

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

Key messages and General comments

A significant number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. Candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments for their chosen questions. The majority of candidates used their time effectively, and were able to answer all the required questions. There were only a small number of candidates who were unable to complete the paper.

Candidates should ensure that they read and follow the instructions given on the paper carefully. There were more rubric errors than in previous examinations, with some candidates attempting questions on several depth studies, rather than the one required.

A small number of candidates wrote very lengthy responses to part (a) questions, which resulted in them having insufficient time to fully develop their responses to part (c) questions. Candidates should be encouraged to plan their time more effectively.

Parts (b) and (c) of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach.

Comments on specific questions

The following comments do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help centres in improving the preparation of their candidates.

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

- (a) There were some well – constructed answers to this question, with candidates focusing in particular upon Garibaldi's actions. Candidates are expected to have knowledge of the events of the revolutions in Sicily and in Naples; there were some answers that were written in very general terms, such as those just saying that they were successful.
- (b) There were some well - argued explanations to this question, especially of the role of the Orsini Bomb plot in Napoleon's decision to become involved. There were also some very general responses.
- (c) Answers to this question focused mainly on the role of Cavour; this was explained effectively. Candidates can improve their responses by looking at both sides of the argument - this will help in accessing the higher marks; for this question they could also have explained the roles of Mazzini and Garibaldi.

Question 2

The limited number of responses to this question make meaningful comments difficult.

Question 3

- (a) This question was answered extremely well. Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the Underground Railroad and the Fugitive Slave Act in particular. Most candidates achieved full marks.

- (b) Candidates were able to identify a number of reasons why the North disagreed with the South over slavery. Explanations focused mainly upon economic and moral reasons.
- (c) Candidates were able to explain that black Americans gained little from the Civil War, with the main focus usually being on the role of the Ku Klux Klan. Few were able to explain positives; most identified the freedom aspect. A small number of candidates explained the importance of the Reconstruction Act. Candidates need to ensure that their answers are firmly placed within the time period being studied, in this case the nineteenth century. There were a number of answers where candidates focused upon events in the 1950s and the 1960s.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates displayed in depth knowledge of the Alliance System in their responses to this question. Most focused their answers upon the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance, detailing their membership, the dates of formation and how the alliances came about.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give a detailed explanation of the contribution of the naval race to tension between Britain and Germany. A few candidates were also able to explain tensions relating to the Kaiser's desire for a German Empire, the rival alliances, and to the situation in Morocco.
- (c) Candidates demonstrated an excellent understanding of reasons for the outbreak of the First World War; naval rivalry between Britain and Germany, the Alliance System, Germany's desire for an empire and military growth were all cited. Some candidates were less secure in their understanding of how problems in the Balkans contributed to the outbreak of war. Answers could have been improved by demonstrating an awareness of the tensions between Serbia and Austria-Hungary and how this related to the assassination of Franz-Ferdinand; this could then be linked to the Alliance System drawing countries into conflict and ultimately to the outbreak of war.

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge of the restrictions upon Germany's ability to attack France. Answers focused upon the demilitarisation of the Rhineland, restrictions on the number of soldiers, conscription being banned and Germany not being allowed tanks or military aircraft. Candidates are expected to focus on the question set; this question referred specifically to restricting Germany's ability to attack France, whereas some candidates listed every term of Versailles they could remember, resulting in the inclusion of much irrelevant detail.
- (b) There were many clearly explained responses to this question. Answers detailed Germany's role in the escalation of events in 1914 into war, Germany's punishment of Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the damage inflicted upon Belgium and France. Some candidates focused their answers upon *how* Germany was punished in considerable detail; their responses would have been improved by focusing on *why* Germany was punished, as asked in the question.
- (c) Some candidates specified the problems faced by the peacemakers, such as the problem of French security, the problem of repairing the damage done and the problem of preventing a further war. These were then explained with clear reference to the various treaties and whether or not the treaties did actually solve the specified problems. Some less successful candidates simply listed the terms of the various treaties, rather than explaining the problems faced by the peacemakers. Others misinterpreted the question and thought it was a question about the League of Nations, and therefore wrote at great length about the successes and failures of the League of Nations.

Question 6

- (a) Some candidates used their knowledge effectively to gain full marks here. They detailed moral condemnation, the discussion of imposing economic sanctions and the discussion of banning of arms sales to Japan and the Commission of Inquiry under Lord Lytton. Other candidates stated that the League did nothing at all and therefore did not gain high marks.
- (b) Candidates explained the role of the Depression in the rise of extremist parties with aggressive foreign policies and the resultant problems for the League. The reluctance of countries to impose economic sanctions which could cause difficulties within their own countries' economies was also

developed, together with explanation of countries' attempts to alleviate the effects of the Depression by invading other countries for resources. Some candidates would have benefited from developing their answers with reference to the question; some were able to identify a number of reasons why the Depression caused problems but could have linked these more clearly to the League.

- (c) Effective answers to this question detailed the aims and principles of the League and then assessed whether they were sound by examining how these principles worked in reality. In less effective responses, candidates were unable to examine the practice of the League when set alongside the aims; they tended to state the aims and make no further comment. Candidates who were aware that the USA was not a member of the League of Nations were on a firmer footing than those who were not aware of this, in answering this question.

Question 7

- (a) Candidates were able to detail the measures taken by writing about the barbed wire barrier, its replacement by a wall of concrete blocks, the placement of guards on the wall and the shooting of people who attempted to climb it. Some candidates explained why the Berlin Wall was erected rather than actually answering the question as set. There was some evidence of confusion between the Berlin Wall and the Berlin Blockade.
- (b) Candidates identified that Solidarity was becoming too powerful and that the Polish government was anxious to avoid intervention from the Soviet Union, but some candidates would have produced better responses by explaining these points. Many candidates wrote at considerable length about how Solidarity was formed, its aims and the contribution of Lech Walesa – rather than answering the question set.
- (c) Some candidates clearly had knowledge of the reasons for the collapse of Soviet control in Eastern Europe. Some explained this in relation to the Soviet Union itself, rather than loss of control in Eastern Europe. Rather than focussing upon generalisations only, candidates can achieve higher marks by giving specific historical support for their arguments.

Question 8

- (a) Some candidates gained full marks by detailing the membership of the Security Council and the roles of various agencies. Others confused the United Nations with the League of Nations. It would help candidates if they were aware of the correct terminology for each, and were then able to apply the correct details to each organisation.
- (b) Candidates were able to explain clearly the concerns of the USA over the spread of communism and how this caused the United Nations to become involved in the Korean War, and also how the USSR boycott of the United Nations contributed. Some candidates wrote generalised answers only, saying that the United Nations wanted to stop conflict.
- (c) Candidates were expected to explain the successes and failures of the United Nations in response to this question; there are numerous examples of both which could be explained. Most candidates would have benefitted from a fuller knowledge of the work of the United Nations.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Some candidates showed a detailed knowledge of Hitler's role in the Munich Putsch, writing a clear and concise account of events. Other candidates were only able to state the general point that Hitler organised the Putsch. Candidates would benefit from knowing the events of 8 November and 9 November 1923, relating to the Munich Putsch.
- (b) Clear explanations were given of the publicity gained by Hitler and the Nazis, Hitler's change in tactics from armed uprising to legal means and the writing of Mein Kampf. A small number of candidates wrote about the Munich Conference of 1938.
- (c) It was noticeable that candidates are now better informed about the role of Hindenburg and von Papen in Hitler's appointment as Chancellor; candidates were able to explain this aspect clearly.

Explanations of Hitler's personal popularity focused upon his oratory skills, his appeal to industrialists and the promises he made to restore Germany to its former glory. A number of candidates wrote in depth about the Reichstag Fire, which was not relevant to this question. There were also some answers devoted to Hitler's policies after he became Chancellor. Candidates need to read the question carefully; this question clearly requires explanation of why Hitler became Chancellor and not explanation of events after he became Chancellor.

Question 10

- (a) Candidates highlighted hopes relating to the supremacy of the Aryan race and German organisational skills. Narrative of actual events focused upon the achievements of Jesse Owens and the impact upon Hitler, German broadcasting skills and the negative perceptions relating to fanatical devotion to Hitler. Some candidates seemed unaware of what the Olympic Games actually were.
- (b) There were many sophisticated explanations focused upon Aryan supremacy and the need for scapegoats for Germany's problems. The better candidates understood the reasons for persecution of minorities; a small number of candidates were able to identify persecuted groups but could have offered better explanations of the reasons for their persecution.
- (c) Explanation of Nazi success in dealing with opposition was very clearly explained. The role of the SS and the Gestapo featured in many answers. Explanations were also given detailing how groups such as the White Rose Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates were dealt with. Some candidates managed to structure a balanced argument here; for others, answers showed that they believed that all opposition was either very low key or was dealt with immediately.

Question 11

- (a) Some candidates displayed detailed knowledge of the exact events taking place in Petrograd on 6 November and 7 November. Others attempting this question would have performed more strongly with a fuller knowledge of events, and by avoiding general statements such as buildings were occupied and there was fighting.
- (b) Candidates showed an awareness of reasons for the civil war in Russia, identifying opposition to Russian withdrawal from the war, the fear of nationalisation of factories, landowners' fears regarding loss of land and the desire of some to restore a Tsarist regime. Many responses would have been improved by developing these identifications into explanations, even though candidates obviously had some knowledge of the areas to which the question related.
- (c) Candidates explained reasons such as Trotsky's leadership of the Red Army, the disorganisation and disunity of the Whites and the Bolshevik control of Moscow and Petrograd clearly, showing disagreement with the quotation in the question. Explanations of War Communism could have been more effective. Some answers described War Communism at length, and would have been more successful if they had explained how it helped the Bolsheviks to win the civil war.

Question 12

- (a) Candidates were able to identify the fact that GOSPLAN was a state planning agency that set targets for industry; most responses could have gone further. Candidates are expected to have knowledge of the details of GOSPLAN.
- (b) Candidates who answered this question were able to describe agriculture in the USSR, although many would have benefited from explaining why it was important to Stalin to change it. Explanations could focus on the inefficiency of the farming methods, the need to sell surplus abroad to make money to fund the development of industry and Stalin's desire to control the countryside and remove the kulaks and their influence.
- (c) Some candidates explained clearly the effects of the deaths of the kulaks, the famines and the failure to increase agricultural production rapidly. It was rare for candidates to explain the successes, such as Stalin managing to export agricultural produce to gain hard currency and also that some modernisation occurred.



Question 13

- (a) Answers focused upon the increase in wages and reduction in prices, meaning that people could afford to buy more. Some candidates focused their answer upon female emancipation and therefore did not address the actual question.
- (b) Candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of Republican policies to industrial prosperity. Laissez-faire, low taxation and tariffs were all explained in depth and were clearly linked to industrial prosperity.
- (c) New technology was well explained; candidates showed detailed knowledge of the introduction of the assembly line and its contribution to the quicker and cheaper manufacture of goods. This point was expanded with particular reference to the car industry and how the expansion of the car industry stimulated many other industries. The role of advertising and the policies of the Republican policies were also detailed. Candidates should be aware of the difference between the economic boom and bust; some candidates wrote in detail about the Wall Street Crash and the subsequent depression. Candidates also need to be aware that details relating to gangsters and the social lives of flappers are not relevant to this particular question.

Question 14

- (a) Most candidates attempting this question were aware that speculation may be viewed as a form of gambling, and they would have achieved better marks by expanding on this. Those who tried to describe buying on the margin were aware it involved borrowing money, and again, expansion on this point would have helped. It is important for candidates to understand these concepts as they underpin the problems on the stock market and in the American economy at this time. Candidates do need to spend time ensuring they understand these key ideas.
- (b) Candidates were able to give a narrative of events relating to the Bonus Marchers; some needed to add an explanation as to why they were seen as a threat by the government. Candidates also needed to explain that the Bonus Marchers were considered by some to be communist agitators, that the government was concerned that the large number of marchers arriving in Washington could be the prelude to a revolution and also that the marchers had considerable public sympathy. It was noticeable that a number of candidates did not know who the Bonus Marchers were.
- (c) Candidates used their contextual knowledge well to explain the contribution of the Wall Street Crash to the election of Roosevelt; they linked the Crash to Hoover's failures in handling the crisis. Some were able to explain the effectiveness of Roosevelt's campaign and his appeal to the American people. Candidates need to take care when answering a question of this nature; the question related clearly to reasons for Roosevelt's election and yet a number of candidates wrote answers solely on the success and failure of Roosevelt's alphabet agencies; this is not relevant.

