

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

There were too few candidates for us to be able to produce a meaningful report.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 1

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully to make sure responses are focused and relevant.

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

General comments

Part (a) answers should focus on specific detail or information and many responses used this approach. Explanation is not required. A small number of candidates wrote very lengthy responses to **part (a)** which resulted in them having insufficient time to fully develop their responses to **part (c)** questions.

Parts (b) and **(c)** require explanation. Better responses tended to avoid narrative or long introductions which 'set the scene'. In **part (c)**, candidates need to argue both for and against the focus of the question to reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should not be a repeat of points made earlier, and it should address 'how far' or 'to what extent'. A number of candidates managed to reach a valid judgement in this way. Less successful responses tended to reiterate earlier narrative material and often included information lacking in relevance.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

- (a) There were many candidates who gained very high marks by focusing on what Lloyd George wanted to achieve (rather than on what he achieved). Brief statements such as 'he wanted a firm and just peace', 'he wanted Germany's war-making potential reduced', 'he wanted a peace which avoided Germany seeking revenge' and 'he wanted to maintain the power of the British Navy' would gain good marks. A short paragraph, or four brief sentences, featured in some of the stronger responses. Some candidates continued at great length even though they had gained maximum marks in the first few lines.
- (b) Successful responses to this question explained the aims and motives of Clemenceau and Wilson, and explained how they contrasted Lloyd George's aims. The most successful answers explained separately how Clemenceau's aims were often opposed to those of Lloyd George and then explained how Wilson's aims were not always similar to Lloyd George's aims. It was essential for high marks that Lloyd George figured in the answer. Some responses just quoted what Wilson and Clemenceau wanted and assumed these were contrary to Lloyd George's aims. Some candidates correctly explained that Lloyd George had difficulty in determining his own aims because of what he had promised the British public in a recent election.

- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating a clear and detailed understanding of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Effective responses to this question briefly noted the terms that limited the German military but then went on to explain how this hurt the pride of the German nation and also explained how this gave the Germans a feeling of being defenceless. Stronger responses then went on to explain how other terms of the Treaty left the German public dissatisfied. These would include the 'War Guilt Clause', the high reparation payments, the lost land and peoples in Europe and the lost colonies. The best responses were able to weigh up whether the military restrictions, or one of the other terms, brought the biggest dissatisfaction.

Question 6

- (a) There were many clear and concise responses to this question. Most candidates were able to list four actions of Hitler in a few sentences or a short paragraph. The most common responses included that 'Hitler re-armed', 'He introduced conscription', 'Hitler re-militarised the Rhineland' and 'Hitler withdrew from the League of Nations'. Some candidates missed the dates given in the question and went on to include Hitler's conquests after 1936.
- (b) Two well-explained reasons were required for this question. Many candidates explained that many thought Britain was not ready to fight because of military cutbacks and the economic problems caused by the Depression. Other candidates pointed out that many people considered Communism a bigger threat than Nazism and a strong Germany would resist Communism spreading. Another relevant point made was that Britain could not rely on Commonwealth countries' support so soon after the horrors of the First World War, while the USA was in isolationism and unlikely to help in the event of war. Many candidates managed to explain at length two good reasons.
- (c) Some candidates appeared not to know what happened at Munich. This resulted in one-sided answers which revolved around Britain and France warning Hitler over Poland and then declaring war when Hitler invaded. Successful responses showed that Munich helped create war by giving Hitler confidence in that he gained territory, military strength and eventually the whole of Czechoslovakia. It also gave Hitler the impression that the Allies would not intervene if he made Poland his next target. Some candidates gained credit for pointing out that Munich made Stalin realise he needed to ally with Hitler to save the USSR and this allowed Hitler to invade Poland because he would not have to fight on two fronts.

