

HISTORY

Paper 2147/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully before they begin, in order to understand exactly what is being asked and to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced answers. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help to ensure that their responses only include relevant details.

In more extensive responses candidates should be encouraged to organise their points into distinct paragraphs, otherwise points can become blurred together or alternatively candidates can lose focus on the question set.

In **part (c)** responses candidates should try to write evaluative, rather than purely summative, conclusions.

General comments

Successful responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study questions. These responses included clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. Less successful responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts lacking in explanation.

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

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

Part (a) responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. Most candidates realised that answers to **(a)** questions can be short and concise and that there is no need to include background information.

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

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Weaker responses often focused only on one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most frequently answered questions in the Core Content section.

Question 5

- (a) This question was well answered and saw some very strong responses. These responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of Clemenceau's aims at Versailles and included four relevant, concisely expressed points. Points made included: 'Clemenceau wanted Germany to pay for the damage caused to France during the war'. 'He wanted security for France and thus wanted to reduce Germany's armed forces'. 'He wanted Alsace Lorraine back from Germany'. Some weaker responses drifted away from the central focus of Clemenceau's aims to discuss what Clemenceau achieved at Versailles. Other less successful responses included incorrect details.
- (b) Some responses misunderstood the term 'self-determination' and interpreted the term as a personal quality or something to do with the League of Nations, rather than one referring to peoples of a colony or area of land wanting the right to rule over themselves. The most successful responses explained two reasons as to why Wilson's belief in self-determination was important. They explained that self-determination was one of Wilson's Fourteen Points, and that it meant that different peoples should have the right to rule themselves. It led to the formation of countries such as Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland. A second reason often explained was that Wilson's idea of self-determination caused conflict with the British and French representatives as both Britain and France ruled over large empires and if Wilson's plans were adopted this would threaten their control over their empires.
- (c) This question was well answered. There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses which discussed the extent to which loss of territory was the most serious consequence of the Versailles Settlement for Germany. Stronger responses identified the territory taken away from Germany and most commonly explained the economic impact this had on Germany. Examples of territory often included the loss of Alsace Lorraine and the temporary loss of the Saar Basin which both included valuable iron ore deposits and rich coal mines, the profits from which would have helped the Germans to pay the reparations. These strong responses then recognised other consequences for Germany and most commonly explained the impact of reparations, the War Guilt Clause and demilitarisation on Germany. Some weaker responses contained detailed knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles but lacked an assessment of the impact of these terms on Germany. Others did not identify any territories and wrote in general terms about the consequences. These responses could have been improved by explaining why the terms led to hardship for the German citizens.

Question 6

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates, who were able to identify occasions on which Hitler broke the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. Rearmament and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland were the two instances most commonly mentioned. Other ways cited included Hitler refusing to pay anymore reparations and his Anschluss with Austria in 1938. Some weaker responses described Hitler's aims without mentioning specific events. It is important that candidates read the question carefully. Other less successful responses included inaccurate information. Common misconceptions included the reunification of Germany and Austria through Anschluss (when the two had never been united) and the retaking of the Sudetenland in 1938 (which had never been part of Germany).

- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses identified the reasons for appeasement - usually the British desire to maintain peace, the need to buy time to prepare for war and the feeling in Britain that Germany had been harshly treated at Versailles. However, these responses were usually rather general and did not refer to specific examples of the policy of appeasement. Other responses made the argument that appeasement was all about trade, possibly confusing with Lloyd George's concerns at Versailles in 1919. Stronger responses were characterised by two explanations. Most commonly they considered the impact of the Great Depression on Britain and the threat of communism. The rationale behind the threat of communism was clearly explained. The spread of communism was considered a great threat after the First World War. British politicians feared the power of the Soviet Union in helping spread communism to Western Europe. Hitler was known as an enemy of communism and he was acting as a buffer against the spread of Soviet communism. British politicians decided to appease Hitler to help strengthen his position against the Soviet Union and reduce the risk of communism spreading.
- (c) Stronger responses included contextual examples on how the increase in aggression from some states in the 1930s was caused by economic factors. They highlighted the effects of the Great Depression on usually Japan and Italy and explained their economic motivation to invade Manchuria and Abyssinia respectively. To produce a balanced response this was then contrasted with non-economic factors for the increase of aggression from some states such as the weakness of the League of Nations, Hitler's territorial ambitions, the counter-productive effects of appeasement and the political/nationalistic motives of aggressive powers. Some weaker responses did not restrict their answers to the 1930s and included events from the 1920s, such as the Corfu incident, to explain Italian aggression. They also sometimes included narrative on the reasons for the Great Depression. It is important to register the time limits in the question. Other less successful responses appeared uncertain of what the question meant by 'aggression'. These responses often included details on the unrest in Germany in the early 1930s and limited themselves to German domestic policies with no reference to the question.