Questions 15 to 25

The limited number of responses to these questions makes meaningful comments difficult.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

Key messages and General comments

Candidates continue to show a developing understanding of the demands of the question paper, producing answers that are clearly focused on the questions as set. Candidates should be encouraged to continue developing this ability to use information and understanding in answering the questions, if higher marks are to be achieved. The examination tests the ability to be selective from the information held and to use the selected information appropriately. This applies equally to candidates across the whole ability range. It should be pointed out that over-long answers do not in themselves gain more marks as Examiners are looking for candidates who can present clear, concise explanations and arguments.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

Candidates were aware that Garibaldi went through Sicily and on to the mainland to defeat the Neapolitans. They could have improved their answers to **(a)** by mentioning Messina and Palermo or how he handed over the conquered territory to the Piedmontese. In **(b)**, most candidates were aware of the impact of the French troops in Rome and the agreement between Napoleon III and Franz Josef, and these points often developed into explanations. Most answers to **(c)** explored both sides. Candidates were able to develop a point about Napoleon and go on to consider, often in more detail, the roles and contributions of Garibaldi and Cavour. Some candidates needed to concentrate on more than Garibaldi.

Question 2

Some answers to **(a)** showed an awareness of the problems faced in relation to the inclusion, or exclusion, of Austria. This was sometimes at the expense of other factors. Better answers contained information about organisation and lack of discipline. Some responses to **(b)** were good, linking the need for a modern military force to the growing economic and political importance of Prussia - putting answers firmly in the highest level. This was sometimes linked to the threat of Austria. Other answers were stronger on the actual reforms than the reasons for them, which placed the answers in lower levels. Candidates can improve their answers to **(c)** if they move from description of the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 to evaluating its role in the creation of the German Empire. Answers giving other reasons were more general than specific.

Question 3

In **(a)**, the conditions endured by slaves were generally well-known and well described. This applied to both living and working conditions. Candidates need to think more widely when considering the increasing importance of slavery as required by **(b)**. The quality of answers would have improved by references to the Missouri Compromise, the Kansas-Nebraska Act or the Dred Scott decision. Weaker answers were often limited to the North hating slavery and the South wanting to keep it for economic reasons. Better answers did consider the question of the extension of slavery (or otherwise), as new states entered the Union. Candidates can improve on basic responses centred on Lincoln and radicals from the North in answering **(c)**, on the treatment of the South after the Civil War, by including references to President Andrew Johnson, the Wade-Davis Bill or the Basic Reconstruction Act. This would allow a more balanced approach.

Question 4

Most candidates were aware of the 'place in the sun' argument and presented this well in **(a)**, often adding the point that colonial rivalry did bring increased tension on the high seas. Some candidates need to take greater care in developing answers and wrote more about 'rivalry' rather than 'colonial rivalry'. Some good answers were produced in response to **(b)**, with the Kaiser's wish to destroy the Entente Cordiale, his wish for growth in Morocco and the snub at the Algeiras Conference all featuring as explanation. Some of the candidates' responses to **(c)** were excellent, with many detailed arguments of the causes of the First World War often starting with the crisis in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908. Other candidates needed a greater understanding of the part played by Austria-Hungary.

Question 5

Candidates would benefit from an awareness of specific terminology. There were many high quality answers to **(a)**, containing both factual detail and examples of mandates and plebiscites. Even without giving specific examples, many candidates scored highly with links made to Britain and France. Some candidates were thrown by mandates - quoting Germany's lost territories in Europe as examples and often missing the point about overseas possessions. Many candidates understood plebiscites. Some responses were aware that a vote of some kind was involved, though what the vote was about was not always explicit. Some responses to **(b)** were excellent. These identified reasons for Germany's disappointment and proceeded to explain each point in a separate paragraph. The idea of a 'diktat', the loss of armed forces and reparations were particularly well argued. Some answers were too brief and lacked explanation, showing uncertainty over the 'war guilt clause'. When writing about loss of territory, too often candidates stated that Germany lost the Sudetenland. Many high quality answers were seen in response to **(c)** from those candidates who from the outset identified Wilson's aims and then applied them to the peace settlements. These candidates were confident in their ability to make relevant judgements. Others needed to develop explained answers with more balanced arguments in order to achieve high marks. Some answers contained relatively long descriptions of the viewpoints of either Wilson or even the other two main political leaders at Versailles, and were not really addressing the question as set. Candidates at all levels would benefit from being more certain as to the meaning of self-determination, with some arguing that this was a failure for Wilson (because Germany did not receive this kind of treatment), while ignoring its application in Eastern Europe.

Question 6

Answers to **(a)** were often clear and sharply focused, with six or seven relevant statements - each of which could have produced a mark. Some candidates needed to be more focused on 'aims', rather than on how the League of Nations was used to help, for example, refugees. Some candidates would have improved their responses with a greater understanding of the reasons why Britain and France dominated the League, as asked for in **(b)**. The idea of the USA not joining was often the point that was developed into explanation. Other points were often identified, although candidates did not always develop them into explanation. This particularly related to the absence of Germany and the USSR. In **(c)**, it appeared as if past questions often obstructed candidates and prevented higher level marks being achieved. Often the idea of success, or failure, interfered with the quality of answer. Despite this, some answers were excellent. These were characterised by the candidate going back to **(a)** and using the aims identified here to test through specific examples taken from the 1920s, as to 'how successful' the League was in achieving them. This approach produced detailed, balanced arguments. Care should always be taken in reading and assessing the demands of the question. A significant number cited Manchuria and the Abyssinian crisis as examples of the League's failure to achieve its objectives but these of course fell outside the period covered by the question. A smaller number wrote about events outside the League, such as Locarno and the Kellogg-Briand Pact.

Question 7

There were many full answers to **(a)**, with good description of the impact of the Berlin Wall. Some candidates needed to be clear on the difference between the Berlin Wall and the earlier event of the Berlin Blockade. Many answers to **(b)** concentrated on Hungary, stating its intentions to leave the Warsaw Pact, and this was well explained. Often the details of the changing leadership of Hungary, and its implications, added to a demonstration of understanding of the period. When answering questions on the end of Communist control as in **(c)**, candidates should realise that it is not enough to state the issues but it is necessary to explain why these issues contributed to the end of control. Descriptions of the USSR in the 1980s, Gorbachev's reforms, the war in Afghanistan were touched on or developed, and these need to be linked to the question.

Question 8

There were too few answers to this question to make comments appropriate.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

In answer to **(a)**, many candidates were able to detail a number of points to describe the SA. A small number did confuse the SA with the SS. Many responses to **(b)** were excellent, with candidates aware of Hitler's intention to topple the Weimar government and that this was judged to be an opportune moment because of the problems in the Ruhr and hyperinflation. Some were less certain about the position of the Bavarian government or of the importance of Ludendorff with regard to possible military support. Others concentrated too much on describing the Ruhr crisis and the printing of money. Some responses to **(c)** were of high quality, with detailed arguments on either side of the debate. In these answers reference to the machinations of von Papen and Hindenburg were usually understood. The link between the Depression and the rise of extreme parties was developed by many, and some tried to explain the popularity of the Nazis as against the communists. Less successful answers were of varying standard, but these clearly pointed up the need for candidates to have a structure on which to hang their answer. These answers, whilst mentioning some of the previous issues, could have been better supported by explanation. Some showed confused chronological knowledge, with the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act being brought into the equation.

Question 10

Candidates need to be aware of the relation of the Nazis to the churches. There were many detailed responses to **(a)**, often containing more detail than required for five marks. Other answers were too brief and lacked focus, often being limited to the Concordat signed with the Catholic Church. For **(b)**, some of the responses were excellent, with good explanation of the fear of reprisals, the popularity of Hitler and the economic recovery. Other responses needed to be fuller and more detailed, with explanation relating to more than just terror. There were responses to **(c)** which showed clear, concise arguments to allow for a judgement of which type of propaganda was the most effective. These answers were logically organised and well argued, with a clear two-sided approach. Less successful answers were able to put forward arguments relating to the merits of the radio but there was a tendency to description in the counter argument.

Question 11

Many candidates, in answering **(a)**, were limited to general answers such as 'equipment' and 'troops'. Some better answers identified the countries involved in supporting the Whites. Candidates would have benefited from knowing where each country had intervened and what level of support had been provided. Some responses to **(b)** were excellent, with most able to explain why the requisition of food left peasants resentful. Most explained the tough punishments given if food was hidden and also the tough discipline exerted in the factories and mines. Other answers needed to explain these points, rather than being content with a narrative / descriptive approach. There were many excellent answers to **(c)**, where candidates established clarity about 'lack of unity'. Where this approach was adopted, all other arguments provided an opposing and creditable view. Some candidates struggled to explain the problems of the Whites, though many identified the reasons for their failure.

Question 12

Many were able to describe the Plans, producing good answers to **(a)**. For some, there was uncertainty about what each plan was trying to achieve, even in the broadest terms. In **(b)**, most candidates knew that in Stalin's eyes the Kulaks were enemies that had to be removed as they were obstructive to his specific objectives for the agrarian economy and ideologically at odds with his beliefs. Some candidates did not display the breadth of knowledge to secure high marks. Some answers to **(c)** would have benefited from being more balanced. At times there was little explanation on the enthusiasm of the workers, as answers concentrated more on the strict discipline and tough punishments meted out. Some did develop explanation around low wages and poor working conditions. Answers were often 'one-sided'. The better candidates explained free education for workers' children and the availability of a health service.

Question 13

There were many good answers to **(a)**, with candidates displaying a sound knowledge of the wider impact of the motor car. Part **(b)** was handled confidently by many candidates who were fully aware of the reasons for the difficulties of US farmers in the 1920s. Particularly well explained points included the impact of new machinery and over production. These points were often supported by comment on government policy and the impact of the Canadian wheat producers. Others, whilst identifying these issues, were less successful in explaining them. There were responses to **(c)** showing a clear ability to judge alternative explanations and, in some instances, candidates reached the highest level of analysis. Others produced imbalanced answers as they concentrated on the period of the First World War itself as opposed to its impact.

Question 14

The quality of answers to **(a)** was good. Those who read the question carefully were able to write a detailed recall answer, whilst some candidates wrote about generalities of the Crash. Some high quality answers to **(b)** explained the whole issue of speculation, credit buying and 'buying on the margin'. These were linked together to show good understanding. Some found it very difficult to extract themselves from a description of speculative activity, which was often detailed and comprehensive. These were usually long and in need of more explanation. Part **(c)** was a question that needed candidates to think about a response before writing. Those who did produced a balance answer, arguing both for and against the hypothesis in the question. These answers sometimes included the wider aspects of ineffectual Republican policies and the banking crisis. Others were more limited, and needed more detail on unemployment and other effects.

Question 15

In the answers to **(a)**, many candidates needed greater awareness of the Communist structure of government established in 1949. Most indicated that the state was run by the Communist Party. There was a need to consider regional structure, as well as the position and power of the Party leaders. There were many good answers to **(b)**. These explained both Communist strengths and Nationalist weaknesses. This was further enhanced by an understanding of how each side treated the Chinese peasantry. There were many strong comments on Nationalist corruption. Some candidates, whilst identifying many points, missed the opportunity to move into explanation mode. There were many strong answers to **(c)**, with candidates producing balanced and explained answers. Most candidates were aware of the changes the Communists needed to make in relation to women, balancing this against the need to bring about land reform and to improve industry. Some candidates, rather than answering the question as set, wrote about how the changes were made, instead of focusing on the question.

Question 16

Some candidates needed to offer more on 'thought-reform' in **(a)**. Answers to **(b)** were much better. Many put this question within the context of both the Second World War and the Civil War to explain why production was limited. Some went on to explain the traditional small-scale nature of Chinese industry and earlier attempts by the KMT which were largely ineffective. Most answers to **(c)** were stronger on the Five Year Plans, although some did explain that that the ordinary Chinese citizen did not reap the benefits with consumer goods or an improved standard of living. The opportunity to increase the argument through the impact of the Great Leap Forward was sometimes missed.