Question 7

- (a) This question was very well answered. The vast majority answering this question gained very high marks. Points such as 'The future of Germany was discussed', 'The future of Poland was discussed', 'The hunting down of Nazi war criminals' and 'The setting up of the United Nations was discussed', were all acceptable. Some candidates went on to explain, in great detail, the discussions over Germany and Poland.
- (b) Answers to this question were variable in quality. Weaker responses made statements such as 'Truman was anti-Communist and confrontational' or 'The Americans had successfully tested an atomic bomb just before the meeting'. The stronger responses explained that 'Truman was confrontational because Stalin had not kept to the agreements made at Yalta, when it had been agreed to have free elections in Eastern European countries'. Similarly, 'Truman felt he would have the upper hand at the Conference because he had just told Stalin that the USA had just tested an atomic bomb and this made Stalin nervous'.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained how both Stalin and Truman contributed to the causes of the Cold War. Many candidates explained how Stalin's failure to abide by decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam, the forming of Cominform and Comecon and then the blockading of Berlin, contributed to the cause of the Cold War. Similarly, good responses explained how the 'Truman Doctrine', Marshall Aid, the establishing of Bizonia and the setting up of NATO equally contributed to the causes of the Cold War. Less good answers often described these points in detail without explaining how they contributed to causing the Cold War. Some candidates wrote about the Korean War, Cuban Crisis and the Vietnam War, which all occurred during the Cold War, but did not cause it.

Question 8

- (a) Of the small number of candidates who attempted this question, most were able to produce two or three of Nagy's planned reforms, but some struggled to find a fourth reform. The most common response was that Nagy wanted to remove Hungary from the Warsaw Pact, followed by wanting Soviet troops to withdraw. The '3 Fs' of 'freedom of speech', 'freedom of the press' and 'free elections to be held' could also be cited.
- (b) Some candidates found it a challenge to produce two well explained reasons. Those that produced an explained reason tended to show that Brezhnev came under intense pressure from other communist leaders, such as Gomulka and Ulbricht, who feared their own citizens would want the same changes Dubcek was suggesting for Czechoslovakia and this would put their communist parties under threat. Candidates could have explained that Brezhnev was fearful of Dubcek taking Czechoslovakia out of the Warsaw Pact and he was fearful of him setting up the Social Democratic Party, which would be in opposition to the Communist Party.
- (c) There were well-developed answers to this question. To argue for and against the focus of the question, most took the view that the Wall stopped people leaving East Berlin and it hid the attractions of West Berlin. Candidates explained well how the Wall went up to stop the 'brain drain' of engineers, teachers, scientists and skilled workers to the West. They correctly pointed out that East Berlin needed these talented people and it had been losing them for years. As the question implied, the other side was keeping western influences out of East Berlin. Candidates explained that the Wall attempted to hide the attractions of the West, such as the higher standard of living, the variety of goods in the shops and popularity of Capitalism.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

- (a) This question was very well answered, with a large majority getting the maximum marks. Many of the candidates made many points more than was necessary. The use of the SS, the murder of Rohm, the murder of Schleicher and the execution of 400 would have been sufficient. Some candidates extended their answers to over a page in length.
- (b) There were some excellent responses to this question. The most well explained reason was that Hitler wanted to keep the support of the army generals, who were unhappy with Rohm's plans to unite the army with the SA, with Rohm as Head of the army. Hitler needed to take action against Rohm or the army generals might turn against him. It was pleasing to note that many candidates explained how Rohm wanted a second revolution with radical policies, which would upset business leaders and Hitler needed the support of business to fund the economic recovery and his armed forces. Weaker answers often only stated that Rohm was a threat as he was a rival for leadership or that the SA was now an embarrassment to Hitler. These points needed to be expanded and explained to gain higher marks.
- (c) This proved to be a testing question for many candidates. There were a number of one-sided answers, and some would have benefited from more content and explanation of why the failure of the Weimar government to deal with the impact of the Depression led to Hitler being appointed Chancellor. It was common for simple statements to be expressed such as 'benefits were cut' or 'the government could not cope with high unemployment' without showing how this led to Hitler's appointment. On the 'other side', there were well explained reasons considering Nazi propaganda, Hitler's oratory, Nazi support for farmers, Nazi support for traditional views and the ability to put over who was to blame for Germany's woes. Candidates were also able to explain successfully the arrangement between von Papen and Hindenburg, which allowed Hitler to be appointed Chancellor.

