall Plan was important to the US. Identified factors included American efforts to keep communism out of Europe and the advantages to its economy from trade. Good quality answers followed a familiar pattern of identifying two points, explaining them, and adding supporting evidence. For example, 'The Marshall Plan was a way establishing US control over western Europe. It made western Europe dependent on the US and drew it into the capitalist system. America needed to sell its goods to keep its economy going. Europe would only be able to buy these goods if it was in good economic condition. So, the Marshall Plan was to help Europe recover after the war, and then it would provide markets for American goods.'

The aim in **part (c)** was to write a balanced answer and explain how far, between 1945 and 1948, the USA and the USSR disagreed over the future of Germany. Responses tended to express disagreement at the expense of agreements. The former focused on explaining disagreements about reparations, and the impact of the establishment of Bizonia, leading to the start of the Berlin Blockade. On the other hand, areas of agreement were developed. For instance, at Yalta the US and USSR faced a common enemy, so they agreed on the division of Germany and Berlin, and the treatment of war criminals and denazification.

Question 8

Candidates were generally secure in their knowledge of the end of Soviet control in Eastern Europe, **part (a)**. Valid references to 1989 included Solidarity winning elections in Poland, free movement across the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communist governments in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania. Answers which mentioned the dismantling of the fence between Hungary and Austria also gained credit.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

The next question, **part (b)**, asked about the importance of Dubcek. Good responses showed understanding of two causal factors, his Prague Spring freedoms, and the realisation of Soviet determination to block reform.

The **part (c)** question enabled candidates to construct effective arguments comparing the perceived threat to the USSR posed by Hungary in 1956 with that posed by Solidarity in 1980 – 81. The best explanations dealt with the violence of the Hungarian rising compared to the large-scale support enjoyed by Solidarity at that time. In each case, the relative danger to the Warsaw Pact was used to reach a supported judgment. For instance, 'Hungary in 1956 was a bigger problem for the USSR because it was a violent uprising against Soviet control. There were demonstrations against Soviet control and Nagy started to introduce reforms. He even said that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact. This was very serious for the USSR because it would weaken the Warsaw Pact and communism generally. The Soviets sent in tanks and troops and there were battles in the streets. Soviet control in Hungary was nearly overthrown, which would have also weakened the Soviet Union.' On the other hand, 'I think that Solidarity was a bigger problem for the Soviets. In 1980 in Poland mass strikes and demonstrations started. These were well organised by Solidarity which was a trade union. By August, the government had agreed to all of Solidarity's demands and by 1981 its membership was over 9 million. It was strong enough to form a government and it also announced that it was fighting for the rights of people across communist countries. This was a real threat to Soviet control in Poland and could have spread to other Soviet controlled countries. It was so serious that the Soviets ordered the imprisonment of Solidarity's leaders, and the organisation was crushed.'

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

The best answers to **part (a)** described the disadvantages of tanks in the First World War (too slow, prone to breakdowns, difficult to manoeuvre across No Man's land) and/or advantages (they caused panic amongst the Germans, could break through the wire and protect the infantry). It was rare to read specific answers about military engagements at Cambrai or Amiens.

There were detailed narratives of the Battle of Verdun in **part (b)**, although the best answers met the specific demands of the question, focussing precisely on why the French were so determined to defend it. Explanations included the point that it was crucial to the outcome of the war. For example, 'If the Germans had won, they would have gained a clear strategic advantage because the accessible route to Paris would have been exposed, making the city vulnerable. Taking the French capital would probably have given the Germans victory, so defending Verdun at all costs was the priority.' The best answers added a second point, for example explaining the threat to French morale.

When answering **part (c)**, candidates knew a great deal about Haig and there were some balanced arguments analysing the proposition that he mismanaged the Battle of the Somme. The failure of planning which marked the failure of the advance on the Somme was explained in detail. On the other hand, good responses showed an appreciation that Haig was right to fight the Battle of the Somme as he did. The Western Front was fought through trench warfare. There was no choice about that, as it was a new type of warfare. He, like everyone else was trying to find new tactics for fighting this type of warfare. His methods did work to some extent. Many Germans were killed, Verdun was relieved and, as a result of the Somme in 1917, the Germans retreated to the Hindenburg Line. Weaker answers would have been improved by a focus on the Somme, rather than making general points about Haig's role as an army commander.

Question 10

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

Question 11

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**; there were detailed references to freedom of expression, new painting styles like that of George Grosz, Bauhaus architectural style and the new stars of the German cinema.

In **part (b),** candidates wrote extended narratives of the problems of the early Weimar Republic but struggled to directly address the question. The Treaty of Versailles was important to the Weimar Republic because the Republic was blamed for terms. For instance, candidates wrote that many Germans did not believe that Germany had been defeated and when they heard the terms of the peace treaty in 1919 they were

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

disgusted. Germany had been blamed for the war, had to pay reparations, and had lost most of its armed forces, as well as land. Ebert, who headed the first government of the Republic, had to sign the treaty but as the first act of the new Republic this was a disaster. The treaty was important to the Republic because it led many people to oppose the Republic.

There was often good knowledge of the economic problems faced by the Weimar Republic in **part (c)**. Balance was achieved in many strong answers which, on the one hand, explained that Stresemann brought stability and confidence back by reorganising the currency and negotiating American loans. On the other hand, candidates explained that Germany's economic recovery was an illusion as it was based on foreign loans, which were recalled after the Wall Street Crash; agriculture never fully recovered, unemployment remained stubbornly high and small businesses continued to struggle.

Question 12

Candidates in **part (a)** were able to describe Nazi racial theories; four separate points or two well developed points were provided by many candidates.

The increasing dissatisfaction with the Nazi regime during the Second World War was less well known in **part (b)**. Good answers explained and developed identified points, such as life in the Hitler Youth became stricter and less enjoyable, or the effects of food rationing, longer working hours and less freedom. Some candidates included that the SS's control continued to increase alongside intense propaganda designed to counter the impact of Allied warfare, such as bombing raids.