Questions 17 to 19

There were too few answers to these questions to make comments appropriate.

Question 20

Most answers to **(a)** were good, with four or five actions being correctly identified. In most instances Nasser was the man focus of the actions. Some answers lacked focus, being over long for five marks and introducing the actions of other countries which lacked relevance to the question. There were many good answers to **(b)**, with the points set out in detail. The emphasis here was on Israeli motivation – their determination to survive, the discipline and training of Israeli troops together with the quality of their equipment, and western support. Part **(c)** brought many quality answers, showing a clear and sophisticated style with the ability to consider alternative explanations. The theme of military superiority was well-developed, as was the lack of co-ordination between the Arab nations. Missing from some high quality answers was an attempt to evaluate the ‘how far aspect’ of the question. Other answers would have been improved by better organisation and a more considered view of selection of material, so as to reduce the length of answer.

Question 21

Generally, answers to **(a)** were strong in relation to what happened on the West Bank and the effect of this on the Arabs. Some answers would have benefited from comment about the agreement to remove Israeli troops from Sinai. There were many excellent answers to **(b)**. The issue of tension in Hebron was well developed, particularly the idea of small numbers of Jews gaining special treatment despite them being a significant minority. The best answers explained the changing attitude of some Jews who began to argue that the treatment they were receiving was wrong as it was a Palestinian town. Less successful answers were characterised by an over concentration on the violence, rather than the reasons for this happening. Answers to **(c)** often required greater balance, with more written about Arafat and his worries about extremists, to the exclusion of the election of a less aggressive Labour government and the willingness of both Rabin and Peres to negotiate.

Questions 21-25

There were too few answers to these questions to make comments appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

Key messages and General comments

A significant majority of answers to this year's questions again reflected sound understanding and good knowledge supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and had worked hard to acquire 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. Teachers, quite rightly, have encouraged their candidates to answer these questions in the form of a short paragraph and it is generally accepted that explanation is not required.

The best answers to **part (b) and (c)** questions satisfied the key objective which is to apply knowledge precisely to what the question is asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which include irrelevant information. The mark scheme gives some credit for the *identification* of relevant 'why' factors but the highest marks are awarded to answers which go further and *develop* each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

It is encouraging to note that a significant number of responses to part **(c)** questions not only try to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation), but also attempt to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should avoid repeating points already made in the essay but, instead, should explain and analyse *how far* the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions confine themselves to merely asserting 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

Comments on specific questions

Section A - Core Content

Question 1

Only a small number of answers were seen to this question. **Part (a)** attracted some good responses relating to Garibaldi's 'Red shirts' and the liberation of Sicily, while **part (b)** answers were knowledgeable about Cavour and his efforts to gain British and French friendship as a result of the Crimean War, including his support for the anti-Russian alliance. **Part (c)** was less well done, with some vague responses which needed to focus more clearly on the precise achievements of Cavour and Garibaldi.

Question 2

Some candidates applied insecure and rather generalised knowledge to this question. **Part (a)** required details of the strength of the Prussian army in the 1860s, such as the importance of the General Staff, its talented commanders, the use of advanced weaponry (such as the needle gun) and the size of the field army plus the reserve. There were better responses in **part (b)**, on the emergence of Prussian military might, Prussia's dominance over the North German Confederation and how the treatment of Austria at Gastein prepared the way for the next step against the French. **Part (c)** could have been better answered by some candidates who should have argued that Bismarck combined a long term strategy with opportunism. Bismarck had planned the Franco-Prussian war by bringing some German states together through the defeat of Austria and by strategies which aroused suspicions of French intentions; on the other hand, evidence of opportunism would have included the way Bismarck exploited the Prussian claim to the Spanish throne and the Ems telegram.

Question 3

There were numerous strong answers to **part (a)**, although the precise reasons for the formation for the Ku Klux Klan in the nineteenth century were less well known in **part (b)**. Answers included vague references to the spreading of fear and terror amongst black people; good candidates brought in points about ex-Confederate soldiers acting as vigilantes, the protection of white businesses and the efforts of the Democratic Party to re-establish itself. **Part (c)** also required more precise knowledge about the Basic Reconstruction Act, 'carpetbaggers' and Johnson's policy of reconciliation.

Question 4

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**, while narrative answers to **part (b)** were more common. Many candidates tended to re-tell the story of the assassination; they should have concentrated instead on the reasons why the assassination took place, such as the resentment Serbs felt against Austria, particularly against the background of events in 1908-9. **Part (c)** found many answers which balanced the naval race as a cause of war in 1914 against other factors such as colonial rivalries, the Balkan crisis, the Alliance System and so on. Some candidates wrote generally about the arms race when the question asked specifically about the *naval* race. A minority concentrated on the other factors leading to war and ignored the naval race altogether.

Question 5

This was a popular question. There were many good answers to **part (a)** which was not about the terms or what France received; it required a focus on what Clemenceau wanted from the peace talks. Less successful responses just mentioned that 'He wanted Germany to suffer' or 'He wanted revenge'. Higher marks were awarded for specific details. In **part (b)**, the reasons why Wilson wanted a 'league of nations' attracted some general answers which related to the devastation of war, the need for peace and for nations to work together plus references to disarmament. Further development of these themes would have produced higher marks. Some candidates discussed at length why the USA did not join the League, rather than focussing on the demands of the question. Some answers to **part (c)** treated this as a 'how fair was the Treaty of Versailles?' style question, and high marks could not be gained by this approach. Some spent time writing about the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the impact that it had on German economy, rather than addressing whether it was accepted or not. Coverage should have included evidence to show either acceptance or rejection of the Treaty, such as the hostile attitude of the Army, Hitler or even Kapp to the Treaty on the one hand, and the reluctance of the Weimar government to accept it, on the other.

Question 6

In **part (a)** there were some sound descriptions of the work of two agencies of the League; answers which only dealt with one agency could not achieve full marks. There were a few candidates who explained different aspects of the structure of the League of Nations, rather than the agencies or commissions. Candidates seemed well prepared for **part (b)** and they were able to show why the absence of the USA, as well as Germany and the USSR, created difficulties for the League. Some took this a stage further and perceptively explained why these absences left Britain and France as the dominant countries in the League, making explicit links to their economic and military weakness, undermining their resolve to deal with international crises. In **part (c)**, there was evidence of good knowledge of both crises (Abyssinia and Manchuria), and there were many creditable attempts to compare the damage inflicted on the League by each. Explanations needed to include specific details of each crisis and avoid general references to the lack of an army, the effects of the Depression, the absence of major powers such as the USA or the opinion that 'the League was doomed from the start'. Candidates should be advised to avoid just writing a narrative of each crisis.

Question 7

Candidates knew the more obvious points about the Warsaw Pact in **part (a)**, such as who signed it, and its general aims. A significant number of answers to **part (b)** confused the Blockade crisis of 1948-9 with the building of the Wall in 1961. Two or three developed points about the defections of skilled workers from the east to the west, about Khrushchev testing Kennedy or about the confrontations at Checkpoint Charlie, would have secured high marks. **Part (c)** answers sometimes needed more balance; it was important to read the question well and limit answers to Eastern Europe. Some commented on the Soviet Union's relations with the USA including the Truman Doctrine and therefore gained no marks for this. There were, however, good explanations of how the Soviets restored order in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, as 'success' was defined in terms of control. However, the other side of the argument (i.e. 'failure') tended to be weaker

and should have focused on the challenges posed by Solidarity in Poland up to 1981. There were interesting attempts to explain 'failure' in terms of the price paid by the Soviet Union because of acts of suppression leading to a loss of international prestige; these responses were rewarded.

Question 8

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

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

In **part (a)** answers often took the form of references to seizing power and destroying the Weimar Republic. Some candidates could have gone further to describe how Hitler sought support from the Army, Ludendorff, unemployed soldiers and those disaffected Germans who wanted to restore a right wing government. In contrast, there was evidence of good knowledge of the successes of Stresemann's policies in **part (b)**. These were used to explain the weakness of the Nazis before 1930. Some digressed from the date, and instead started looking at measures that were put in place later than 1930. Good answers were able to draw on the aftermath of the Munich Putsch by making explicit references to the banning of the Nazi party and the ban on Hitler making speeches. Candidates appeared less secure when called upon to explain the rise of Hitler to the position of Chancellor in 1933 as required by **part (c)**. There was a lack of balance as answers concentrated on the ways the Nazis exploited the Depression, linking propaganda and votes to promises to help alleviate the worst effects of unemployment. To achieve higher level marks, an understanding of the political crisis and subsequent negotiations relating to Hindenburg, Papen and Schleicher were required as they are central to the offer made to Hitler to become Chancellor. For some candidates this latter aspect was less well known.

Question 10

Part (a) was answered well and there was good knowledge of the roles of the SS and Gestapo. It was also rare to see poor answers to **part (b)**; the reasons for anti-Semitism, with references to the economic and racial basis of Nazi policies, including the impact of Hitler's early years in Vienna, were well known. Candidates can avoid lengthy narratives about the treatment of Jews by relating their ideas to the specific explanation demanded by the question. Encouragingly, many candidates were able to apply relevant knowledge to both sides of the **part (c)** question, and these responses gained high marks. The activities of the police state were used as evidence of oppression, while explanation of the 'control' created through the media, Schools, Hitler Youth and economic recovery gave these answers balance. Candidates are always advised to check the dates given in questions; in this case answers should have been confined to the late 1930s, hence discussions about the effects of the Depression in the early 1930s were not required.

Question 11

Candidates knew a great deal about the 'Red Terror' in **part (a)**. Answers to **part (b)** tended to be more descriptive. The question was looking for a precise explanation why Lenin's previous supporters had turned to mutiny, why the Kronstadt sailors objected to War Communism and other policies which had 'perverted' the ideals of the Revolution, as well as a fear that the rebellion might spread. However, answers to **part (c)** revealed some real strengths, with sound arguments supporting Lenin's leadership as the key to Bolshevik success by 1921, and explanations of other factors such as the work of Trotsky and the weaknesses of their Civil War opponents.

Question 12

Most answers to this question were good. There was secure knowledge of NEP (**part (a)**) and the difficulties collectivisation caused for Stalin (**part (b)**). The resistance of the Kulaks and the consequences for famine in the Ukraine and other agricultural regions were well known. **Part (c)** answers were often effectively argued, with sound analyses of economic successes placed against a background of poor living and working conditions. The highest mark was achieved by defining what 'success' might mean in the USSR under Stalin and arguing the relative importance of each group of factors.



Question 13

Part (a) was well answered. Many candidates could correctly identify the different industries (e.g. rubber, petrol, road, glass etc.) that benefited from the growth of the motor industry. Responses to **part (b)** would have been improved by being less general and the inclusion of more references to specific supporting factors, such as the fact that eight out of ten radios were bought on credit which would stimulate American manufacturing. Some limited themselves to only writing about either hire purchase **or** advertising, which made it harder for them to achieve full marks. For **part (c)**, it was important to link social aspects to the 'economic boom' as the question made reference to the 'lives of all Americans'. Many wrote about flappers and the growth of female independence in America, and made no links to the 'economic boom', therefore missing out on higher marks. Surprisingly, many answers focused on those groups in the USA which failed to benefit from the boom and so were one-sided; candidates might be encouraged to maintain a balanced approach to this style of **part (c)** questions.

Question 14

Part (a) was generally very well answered, although a few wrote about the aftermath of the Crash, rather than focusing on just that day. There were some impressive explanations in **part (b)**, particularly of Hoover's belief in 'rugged individualism' and that 'prosperity was just around the corner'. For more marks, candidates might have added an analysis of Hoover's limited attempts to solve the problems of Depression and why they had little success. Answers to **part (c)** were sometimes unbalanced by focusing on the role played by share speculation, rather than identifying other causes, such as mass production methods and tariff policy. Where this occurred, it limited the marks candidates could achieve as they did not manage to create the 'other side of the argument' in the answer.

Question 15

In **part (a)**, many candidates possessed a good knowledge of Communist guerrilla tactics, the sympathetic treatment of peasants and the later attacks on Chiang's armies. **Part (b)** answers contained some real strengths, with wide coverage of a range of identified points which were then explained fully, linking them explicitly to the loss of the people's support suffered by the Nationalists during the Civil War. In **part (c)**, there was a tendency to concentrate on the economy; better responses included explanations of China's resistance to change and the refusal of the world to recognise the Communists, as counter arguments.