Question 12

- (a) This question was well answered, with a large majority of the candidates gaining maximum marks. Many went through the subjects taught as 'physics lessons concentrated on weapon making', 'Nazi racial beliefs were reflected in the teaching of biology' and 'history lessons taught about the November Criminals'. Candidates also stated that lessons showed loyalty to Hitler or the lessons showed hatred to the Jews.
- (b) Answers to this question were variable. Effective responses explained how the Nazis wanted the German youngsters in the Hitler Youth so that they could be indoctrinated into following Nazi ideas and beliefs and to show their loyalty to Hitler. It was important to explain how the movement prepared boys and girls for their respective roles in Nazi society. Many developed this well, showing the type of activities done in the movement and the benefits this would bring to the nation in the future in a Nazi Germany.
- (c) Strong responses to this question showed when the policies towards women and the family were successful, and when they were not successful. Candidates could explain that the encouragement for women to have children did have success as the population increased. Candidates could explain that the policy of encouraging women to stay at home failed during wartime when they were encouraged back to work. Less successful responses provided a long narrative of what the policies were, but without suggesting whether they were successful or not successful. It is important to read and determine the focus of the question.

Question 13 and 14

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

Question 15

- (a) The majority of the small number of candidates who answered this question scored high marks. The most common responses were that Sacco and Vanzetti were anarchists, that they were eventually executed for the crime and that they probably did not commit the crime. Candidates could also have stated that the trial judge was biased, that the trial was more about their beliefs than the crime itself, that there were numerous appeals and that it was not a fair trial.
- (b) Most candidates produced one explained reason and this tended to centre on the change from radio being mainly a news network to being one of light entertainment. This allowed candidates to include much detail on dance bands and artists such as comedians, impersonators and instrumentalists. Most candidates struggled to find a second explained reason, including simple statements such as 'radios were cheap and therefore most households had them'. A good second explained reason could have been the decline in the Vaudeville and Variety theatres resulting in an increased place for radio and allowing many of the variety club stars an extension to their careers by performing on the radio.
- (c) This question produced mainly one-sided answers. There was much detail on the Anti-Saloon League and the Women's Temperance Union's activities and their reasons for their actions. Answers tended to agree with the statement given in the question by explaining the damage done by alcohol in the form of poverty, crime and damage to the family. Candidates struggled to find non-social problems to explain. Candidates could have improved their responses by explaining how business thought Prohibition would be good for the economy as it would reduce absenteeism and promote hard work. There was also an anti-German feeling just after the First World War and many brewers were of German descent, therefore making alcohol unpopular with those pressing for Prohibition.

Questions 16 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 2

Key messages

This paper focuses on the ability to use historical sources in their historical context – to interpret, cross-reference and evaluate them. Contextual knowledge is not the main focus but it is still important as it helps candidates to interpret and evaluate sources. All the questions are primarily about the sources and so candidates' answers should be as well.

When using a source, candidates should also consider the provenance – who wrote or drew it, when it was produced and whether it was private or public. This will help candidates work out the purpose of the source which is always an important aspect of the source to consider.

Candidates should try to use their source skills to answer the questions. Rather than simply displaying source skills, candidates should deploy these skills to answer the question set. The best answers were those that directly addressed the question in the first sentence. These answers then went on to develop the reasoning and support. It is not necessary to produce paraphrases or descriptions of sources.