Question 7

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates lacked knowledge of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and either did not answer the question or included incorrect information. Successful responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the incident. Credit was given for: American warships in the Gulf of Tonkin were attacked by North Vietnamese gunboats. As a result of this attack, the US Congress passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which gave President Johnson the authority to do what he thought necessary. Other relevant details most commonly cited were that the incident took place in August 1964 and that as a result of the attack, ground troops were sent to Vietnam in 1965.
- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why US public opinion turned against the war. The two most common reasons identified were that the war was reported on American TV which had not happened before and the war was considered to be a waste of money and resources. The first identification was explained by developing the idea that American people were seeing the devastating effects of the USA's use of chemical weapons such as agent orange and napalm on Vietnamese civilians, as in the My Lai Massacre. This shocked the American people and resulted in massive protest against the Vietnam War. Other reasons identified and explained included the fact that the war had become unwinnable and thousands of young American soldiers were being killed. Weaker responses usually readily identified reasons but these needed to be fully developed into explanations.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer to explain reasons why the US failed to contain the spread of communism and then provide examples to demonstrate the other side of the argument. Strong responses commonly used the war in Vietnam as an example of the US failing to contain the spread of communism. These responses included details from the war to explain how the US failed to defeat the Vietcong in South Vietnam and after the evacuation of US troops the South was overrun. As a result of Vietnam becoming communist the domino effect occurred whereby Laos and Cambodia also fell to communism. On the other side of the argument stronger responses then produced evidence and explanations from events in Cuba and/or Korea to prove US success in containing communism. Some weaker responses contained detailed accounts of events in Vietnam, Korea or Cuba without assessing of the impact of the actions towards containing communism. It is important to link points made to the question.

Question 8

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates who had a good understanding of the events in Hungary in 1956. Successful responses included a number of concise and relevant events including: demonstrations resulted in Stalin's statue being removed, Nagy was announced as Prime Minister, he announced that Hungary was to leave the Warsaw Pact and on 4 November Soviet tanks invaded Budapest. Weaker responses included events after 1956.
- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses were characterised by the explanation of two reasons why Czechoslovakia was invaded in 1968. The most common reason explained was that the Soviets were afraid that Dubcek's ideas would spread to other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. His reforms included a free press, freedom of speech and reducing government control over industry. If these reforms were allowed in Czechoslovakia there was a worry that people in other communist countries would demand the same freedoms. Other factors identified and explained included the fact that the USSR would look weak if they did not take decisive action and they were worried this would weaken the Communist Bloc in the Cold War against the USA. Weaker responses shifted the focus of the question and described Dubcek's reforms, rather than emphasising why Czechoslovakia was invaded.
- (c) Stronger responses were characterised by demonstrating a good understanding of Gorbachev's policy in the Soviet Union from 1985 to 1991. Successful responses explained how Gorbachev made little effort to defend Soviet power in Eastern Europe. He was a new type of leader in the Soviet Union who realised that the Soviet Union was in economic trouble and spending too much on arms in the unwinnable war in Afghanistan. He believed in different policies such as Glasnost and Perestroika. He made it clear that he would not oppose attempts at democracy in Warsaw Pact countries and he would not send Red Army troops into these countries to stay tied to the Soviet Union. He would let Eastern European countries decide their futures. These responses then produced a balanced argument by identifying and explaining other reasons for the collapse of Soviet power in Eastern Europe, most commonly the rise and impact of Solidarity. Weaker responses were characterised by a narrative of Gorbachev's reforms, with no reference to the collapse of Soviet power.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This question received the most responses from candidates in the Depth Studies section.

- (a) The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of what happened on the Night of Long Knives, demonstrating their knowledge of the involvement of the SS, Hitler's granting of a period of leave to the SA and the fate of Rohm and leading SA figures, as well as the murder of former Chancellor von Schleicher. Some responses sought to explain the nature of Hitler's anxieties about Rohm and the SA and the position of the German army at this time. This was obviously relevant to Hitler's course of action but it was not central to the thrust of the question which required an account of the events. Other responses confused the Night of Long Knives with Kristallnacht.
- (b) There were many strong responses to this question in which the success of the Weimar Governments in the 1920s and the lack of appeal of extremist parties were identified and explained as reasons why the Nazi Party had little success before 1930. Responses tended to be stronger on the strength of German industry and culture in the Stresemann years. They often included evidence of the successes of Stresemann in economic and foreign affairs, resulting in the German population seeing little reason to change to an untested, extreme right-wing party. Less successful responses were weaker on the Nazi side, limiting their response to identifications such as, 'they were an extreme party' and 'the Munich Putsch was a failure'. These identifications needed to be explained by emphasising the violent nature of the Nazis and the resulting lack of appeal. A minority of candidates drifted away from the question by outlining the factors that propelled Hitler into power between 1930 and 1933 and arguing that they were absent in the 1920s.

- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Most candidates were secure on the events surrounding the Reichstag Fire and explained how Hitler exploited this event to attack and effectively destroy the communists as political rivals, arresting and imprisoning many of them. More could have referred to how this impacted on the elections of March 1933 which would have supported this side of the argument. On the other side of this question stronger responses appreciated that the time span was limited to 1933 and explained the impact of the passing of the Enabling Act as an important event in Hitler's consolidation of power in 1933. They detailed the terms of the Act and how he used the act to consolidate his power providing examples such as: creating a one-party state, destroying the power of the trade unions and purging the civil service. Weaker responses saw the Enabling Act and the Decree for the Protection of People and State as the same thing, following on immediately in the aftermath of the Reichstag Fire. These responses therefore asserted or implied that the crackdown on the communists immediately after the Fire was carried out under the Enabling Act when in fact this was still to come. Other weaker responses included details of Hitler's rise to power which lacked relevance to this question, for example ignoring the limits of the question which was solely concerned with 1933. There were knowledgeable explanations of the Night of Long Knives, the death of Hindenburg, the army oath and the increasingly hostile anti-Jewish policies and actions. It is important that candidates read the question carefully to ensure the correct time span and note the key words in the question, in this case 'events' which led to Hitler's consolidation of power in 1933.

Question 12

- (a) A significant number of responses included details on the events of Kristallnacht when Jews suffered personal attacks by the Nazis and attacks on synagogues, shops and private houses. However, Kristallnacht happened in 1938. Successful responses included details of actions taken by the Nazis against Jewish businesses in 1933. Credit was awarded for non-violent methods such as 'the boycott of Jewish businesses', 'Jewish businesses were identified with the Star of David', 'posters on shop windows told people to stay away' and 'SA men stood outside the shops deterring entry'. Other responses drifted from the focus of the question to explain why Hitler hated the Jews.
- (b) Strong responses identified and explained two reasons why mass rallies were important. The most common explanation was that it was an excellent propaganda opportunity to show the power and strength of the regime, with leading Nazis such as Goebbels and Hitler making persuasive speeches whilst emphasising Nazi ideals. These reinforced the personality of Hitler and encouraged support for the Nazi regime. Successful responses also explained that the rallies associated with the Nazis brought excitement to the Germans, such as those at Nuremberg with military bands, marching and displays often at night by torchlight, to create interest, support and loyalty. A small number of candidates struggled to understand the term 'mass rallies'.
- (c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. In agreement with the hypothesis, responses explained the control that the Nazis had over German society. They commonly explained this in terms of the terror and force used to suppress any opposition, discussing the Gestapo who had unlimited powers to search houses, arrest people on suspicion and send them to concentration camps without trial or explanation. Many Germans were frightened to speak out against the regime even if they wanted to. Control was also exercised through the media, and evident in the control over women and education. The strongest responses fully explained how and why this control took place and the resultant impact. These strong responses also gave consideration to ways in which the Nazis were not in control of all German people. They explained how many young people believed in freedom of expression and values which conflicted with those of the Nazis. They used the Edelweiss Pirates as an example and showed how they shared a strong distaste of the strict regimentation and sexual segregation of the Hitler Youth, so they often beat them up. During the war they carried out acts of sabotage, helped army deserters and even assassinated a Gestapo chief. The activities of the Swing Movement, the Kreisau Circle and members of the Church were also often used as examples of areas where the Nazis faced challenges to their ability to control German society. Weaker responses often adopted a narrative approach on the control exercised by the Nazis. It is important that reasons are identified and then supporting information linked to the question is given in answers. Other responses were one-sided and would have benefitted from identifying and explaining the few areas which the Nazis did not fully control.

Questions 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 2147/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully. This will help them to understand exactly what is being asked and will give them the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help ensure that responses only include relevant details.

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

In **Part (c)** responses it is a good idea to encourage candidates to practice writing evaluative, rather than purely summative conclusions, in which they make a judgement.