Question 16

Once again, the importance of looking carefully at the question became apparent in answers to **part (a)**. Candidates knew a great deal but some would have benefited from focusing more closely on 'coming to power'; some went too far into later Communist policies and went beyond economic problems as required by the question. Those who attempted **part (b)** produced strong responses related to Communist philosophy, Mao's convictions and the fact that women were a source of untapped labour. **Part (c)** reflected good preparation for the exam as many were able to construct well supported arguments to assess the benefits and drawbacks of the first fifteen years of Communist rule.

Questions 17-23

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

Question 24

Candidates could have further developed and improved their sometimes general answers to **part (a)**, by including details about spreading Christianity, offering medical facilities to Chinese peasants, preaching against the taking of opium and translating Christian literature into the local tongue. In **Part (b)**, responses sometimes did not achieve the highest level because points about Western military power, favourable trading concessions, the supply of opium, and the weakness of Chinese resistance needed more developed explanations. In **part (c)**, answers were sometimes confined to more obvious points related to the Boxer rebellion and the impact of the opium trade. To gain higher level marks, a wider range of explained factors was required.

Question 25

Part (a) was well answered and candidates knew much about how India was ruled, bearing in mind the date in the question, 'before 1857'. Encouragingly, there were many strong **part (b)** responses which covered the policies proposed by Bentinck as Governor-General, and seeking to explain why they were controversial. In **part (c)**, candidates needed to produce secure arguments relating to change and continuity resulting from the impact the Indian Mutiny. The answers seen tended to be more descriptive of general developments in India during the second half of the nineteenth century.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

Key messages

The overall key message is that this paper necessitates a close concentration on the sources provided. Candidates do not need to paraphrase the source in full before answering the question set, but their answers must be rooted in the source.

Secondly, candidates should use their contextual knowledge to inform their answers. Examples will be given in the specific comments.

General comments

The majority of candidates were entered for the 20th century option. There were plenty of excellent scripts, with candidates showing the ability to analyse the sources and to buttress their answers with sound contextual knowledge. Weaker candidates were often those who were not entirely familiar with the requirements of this paper.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

Question 1

How far do these two sources agree is a common opening question. Candidates usually have little difficulty in achieving reasonable marks, but most could score more highly with a little more attention to detail. There will always be agreements and disagreements to be found, and detailing at least one of each will normally score high marks. What is needed, though, by many candidates, is a focus on finding very precise, exact matches or mismatches. So, here, it is not a disagreement to say that one source says there were political banquets whilst the other says all was peaceful. These are separate, not contradictory points. It is not an agreement to say that one source says there were demonstrations and the other says there were barricades. It is an agreement to say that both sources agree that barricades were erected. It is a disagreement to show that one source says the king did not use the troops, whilst the other refers to the use of troops.

Question 2

Candidates' attempts to interpret the cartoon were varied. It was widely thought to show that liberty was ruinous to France, rather than expressing the pent-up frustration of the radicals and their joy at the outburst. The figures in the source are actually running towards the volcano. When this was realised candidates could achieve high marks by contrasting this with Guizot's very conservative attitude.

Question 3

Utility questions can be answered in certain ways and the candidates approached this question using well-honed techniques. At lower levels, candidates simply took pieces of information from the source. This was usually coupled with a comment on what information about the topic the source did not provide. This needs to be specific to the question, in this case the events of 1848. At a higher level, candidates considered the reliability of the source, but then went on to say how this affected the utility. It is necessary to say more than, e.g., 'it is biased towards the government so not useful'. The answer should explain how it is biased and how this affects the usefulness, to reach a high level.



Question 4

In these types of questions, candidates need, at some point, to say whether they are surprised or not. And they must be surprised or not by the correct source, in this case G. There is always an obvious mismatch which candidates should seek to establish first. Here, most were able to see the tension between F (prosperity) and G (rebellion) quite easily. But there is usually another way of looking at what the sources imply, also. Here, some spotted that F was dealing with the workers, whilst G was dealing with the middle-class reformers, so G did not really clash with F. Additionally, there was a good opportunity to use context to explain away the apparent tension; the background information, e.g. points out that the workshops had to be closed, and that there was fierce opposition to new taxes.

Question 5

This reliability question could have been answered better by some, who simply accepted that the source was a realistic picture of events. Candidates answering questions on the reliability of a source can gain high marks by challenging the version of events in the source. In this case the picture was clearly unrealistic as well as unreliable because of its propagandist purpose. The best answers, though, were able to check some features by cross-reference, say to the mention of barricades in Source A, and, even better, to use the source itself as evidence of the image the rebels wished to portray of themselves.

Question 6

The best-performing candidates on this question focused on the question which was set. Some candidates struggled to find any direct reference to economic matters outside of Sources A and B. However, better candidates proceeded by not simply discounting all the other sources as not being relevant to the question, and they saw that these sources offered alternative explanations, e.g. political motives for the revolution. It is usually possible to use every source when answering this question.

20th century topic

Question 1

A striking feature of many answers to this question was the use made of the provenance by many candidates to go straight to a high level answer. Few contented themselves with picking out bits of information from the source; many pointed to the obvious bias of the source and explained how this would affect its utility; but perhaps most immediately realised that the source's main use was to reveal the official Soviet reaction to the Marshall Plan, or perhaps the way in which they hoped to affect the reactions of others.

Question 2

The easiest initial move with questions like this is to compare the two sources and find a difference between them which makes it seem as though one of them is lying. It is of course important to focus on the source named in the question, in this case Source C. Most candidates did see the tension between B and C without difficulty, some just matching 'not directed against any country' with Truman's anti-Soviet stance, while others expanded this a little to show that there seemed to be a difference in the nature of the Plan, Marshall claiming it as humanitarian, Truman as political. A good number of candidates then made the move to evaluate one - usually C - or both of the sources to check how their reliability might affect the answer, e.g. by pointing to Truman's need to convince Congress. However, in this type of question it is often possible to reconcile two sources which appear to conflict. Here, the best answers saw that both were out to stop Communism in their different ways, and candidates used their contextual knowledge to support this.

Question 3

A good example of the need to read the question closely; this question asked about the cartoonists, rather than the cartoons; some candidates spotted this. There were many messages which could be taken from these two and few candidates had much difficulty in finding at least one similarity - usually the benefits of Marshall Aid, and one difference - usually centred on the Iron Curtain (not the Berlin Wall as some thought) in D. There were few misinterpretations; the main area in which candidates could improve lay in the need to interpret, rather than just describe the sources. 'D shows that Stalin was angry about Marshall Aid' or 'E shows that Europe needed the American wind to get the windmill going', are descriptions of what can be seen in the cartoons, whereas candidates need to include valid interpretation.

Question 4

This cartoon produced mixed responses. Some did not notice the provenance and assumed it was an American cartoon about the benefits of Marshall Aid. Some of those who did this got closer to the real meaning by seeing it as a threat to the Soviets - but thought it was the Americans who were sending the threat via the cartoon. Those candidates who used the provenance had no difficulty in using their contextual knowledge to explain that it was a warning against American imperialism to members of the Soviet bloc. Good candidates picked up on the date, which should have made it clear that it was not a plea to the Czechs to reject Marshall Aid.

Question 5

Reliability questions can pose interesting challenges for candidates and elicit varied standards of response. The majority of answers here either fell into Level 2 or went straight to the top Level. Again, the key to attaining the latter Level was to note the provenance. This made it clear that the source was from the 1990s, when the Soviet empire had dissolved, and therefore there was far less reason for Yerofeyev to lie, or to peddle the former official line. So, the source had more reliability, despite the many lower level weaknesses that were suggested by some candidates, e.g. poor memory, bias, fear of his superiors etc. It was also possible to check some of the claims made via contextual knowledge, but few went beyond simply asserting that what was in the source was what really happened.

Question 6

In this question, the stronger candidates were the ones who, each time they dealt with a source, made sure that they were actually relating their material to the issue of either American power or economy, and whether or not it had been benefitted. In Source C, good candidates used the source to argue that the Truman Doctrine buttressed US power by containing Soviet expansion, or even that it was all part of an American method of expanding their alliances for the purpose also of increasing trade. In Source E, many simply said that it showed America being generous to Europe, whilst others were able to see that it might also suggest American power increasing - no blow from E.R.P, no prosperity, or a boon for the American economy, as trading partners would prosper. Candidates must relate each source to the question in this manner.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

Key messages

The overall key message is that this paper necessitates a close concentration on the sources provided. Candidates do not need to paraphrase the sources in full before answering the question set, but their answers must be rooted in the sources.

Secondly, candidates should use their contextual knowledge to inform their answers. Examples will be given in the specific comments.

General comments

The entry for this paper has increased significantly and the general standard of answers has improved. The twentieth century option was the more popular of the two options, with only a small number of Centres entering candidates for the nineteenth century option. Candidates demonstrated good contextual knowledge and a range of source skills such as interpreting, comparing, inferring and evaluating. The latter still poses the greatest challenge for candidates as some still rely on making assertions about bias. The overall quality of the answers was high but the following comments focus on areas where there is room for improvement.

It is important to remind candidates that the questions as set need to be answered. It is not enough to demonstrate an understanding of the sources and the context, or to show the abilities to interpret and evaluate sources if these abilities are not used to explicitly address the question. Some candidates carry out the necessary work on the sources but then miss the opportunity to use it to provide an answer to the question. For example, in response to Option B **Question 3**, some candidates identified differences between Sources D and E but neglected using these to support a conclusion about whether or not D proved E was right. Candidates will be helped if they can be encouraged to start their answers with a direct reference to the question e.g. 'Source D does not prove Source E was right because...'

Starting answers this way will also help candidates avoid summarising sources for a page or more before addressing the question. Some candidates wrote at great length, with only a small part of what they wrote directly addressing the questions. The best scripts were often the most concise. They showed that the candidates had thought carefully about the sources and their answers before they started writing. It is always a good idea to know what your answer is going to be before you start writing it.

Some candidates still struggle to read and interpret sources as a whole. They scrutinise sources in great detail but this often takes them away from considering the overall or big message of a source. Going beyond the individual details of a source (whether written or pictorial) and working out the big message nearly always takes an answer to a higher level in the mark scheme.

Some candidates could be clearer about the difference between message and purpose questions. The former are easy to identify because they usually contain the word 'message' e.g. Option B **Question 5**. Purpose questions (Option A **Question 5**, Option B **Question 2**) require candidates to make several moves. They need to work out the message of the source and then consider why the author wanted to send out that message at that time. This will involve suggesting the intended impact on the audience and why that impact was required at that particular time and in that particular context.

Option A: 19th Century topic

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Most candidates were able to explain differences and/or similarities. For example, many candidates explained that Source A focuses on outside factors defeating the revolutions whereas Source B focuses more on factors inside Italy. Only a few candidates managed to reach the top level in the mark scheme. To do this they needed to read each source as a whole and then compare them e.g. Source A is generally sympathetic to the revolutionaries, while Source B is critical; Source A's tone is emotional while B's is more neutral.

Question 2

This question required candidates to compare the impressions given of Pope Pius by Sources C and D. They needed to evaluate the sources to enable them to conclude whether D makes C surprising. Most candidates were able to compare the sources. Nearly all understood that Source D shows Pius IX to be two-faced or untrustworthy. Source C was interpreted in two different ways, Pius as two-faced or Pius as honest and open. Both were accepted. Far fewer candidates moved on to evaluate the sources and most evaluation that was attempted needed to be developed. Source C can be evaluated by considering Pius's purpose in the context of 1848, while both sources can be evaluated by using knowledge of Pius and his role in the events of 1848-9.

Question 3

This question produced a wide range of interesting answers and there were very few weak answers. Some candidates used the impression given of Garibaldi by Source F to argue that Charles Albert would have been swept away by his charisma. Most candidates either argued that both Charles Albert and Garibaldi would have supported the cause of Italian independence or contrasted the cause of independence in Source E with that of Republicanism in Source F. Very few candidates attempted to evaluate either of the sources.