Some found it difficult to apply relevant knowledge to both sides of the **part (c)** question about how far women accepted Nazi policies towards them. Candidates wrote more confidently about those women who did accept what the regime offered them. For example, they were bribed to do the things the Nazis wanted them to do, like get married, have lots of children and stay at home and look after the family. They were given rewards for having children. They were also bombarded with propaganda about their 'proper roles'. This happened at school, in the German Maidens' League and everywhere around them. They were conditioned into thinking the Nazi policies were the right ones. On the other hand, counter arguments referred to the fact that in peacetime, some were very unhappy when they were forced out of the professions and discouraged from being in the workplace. These women had enjoyed the freedom brought about by having their own careers. This had all been introduced during the Weimar Republic and these women did not want to lose their new independence and freedoms. Stronger answers were able to argue from both sides, although it was more common to read unbalanced answers.

Question 13

In **part (a),** responses to the question about Stolypin's agricultural reforms focused on peasant land banks, that wealthier peasants were allowed to buy land, resulting in a 'middle-class' of peasantry who owned their own farms. Production increased and new farming methods developed. The importance of the October Manifesto was well known, as shown by answers to **part (b)**. Candidates recognised that here was a possibility that, if the Tsar took no action, he would be overthrown. To prevent this, Nicholas needed to reform Russia and satisfy some of the discontented groups. In his October Manifesto, the Tsar offered the people reforms. The middle-class liberals were delighted that their voices would now be heard, and they supported the Tsar in putting down the revolution. Many answers went on to explain the impact of the Duma and gained credit for this.

Candidates produced some balanced responses in **part (c)** to explain the reasons for the abdication of the Tsar in 1917. Factors such as the impact of the Tsar on the progress of the war and the roles of the Tsarina and Rasputin were well known. The best answers, when dealing with the rioting aspect of the question, were able to move beyond narrative and explained why it was so important. For instance, 'Rioting brought St Petersburg to a standstill. When the Tsar ordered his army to put down an alternative government set up by the Duma, it refused. Soldiers then joined the demonstrators and they marched to the Duma, demanding it took over the government. At the same time, revolutionaries were setting up the Petrograd Soviet to control the city. It was clear that the Tsar was finished.' Taken together, these points, which represented the proposed factor and alternative causes, constitute a strong response. The best answers went on to make a judgement which explained links between the immediate and background factors.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 14

Answers to **part (a)** tended to make generalised points about the severity of the losses imposed by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk; specifics such as Russia losing 34 per cent of its population, most of its coalmines and having to pay 300 million gold roubles, featured in the best responses. **Part (b)** revealed good understanding of the importance of Kornilov in 1917. His part in exposing the weakness of the Provisional Government while strengthening the Bolsheviks was well explained – two paragraphs each containing an explained reason often characterised the best responses.

Part (c) enabled many candidates to compare the relative importance of War Communism and the NEP. Some strong arguments balanced the crucial role played by War Communism in contributing to the victory in the Civil War, with its unpopularity (citing the anger of the Kronstadt sailors) paving the way for the NEP, which probably saved the Bolsheviks by allowing limited private ownership and an end to famine, as food production increased.

Question 15

In **part (a)**, candidates knew many of the benefits the motor car brought to people's lives in the 1920s. Better answers focused on jobs, people moving to live in suburbs, more holidays, and leisure opportunities.

Responses to **part (b)** tended to be descriptive and would have benefited from more reference to the word 'important'. The best answers explained that this was a disagreement over Darwin's theory of evolution, and the impact of the case. For instance, 'A teacher broke the law by teaching the theory and was put on trial. It was important because it showed the difference in beliefs and way of life between those living in towns and those living in rural areas. People in the country tended to be very religious and believed what the bible said literally. They believed God made humans to be like him. Some people in the cities believed in the theory of evolution and thought that the rural dwellers were 'backward'.'

For **part (c)** it was important to balance whether or not prohibition achieved its aims. When narratives were linked to the demands of the question, stronger answers resulted. Good responses recognised that, while prohibition was supposed to make America a better place, there was evidence of gangsterism, illegal production, corruption and violence. Stronger responses typically identified other factors such as reductions in the amount of alcohol drunk by Americans, which fell by 30 per cent in the 1920s – in many rural areas it was popular and strictly enforced. Less damage was done to many families, while people were arrested for breaking the law and many illegal distilleries were seized and closed.

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

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- Candidates should provide a direct answer to the question, rather than repeating what a source says or shows. Every question instructs candidates to use details of the source. Using the details means selecting appropriate material to answer the questions. A good way to make sure that the question is being answered is to use the wording of the question in the first line of the answer. So, for example, if the question is *Why was this source published?* The answer should be started with 'This source was published because…'.
- Time management is important. There is enough time to read through, and think about, the sources before starting to answer the questions. Knowing what is in the sources as a set will help in answering all the questions. But it is also important not to use too much time up on this. Candidates need to ensure that they finish the paper and leave sufficient time for **Question 6**, which carries the most marks.
- In some questions, whether or not you can believe the author of a source is an important issue. In evaluating this, candidates often check what the source says or shows against their background knowledge or against what other sources say. This is called cross-reference, and it can be an effective way of judging a source's reliability (although if the cross-reference is to another source, then the reliability of that source is clearly also important). In stronger responses, candidates use their understanding of the possible purposes the author might have had in saying what they did. Sometimes, in less successful responses, this is attempted but only the provenance is used, producing general assertions such as 'This source was from an election speech, so she was just trying to win votes.' Evaluation of purpose needs to use contextual knowledge to explain why that particular speech was being made at that particular time, as distinct from any speech being made at any time. If they are done well, these analyses of purpose will always be the most persuasive and effective answers.

General comments

Most scripts were complete and there was little indication that candidates experienced a shortage of time. In general, the sources were understood well, and candidates showed a good level of contextual knowledge with which to support their answers where appropriate. It was relatively rare to see successful source evaluation. Not all questions invite source evaluation, but in those that did, candidates sometimes seemed unaware of it, and answered instead on the source content taken at face value. Questions asking for interpretation and comparison of content were often answered rather better. A large majority of answers were on the twentieth-century option, though there still significant numbers on the nineteenth century.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth-century topic

Question 1

The essential point in answering questions that ask for sources to be compared is to match 'like with like'; in effect, there has to be a common criterion on which the comparison is based. Some candidates struggled to do this on the two given sources. There were, though, several similarities, and many answers gave, for example, the idea that imperialism was about 'civilising', something explicit in Source A but clearly also present in Source B. Others found agreements on the need for markets, or on markets being closed by protectionism. More candidates could have looked at the overall messages of the sources and detected the approval of both authors of imperialism.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

Many responses would have been improved by contextual awareness of what the Kaiser's purpose might have been in making his speech. Answers tended to be based firmly on the content or the provenance but some found it a challenge to pick a comprehensible message out of the source, candidates struggling to make sense of what the Kaiser was saying. The best of the answers used the provenance to infer general purposes, such as raising morale, or encouraging the recruits to serve their country.