When using a cartoon, candidates should try and use all the clues in the cartoon, including its date and place of publication, to work out the big political point that the cartoon is making. This will help candidates to explain its message and its purpose. Candidates should be careful not to read cartoons literally.

Finally, when answering comparison questions, candidates should make direct point-by-point comparisons and should avoid simply summarising the two sources.

General comments

The overall performance of the candidates was very good. Most had a clear understanding of what they had to do and dealt with the sources most effectively. There was almost no evidence that the sources were not understood or that candidates were struggling to explain what they wanted to say. No candidates failed to complete all six questions. Very few candidates attempted the nineteenth century option. The majority of candidates demonstrated that they could interpret and evaluate sources and make appropriate use of their knowledge and understanding of the historical context. **Questions 1, 2, 4 and 5** were answered very well. **Question 3** responses were generally less successful. Some of the stronger candidates could, with a little more focus, have produced better answers to **Question 6**.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

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

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates saw this cartoon as being critical of Truman or the United Nations. This question posed no difficulties at least as far as working out valid sub-messages. However, better responses managed to explain the big message of the cartoon – that UN intervention in Korea showed that it was not going to make the same mistakes that the League of Nations made. A reasonable number of candidates identified this big

message. The question asked about the ‘cartoonist’s’ message and a number of candidates could have improved their answers by explaining that the cartoonist was expressing approval of UN and US actions. Some responses would have benefited from contextualising the cartoon to Korea.

Question 2

Nearly all the candidates explained how Sources B and C differ. This however, was not what the question asked. To achieve good marks, candidates needed to go on and focus on not just what the sources say but where they come from. A good number of candidates did this and were able to explain why Truman and Gromyko would have different perspectives of the events in Korea. The best answers focused on the purpose of the two sources and explained how and why their intended impacts on their audiences were different.

Question 3

On this question many candidates appeared to be unfamiliar with the concept of ‘surprising’. The starting point to answering this question is to find agreements and/or disagreements between them. For example, Source D claims that South Korea was causing trouble, whereas Source E claims that it was North Korea. Source D suggests the Soviets were supporting and encouraging North Korea, while Source E suggests that Stalin decided to withdraw support. Candidates can base their answers simply on the fact that the sources agree or disagree. However, it is important that they use agreements or disagreements between the two sources to state whether they think Source E makes Source D surprising or not. Better answers went on to evaluate one or both the sources, for example, candidates argued that as Khrushchev swept away much of Stalinism when he came to power, what he says about Stalin cannot be trusted and so Source E does not make Source D surprising. Some candidates struggled because they were not sure what they were trying to explain and a good number did not get as far as the agreements and disagreements between the two sources.

Question 4

This question produced many good answers. Most candidates were able to reject Truman in Source F because of the contradiction with Source G about the motives behind Truman’s actions. A good number of candidates went further and cross-referenced to other sources or to their knowledge and understanding of the period. Explanations included those based on knowledge of containment, the Truman Doctrine and the Domino Theory. Going on to consider Truman’s purpose in his memoirs would have further improved answers.

Question 5

This question was also answered well. Candidates knew a lot about General MacArthur and used this knowledge to explain the message of the cartoon. However, the question required candidates to go beyond this and explain the purpose of the publication of the cartoon. Many were able to do this by suggesting that it was published to increase opposition to the USA. Some candidates would have improved their answers by setting them in the context of the Korean War.

Question 6

Candidates had a clear understanding of what they had to do with this question and based their answers on use of the sources. Many candidates scored high marks on this question by carefully explaining how some sources agree, and others disagree, with the statement that American intervention in Korea in 1950 was justified. The key to producing a good answer is to keep focused on the hypothesis and not wander on to an alternative one. A few candidates could have achieved better marks. Some stopped after explaining how the sources agree with the statement, while others did not fully explain how sources agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis. Some candidates simply identified appropriate sources and made assertions about them. They would have improved their response by including proper explanations, e.g. ‘Source E does provide evidence that justifies US intervention because it states that the North Koreans were trying to cause an internal explosion in South Korea to allow the North to take it over. This gave the US good reason to intervene – to protect the South from this threat.’ Many candidates attempted evaluation but most struggled to achieve it in a valid way. Better responses did not simply evaluate a source. They explained how the evaluation related to the provision of evidence in relation to the hypothesis, e.g. does it make the evidence from a source that supports the hypothesis stronger or weaker?