Question 4

Most candidates were at least able to make inferences from Source G about the nature of Garibaldi's supporters, and a few used their knowledge, or cross-referenced to other sources, to question the impressions given by Source G. To reach the top level in the mark scheme candidates needed to realise that the source can be used as evidence of English attitudes towards Garibaldi and his supporters.

Question 5

This question was answered reasonably well. The weaker answers took reasons from Source H but a number of better answers were based on knowledge of the events of 1848-9 and suggested valid reasons for Radetzky writing the letter.

Question 6

This question was answered well. Almost all candidates used the sources and many scored high marks through careful explanations of how some sources support, and others oppose, the claim that the revolutions in Italy failed because of foreign intervention. There were a few candidates who would have benefited from explaining more carefully, rather than just asserting that sources did, or did not, support the statement.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. It required candidates to compare Sources A and B. The question asked how far the two sources agree. To answer 'how far' candidates needed to explain

agreements and disagreements. The question produced a wide range of answers. Most candidates were able to explain either agreements or disagreements and a significant minority explained both. Agreements explained by candidates included: the Marshall Plan divided Europe and the Soviet Union rejected the Plan; disagreements included: Source A suggests that the Plan was designed to help Europe while Source B suggests that it destroyed Europe's independence. The top level in the mark scheme required candidates to compare the overall messages of the two sources e.g. Source A claims the Marshall Plan was good, while Source B claims that it was bad. Fewer candidates reached this level. Most candidates can compare sources well for points of detail but need to improve on reading sources as a whole for their big messages. A small minority of candidates summarised each source and neglected to identify any agreements or disagreements. A larger group of candidates spent a page or more summarising each source and then in a conclusion, compared the sources. These candidates could have used their time more usefully by adopting another approach, and they often identified fewer agreements and disagreements than candidates who produced a point-by-point comparison from the first line of their answers. Candidates will be helped if they are encouraged to use the wording of the question in the first line of their answers e.g. 'These two sources agree on the following points...'

Question 2

This question asked candidates to explain the purpose of the cartoon. It was good to see that most candidates were aware that this type of question requires them to **(i)** interpret the cartoon for a message, **(ii)** explain what the purpose of sending this message was (i.e. what was the intended impact on its audience?), and **(iii)** say why the cartoonist had this purpose at that time (placing purpose in the context of relevant events in 1947). The cartoon's big message is that the Soviets are waiting or preparing to take over Czechoslovakia. From this can be inferred a possible purpose e.g. to encourage the USA to provide military help for Czechoslovakia. The context is the strained relations between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union in 1947 - the dispute over attending the conference about the Marshall Plan and the appeal by Czechoslovakia to the USA for help. Answers that explained both purpose and context were placed in the top level of the mark scheme. Some candidates were unable to explain the big message but reached a high level in the mark scheme by explaining a valid sub-message e.g. the Soviet Union was a threat. Other candidates only explained the context. These answers were often detailed, accurate and demonstrated a good understanding of events in 1947 but were limited in the level they could reach because they failed to address the message or the purpose of the cartoon. A significant minority of candidates misinterpreted the cartoon. They either thought that the Soviet Union had already conquered Czechoslovakia (the Background Information and the title of the cartoon tells them otherwise), or they wrote that the cartoon is saying that the USA is waiting until the time is right to invade Czechoslovakia.

Question 3

This question required candidates to start their answers by comparing the two sources. Most were able to identify surface similarities and differences e.g. they both show there were demonstrations, D suggests the demonstrations were about pay and food while Source E suggests that there were also political factors involved. Many of these candidates used these similarities and/or differences to address the question - whether Source D proves that Source E is right. There were other candidates who identified similarities and/or differences but then neglected to use them to address the question.

There is, of course, far more to a good answer to this question than surface comparison. To reach the top levels in the mark scheme, candidates needed to understand the big point that Source E is making by using the two parts of the cartoon together. This cartoon is suggesting that US domination (in the top part of the cartoon) has alienated the peoples of Europe. This then needed to be compared with what Source D shows. Candidates who reached the top level of the mark scheme explained that Source D cannot prove that Source E is right because of the political purpose of E (this purpose had to be explained).

Question 4

This question produced a full range of answers. It required candidates to explain why Sources F and G differ. Some would have benefited from reading the question carefully and assumed it was asking them to simply explain how the sources differ. Most candidates were able to go beyond this and did suggest that the sources differ because of their provenances - one is American and one Russian. To achieve higher marks these answers needed to be explained using relevant knowledge of the period. Some candidates did this by focusing on the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine or on the Cold War more generally. Others focused on the two speech-makers - Truman and Zhdanov (the latter as the organiser of Cominform's first meeting). Better answers focused on the audience of each source (the US Congress AND Cominform), while the top level in the mark scheme was reached by candidates who concentrated on the possible purpose of each of

the two speakers. It needs to be emphasised that in all levels it was necessary for candidates to use whatever approach they had adopted to explain why the sources differ. It was not enough, for example, for candidates to simply explain the context of the Cold War. Some candidates spent a page or more summarising each of the sources before they began to address the question. Some of them, once they had started in this way, did not return to the question. The best answers started with the words 'These two sources differ because...'

Question 5

Most candidates were able to suggest a valid sub-message of the cartoon, although some misunderstood and thought the cartoon shows Truman or the Soviet Union breaking down divisions between East and West. The big message of the cartoon was taken as the US using money to defend the West against Communism. Valid sub-messages usually covered parts, but not all, of the big message e.g. the West is being defended against Communism, or Truman was dividing Europe. There were an encouraging number of excellent answers where candidates focused on the attitude of the cartoonist. Some candidates argued that the cartoonist is supporting Truman, while others argued he is criticising Truman. Both were accepted as long as there was valid explanation based on context and use of details of the cartoon e.g. the way the East is portrayed.

Question 6

There was a great range of answers to this question. Some candidates appeared to be unaware that they had to use the sources, although the question said 'Use the sources to explain your answer'. This approach (not using the sources) restricted the number of marks that candidates could achieve. Most candidates did use the sources, and with varying degrees of success. It was important that candidates did not just assert that a source supports or disagrees with the statement that the USA was to blame for dividing Europe into two camps. They needed to explain how the sources agreed or disagreed. This explanation needed to directly relate to the issue of 'dividing Europe'. Candidates can be assured beforehand that there will always be some sources which agree with the statement and others which disagree. There are marks reserved for evaluating the sources. This evaluation needs to be developed. Candidates need to go further than to simply state that sources are biased because they are written by e.g. an American or a Russian.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

Key messages

The overall key message is that this paper necessitates a close concentration on the sources provided. Candidates do not need to paraphrase the sources in full before answering the question set, but their answers must be rooted in the sources.

Secondly, candidates should use their contextual knowledge to inform their answers. Examples will be given in the specific comments.

General comments

Almost all candidates for this paper display a good level of contextual knowledge in their answers, which is used effectively to develop the source material. The general level of comprehension of the sources is high, and this, coupled with the good levels of literacy demonstrated in most scripts, means that most answers achieve a competent standard. Candidates can be relied on to perform most effectively on questions which demand explanation of sources in context. The area in which they are less strong is source evaluation; that is, analysis of the reliability of the source content. Here, responses tend to rely on comments about source provenance, whereas they need to look in detail at what the source actually says or shows in order to reach judgements about, for example, the purpose of the author in representing events in a particular way.

Comments on specific questions

19th century option

This option is taken by a small number of candidates, and it is difficult to make detailed meaningful comments about the performance of candidates. The scripts demonstrated similar strengths and weaknesses to those on the 20th century option.

Question 1

The two sources gave contrasting accounts of the backgrounds to the 1848 revolutions in Germany, with the basic difference being that Source A saw the causes as being essentially economic in nature, whilst Source B saw them as political. Candidates found it harder to detect this difference than might have been expected, a problem which was echoed in answers to **Question 6** where many candidates clearly did not fully understand the distinction between social/economic causes on the one hand, and political on the other.

Question 2

Most answers detected that Lichnowsky would have been happy with the aspects of the Hippenhelm programme that dealt with the alleviation of social distress. Many responses would have been improved if candidates had also appreciated that, as an aristocrat, he would have been very unlikely to have supported the calls for political change, and in fact would have wished to preserve, rather than question, the existing social order.

Question 3

The overwhelming majority of candidates were able to identify some valid reasons for publishing the illustration. These ranged from those that used only the context (e.g., 'because the revolutions were going on at that time'), through to those who detected possible messages the artist might have wished to transmit to the audience (e.g., 'to tell people what the revolutions were like'), to those that understood that the artist

would have had a purpose beyond the mere message of the drawing (e.g., 'to arouse support for the revolutionaries'). Answers would have been enhanced if candidates had also detected the heroic image that the artist was creating, rather than simply accepting the image as a true depiction of events.

Question 4

Whilst a few candidates appeared not to believe that a song could provide useful historical evidence, the great majority could recognise the fact that the song supported the idea that the 1848 German revolutions were nationalist in nature. Few pushed their answers further, either by testing the reliability of the impressions given by the song, or by suggesting that its real utility lies in providing us with evidence of how the revolutionaries would have wished other people to perceive them.

Question 5

Candidates would have benefited from informing their answers to this question with contextual knowledge. Given that the refusal of the crown by Frederick William IV is such a conclusive event in the story of the 1848-9 revolutions in Germany, it was surprising that many candidates did not use such knowledge. Had they done so, the source would not really have surprised them. Some found it hard to understand how anyone would turn down the chance to be a king, or alternatively were unsurprised on the grounds, for example, that being a king must be hard work, so of course he would not want to have to do it. In other words, candidates could have achieved higher marks by using informed explanation, rather than unhistorical, everyday empathy.

Question 6

As mentioned earlier, there was some uncertainty over 'economic grievances'. However, candidates were still able to score well since, even if, for example, 'feudal dues' in Source A were not seen as 'economic', most answers could identify other aspects of the source which were (e.g. 'insufficient jobs'), and the alternative factors could still be drawn from other sources which indicated that the causes were political in nature. Some candidates looked only at the given side of the hypothesis – 'economic' causes. They could have improved their responses by looking at the alternatives.

20th century option

Question 1

The question asked how far two sources on the Soviet Union and the origins of the Cold War agreed with each other. The sources contained some clear agreements, for example that the Soviet Union needed to feel secure. Almost all candidates were able to identify at least one such agreement. There were also disagreements, though these tended to be less explicit in the source content. A good example of difference was in the way in which the Soviet Union sought security – by challenging the USA in Source A, and by constructing the Iron Curtain in Source B. Of course, the best answers addressed the issue of 'How far?' by looking for both agreements and disagreements, with many able to link these by suggesting that, whilst the sources agreed on the Soviet Union's desire for security, they disagreed on the means by which this security would be achieved.

Question 2

Answers to this question provided a good illustration of the need to evaluate sources in order to achieve a high-level answer. Candidates were asked whether or not they were surprised by the differences in two comments on the Marshall Plan, one from a Soviet perspective and the other American. Clearly, it was possible to be surprised by the fact that they differed, but such answers were limited by not taking into account either the provenance of the sources, or the historical context. So, the fact they differed was unsurprising given that they were opposing points of view, and many answers developed this idea further by using contextual information about Soviet and American attitudes to the Marshall Plan. There was, though an additional possibility for source evaluation, by looking at the possible purposes of the authors in saying what they did. For Malenkov, the Soviet source, this could be the fact that what he said was bound to be shaped by the impression the Soviet Union would want to make on other Eastern European countries (who they were trying to prevent accepting Marshall Aid). For Clifford, the American, the relevant point was that he was speaking in 1972, long after Marshall Aid had ceased to be a controversial topic, and was thus freer to speak the truth than he would have been in 1947. For both sources the content gave clues to these lines of argument – the clearly over-the-top accusations of Source C, and the surprising admissions of Source D.

Question 3

The cartoon was interpreted effectively by the great majority of candidates. The rich detail of the source opened up many lines of possible interpretation, but the over-arching ideas that the cartoon concerned the power struggle in Eastern Europe, and illustrated Stalin's aggressive expansionism, were detected by almost everyone. However, the real message of the cartoon was what the cartoonist wanted to say about these events. Most answers were good on the events, but needed to go further in exploring the cartoonist's opinion. The cartoon contained a clear judgement, which at its simplest could be summarised as saying that the West/USA represented good, whilst the Soviet Union represented evil. Many candidates were able to comment on the cartoon's unflattering portrayal of Stalin, but would have achieved better responses if they had seen that the main message of the cartoon was not judging Stalin alone, but was commenting on both sides.