General comments

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

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

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

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

- (a) This question was answered well, with many candidates able to recall specific terms that applied to Austria in the peace settlement. Good knowledge of the territorial changes was shown, as well as the limitations placed on the Austrian armed forces such as the limitation of the army to 30 000. Less successful answers confused Austria with Germany, or occasionally thought that Austria had gained from the peace settlements.
- (b) Candidates were less assured on this question, and many answers displayed a lack of understanding about what Danzig was, and therefore why it was important in the peace settlement. Some answers also concentrated on what happened to Danzig, rather than considering why it was important in the negotiations. Stronger answers were able to explain why Danzig was important as a sea port and trading centre to both Germany and Poland, and therefore both countries would want control of it. Some answers were also able to explain that the Big Three also disagreed about what should happen to Danzig, with Clemenceau and Wilson arguing that it should be given to Poland, and Lloyd George believing that it should remain with Germany.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with the more successful answers able to explain what the specific aims of Lloyd George or Wilson were, and why they found it difficult to achieve particular aims. Strong responses were able to explain, for example, the difficulty that Lloyd George faced in achieving his aim of not destroying Germany, so as to allow it to remain as a trading partner, when compared with the demands of the British public to treat Germany harshly, and his need to satisfy these demands. When considering the difficulties that Wilson faced, candidates often focused on either the Fourteen Points as a whole, or specific ideas within the Fourteen Points. Explanations were often based around a consideration of the idealistic nature of Wilson's ideas, when compared with the demands from Clemenceau and Lloyd George whose countries had suffered more than America during the war. When explaining the difficulty of achieving self-determination, for example, candidates were able to explain that this conflicted with Britain and France who were determined to preserve and potentially increase their empires. Less assured answers described the aims of Wilson and Lloyd George, without explaining why they found it difficult to achieve these. Some answers did try to explain why they found it hard to achieve their aims, but lacked the contextual support or produced generalised answers based on disagreements between the Big Three.

Question 6

- (a) Most candidates were aware that the Anglo-German Naval Agreement allowed Germany to increase its navy, often accurately identifying up to 35 per cent of Britain's navy, and that it broke the Treaty and France was unhappy at not being consulted. Fewer mentioned submarines or their 45 per cent limit. Weaker answers lacked knowledge. Some answers also confused it with the reduction of Germany's navy in the Treaty of Versailles.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify or describe at least two aspects of Anschluss, most commonly that Hitler wanted a Greater Germany, that it broke the Treaty or that he wanted the Austrian resources and army. More answers could have been developed into an explanation by showing why this would be important. Some responses referred to Austrians as Germans rather than German speakers, or stated that Austria was needed to fulfil Lebensraum.
- (c) This question was answered well, and many strong responses were seen on the importance for Hitler of Germany's involvement in the Spanish Civil War. Many sound answers provided an explanation of why Hitler needed to test his new weapons. Many then went on to explain the importance of how his new alliance or friendship with Mussolini led to the successful completion of Anschluss in March 1938. There were a number of unbalanced responses, primarily because candidates were not able to bring the same insightfulness on the importance of the takeover of Czechoslovakia for Hitler as they did on the Spanish Civil War. Many responses gave detailed descriptions of both the Sudeten Crisis and of March 1939, without explaining their importance for Hitler. Weaker responses often described Hitler's involvement in the two events, rather than arguing the importance of the involvement, or incorrectly stated that the Sudetenland was taken from Germany in the Treaty of Versailles. Some candidates, who did try to explain the importance of the takeover of Czechoslovakia, concentrated on its importance for Britain, France or the USSR, rather than for Hitler.

Question 7

- (a) This question was answered well. Different approaches to the question were seen, with some candidates concentrating on Stalin's motivation and actions during the Blockade, such as the blocking of roads, while other answers concentrated on the response to the Blockade by France, Britain and the USA, such as the airlift. These were both valid approaches. Less successful responses confused the Berlin Blockade with the Berlin Wall, or East Berlin with West Berlin.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question, with many answers able to identify or describe reasons, but lacking in explanation. Most candidates were able to show that Stalin wanted control over the government of Poland to increase his sphere of influence, or to spread communism. Most answers were also able to identify the geographical significance of Poland. Stronger responses went further and included explanations of Stalin's expectations after the wartime conferences, the USSR's previous history with Germany, or the context of the Cold War in the late 1940s. Other responses, sometimes lengthy, described the post-war situation without linking it to why this would mean that Stalin wanted control over the Polish government, or made assertions such as the need for resources.
- (c) Some good answers to this question were seen, with most candidates able to provide explanations on at least one side of the argument. Many such answers focused on the American desire to stop communism as their main point and were able to explain this with solid contextual support. Other arguments seen on the side of America benefitting from the Marshall Plan also explained the propaganda impact of Marshall Aid in the USA and were also able to explain this within the Cold War context. Fewer answers were seen which were able to explain how Europe benefited, as arguments on this side were often generalised statements about improvements to the economy of European countries, rather than exploring the specific impact, or considering European countries individually. Such answers could have been strengthened by referring to the details of the Plan such as the provision of raw materials, goods and machines to stimulate the economy, for example, nets provided for Norwegian fishermen, or tractors for French farmers, to explain the benefits gained. Other answers believed that Marshall Aid was accepted by Eastern Europe or confused the Marshall Plan with Containment.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