Question 3

In order to identify agreements and disagreements, candidates first had to interpret the two cartoons. There were a number of misinterpretations of either one or both of them, most often Source E, which was seen as disapproving of imperialism because of the people being killed. Other responses were generally able to show some understanding of Source D. However, comparisons tended to be on details, such as 'Cape to Cairo', rather than on the views of imperialism presented by the cartoons.

Question 4

In general, candidates struggled to produce a reasoned answer on whether or not they found Source F surprising. However, some candidates were able to give a genuine reason for surprise – most often for the fact that German soldiers engaged in putting down the rising were showing some sympathy and understanding of the Africans.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to provide reasoning for finding the advertisement useful as evidence about imperialism. Although many responses just saw it as evidence of the way imperialism would improve the lives of all nations around the world, a good number moved beyond that to seeing the source as revealing attitudes of imperialists to people in other parts of the world.

Question 6

Some responses appeared to be addressing a slightly different hypothesis – generally on whether or not imperialism was a good thing. The given hypothesis was on motives for imperialism, specifically on whether spreading 'civilisation' was the main reason for it, and better responses dealt with this aspect. Less successful answers had difficulty in using sources to illustrate the given motive, or to find alternative motives. These answers went through what the sources said or showed but would have benefited from greater engagement with the hypothesis.

Option B: Twentieth-century topic

Question 1

The two sources offered plenty of agreements and disagreements of detail, and most candidates managed to successfully match the sources for at least one of these. Better answers provided examples both of agreements and of disagreements. In less successful responses, some candidates summarised the content of the first source, and then wrote 'However…' before going on to summarise the content of the second, but there was no explicit matching of any detail from the content of both sources. The basic principle underlying the idea of comparison is the process of matching 'like with like', that is, there must be a common criterion on which the comparison is based. Some answers put content from both sources together, and clearly thought a comparison was being made, but the material used did not constitute a genuine match. The best answers looked beyond the detail of the two sources and considered instead the opinions or points of view of the two authors, noting that the writer of Source A was broadly understanding and sympathetic towards Chamberlain/appeasement, whilst the writer of Source B viewed appeasement negatively, seeing it as a mistake.

Question 2

Though the cartoon was usually interpreted accurately, the reasons given for publication were limited in range, being based on the context or on the message of the cartoonist. These could be general to the situation in the mid-1930s, or specific to the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, which had occurred a few days before publication. The specific answers were the stronger ones, particularly if they made the point that the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

cartoonist was critical of the European leaders depicted. It was unusual to see an answer that also considered the cartoonist's purpose. This would in turn be based on an awareness of the audience, which, given that the source was a British cartoon, could be assumed to be the British people, and by extension, British politicians, including the government. The purpose would be the intended outcome of the message – in other words, the cartoon was published to get Britain to do something about Hitler's aggression, by trying to push the government into action, or by getting the public to protest at the government's inaction.

Question 3

This question required candidates to compare the two sources, to notice the differences, and to reach a conclusion based on the fact that the two sources disagreed. Some responses did not follow this approach and weaker responses did not engage with the issue of resignation at all. Others jumped to the issue of whether or not Cooper should have resigned, and answered on the basis of only Source D or Source E. Most other answers made a valid comparison and either concluded that the difference between the two sources did indeed mean that Cooper had to resign, or, slightly better, saw that Source E was actually a response to Source D, and that Chamberlain was thus explaining why Cooper need not resign. More candidates could have gone on to consider whether Source E was accurate and/or credible. This could be done by looking at Chamberlain's purpose in presenting the Munich agreement in the way he did. He had an obvious motive in making it look as good as he could. Alternatively, contextual knowledge could have been used to show that whatever Chamberlain said about Munich, there were still a few voices raised at the time against the agreement. In other words, answers could have been based on not taking Source E at face value, and thereby reaching the conclusion that Cooper should still have resigned.

Question 4

This question was answered well by most candidates, who were able to give contextually informed reasons for why they were surprised or not by the content of Source F. Some of these were more persuasive than others. For example, it was common to see anachronistic arguments expressing surprise that the source was celebrating war being avoided, when war actually broke out less than a year later. Others simply explained how the source was consistent with Chamberlain's policy of appeasement, so therefore could not be surprising. Better was to explore the idea of whether, given the circumstances of the time, the source could be seen as surprising. This could be done by referring to Hitler's previous record of aggression and breaching international agreements – why would people believe that this time anything would be different? Alternatively, other answers explained that there were critics of appeasement, who were pointing out the deficiencies and shamefulness of the Munich agreement – why, then, would anyone want to celebrate it? The best answers were able to explain why it was not surprising that a British newspaper would want, at that particular time, to represent events in this way. This was a true reflection of mainstream British public opinion at the time.

Question 5

Being asked to compare two cartoons requires that they are first interpreted. In this respect, candidates struggled more with Source G than with Source H. Firstly, it was often seen as a comment on the Munich agreement, but it predated the conference. Secondly, it was seen as critical of Chamberlain, which was a clear misinterpretation. The cartoon certainly sees the chance that Chamberlain might not succeed in saving the world, but it depicts him as admirable for trying. Despite this, most answers included some valid points of comparison, such as Chamberlain trying to save peace in both sources, or being strong in Source G but weak in Source H. Better answers saw the cartoons as comments on appeasement's prospects of success, where Source G could be interpreted either way, but Source H definitely indicated that it would fail. Best of all were comparisons of the points of view on appeasement as a policy (which could be given as points of view about Chamberlain), with Source G approving and Source H disapproving.