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

General comments and Key messages

A small range of Depth Studies were undertaken in this examination session. **Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45** was the most popular choice among candidates. There were also some responses for **Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41** and **Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945**.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide-range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported or sustained arguments. Less successful answers contained much narrative, description or background information, and often did not properly address the question that was set. Some candidates wrote at length about a particular topic or Depth Study instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and to ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. This is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

Comments on specific question

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

There were too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates though **Question 3** proved the more popular choice.

Question 3 was generally well answered by candidates. Good responses contained plenty of examples of how significant Hitler was as a reason for the Nazi Party gaining power. Most commonly cited were Hitler's role in the Nazi Party, his publicity from the Munich Putsch, his oratory skills, his creation of the SA and Hitler Youth, and his manipulation of events such as the Reichstag Fire to increase his power. This was then balanced with other factors that helped the Nazis gain power such as propaganda, the effects of the Depression, 'negative cohesion', particularly fear of Communism, and the role of political leaders such as Hindenburg and von Papen. The strongest answers explained these factors convincingly and provided a breadth of factual evidence to support their arguments. A few responses attempted to make valid judgements about the most important factor. Weaker answers tended to be narratives of the Nazi Party from 1919 to 1933. Some responses drifted outside of the chronological parameters of the questions set and examined Hitler's early life or went too far forward and looked at elements of life in Nazi Germany when the Nazis had already gained power.

Question 4 was chosen by a small number of candidates. The strongest answers examined a range of factors that demonstrated the significance of the Church opposition such as Catholic opposition from Bishop Galen and the demonstrations against the T-4 Euthanasia Programme, protestant opponents such as Niemöller and Bonhoeffer and the setting up of the Confessional Church. This was balanced by both explaining why Church opposition was effectively dealt with by the Nazis in the form of the concordat, the closing of Church schools and youth groups as well as the use of concentration camps and also by examining other forms of opposition in Nazi Germany. Most commonly cited were youth opposition such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement and army opposition, in particular the July Bomb Plot. Less successful responses lacked specific knowledge of many of the events or were too descriptive. A few responses became narratives of life in Nazi Germany and were not focused on the demands of the question.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

There were too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

A small number of responses were seen to **Question 7**.

Question 7 was generally well answered by candidates. The best responses gave a wide variety of examples of mass marketing techniques such as advertising, credit and hire purchase schemes and the use of mail order catalogues. A few responses linked this with mass consumption and mass production. This was then balanced by examining and explaining the importance of other factors that led to the boom such as the new inventions and techniques like Henry Ford's assembly line, confidence in the economy, the USA's natural resources and the impact of the First World War. A number of the responses were well focused on the question and made valid judgements and conclusions on the relative importance of these factors. Weaker responses tended to be mainly descriptive, though generally rich in facts and figures.

Question 8

There were too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

There were too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

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

There were too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A small number of responses to **Question 13** were seen, but no candidates chose **Question 14**.

Question 13 was reasonably well answered. Knowledge of Jewish militant groups was good and most candidates were able to cite the important actions taken by groups such as the Haganah, Irgun and the Lehi. Most commonly cited were the attack on the King David Hotel in 1946 and various attacks on British soldiers. This was then balanced by examining other factors that led to the British withdrawal from Palestine such as the influence of the USA and Zionist sympathisers, Jewish immigration and British actions. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive and lack the factual range and depth of the period. There were some less successful responses in which the answer only examined the actions of Jewish militants and contained no balance.