- (a) Excellent responses to this question were seen, with most candidates displaying very strong factual recall. Strong answers stated the aims of the Spartacist uprising, providing details of the leadership and uprising itself, or wrote about the use of the Freikorps and the execution of Liebknecht and Luxemburg to show how it ended. Errors were rare, but such answers generally confused the Spartacist uprising with the Kapp Putsch.
- (b) Mixed responses to this question were seen. Candidates were very confident in their knowledge of why there was a crisis in the Ruhr but were less able to provide two separate explanations. Stronger answers were able to explain that the failure of Germany to pay reparations resulted in the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr and provide two separate consequences of this. These answers were able to explain the immediate impact of passive resistance and the French response to this with violence and the expulsion of Germans from the Ruhr. They were then able to provide a separate explanation often based around the resulting hyperinflation. Other answers provided lengthy and accurate descriptions of what happened, but they would have been improved by addressing the question set or supporting more than just one explanation.

- (c) Some good responses to this question were seen, mainly on one side, although some candidates were able to go further and produce a balanced argument. Most answers were confident in explaining how Stresemann restored Germany's strength between 1924 and 1929, and were able to provide at least two explanations, often based around the improvements he made to the economy, and the improvements he made for Germany's international relations. These answers were supported by a good level of contextual knowledge, for example of the impact of the Dawes Plan, with candidates able to explain the impact of the loans on German infrastructure. Responses were less assured when examining the other side of the argument. Stronger answers were able to explain the potential structural weakness of relying on American loans or explained that not all sectors of the Germany economy benefited, for example farmers. Less successful responses did not focus on the specific question and tried to show how Germany was weakened after the Depression or included details of Hitler's actions. Other responses tried to explain the problems caused by cultural changes such as Bauhaus, but these were not as a result of Stresemann's actions.

Question 12

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and were able to display detailed knowledge about how the Nazis used the radio. Many answers were able to show not only what was allowed to be broadcast on the radio, but also how the Nazis made radios accessible to Germans by making them cheaper or putting up loudspeakers in the streets.
- (b) There were some very good answers seen to this question, with most candidates able to explain at least one reason why the Gestapo was feared by Germans. Such answers were able to show that the overarching powers of the Gestapo, such as the ability to arrest people or send them to concentration camps, made Germans scared as they feared for the lives of themselves and their families. Other responses explained that the use of informers meant that Germans were scared to speak out as they did not know whether they would be overheard. Other answers often had a good knowledge of the Gestapo, but described what they did rather than linking it to the question by showing the consequences of their activities on the German people.
- (c) Responses to this question were mixed. Stronger answers were able to explain that Hitler's policies towards the Jews did appear to have popular support, perhaps due to the indoctrination that young people experienced in schools, or other anti-Semitic propaganda. Balanced answers were also achieved, often through an explanation that, although there was not necessarily resistance to Hitler's policies, this was a result of the fear the Germans experienced, resulting in tacit acceptance rather than active support. Other responses were able to provide examples of individuals such as Galen and groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates who did actually oppose the policies. Less successful answers did not address the issue of popular support, tending to produce lengthy description of the policies, often expanding outside the dates given in the question, to include the Holocaust.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

- (a) The majority of candidates mentioned the assembly line or conveyer belt and most often followed this with recognition that the workers were static and that the 'parts' moved to them. Some also mentioned how quicker processes and greater volumes meant cheaper products.
- (b) Some very good responses to this question were seen, with candidates clearly displaying a good level of knowledge about the importance of the development of advertising to the boom. Many candidates were able to identify or describe at least two aspects of advertising, with common responses identifying that advertising encouraged consumers to purchase a particular product, or that advertising was effective across many industries, including the entertainment industry. A number of answers would have benefited from providing a link or explanation as to how advertising impacted on, and was therefore important to, the boom.

- (c) Nearly all responses showed a clear understanding of groups who did and did not benefit from the boom. A number of answers included an explanation of the impact of new consumer goods, such as cars and domestic appliances, and how these had changed lives for the better. Many candidates were able to achieve a balanced answer by explaining which groups did not benefit from the boom. Such answers were able to explain how and why the coal industry declined because of the advent of electricity, and thus the subsequent effects on coal miners. There were also some good explanations of how agricultural overproduction and Canadian competition had affected farmers and why this had led to reduced income and increased farm evictions. Less successful answers would have been improved by a focus on the specific issue in the question, rather than writing generalised answers about society in the 1920s. These answers tended to focus on the social, rather than the specific economic impact, of discrimination during the boom.