Question 6

This question always asks candidates to use the sources to test how far the given hypothesis can be supported from the evidence. The essential point is that the content of the sources has to be used in the process of explanation. Sometimes the content is sufficient in itself, but often some additional explanation is needed to relate the content to the hypothesis. So, with these sources, aspects of Source B, for example, could be seen as requiring little extra comment in showing appeasement was an error. It would be enough simply to say, 'Source B shows appeasement was an error because it says World War Two could have been avoided had the democracies been prepared to stop Hitler earlier.' In contrast, simply describing Source C would not be enough in itself. Rather, it would need to be explained, for example, 'Source C shows appeasement was an error. It shows European leaders failing to stand up to Hitler over the remilitarisation of

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

the Rhineland. It means that by failing to do this, they are dooming themselves to having to give in to any of Hitler's future demands.' Without the additional explanation, the source would not have been effectively used. Most answers contained a mixture of proper source use and attempts that fell a little short of making clear the link to the hypothesis. Since candidates are generally well aware that they should be looking for evidence both supporting and countering the hypothesis, most answers succeeded in explaining at least one source on each side, though some responses appeared to just want to show that appeasement was an error. Some candidates did not demonstrate any valid source use. These could be answers that made reference to the sources, but without finding material that related to the hypothesis; they could be answers that wrote about appeasement without engaging with the sources; they could be answers that were based on what appeared to be an alternative hypothesis. A final way in which attempts at source use lacked validity was where sources were grouped, and generalisations made about the group. This only worked if the generalisation was valid for all the sources in the group.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

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

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

Question 2

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

Question 3

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

Question 4

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

Question 5

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

Question 6

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

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

Question 2

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

Question 3

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

Question 4

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

Question 5

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

Question 6

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and all the sources before attempting to answer the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main focus of the paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding should help them to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. Candidates should directly address the question in the very first sentence of their answer, for example, 'The photographer (Source C) would have/would not have agreed with the cartoonist (Source D)…' or 'Source E is useful/not useful because…'.
- Avoiding descriptions of visual images and paraphrasing written sources is important. There is no need for candidates to write summaries of the sources before engaging with the question. It is their interpretation of the sources that is important.
- On **Question 1**, candidates do not need to write a summary of Source A, followed by a summary of Source B. They should engage with the question immediately and try to address similarities and differences between the two sources from the outset.
- On **Question 6**, candidates must ensure that the sources are used as the basis of the answer. They should not write a general commentary using their own knowledge in response to the question asked. Candidates should engage with the content of each source and make it clear whether they are using it to agree or disagree with the given statement. They must explain *how* the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question. Candidates should also ensure it is clear which source is under consideration by referring to it by its letter and by explicit reference to its content. This could be, for example, in the form of a quote or by relaying what can be seen in an image. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support *and* challenge the given hypothesis. The highest levels cannot be achieved if only one side of the argument is addressed.
- 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 quotation that misses out some of the words and replaces them with ellipsis points. The words that are used must make sense and support the point the candidate wants to make, so giving the quotation in full is crucial.

General comments

Most of the scripts were on the twentieth-century option, so there were too few responses on the nineteenth century option for meaningful comments to be made. Most candidates completed all six questions. There were very few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both options. A good number of candidates were able to produce responses that demonstrated the necessary source handling skills and the ability to apply contextual knowledge relevantly.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well and most candidates were able to identify agreements between the two sources. For instance, the sources both agree that the British government did not want war or that they took no military action, the British public had some sympathy for the Germans and that the British government was keen on Hitler's offer of a non-aggression pact. Many candidates were also able to pick out differences, explaining, for example, that in source A, the British government did try to persuade the public about the need for rearmament, while in Source B there was no real attempt to do this or that in Source A, the British government has a clear policy, whereas in Source B this is not the case. The best answers were from candidates who were able to explain the overarching 'big messages', that being that the author of Source A believes that British policy over the Rhineland was understandable, whereas the author of Source B is critical of the policy of the British government. As mentioned above, candidates should avoid summarising each source and then simply asserting that they agree or disagree. Point-by-point comparisons work best, and these must be based on common criterion. For example, to compare the French opinion of the importance of the Rhineland in Source A with British opinion in Source B would not be comparing 'like with like'. However, to note that Source A says the French were not interested in the Rhineland, whereas Source B states they were, is a valid match.

Question 2

In **Question 2**, candidates were asked to consider two visual sources and conclude whether the photographer (Source C) would have agreed with the cartoonist (Source D). Many were able to make inferences from the images and explain how the photograph does or does not support the cartoon. The most commonly cited example being that the crowds cheering and saluting the Nazis' arrival in Source C shows that the people supported the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and this support is mirrored in Source D and is evidenced by the numerous Nazi flags on display. The support from the crowd in Source C could also be used to show disagreement between the two sources when compared with the deserted streets in Source D. What is important in a question like this is that candidates consider the opinions of those who created the sources. In this case, their opinions about the remilitarisation of the Rhineland differ; the photographer clearly supports the actions of the Germans, while the cartoonist is critical and disapproving. If candidates could explain these contrasting views and use details from the sources to support this, they could achieve strong answers. The best responses were by those who could additionally evaluate the photograph by considering what the motives of the photographer might have been.

Question 3

There were many good, but few outstanding answers to this question, which asked about the usefulness of Source E for a historian studying the crisis over the Rhineland. Many were able to make valid inferences about the British position or Eden's views, identifying, for example, that the British wanted to avoid military action or sought to stop the French from acting. However, few answers went beyond this. It was possible to evaluate Source E through cross refence to other sources or the use of contextual knowledge to argue that it is useful or indeed, not useful. For example, Source E suggests that the French might 'demand action of a military character.' However, knowledge and reference to other sources, for example Source A, might suggest otherwise. The source is nevertheless ultimately useful; it explains why Hitler was able to act in the way that he did - that is the appeasing attitude of the British facilitated the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. Moreover, the fact that Source E is a private, rather than public document, makes it useful as this ensures it gives us a genuine insight into the real views of the British government.

Question 4

The focus of this question was two written sources, one by Eden and the other by Churchill. Candidates were asked whether Churchill's words make Eden's surprising. Many candidates were able to identify points of disagreement, or in a small number of cases, agreement, between the sources and used these to explain surprise and/or a lack of surprise. While there were numerous disagreements, the most commonly referenced were that Eden says Germany is interested in peace, while Churchill argues that this is not the case and that the Germans will move to incorporate Austria imminently. Another disagreement was over collective security. Eden argues Germany wants to promote a system of peaceful security, while Churchill maintains that collective security has broken down. The best responses were from candidates who could make a valid comparison between the sources and then explain a reason for the disagreement (or agreement) based on an evaluation of at least one of the sources. For example, in Source F, Eden's purpose could be to justify his lack of action and in Source G, Churchill could be justifying his own stance and proving

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

that he was right. A number of candidates came to a conclusion about whether or not they were surprised and based this solely on an evaluation of Source F, without making any comparison between the two sources. It is important that candidates base their responses on the sources specified in the question.