Question 4

Answers to this question showed much the same characteristics as those on **Question 3**. This time candidates were asked to compare two cartoons, and their answers were again good on source interpretation, and in understanding the specific historical context in which the cartoons were set. As the question asked 'How similar?', many candidates started by identifying similarities, even though the cartoons fundamentally disagreed. There was some justification for this approach, since there were sub-messages which contained genuine agreements – that the European economy was in a mess, or that the USA was the dominant power. However, at the heart of the matter were the two entirely contradictory portrayals of the Marshall Plan, with the British cartoon seeing the Plan as an essential help to Europe, but the Soviet cartoon seeing the Plan as a means to enslave and control Europe. This difference was detected by many candidates, though some were slightly misled by the fact that Source F shows Uncle Sam as being reluctant to help. Using contextual knowledge, it was possible to perceive the cartoon as showing the initial reluctance of the US Congress to grant the money needed. This was fair enough, in itself, but Source F still shows Marshall making every effort to help Europe, which is entirely different from the message of Source G. Rather than perceiving the messages of the cartoons as what they were depicting about the events, candidates would have improved their responses by looking at what the cartoonists' were saying about those events. Thus the real difference was that the cartoonist of Source F was praising Marshall Aid, whilst Source G was criticising it.

Question 5

For some candidates, answers to this question would have been improved if they had fully understood the role of diplomats. The question asked why British diplomats in Belgium submitted a report to the British government on Belgian reactions to Truman's 1947 speech, in which he announced what became known as the 'Truman Doctrine'. Possible reasons for the report ranged from telling the government what to do, to trying to avoid war, or even to ensure that Britain sided with the USA in the Cold War. The real reason, of course, must have had something to do with what was happening in Belgium, as Source H indicated. Some candidates did not spot this, so almost by default they concentrated instead on the broader Cold War context, rather than on Belgian reactions to this context. This was a logical but limited way of answering. A few candidates understood that the source showed what the British would have regarded as a worrying diversity of Belgian reactions, some pro-Soviet, to Truman's speech, and that the diplomats would therefore have been alerting their government to the possible complications which might arise from this in Western Europe at a time when Cold War tensions were heightening rapidly.

Question 6

The requirements of **Question 6** now seem to be well known. It is rare to see candidates not using the sources, or even using the sources to support only one side of the hypothesis. Almost all candidates understand that they must work through the sources, finding evidence both to support and to question the given hypothesis. The issue, then, is whether they are capable of using the source content in the appropriate way. On this occasion the hypothesis to be tested was that the Soviet Union was to blame for the Cold War. Not all the sources dealt directly with the issue of blame, and candidates therefore had to be able to explain how the source content might be made relevant to the issue. For several sources it was, therefore, possible to see them as either supporting or questioning the hypothesis, depending on how the content was used. For example, Source D could be seen as illustrating Soviet blame since it talks of preventing Soviet expansionism, so the expansionism is the problem. However, it might also be seen to blame the USA since they state that their plan is to challenge Soviet expansion, so the challenge is the problem. Most candidates were able to use at least a couple of sources on each side of the argument.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages and General comments

The number of Centres entering the coursework option rose significantly. The overall quality of work was as high as that seen in previous sessions, and in some aspects improved. Almost all Centres used assignments that were appropriate and suitable samples of candidates' work arrived promptly with Moderators. A few Centres did not include a copy of the set assignments. Moderators find it useful to see these. Most of the work was carefully and accurately marked and only a small number of Centres had their marks moderated. Many Centres annotated the work in detail and this was a great help to Moderators in understanding why certain marks had been awarded.

Comments on assignments

Assignment 1

Most Centres still use structured questions, although a few more are using essays which allow more able candidates to develop their analyses at greater length and to a greater depth. Structured questions have the advantage of providing candidates with clear 'signposts'. The first part of a structured question can require candidates to provide a causal explanation for one factor. The second part can require a multi-causal explanation where candidates have to demonstrate how causes interacted with each other, while the final part of the question should ask candidates to reach and support a judgement about the relative importance of at least two causal factors. Many Centres followed this pattern in their structured questions. Occasionally the marking was a little generous because not enough complexity was demanded before high marks were awarded. Candidates need to clearly demonstrate and explain the interaction between causal factors, and when they are asked to reach a judgement about the relative importance of different causal factors they should directly compare them for importance and develop a supported and developed clinching argument why one is more important than another. Sometimes candidates wrote well about each factor but then just asserted that one was more important than the other. In an essay, candidates need to include all these aspects but with less guidance. Some excellent essays were seen. There were also some very narrative essays that lacked analysis.

Assignment 2

Most Centres used Paper 2 as a model for their Assignment 2. This worked well as it allowed for a wide range of source skills to be assessed. A few Centres set too few questions and used too few sources. In these cases, too narrow a range of skills was assessed. The skills tested should include: interpreting sources, comparing, cross-referencing, inferring purpose and evaluating. All assignments should finish with a question that requires candidates to use all the sources to test a hypothesis. Generally this assignment was marked accurately and marks were adjusted less often than was the case for Assignment 1.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

This paper is made of two halves. The first half is based on sources and it is essential that candidates use source content to deliver their answers. The second half is based on knowledge and marks are gained by the delivery of detail and understanding. Generalisations and imprecise observations do not produce high marks.

General Comments

Germany was again the most popular choice for candidates. There were many Centres that concentrated on the USA Depth Study and some Centres answered the questions set for the Russian Depth Study. Apart from that, there were too few attempts at the other Depth Studies to make relevant and helpful comments.

There were very few rubric infringements and most candidates wrote in dark blue and black ink which helped Examiners to appreciate and understand all that the candidates wished to convey.

One aspect of candidates' answers which was consistent and could have been improved on across all three Depth Studies attempted, was the treatment of **Question (a) (iii)**. Many candidates' answers consisted of either comments on what the sources were about, without specific reference to the sources' content, or were very general and undeveloped references to the provenance of each source. Examples will be given in the comments on specific questions, but these answers do not produce high marks. It is essential that source detail is given in these answers and that evaluation of the sources is complete, rather than general and speculative.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Candidates were able to show in their answers to **Question (a) (i)** that Germany was determined to maintain its peace with Russia, while at the same time aiming to have all territories of Germany and its allies restored. Belgium was to have a major German influence beyond that of other nations. Inferences regarding German aims were easily identified but a minority of candidates did not appreciate that the German Vice-Chancellor was speaking in September 1918 and that the war had not ended. Some candidates asserted that these comments were in response to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Most candidates were able to demonstrate that Source B showed that, although Germans felt victimised by the Treaty of Versailles, the terms could have been much worse if Britain and the United States had not restrained the demands of Clemenceau. Candidates also pointed out that Germany had brought serious punishment on itself by the harsh terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and deserved every harsh element of punishment – some believed Germany should have been punished more. Many answers to **Question (a) (iii)** could have been better. Some candidates offered answers about the general areas of the sources, without using any real references to the content of the sources e.g. 'Source A is about how the Germans saw their relationship with Russia and Belgium', and Source B 'was about how Germany was punished by the Treaty of Versailles'. It was rare to find expansion from these general observations. Others used responses of undeveloped or stock evaluation to answer. There were comments about Source A which asserted that it was the German Vice-Chancellor speaking so he would know what was happening, and about Source B, many wrote that the historian would have had time to research thoroughly, or that he was British and, therefore, hostile to Germany. Better candidates saw that there were opportunities to evaluate through cross references about the treatment of Russia in both sources, to use the tone of Source A against that of Source B, or use the date and context of Source A to show that the German Vice-Chancellor was in denial about the inevitability of defeat in September 1918.

Many candidates were able to identify Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles as the War Guilt clause and placed it in the context of the whole treaty. A substantial minority offered any general punishment of Germany in the terms of the treaty as an answer to **Question (b) (i)**. Some candidates who attempted this Depth Study knew sufficient detail of the Kapp Putsch to gain full marks on **Question (b) (ii)**. Many candidates spoke generally about how the government was not pleased and put it down, while others confused it with the Munich Putsch. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were often full and contained all the expected information regarding reparations, French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr, the passive resistance and the printing of money etc. There were many who gained full marks but there were also those who concentrated on the printing of money and the results of hyperinflation, with wheelbarrows of money being collected twice daily etc. Candidates would have achieved higher marks if they had realised that the question asked for the reasons for hyperinflation - not the results of the fall in the value of money. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** could have contained more sustained and relevant detail about the foreign and domestic achievements of Germany in the period 1923-1929. Higher achieving candidates offered much domestic progress in the Golden Years and offered details of foreign confidence in Germany and treaties signed, and League of Nations membership. Other answers were a little general on Germany trying to recover from the war and trying to get industry moving against trying to improve relations with other countries. Specific detail would have improved these answers. Others wrote about issues before the stated period, while some wrote about Hitler's attempts to reinvigorate Germany after 1933.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

In answers to **Question (a) (i)**, candidates found little difficulty in showing that the Whites were ruthless yet unprepared. Candidates offered evidence from the source regarding executions and harsh treatment and also commented that the Whites must have been unprepared because they had to live 'off the land'. Whilst 'unprepared' was probably not the correct word to use, the general idea of confiscation and intimidation was acceptable. Candidates were also able to discern, in **Question (a) (ii)**, that Trotsky was strengthened by his involvement and success in the Russian Civil War by Red Army support and hero status, but at the same time had been undermined by machinations and manoeuvring at the centre of the regime while he was away. Candidates often wrote that the White commander would try to make his actions 'look good'. It may be difficult to understand that assertion from the content of Source A, while others in their answers to **Question (a) (iii)** said that the British historian would have had plenty of time to research. Better candidates showed via contextual knowledge that participants in the Civil War were often motivated by self interest and self preservation, even when they were on the same side.

Most candidates knew the role of the Cheka in Russia from December 1917 (**Question (b) (i)**), and many were able to describe the aims of War Communism in **Question (b) (ii)**, although some candidates made sketchy and imprecise comments about grain requisitioning. There were many excellent answers to **Question (b) (iii)** about why the Bolsheviks were more successful than the Whites in the Russian Civil War. Full and lengthy answers were delivered, showing the advantages and unity of the Bolsheviks against the disunity and motives of the Whites. In **Question (b) (iv)**, most candidates were able to offer an opinion as to whether Trotsky or Lenin did more to establish Communist rule in Russia by 1924 but more could have offered sustained detail in evidence. It was not unusual to find answers that went no further than to state Trotsky won the Civil War but Lenin was the 'real brains' behind the movement. Relevant detail was required here to support arguments.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Candidates were able to infer from Source A in their answers to **Question (a) (i)** that there had been economic effects on a variety of individuals and groups but that Hoover was asserting that the strong banking system had returned to the funding of business and this had helped foreign trade and controlled inflation. Some candidates observed wryly that Hoover was in wishful thinking mode here but then did not use that idea in evaluation of the sources in answers to **Question (a) (iii)**. Candidates found it relatively straightforward to uncover evidence in Source B to show that although Hoover had tried to take effective action between 1928 and 1931, his efforts had been partial, second hand, and he had been largely ignored. Many candidates scored well here, in **Question (a) (ii)**, but some produced one sided answers in trying to defend Hoover's record. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were almost always about the content of both sources. Either candidates produced specific detail from the sources or produced answers which talked about the general areas of each source's focus, without specific detail. Also there were again examples of 'Hoover was the president so he would know what was going on' and 'Source B was from a biographer of Hoover so he would be on his side'. Better candidates evaluated by knowing the significance of the State of the Union speech, and the optimistic tone of the speech for a variety of reasons, against the balanced and

moderate tone of Source B, which could be cross referenced to Source A to demonstrate support or criticism of Hoover's optimism.