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 2147/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- Candidates should avoid describing or summarising the source at the beginning of an answer. They should try to provide a direct answer to the question in the first sentence. The rest of the answer should be used to explain and support.
- Contextual knowledge should only be used to improve the quality of the answer – to explain and support it.
- When answering **Question 6**, the sources must be used. This question is primarily about the sources.
- When quoting from a source, the quotation in full should be given.
- Impressions and inferences from sources should always be supported with detail from the sources.
- When asked about the message of cartoons, candidates should try to focus on the point of view of the cartoonist.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option, although a number of responses to the nineteenth century topic were seen. The overall quality was mixed but this included many strong scripts. Candidates' contextual knowledge was often sound but some candidates were unsure how to address some of the questions. This was particularly true of **Questions 3** and **6** in the twentieth century option. A number of candidates did not attempt **Question 3**, and **Question 6** proved challenging for some.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates just paraphrased the source and kept to description and surface detail, without forming any impressions about the relationship. A small number provided impressions but they were not about the relationship between William and Bismarck. Valid impressions that candidates suggested included: Bismarck needed William, Bismarck usually got what he wanted from William and the relationship was volatile. It is important to remember that impressions need to be supported from the source. A small number of candidates managed to explain the overall impression which is that the relationship was one of mutual dependency.

Question 2

The first step in answering this question is to identify agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources, for example Bismarck gets his way in both sources, while the sources disagree over William's attitude towards Austria. A reasonable number of candidates managed to use these agreements or disagreements as reasons for finding Source C not surprising or surprising. The best responses evaluated one of the sources. Weaker answers were based on the provenances of the sources and did not use the content.

Question 3

Many candidates paraphrased the source and in effect repeated the surface information contained within it. Candidates would have improved their responses by making inferences from the source, for example about the relationship between Bismarck and William in the decision-making process. The best answers evaluated Source D either by cross reference to their knowledge or by considering the provenance of the source.

Question 4

The best answers brought together the big message of the cartoon, its context, and its purpose. A good number of candidates managed to do this. Their answers greatly benefited from their contextual knowledge. They were aware of the importance of the Austrian defeat in 1866 and the following annexation of some north German states by Prussia. This knowledge enabled them to explain how the cartoon's purpose may have been to warn the French about the threat from Prussia. These answers were supported by references to details in the cartoon. Most candidates were able to explain either a sub-message of the cartoon, for example Prussia is aggressive, or explain the context. This question is about the reasons why the cartoon was published. It is important that candidates, whether they are writing about the message, context or purpose of the cartoon, make it clear that they are suggesting reasons for publication.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. The best showed an understanding that the cartoonist's big message is that William grabbed all the glory for the achievement of unification but it was Bismarck who was actually the architect of it. Big messages are based on putting all the main details in the cartoon together, using it as a whole, and asking oneself, what is the big point that the cartoonist wants to get across? The sub-messages that many candidates gave were based on just one part of the cartoon, for example William was conceited, William was a fool and Bismarck was responsible for creating a united Germany. All of these valid answers were informed, even if implicitly, by contextual knowledge. Misinterpretations offered by some candidates, for example Bismarck was insignificant, William was responsible for unification, and William had lost his crown, were made when candidates were unable to bring knowledge to their reading of the cartoon.

Question 6

This question was answered reasonably well. Most candidates were able to explain how some sources support the hypothesis, for example Source B explains how Bismarck managed to persuade William not to attend the conference in Frankfurt. Better answers also showed how other sources disagree with the hypothesis, for example Source C shows how Bismarck failed to win William over and had to depend on the Crown Prince doing this for him. When sources are being used in response to this question it is important to explain, with a clear and direct reference to the relevant part of the source, how the source supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. It is also important to use each source separately. Sources may be grouped, for and against the hypothesis, but then each source in each group needs to be used by itself.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. There are many agreements between the two sources, for example they both claim that US failure to join the League weakened it, that Britain and France acting together was important for the League and that the League was popular. Disagreements are also there, for example Source A claims that Britain and France were to blame for the League's problems, while Source B blames the USA. A number of candidates summarised both sources first but most then went on to produce proper comparisons. Only a very small number neglected to make any kind of meaningful comparison. Agreements and disagreements were identified and explained carefully but only a few candidates managed to compare the big messages of the two sources – Source A argues the League had little chance of succeeding, while Source B claims that it could have worked but for the events of the 1930s which destroyed it. It is important to remember that disagreements need more explanation than agreements. With agreements it is enough to state, for example 'Both sources state that the Depression harmed the League.' Disagreements, however, need to be unpacked a little more, for example 'Source A states that the League never had a chance, while Source B states that it did have a chance of succeeding.' It is not enough to state, for example, 'The sources disagree over whether or not the League of Nations ever stood a chance of succeeding.'