Question 5

This question, which asked why Flandin attended a particular meeting of British politicians, businessmen and journalists, proved challenging for a number of candidates. Some of the responses mainly repeated what Source H said and then asserted that Flandin attended the meeting to say these words. Better answers inferred a valid purpose from Source H and concluded that the meeting was attended by Flandin so that he could convince the British to act in support of France or to take action against Germany. Equally valid were responses based on the context of the time which discussed how the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and connected developments prompted Flandin to attend the meeting. What was crucial in achieving a higher level response was a consideration of why Flandin was meeting with this specific group of people at this specific time. His purpose was to get the British politicians, businessmen and journalists to create pressure on this topic and spread the word to convince the British to act because, at this time, the British government was not acting in the way that he wanted.

Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved strong answers by carefully explaining how some of the sources can be seen as providing convincing evidence that British policy over the Rhineland was justified, while others argue that British policy was not justified. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Other responses would have been improved by candidates making it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. 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. An example of this could be: 'Source B shows that British policy over the Rhineland was not justified. It tells us that the British government mistakenly trusted Hitler, they 'ridiculously argued that Hitler must be a sensible man' and were 'naïve enough to believe that, if they got around a table with Hitler, they would be able to come to terms and avoid war.' They also 'missed the last opportunity to stop Hitler'.' Another issue 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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

It is important that candidates have an understanding of the concept of significance. They should understand that something or somebody can be significant in some ways but not in other ways. They should also be aware that judgements about significance are provisional and can change if, for example, significance is considered from a different perspective.

Candidates' titles should enable them to use a range of criteria to make judgements about significance. It is recommended that 'significant' is used in the title.

Candidates should not work their way through a list of criteria in a mechanistic way. They need to be aware of possible criteria and then decide for themselves which will work well with their subject.

Narrative and description are not required in candidates' answers. Candidates should try to keep to the assessment of significance all the way through.

Candidates should try to assess significance, rather than describe or explain it.

General comments

The overall standard of work was high, with many excellent assessments of significance, although there were still some weaknesses. Most of the titles used were suitable and the marking was generally accurate.

Comments on specific questions

Most titles were suitable and allowed candidates to assess significance in a broad way, using a range of criteria. There were many assignments on different aspects of the Germany Depth Study, but other Depth Studies were also used, such as Russia and The First World War. Examples of the types of title that worked well included:

Assess the significance of the New Deal for the USA.

Assess the significance of Stresemann.

Assess the significance of the Great Depression for Germany.

How significant were the Five-Year Plans for Russia?

How significant were Nazi policies towards women, 1933 – 45?

How significant were technological innovations during the First World War?

Some titles (see list below) led candidates to treat the subject, for example, the Depression, as a causal factor. This led to candidates writing about other causal factors and comparing their importance. In fact, these other factors often accounted for well over half the answer. The titles in the list above allowed candidates to use a range of criteria and to consider the different ways in which their subject may have been significant. Of the titles in the list above, the ones that used 'Assess the significance of…' were the more likely to encourage assessment. Examples of the types of title that worked less well included:

How significant was the Depression in Hitler coming to power?

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

How significant was the war at sea in the Allies victory in the First World War?

How significant was the Reichstag Fire in consolidating Hitler's power?

Some thought should also be given to the choice of subject. Often figures such as Stresemann or Goebbels work for assessments of significance, while figures such as Hitler are generally too large to be handled well.

The best answers were based on an understanding that their subject, for example the New Deal, was significant in different ways and for different reasons. For example, candidates could assess the political, economic and social significance of the New Deal. Alternatively, they could assess its significance for different groups such as the rich, the poor, farmers, black Americans and the two main political parties. Another approach could consider the immediate and longer-term significance of the New Deal. One way of approaching significance that worked well was to compare what was happening before and compare this with what developed afterwards. This can help candidates to judge if there was much change and how far this change mattered. It might even raise the issue of turning points. The best answers finished with a conclusion that compared the different ways in which, for example, the New Deal was significant, and reached a judgement about the most important way in which it was significant.

It is important that candidates try to assess significance. Some candidates described or explained how their subject was significant but did not get quite as far as assessment. The best answers used supported arguments to convince the reader that their subject was significant in some ways but not in others. There was a tendency for other candidates to assume that their subject was significant and that they just had to explain how. There was also a tendency in some answers to equate significance with success. Some of the best and most interesting work was seen where candidates explained that a factor was significant because it failed.

Some candidates wrote overly long sections on other factors, while some started their answers with much descriptive background material, which was not necessary and did not contribute to the assessment of significance. Others simply explained what a historical figure did, or explained the outcomes of an event or development, without really commenting on the significance. They would have improved their responses by asking themselves the question – why and how far did the achievements of an individual or the outcomes of an event, matter? This would take them closer to assessment of significance.

Much of the marking of the coursework was done well. The generic mark scheme was often used accurately and both marginal and summative comments were helpful. It is important to remember that a 'best fit' approach should be used when using the mark scheme. Candidates should not be expected to match every statement in a level. Their work will often contain elements of one level and elements of another. It is important to consider an answer as whole. The crucial question to ask is - which level in the mark scheme best reflects the qualities of this answer as a whole?

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework 41

Key messages

A limited range of Depth Studies was undertaken, with Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45, Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–1941 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41 being the most popular. There were also a small number of responses for Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18. Overall, answers showed a limited ability to select or recall adequate contextual knowledge, in order to answer the question. Most candidates attempted balance in their answers, although some responses would have benefited from more details. Few candidates produced brief plans but many of the successful answers seen used these to select relevant information which could be used to specifically answer the question. Occasionally, however, plans showed a lack of understanding of the question, as material was included which was not relevant. In such cases, the question was not fully answered or not answered at all, with no relevant material included. Material should be selected and deployed to answer the specific question set. Some candidates are providing detailed background information. Instead, they need to provide material which can be deployed to answer the question.