Many candidates had a partial understanding of 'rugged individualism' in **Question (b) (i)**, but some were not able to describe in detail the events in the stock market between 21 and 29 October 1929 (**Question (b) (ii)**). Some candidates wrote of overconfidence and panic selling leading to the crash. However, there were a few excellent answers which told of the context, the selling, and the propping by banks which then sold to protect themselves, followed by panic selling. Candidates who scored well on **Question (b) (iii)** mentioned specific industries like farming, textiles and coal, which had difficulties before 1929 and placed them in a context of new challenging technologies, post war marketing, tariffs, competitors and the post-war changes. Less successful candidates wrote very broadly and without specific detail or illustration of their general assertions. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** would, in some cases, have been enhanced by more detail, and fewer general assertions such as, 'Hoover was known as a do nothing president'. Most answers had a balance, but would have benefited by expanding and arguing from a position of knowledge, and command of the subject matter. A substantial minority used the detail from Sources A and B to construct their arguments.

There were insufficient attempts at answering the questions set for the other Depth Studies to make relevant and useful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

The examination is divided into two halves. Part **(a)** involves responding to questions about source material and high marks will only be achieved by candidates if they use appropriately the source content provided. The second half of the paper, Part **(b)**, requires answers which show knowledge and understanding. Candidates should be aware that specific detail in the answers is considerably more useful than generalisations.

General comments

Germany was the most popular Depth Study with candidates. Next in popularity were the Depth Studies which gave questions about Russia and the USA, with the Depth Study on Israelis and Palestinians also attracting a good number of candidates. Indeed, all Depth Studies were attempted and comments on individual questions will follow below.

There were few rubric infringements in this season and most candidates wrote clearly in dark blue or black ink so that all they wished to convey was accessible to Examiners.

One aspect that affected candidate performances was the response seen to **Question (a) (iii)** in all Depth Studies. Some candidates wrote in very general terms about the sources without mentioning actual source detail, or they commented on the provenance of sources in an undeveloped or 'stock' fashion. Examples will be given below but these answers did not gain high marks.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945

Candidates were able to draw inferences from Source A about Nazi attitudes towards women in **Question (a) (i)**. It was interesting to note that many candidates accepted the words of Hitler at face value and felt that his words were praising women and defining their role in the Third Reich. Others felt that Hitler's words were propaganda and were defining the straight jacket of women's role in Nazi Germany. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** on changes to Nazi policy towards women usually found that the policy had to change depending on circumstances. Many scored well here but a few candidates thought that the initial Nazi policies that were established were a change in Nazi policy – not a change from past governments' policies. Hence, these answers were confused. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** ranged from the sophisticated to the bland. The better candidates evaluated the two sources by the tone and language of Source A, the balance of Source B, and they cross referenced between the two sources to show how they supported or contradicted one another. Candidates at this Level gave examples selected from both sources. Less successful candidates said that Source A was from Hitler and, as he was the leader, he would know what the policy was, or asserted that the schoolbook published in 1991 would have allowed time for research to 'get things right'. Others claimed that the tone of Source A showed it was propaganda but did not quote words from the source in support.

For **Question (b) (i)**, most candidates were able to nominate at least one group forcibly sterilised in Nazi Germany, although some of the answers showed that candidates did not understand the word 'sterilised' – they nominated groups that were victimised. Changes made by the Nazis in education were well known and many scored well in **Question (b) (ii)**, and the importance to the Nazis of education was well explained in **Question (b) (iii)**, with good comments on control of the population, support of the young and the need to create support in the longer term. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on how far the Hitler Youth movement was the most successful Nazi organisation, fell into two groups. Both were acceptable as legitimate ways to

answer. One group of candidates compared the organisation and success of the Hitler Youth against other youth movements or those groups which opposed Nazism. Other candidates compared the Hitler Youth movement's achievements against a variety of other Nazi organisations ranging from the SA and the Gestapo to work-related movements. Many candidates scored well from detailed answers with compelling arguments.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates were able to draw many inferences from Source A about the peasants and their lives in Russia at the beginning of the century in **Question (a) (i)**. Many commented on the note in the attribution that this report was from one of the Russian Empire's richest farming areas, and concluded that other peasants must have been in an even worse state. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** often found that after 1905 political parties in Russia were safer provided they were peaceful – or acquiesced – while other parties who wished to change the whole political system remained at risk of arrest or death. Most candidates found a balance of evidence for their answers. Better answers to **Question (a) (iii)** commented on the fact that Source A was about a richer area in Russia and cross referenced with Source B to show that little had changed for the better for anyone, and that all people were expected to accept the status quo, whether in living conditions or in politics. Less successful candidates asserted that Source A was an official Russian government document 'so it would want to make things look good', while others claimed that the British historian would have 'had time to research thoroughly'. These last examples would not have gained high marks.

Most candidates were able to identify the Okhrana in **Question (b) (i)** and describe its role, but some answers to **Question (b) (ii)** needed to focus more directly on Father Gapon's role in the events of Bloody Sunday, rather than writing copiously about all the events and personalities involved in those events. There were many good answers as to why Tsar Nicholas II was able to maintain control over Russia after the 1905 rebellion in **Question (b) (iii)**, and there were some nice observations regarding the October Manifesto being a delaying tactic until sufficient troops had returned to crush the rebellion, and the Duma was described as toothless and worthless. There were interesting treatments of **Question (b) (iv)**, on how far it was military defeat in the First World War that caused the overthrow of Nicholas II. Many candidates felt that it was defeat that caused his downfall but also offered other reasons of poverty, food and land as issues. Better candidates saw the war as a catalyst that drew all the long existing grievances together. There were interesting and graphic explanations by some as to the roles of the Tsarina and Rasputin in the Nicholas' downfall.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

In **Question (a) (i)** candidates drew inferences from Source A that the Ford Motor Company was a huge organisation that did not have the best planning as it laid off workers while a new model was designed. Others felt the company showed no concern for its workers and that profit and competition was all that the managers worried about. Candidates were often critical of the Ford Motor Company. Most candidates were able to find a balance of evidence in Source B to answer **Question (a) (ii)** on how far the source showed that the US governments of the 1920s supported economic freedom. However, candidates sometimes disagreed as to what the evidence actually meant. Some felt that the Federal Highways Act of 1921 which funded fifty per cent of new major highways was a means to encourage economic progress and allow businesses to flourish with better transport links, while others felt that this was government interference and direction of how business should operate. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** included cogent comments on the utility of the sources by putting the detail of both into the context of the booming 1920s, quoting from the sources, and showing that regulation affected very little of business practice towards workers or business. Workers' protection appeared of little concern while business was allowed to use price fixing and unfair trade practices to make a profit. Cross referencing between the details of the sources often brought good marks. Other candidates said Source A was from the Ford Motor Company's official history so 'would want to make the Company look good', and Source B was from the official United States Information Agency and would want 'to cover up problems'. Again, these unsupported and unsubstantiated claims did not score well.

In **Question (b) (i)** candidates were able to name many devices that appeared in homes in the 1920s, although some of the devices named were not invented until much later. However, most candidates scored maximum marks here. In **Question (b) (ii)**, some candidates would have benefited from being able to offer extensive descriptions on the treatment of trade unions. There were general observations that the government and businesses did not like trade unions but more could have included specific detail like blacklisting, naming unions as Bolsheviks, using troops against protest, or even actions by the Supreme Court. This area of the 1920s could have been better known. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** ranged from the detailed description of the hardships of named minority groups to general observations that life was hard for a large number of people without naming specific groups or their individual problems. Answers to **Question**

(b) (iv), on how far the greatest weaknesses of the 1920s economy were in the banking and credit industry, attracted two main methods of answer. On a narrow basis, some attempted to show both the strengths and weakness of these industries, while other candidates tried to compare the weaknesses of banking and credit against other industries in the whole economy. Both treatments were legitimate but some candidates would have benefited from finding more sufficient detail to support general observations.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

There were some well-informed candidates who performed very impressively on this Depth Study. In **Question (a) (i)**, candidates saw that the conversation between Mao and his doctor showed tensions in the relationship between Mao and Stalin but they also found that Mao sounded boastful as to his role in the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty. Good inferences were supported by source detail. Candidates also found a balance in Source B to show that while the West thought that the communist alliance between the USSR and China was a danger to world peace, the two communist nations had very different agendas and were rivals with one another. Some succinct argument gained good marks here on **Question (a) (ii)**. There was much cross referencing by candidates who scored well in answer to **Question (a) (iii)**. They quoted detail from each source to show that both agreed that there was tension and rivalry between the leaders and the states in general. Less successful candidates speculated about the motives of Mao's doctor in showing that Source A was useful, and also there were some who stated that 'the British historian would have had time to check his facts', or 'as he was British, he was opposed to both the USSR and China'.

In **Question (b) (i)** candidates found no trouble in identifying two areas outside China where the Communist Chinese government had intervened between 1950 and 1975. Many scored full marks on this question, but on **Question (b) (ii)** information about China's relations with Tibet since 1950 was not so well known and there were few complete descriptions. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the withdrawal of Soviet aid from China after 1960 was much better known and many gave full and long explanations, drawing on relevant and pertinent detail. In **Question (b) (iv)** candidates also were able to show that while China was still a very private country which did not want interference and contact in the political sense, it opened up much more in contacts to maximise business, finance and industrial developments. Nixon's visit to Mao was often mentioned as was the change made by the arrival of Deng Xiaoping as leader of the Chinese in 1978.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

While some candidates, in answering **Question (a) (i)**, found little difficulty in drawing inferences from Source A about conditions in towns in South Africa by 1922 and gave detail of how conditions varied in different areas, a few reproduced the source with no comment to answer the set question. Similarly, some candidates repeated some or all of Source B in answer to **Question (a) (ii)**, while better candidates tried to find a balance of evidence in the source to show that it was difficult to restrict where black workers lived. At best, answers to **Question (a) (iii)** compared and contrasted the evidence in both sources. A few candidates couched their answers in the context of the apartheid era.

Most candidates would have benefited from more knowledge of the issues raised in Part **(b)** questions. Answers tended to be general and non-specific. Candidates could have achieved higher marks by preparing themselves to answer questions on the whole range of the syllabus and not relying on marks gained in Part **(a)** answers to produce an overall respectable mark.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994

Candidates found few problems in drawing valid inferences about Israel in 1973 from Source A in **Question (a) (i)**. They commented on Israelis being surprised by the onset of the Yom Kippur War but also that they were prepared, with well laid plans and all reservists knew exactly where, and to whom, they should report. Most candidates were able to find a balance of evidence in Source B in their answers to **Question (a) (ii)** about whether the Yom Kippur War had improved prospects for peace. Candidates demonstrated that both Egypt and Syria hoped that diplomatic endeavours would secure lasting peace, while Israel, hoping for peace, was reluctant to give up territory it had conquered for fear of appearing to reward Arab states for starting the war, or in fear of future Arab attacks. Attempts at evaluation in answers to **Question (a) (iii)** had some candidates pointing out, by way of cross reference, that the Israeli view of confidence in case of war and surprise that it had been attacked compared to the attitudes of both Egypt and Syria in Source B where the motives for war were not in the prospect of victory but in the hope of later negotiation. Hence, Israel was bound to be surprised by the attack as it knew the mindset of both Egypt and Syria was that they could not win a war against Israel.

In **Question (b) (i)**, most candidates were able to identify the Golan Heights and gave contextual information as to its significance. Equally, candidates had good information about the early successes of both Egypt in crossing the Suez Canal and occupying areas of Sinai, and the tank attack by Syrian forces in the Golan Heights in **Question (b) (ii)**. High marks were awarded here. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were largely based on the reactions of the USA and the USSR to the fighting. Neither wanted to be seen as backing a losing client state and they were both fearful, especially the USA, of the oil weapon. Supplies were cut and this threatened the economies of Western states. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether the Yom Kippur War increased the chances of peace in the Middle East were usually balanced with good comment on the activities of Sadat, Begin and Carter on the one side, while arrangements with Egypt being the only positive side from Arab nations, which condemned Sadat in 1979 for relations with Israel, were also cited. Good candidates also pointed out that no solution had been found to the Palestinian problem and Sadat was assassinated in 1981.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

Answers to **Question (a) (i)** on the textile industry saw candidates suggesting that while the spinning element was subject to change, very little advance had been made in weaving, apart from the introduction of the fly-shuttle. Workers did not appear to have gained much from the changes. Candidates saw that Source B offered something of a balance of evidence about changes in the textile industry. In their answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates quoted the changes in machinery had seen the introduction of the factory system but that weaving was still being done in weavers' cottages. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, on whether one of the sources was more useful than the other as evidence about the cotton industry, were often a comparison of the content of the two sources.