Question 2

There were three valid approaches to this 'purpose' question and this made a wide range of answers possible. Candidates could focus on the context, the message of the cartoon, or its purpose. Many combined these approaches to produce very strong answers. Most candidates started their answers by using a contextual approach. They used their contextual knowledge to explain one reason why the cartoon was published in December 1917 was the fact that the US Senate had rejected the Treaty of Versailles (and therefore membership of the League) in the previous month. Many of these candidates also used the message of the cartoon as a reason for publication. For example, the cartoon suggests the League was going to be weak because the USA was not a member. Better answers considered the possible purpose of the cartoon as a reason for publication. Answers included: to criticise the USA for not joining and to put pressure on the USA to join. In the very best answers candidates either explained the big message of the cartoon or combined purpose, big message and context. The big message was taken as the League will fail because the USA refuses to join the League. It is important that candidates remember they are being asked for reasons why the cartoon was published. This makes it crucial that they do not just interpret the cartoon or explain its context or purpose, but that they use such analyses as reasons for publication of the cartoon. To help themselves do this, they should try to begin their answers with 'This cartoon was published then because...'. Answers that did not provide a reason for publication could not achieve higher marks, no matter how good the analysis of the cartoon was. It is essential to answer the question set.

Question 3

Candidates struggled with this question. Some found it a challenge to find agreements or disagreements between the two sources. The essential agreements and disagreements are over Britain. They agree that Britain was trying to avoid its obligations but also disagree because of Baldwin's claim that Britain was loyal to the League. A reasonable number of candidates found valid but less satisfactory agreements/disagreements, for example both sources suggest the League was weak, and Source D sees Britain as being to blame for the failure of the League, while Source E places the blame on the USA. Such agreements and disagreements could be used as the reason for arguing that Source D makes Source E surprising or not surprising. Few candidates went on to evaluate one or both sources. Less successful answers were based on the provenance of each source without making proper use of the content of the sources.

Question 4

Most candidates were more successful with this question. Only a small number limited their answers to describing surface details and there was much valid interpretation of the cartoons. Many candidates explained that both cartoons show the League to be failing. They were less successful on the disagreements but a reasonable number pointed out that in Source F the League is doing nothing, while in Source G, it is at least trying to get the USA to help. The best answers were from those candidates who focused on the opinions of the cartoonists and explained that they both were criticising the League for failing to act over Japan's aggression in Manchuria.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of responses. A small number of candidates struggled with producing impressions from Source H. Impressions are based on inferences from the source and give us something that the source does not directly state. These candidates tended to paraphrase the source and just described the actions of the USA. Better answers managed to produce impressions, for example that the USA was keen to be involved in international affairs but did not always go on to explain the overall impression from Source H – that the USA was keen to be involved in international affairs and that this was mainly from economic motives. The best answers went one step further and explained that the main impression we get from the source about the USA's attitude towards international affairs is a good or a positive one (this had to be supported).

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates make careful use of the sources when answering this question. A number of candidates would have improved their responses by making use of the sources, rather than just writing about the failures of the League. The most common type of answer was where candidates used some of the sources to support the idea that the League's failure was because the USA was not a member but they did not go on to also explain that other sources suggest other reasons for the failure. There were also a number of answers that referred to the sources very generally. When sources are being used in response to this

question it is important to explain, with a clear and direct reference to the relevant part of the source, how the source supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. It is also important to use each source separately. Sources may be grouped, for and against the hypothesis, but then each source in each group needs to be used by itself.

HISTORY

Paper 2147/22
Paper 22

Key messages

- Candidates should answer the question that has been asked. If the question asks whether a source proves someone was lying, then the issue of lying must be addressed. If the question asks why a source was published, then a reason for publication must be given. Questions should be answered in a direct and explicit manner, which goes beyond just writing about a source.
- Every question asks for an explanation of the answer. This means using the source and knowledge of the topic to make clear how and why conclusions have been reached. Explanations must make sense and so sources need to be used in a way that is consistent with any conclusions reached.
- There is no need for candidates to copy out or describe the source before addressing the question.