General comments

Some answers lacked development but still managed to produce balance by providing relevant and detailed descriptions. In a number of other responses candidates picked up on only part of the question and wrote a narrative response, sometimes with limited links. At times candidates missed the chronological parameters of the question. Some of these less successful responses wrote unfocused descriptions covering an unspecified time period. Candidates need to firstly look at the question and know exactly what it is asking, recognise the time parameters set and organise their work through planning. There were also some rubric infringements where more than one question was answered. These were mainly candidates who answered questions on all the Depth Studies.

Successful answers should be balanced and address the question directly, deploying contextual knowledge to fully support a line of argument. They need to make judgements and come to conclusions which are well explained and supported with evidence.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1

This question required candidates to give reasons for the outcome of the First World War. The given factors were the Battle of Verdun and the Battle of the Somme. To achieve balance other aspects, for example the British Blockade of German ports, the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive and the German Revolution of October 1918, needed to be considered. Responses to this question would have been improved by greater contextual knowledge and focus on the question.

Question 2

The focus on this question was on the reasons for Germany's defeat in 1918. The given factor was the entry of the United States into the war. To achieve balance, factors such as the failure of Operation Michael, Germany leaving the Hindenburg Line and events within Germany such as the Kiel Mutiny, could be included. There were very few responses to this question but some of the answers seen were able to select relevant material and use this to answer the question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Question 3

This question was the most popular for this Depth Study. The question required candidates to show why Nazi support grew between 1930 and 1932. The given factor was propaganda but to achieve balance, other reasons such as the Great Depression and mass unemployment, the weakness of Weimar coalitions and their inability to handle the crisis, and the fear of Communism, would need to be considered. There were many good responses to this question. These responses carefully chose valid contextual material and kept to the timeframe of the question. Less successful responses did not do this and instead wrote about propaganda more generally. This included examining propaganda before 1930 and also focusing on the use of propaganda during the Nazi period post-1933. There were references to Goebbels as Propaganda Minister, and the use of radios and censorship, which was not possible until the Nazis were in power.

Question 4

This question asked candidates to consider increasing Nazi control over Germany after 1933. The given factor was the role of the German Labour Front (DAF). To achieve balance, other factors such as the role of the SS, the use of concentration camps, propaganda and the Hitler Youth Programme, would need to be considered. A number of candidates struggled with their knowledge of the DAF and this meant that they were unable to produce balanced responses. There were some good references to other forms of control such as the SS and concentration camps.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Question 5

This question focused on the reasons for the fall of the Tsar in March 1917, with the given factor being the impact of war on the civilian population. To achieve balance, other factors such as long-term issues of land reform, the role of revolutionaries such as the Bolsheviks and SRs, the lack of food and heating in the cities and poor working conditions, needed to be addressed. Some candidates focused too much on the Russo-Japanese War, which could be relevant but needed to be linked to the eventual downfall of the Tsar in 1917. There were some more focused descriptions of the impact of the Tsar going to lead the army and leaving the Tsarina in control, although these sometimes lacked specific detail.

Question 6

This question asked candidates to give reasons as to why Stalin introduced the Five-Year Plans. The given factor was to modernise industry so, to achieve balance, aspects such as removing the Kulaks and NEP men, taking control of the economy to centralise his own power and the need to improve defence, needed to be discussed. Fewer candidates chose this question than **Question 5**. Some candidates did not fully address the reasons for the introduction of the Five-Year Plans and instead wrote descriptions of their achievements and outcomes.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

Question 7

This was a popular question among candidates and it asked candidates to look at the causes behind the economic growth in the USA during the 1920s, with the given factor being the availability of credit. To achieve balance, other relevant factors such as the role of the car industry and Assembly Line, Republican policies and availability of natural resources, needed to be discussed. Successful responses understood the role of credit such as Hire Purchase and were able to show how this led to increased sales and economic growth. Other responses were confused by the different forms of credit and mixed up loans used to buy consumer goods with the buying of shares on the margin. In such answers, candidates were unable to explain the importance of credit and so could not effectively answer the question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

This question was less popular than **Question 7** and it asked candidates to look at the consequences of the Depression. The given factor was the Bonus March. To achieve balance, other factors could have included growing unemployment, widespread homelessness and poverty, the building of 'Hoovervilles' and the migration of agricultural workers to towns. Roosevelt becoming President could also be a valid consequence. Many of the responses would have benefited from more detail. Some went on to examine the New Deal era, which did have some relevance, but was not the main focus of the question.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework 42

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 reach conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies was undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41. A number of candidates attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18, Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41 and Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E (China) and Depth Study F (South Africa) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced answers with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, and a very small number managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or failed to properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1 was the more popular choice this session with only a small number choosing **Question 2** for their response.

Question 1 was generally well answered. Candidates had a good knowledge of the BEF and its impact on the development of the war on the Western Front by the end of 1914. Many good responses were able to provide detailed descriptions of how the BEF contributed to the Battles of Mons, the Marne and the First Battle of Ypres, and assess their importance in the development of the war. This was then compared against other factors such as Belgian resistance, the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, Russian mobilisation and the impact of new technology on the Western Front. The strongest answers gave well-selected examples to support their explanations and made convincing judgements in their conclusions about the most important factor. Weaker responses tended to include errors in contextual knowledge or, more commonly, material that went beyond the end date cited in the question, frequently referring to the battles in 1916 and beyond. It is vital that candidates read the questions carefully and make note of any chronological parameters.

Question 2 produced a small number of good responses which were able to give details about the impact of recruitment on the Home Front and some good descriptions of the early volunteer army created by Lord Kitchener through to the implementation of compulsory military service, as created by the Conscription Acts in 1916. Balance was commonly provided by examining other significant factors that impacted the Home Front such as the Defence of the Realm Act, women's war work and rationing in 1918, due to unrestricted submarine warfare and censorship. Less successful responses tended to lack depth and breadth in their

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

material and were very limited in terms of providing specific examples about the British Home Front. A small number of candidates also mistook the British Home Front for the front line in Belgium and France.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Both **Question 3** and **Question 4** were answered by many candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates had a sound knowledge and good understanding of the economic problems faced by Weimar Germany by 1923. Good answers focused on the economic impact of the First World War, particularly the huge debt run up by the Kaiser's government, and the financial terms of the Treaty of Versailles, most specifically the reparations and its consequences for Germany, such as the occupation of the Ruhr and hyperinflation. Balance was provided most frequently by comparing and contrasting alternative factors that led to instability. This often included political violence from extremists, the resentment caused by the War Guilt Clause of the peace settlement and the territorial losses and military restrictions imposed on Germany by the Allies in the Treaty. Many explanations and conclusions were very convincing and were well-substantiated with precise and detailed evidence. Weaker responses lacked the precision and detail found in stronger answers and gave limited descriptions, often containing factual errors, including statistics, dates and events. Some candidates confused the Ruhr and the Rhineland, and others quoted the reparations figure incorrectly.