While many found it easy, in **Question (b) (i)**, to nominate two sources of power used in textile factories, some candidates did not appear to understand the term 'sources of power'. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, on the disadvantages of the domestic system, brought general answers about size, efficiency etc. and many candidates could have achieved better marks by including examples and improvements. The same qualities were shown in answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, on why factory acts were passed in the nineteenth century. Candidates were well aware of conditions, exploitation and cruelty but more could have commented on the change of views of some owners, the actions of philanthropists or increased awareness of conditions in factories. Where candidates did offer detail in answer to **Question (b) (iv)**, on whether the benefits of the factory system outweighed the disadvantages, candidates offered size and the efficiency of the operations against the dangers to, and exploitation of, the workers. Few saw regular work and pay, housing and proximity to the workplace as advantages.

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century

In their answers to **Question (a) (i)**, candidates saw that Lord Lugard was suggesting that the education and training of 'primitive tribes' would give them skills and introduce them to modern technology in order to improve their lives and industry. A few saw the 'sting in the tail' of them being able to purchase cloth and household goods from traders – presumably from the Mother Country. Most candidates who attempted this Depth Study saw a balance of evidence in Source B. In **Question (a) (ii)** they accepted that the source was arguing that Africans could not work in the same way as Europeans because of climate and personality, but that this could be made successful by having a changed working system. They also pointed out that imperialism had not failed in Africa as the imperialists were still there. Less successful candidates tended to accept that imperialism was failing and would never work properly. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** tended to follow the pattern of comparing and contrasting the content of the sources.

Some candidates were able to state that the Congo was controlled by Belgium and South West Africa was controlled by Germany by the end of the nineteenth century, but it is rare to find candidates who could nominate both in **Question (b) (i)**. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, asking for a description of 'indirect rule', were accurate and informed, although some candidates struggled to understand the term. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** tended to be lists of benefits that European countries saw from having an empire. Accurate though these lists were in terms of prestige, power, trade, markets, raw material and the spread of Christianity, candidate responses would have been improved by the inclusion of an example of a named European country, the name of a colony or a concrete example of any of the listed items. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, on whether imperialism only benefited Europeans, was dealt with largely in two ways. Some candidates compared the benefits of empire to the disadvantages to Europeans – health, danger etc., while another group compared the benefits to both Europeans and those groups which had been colonised. Both treatments were legitimate and there were interesting observations. Some candidates felt that Europeans always gained, while those who had been colonised always lost.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

Depth Studies A (Germany, 1918-1945) and C (The USA, 1919-1941) were the most popular topics, followed by Depth Study B (Russia, 1905-1941). A smaller number of candidates had prepared for Depth Studies D (China, 1945-c.1990), F (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994) and H (The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century). Too few responses were seen to other topics to make comment worthwhile.

Almost all scripts were well-presented and written in excellent English, and many displayed very secure historical knowledge in **Section B** answers. The majority of candidates approached **Questions (a)(i) and (ii)** in line with the criteria but were not always effective in addressing **Question (a)(iii)**. Generalisations on reliability, no matter how long, do not produce high marks. Such points must be substantiated with specific reference to the content of the sources in relation to the issue presented in the question, if candidates are to progress to higher marks.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1 Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

- (a) (i) All candidates made valid inferences from Source A about the Nazi Party in 1929 and most supported them with specific detail from the source to attain the highest level marks. The one flaw evident in some answers was the claim that a vote of 2.6% indicated that the Nazis were very popular and that twelve seats in the Reichstag made them powerful.
- (ii) Some very sound responses were focused securely on the issue of democracy and explained how far this was discernible in Weimar Germany, using relevant material from Source B. That there were still elections, a Social Democratic Party, a moderate coalition government in Prussia and the relative electoral unpopularity of the extremist parties were used to indicate some continuing success for democracy. Thus a balance was shown for the inter-party violence, extremism and the influence of Stalin on the Communist Party, which were undermining democracy. The majority of answers concentrated on the latter aspects to support agreement and it is worthwhile to remind candidates that a balance will be found within a source if it is given sufficient consideration.
- (iii) Most candidates focused on Source A as providing more evidence of the organisation of the Nazi Party, the support of wealthy industrialists, the exploitation of memories of the war, as well as Hitler's speechmaking as factors in gaining support. So long as aspects of Source B, such as the appeal of the Party to those opposed to Communism, a Nazi newspaper to spread their influence and the irony of Communists and Nazis working together, were also considered, answers could gain high level 3 marks. This was certainly a more effective approach than offering weak generalisations on the issue of reliability. The best candidates assessed the sources' content against their own knowledge of the context and made some cross-references between the sources, as well as the significance of newspaper reports to reach a judgment on utility.
- (b) (i) Most candidates knew von Papen and von Schleicher. Fewer named Marx, Muller or Bruning, whilst others were not credited for including Stresemann and Hitler as Chancellors in the 1928-1932 period.
- (ii) There were a number of excellent answers detailing President Hindenburg's political actions between 1930 and 1933, from his use of Emergency Powers to back his chosen Chancellors, his re-election as President to blocking and then, despite misgivings, accepting Hitler as Chancellor. Some responses were vague, but did appreciate the use of Article 48.

- (iii) Some candidates wrote about the Ruhr and hyperinflation in 1923, instead of answering on the question set. However, the majority appreciated the 1933 focus and offered a range of reasons, including the significance of the Wall Street Crash, the recall of American loans, the weaknesses of the German economy and banks, as well as the fear of a return to hyperinflation, as factors.
- (iv) Dates were again significant in this question as weaker answers claimed the Nazis were using the Gestapo and concentration camps between 1930 and 1933. Better candidates did focus on the use of the SA, threats, intimidation and the Reichstag Fire as evidence of violence and compared this with the appeal of the Nazis to different social groups, their use of propaganda and the economic crisis. Many answers would have benefited from better knowledge of the specific elections in this crucial period.

Question 2 Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

- (a) (i) All candidates were able to draw valid inferences from these statistics but many failed to support them with specific examples from the source and thus limited their marks.
- (ii) The majority of candidates saw some balance in this source and a number went beyond mere quotation to explain why the sheer scale of the task and its achievement could be seen as effective yet, at the same time, the speed and inexperience of the workers calls that into question.
- (iii) Better candidates considered and supported what such emphasis on raw materials and building work meant for industrialisation and they made some cross-reference between the railways and structural work of Source B, and the output in Source A. Some candidates struggled, writing 'statistics can not be trusted, Americans are anti-Communists so will be biased'. Without the inclusion of any substance from the sources, this is insufficient as assessment.
- (b) (i) Most candidates correctly identified what a gulag was and described the inmates and conditions.
- (ii) The 'carrot and stick' of encouragement were known by most candidates. Although some were rather vague, others gave a range of incentives and punishments to gain full marks.
- (iii) All candidates knew of Stalin's determination to modernise Russia and provide for the military. There were a number of excellent answers which developed these with specific support and pointed to a range of other reasons such as moving away from the NEP and to gain from exports.
- (iv) Many responses considered a range of Stalin's policies - if with limited depth, but the focus of 'a modern, industrial state' tended to be left as implication, rather than directly addressed, except in the best answers. These also balanced the positive economic and social benefits of Stalin's policies against their shortcomings, and the over-riding dictatorial regime.

Question 3 Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

- (a) (i) There were many excellent answers to this question in which candidates supported a number of valid inferences from the source. That the Native Americans were treated almost as children, kept virtually captive under state supervision until they should prove themselves capable of conforming to set criteria, were well explained.
- (ii) Here, too, a substantial number of candidates did well with balanced responses which went beyond mere quotation into reasoned focus on the issue of racism being accepted throughout the United States. Appreciation of literacy laws as a factor in southern and some western states was balanced by the points that these were a minority of states and that there was opposition in Alaska, although in these states both Black Americans and Native Americans were regarded as inferior.
- (iii) There were some generalised answers on the issue of 'reliability'. However, most candidates did consider the content of both sources if, at times, not making the transition to 'inequalities' rather than simply racism. Those who made good use of the last two sentences of Source B linked to the type of questions being asked in Source A, as well as the issue of literacy laws, and gained high marks.

- (b)(i)** The large majority of candidates knew who Sacco and Vanzetti were, and could expand on this to include their fate.
- (ii)** Here, too, most candidates had knowledge of the Ku Klux Klan, although a number would have improved their responses by focusing on their 'activities', rather than detailing their aims. Those who focussed on the right areas and went beyond lynching, gained high marks.
- (iii)** The majority of answers were soundly focused and a range of reasons was well developed to fully merit high marks. Some less successful answers considered the results of prohibition, rather than reasons for its introduction.
- (iv)** Almost all candidates offered a degree of balance on some range of aspects on the issue of change in the role of women. The performances of some candidates would have been improved if they had supported points with convincing details beyond description of flappers. The most effective responses were from candidates who pointed out that flappers were a minority of women and, in the main, urban middle class, whilst the majority of the working class and rural women experienced little more than superficial change in their role. How far gaining the vote represented major change during the 1920s was also debated in some very good answers.

Question 4 Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

- (a)(i)** The majority of candidates had little difficulty in drawing valid inferences directly supported from the source about the lives of the Chinese people in 1982, although few made any on the 'luckier parts of China', as an indicator of differences.
- (ii)** Most candidates did appreciate the balance in Source B and the best answers were explanations, rather than simple quotations.
- (iii)** This was the weakest response for many candidates as they simply pointed out that as both were British, 'they must be biased', without any explanation or support from the sources. Contextual knowledge could have been used to assess their utility, and some cross-reference on the issue of wealth in the economy.
- (b)(i)** All candidates could give a general definition of the Gang of Four, and some would have benefited from specifics on their names or role.
- (ii)** Most answers indicated some knowledge of the Tiananmen Square events if, at times, limited detail was given.
- (iii)** The majority of candidates would have benefited from more secure knowledge on reasons for Deng Xiaoping emerging as leader. Some merely quoted Source B.
- (iv)** Most candidates could make points on the focus of 'relaxed control', and some were soundly developed with supporting detail to reach a balanced conclusion.

Question 6 Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994

- (a)(i)** Almost all candidates saw valid inferences in President Nasser's attitude to the Suez Canal. Some would have produced better answers by including specific quotation from the source to support them.
- (ii)** There was some well-explained balance in a large number of responses to this question and most candidates appreciated its focus.
- (iii)** Many answers to this part of the question, as in other Depth Studies, were the least effectively developed as candidates did not go beyond generalities on bias and so restricted their marks. To demonstrate the validity of such points, support from the sources is essential and contextual knowledge can be used as a further measure of utility, as well as cross-reference between the sources.

- (b)(i) Some candidates were able to explain what the fedayeen were. Some did not attempt the question.
- (ii) Most candidates would have benefitted from a more secure knowledge of the Sevres Accords.
- (iii) Some sound answers were able to develop a range of supported reasons for the importance of the Egyptian seizure of the Canal, and most had some general awareness.
- (iv) Most candidates had some knowledge of the involvement of the USA and USSR in general. Many responses would have merited higher marks if they had supported this with specific examples across the wider range of conflicts beyond the Suez War. Also, the actions and importance of other states could have been assessed by more candidates, in order to achieve balanced responses.

Question 8 Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century

- (a)(i) Candidates had little difficulty in seeing and supporting valid inferences on the more noble aspect of imperialism expressed in this French source.
 - (ii) Here, too, some sound answers developed a clear and balanced focus on the spreading of Christianity as the main motive of imperialism, although some were less convincing in arguing that doing so with weapons supported this.
 - (iii) 'Bias' was the focus of many answers to this question, rather than offering any specific source detail or contextual knowledge to support this, or cross-reference of the content of the sources, for example on 'barbarian' of A and 'heathen' in B, to establish utility in relation to the focus on European attitudes. This would have improved many responses.
- (b)(i) Most could identify at least one nineteenth century French possession.
 - (ii) The obvious motive of conversion was known by all and a number were able to go beyond this to detail other humanitarian aims and some economic ones.
 - (iii) Trading opportunities, inter-European rivalries and the exploitation of resources were known by most candidates and some supported these with specific details, if few differentiated between Africa and Asia.
 - (iv) General points on European gains from Africa were made by all candidates - with some attention to losses. Specific support of what either entailed or differentiated between European countries involved, could have led to higher marks for some.