Question 4 was also generally well answered. Some of the strongest responses had a very good grip of Nazi policies towards women and were able to give detailed descriptions of the three Ks, the marriage loans the Nazis implemented and the use of the Mother's Cross as a reward for childbearing. Many candidates then assessed the significance of these policies by explaining how the introduction of conscription and the outbreak of war led to the Nazis abandoning many of these policies in favour of women's war work. Some candidates also compared and contrasted Nazi policies towards women with other factors such as youth policy, rearmament, racial and antisemitic policy, for example. This gave the strongest answers a great deal of scope and range to reach substantiated conclusions. Other responses would have been improved by going beyond limited descriptions and general assertions and providing in-depth contextual knowledge. Often these less successful responses were one-sided, rather than balanced.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Both questions were attempted, although **Question 5** was answered by more candidates.

Question 5 was generally answered well this session. Candidates were able to give some good detail about Stolypin and his reforms and explain how his carrot and stick approach helped restore the Tsar's authority after the 1905 Revolution. Many candidates cited Stolypin's agricultural reforms that allowed peasants to leave the mir and buy more land using the Land Banks, as well as his increased use of execution by hanging for perceived opposition to the Tsar. Balance was achieved in many answers by comparing and contrasting the importance of Stolypin with other factors that helped restore the Tsar's authority such, as the October Manifesto and the setting up of the first State Duma, the provision of some civil rights for the public, the use of the army, Cossacks and Okhrana to deal with strikes, riots and political opponents. The best responses contained detailed and well-supported explanations and reached conclusions about the relative importance of the different factors. Weaker responses tended to drift too far from the focus of the question and examined in too much detail the nature of Bloody Sunday and the 1905 Revolution, which were causes of the instability in Russia, and so largely lacking in relevance to this question.

Question 6 saw a few good answers that were able to provide convincing arguments and assess the significance of political opposition as a reason why Stalin launched the purges in the 1930s. These responses focused on the removal of 'Old Bolsheviks' such as Zinoviev and Kamenev in show trials, as well as thousands of other members who were not Stalinists. This was then compared against other causes such as Stalin's desire to remove perceived opposition in the armed forces, to remove potential opponents in the general public and even in the NKVD itself, in order to cement his autocratic rule in the Party and state. The strongest responses were able to make some assessment about the most significant causes of the purges in the 1930s, but a good number would have benefited from greater contextual knowledge or much less focus on the consequences of the purges. A few of the weaker responses did not address the question properly and focused their answers purely on the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation instead.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular Depth. Both questions received a high number of responses.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 7 proved a challenge for a good number of candidates. Many responses would have been improved by addressing the question more accurately and by showing a greater understanding of the technological innovations or older industries referred to in the question. Innovations included the increased electrification of homes and industry, the use of assembly line production methods, new materials such as rayon and Bakelite, new machines such as tractors and combine harvesters and newer fuel sources such as oil and gas. Older industries included the coal, textile (cotton, silk and wool primarily) and farming industries. Good responses were able to explain how these newer innovations led to overproduction in older industries and thus lowered prices for goods and decreased profits for the farmers or factory owners. This in turn led to decreasing wages and higher unemployment for workers and labourers, especially black Americans and the new immigrant population. A small number of candidates was able to provide convincing counterarguments by examining alternative factors such as the issues caused by high tariffs and the retaliatory tariffs imposed by foreign countries, new fashions which saw older textiles decrease in popularity and the decreasing demand for foodstuffs and other materials after the war. A good number of responses focused more on giving reasons for the economic boom or identifying older industries inaccurately and providing material on entertainment industries.

Question 8 generally produced responses of good knowledge and understanding of the significance of tariffs, candidates able to cite specific examples in their explanations. The best answers fully understood how import tariffs in the USA led to a tariff war with foreign countries, which damaged the USA's ability to export surplus goods overseas, and thus led to severe overproduction and economic instability by 1929. This was then contrasted with other significant factors such as the role played by speculation, inequality of income across the USA, the decline of older industries such as coal and textiles and the increasing debt built up by the public due to hire purchase schemes and buying shares 'on the margin'. Explanations and conclusions were often very convincing when fully substantiated with accurate evidence. Weaker responses commonly misunderstood how tariffs worked and missed that it was the retaliatory tariffs that actually hurt the US economy, rather than the import tariffs imposed by the Republican government.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates.

Question 13 was well answered in most cases and demonstrated some excellent contextual knowledge and understanding of Arab-Israeli relations since 1945. Many candidates were able to give detailed facts and precise examples to support their explanations of how and why the Yom Kippur War impacted Arab-Israeli relations, commonly referencing the oil weapon, the nature of the surprise attack on Israel, the global Cold War dimension of the conflict and the future peace process that would evolve out of the conflict, and a desire for a diplomatic solution. This was then contrasted with other important factors such as the roles of key individuals like Sadat, Begin and Carter, the role played by the superpowers, previous Arab-Israeli conflicts and the actions of Arafat and the PLO, amongst others. The best answers were well-structured and coherently argued, with some providing convincing and substantiated judgements in their conclusions. A small number of less successful responses tended to lack the necessary depth and range in contextual knowledge of the period since 1945 and often repeated examples or gave general assertions instead of supported assessment, which is necessary for high level answers.

Question 14 was also well answered by many candidates. Good answers were able to provide a wealth of detail about the significance of the PLO and how it both contributed and was sometimes detrimental to the peace process. Many responses referred to the role Arafat played in the PLO and how he transitioned from promoting militancy to promoting diplomatic methods among PLO members and explained how and why this aided the peace process. This was then balanced against other significant factors in the development of the peace process such as the role of the USA and the United Nations, the Intifadas, international sympathy for the Palestinian cause, the changing nature of Israeli support for the process and the impact of Islamic fundamentalism and Arab nationalism. The strongest responses provided precise examples to support the assessment of significance and then reached convincing judgements in the conclusion. A small number of the weaker responses would have benefited from the greater depth and breadth required to fully assess significance at an adequate level. These answers tended to have more generalised assertions and limited

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

descriptions. Some candidates overly focused on the period before the peace process and instead examined Israeli-Palestinian relations in a more generalised fashion. Some of the resulting material was inaccurate and lacking in relevance.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework 43

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 reach conclusions.

General comments

A small range of Depth Studies was undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany,1918–45 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States,1919–41. A number of candidates answered from Depth Study A: The First World War,1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia,1905–41. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E (China), Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced answers with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, and a very small number managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or failed to properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1 was a more popular choice among candidates than **Question 2** this session.

Question 1 was generally well answered on the whole. The strongest responses got to grips with the focus of the question and had a good knowledge of the changes made by von Moltke to the Schlieffen Plan and were able to explain how and why this led to the Plan's failure by the end of 1914. Most candidates examined the changes von Moltke made to the route and composition of the German armies on the Eastern and Western Fronts. This was then balanced against other factors such as Belgian resistance, BEF entry into the war, rapid Russian mobilisation and the impact of new weapons and technologies. Descriptions were very often detailed and precise and there were some well-developed explanations supported by well-selected examples in the best answers. Weaker responses tended to lose focus on the question and gave sometimes detailed narratives of the early months of the war, although a few candidates drifted into 1915 and beyond, which was not relevant to this question. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters set out in the question.

Question 2 produced a small number of good responses that were able to give details about the contributions women made on the British Home Front such as war work, farming and public service roles. This was then compared to other factors linked to the war effort such as recruitment, censorship and the Defence of the Realm Act, most commonly. However, descriptions and explanations were lacking examples in many responses; their inclusion would have led to greater depth and breadth and, therefore, better answers. A small number of candidates did not address the question properly and examined how women contributed to the war effort on the front line, rather than the Home Front.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Question 3 was the more popular choice, with only a small number of candidates attempting **Question 4**.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates had a sound knowledge and good understanding of Stresemann's foreign policy achievements and were able to give details in their explanations of how this helped lead to increased stability in Weimar Germany between 1924 and 1929. Many responses examined the impact of the Dawes and Young Plans, the Locarno Treaties, as well as Germany's membership of the League of Nations. This was then contrasted against other relevant factors such as Stresemann's economic policies, political stability in Germany and cultural developments. The best responses gave supported explanations and reached valid judgements about the most important factor/s for increased stability in this period. Less successful responses tended to lack contextual knowledge or focused too closely on giving background information about the beginning of the Weimar period immediately post-First World War, which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 4 proved to be challenging for some candidates. Candidates on the whole were unable to give adequate detail and examples about the impact of the Second World War on life in Nazi Germany and instead either confused the Second World War with the First World War or focused more generally on Nazi Germany after 1933. A small number of good responses were able to provide descriptions and explanations of how rationing, women's war work, Allied bombing campaigns and the implementation of the Final Solution affected life in Germany, which in this instance, included the Greater Germany area. This was then most commonly compared and contrasted with how life had been in Nazi Germany before the war. Some candidates opted to demonstrate how some aspects of life in Nazi Germany such as propaganda, censorship and the police state remained mostly unchanged, whilst others stressed how these aspects, especially the crackdown on opposition groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates, became more prominent during the war. There were some attempts at reaching conclusions and final judgements, but these tended to be largely unsubstantiated.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Both questions were attempted. **Question 5** was the more popular choice among candidates.

Question 5 was generally answered well. Candidates were able to give details about the impact of the Russo-Japanese War and how this led to increased opposition to the Tsarist government. Many candidates were able to provide good examples of socio-economic and political impact and make valid links to the outbreak of the Bloody Sunday incident in their responses. This was then compared to other factors such as the 1905 Revolution, the peasant land issue and the poor living and working conditions faced by many Russian workers in the cities. The best responses contained detailed and well supported examples in their explanations, which allowed the candidates to reach a final judgement in their conclusions. Other responses would have benefited from much stronger contextual knowledge or much greater focus on the parameters set out in the question. A few candidates mistook the Russo-Japanese War with the First World War and some disregarded the 1914 cut-off point and examined the period up to 1917 and beyond.

Question 6 saw some common errors from candidates. Candidates, on the whole, had a strong contextual knowledge of how and why the Red Army were significant in terms of winning the Russian Civil War. Whilst this was a relevant point, it was not the sole focus of the question, which required candidates to examine how significant the Red Army was to the consolidation of Bolshevik rule. This led many candidates to only answer the question in terms of why the Bolsheviks won the Civil War. Some stronger responses did acknowledge the parameters and focus of the question more accurately and examined other factors such as the roles of Lenin and Trotsky, War Communism and the NEP, the use of the Cheka and the Red Terror. These answers were much more balanced in their approach, allowing candidates to reach some well substantiated conclusions about which factor was the most significant.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular topic, with **Question 7** answered by many more candidates than **Question 8**.

Question 7 was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to give some valid material on the importance of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. This was most commonly expressed in terms of their social and political impact. Many candidates examined how the KKK grew in membership, how they reinforced segregation in the South, supported Prohibition and promoted anti-communism during the Red Scare. Some

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

candidates also gave examples of specific Klan violence, as well as other crimes they committed. This was then balanced against other factors such as the entertainment industry and its impact on American culture, Prohibition, the economic boom, as well as other forms of intolerance such as religious fundamentalism and increasing anti-immigration sentiment. The wide scope of the question allowed candidates to reach many different valid conclusions. Weaker responses were often lacking contextual knowledge and gave more generalised narratives of the USA in the 1920s, with many also extending the scope of their answers to include the 1930s Depression era, which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 8 had some good responses. The strongest answers were able to give a good level of detail about how and why the Republican Party opposed the New Deal reforms of Roosevelt, which often included their opposition to his higher public spending, taxation and interference in states' rights. This was then balanced against alternative opposition such as businesses in the form of the Liberty League, radical opposition from the likes of Huey Long and Dr Townsend and, most importantly, the Supreme Court, where some of the best responses were able to cite specific examples of cases that challenged the New Deal such as the 'Sick Chicken' case. There were some very convincing explanations and conclusions given by candidates who had an in-depth knowledge of the New Deal era. Other responses tended be much more generalised or even one-sided in their approach, which led to vague descriptions and assertions in the answers provided.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2023