General comments

There were insufficient scripts on the nineteenth century option for any meaningful comments to be made. This report therefore applies to the twentieth-century option. Candidates sometimes struggled to apply historical skills in answering the questions. There were, of course, many scripts of high quality. Many candidates clearly had a good level of historical knowledge on the topic. Nonetheless, some candidates appeared less sure of how to answer the questions effectively. For example, in **Question 1**, where two sources had to be compared, some candidates did not succeed in finding both agreements and disagreements, and some seemed unsure of what would count as valid dis/agreements. In **Question 6**, where candidates should be aware that the sources will always offer material both to support and question the hypothesis, a number of candidates just agreed with the hypothesis and answered on just the one side. Where they arose, opportunities to evaluate the sources were missed by some, or attempts to cross-refer between sources were limited by a lack of clarity on what the cross-reference achieved. Some responses would have been improved by starting with a focused engagement with the question, rather than with simple description or repetition of a source.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

The sources offered plenty of opportunities for valid comparisons, both of agreements and disagreements. It was, though, important to make sure that what was claimed of a source was indeed accurate. For example, a common attempt at noting a disagreement was to say that the two sources differed in the reasons given for Hoare's support for the Hoare-Laval Pact – in Source B because he was afraid of a clash with Italy, and in Source A because he was concerned about the German menace. Yet Source A gave as another reason that he was concerned to retain Italian friendship, which actually suggested much the same as Source B. The best answers were able to look at the sources as a whole and saw that there was an overall disagreement on who the authors blamed for the failure of the League in the Abyssinian crisis. In Source A this was claimed to be Britain ('did not think the League could enforce international law...the result was failure for the League.'). whilst in Source B both Britain and France were seen as culpable ('neither wanted to alienate Mussolini...the League was fatally damaged.'). Some responses would have benefitted from more precision and awareness about exactly what the sources were claiming. Many saw that Source A blamed Britain, but

then stated that the difference was that Source B blamed France, but using another part of Source B that was not about attributing overall blame, such as France pressurising Britain not to apply sanctions. A number of candidates wrote out the sources before answering the questions. In some answers a couple of sides of writing, first summarising Source A, then Source B, was followed by a brief conclusion in which one or two comparisons would be attempted.

Question 2

This question and **Question 4** raised similar issues. Both questions were set on cartoons about the developing crisis in the period before the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. However, in both instances, many candidates answered as if the invasion had already occurred, which produced a variety of misinterpretations of the cartoons. There were several elements to Source C: the central figure of Mussolini, Britain and France as bystanders to the events, and the figure representing Western civilisation. Many candidates could provide valid sub-messages on some or all of these: that Britain and France were pretending not to see Mussolini's bullying, that Italy was strong and domineering, that the League of Nations was weak. There was also an overall message that brought the elements together: that the League was doomed to fail over Abyssinia. Better candidates spotted this. However, the best answers detected the cartoonist's opinion: that Italy's hypocrisy was being condemned, as indicated by the words uttered by Western civilisation.

Question 3

Questions that ask whether a source is lying are generally answered well, and this was no exception. Many answers spotted the obvious contradictions between Sources D and E, and concluded that these proved Laval was lying in Source D. A smaller number saw that there were ways in which Source E confirmed aspects of Source D, and reached the conclusion that this proved Laval was not lying in Source D. Both of these approaches would have been improved by an awareness of the need to evaluate either or both sources in relation to their audience/purpose in order to cast further light on the content comparisons. Given that candidates were told that Laval had made a secret agreement with Britain in September, it should have been apparent that Laval had an ulterior motive in trying to reassure the League's Assembly of France's commitment to the Covenant. Similarly, given the uproar that greeted the exposure of the Hoare-Laval Pact, Laval was surely engaging in a face-saving exercise in his speech to the French Parliament in December 1935. Better answers explored these kinds of issues in determining whether the content comparisons were a valid indicator of lying or not.

Question 4

Candidates who thought the cartoon was commenting on an invasion of Abyssinia that had already occurred were very likely to give an invalid reason for its publication. In fact, the cartoon was predicting the likely consequences of failing to stand firm against Mussolini's increasingly aggressive approach towards the Abyssinian issue. With this kind of question, possible reasons for publication could fall into three broad categories: reasons based on context (what was happening at that time), reasons based on message (what the cartoonist wished to tell the audience), and reasons based on purpose (the impact that the cartoonist hoped for). Most valid answers were based on messages derived from interpreting aspects of the cartoon (for example, the League was weak, Mussolini was aggressive, war was likely etc.), but more candidates could have appreciated the cartoonist's main point – to say that the British/French/League should take a firmer stand against Mussolini. Answers based on a plausible purpose, such as attempting to stir up public opinion in favour of the League, were rarer.

Question 5

To answer this question effectively candidates needed to make clear exactly what in the source it was that they believed or disbelieved. This was sometimes missed and replaced with a general belief or disbelief of the source as a whole, making it difficult to know what any ensuing explanations applied to. This was particularly the case as the source contained many different claims. The most straightforward way of explaining whether or not Hoare could be believed was to check what he said against contextual knowledge or other sources. In fact, this was what most candidates tried to do, but explicit checking against other sources could have been attempted by more. Instead, some relied on reasoning that varied between simple assertions that something was true or false and detailed examination of Hoare's claims against specific knowledge of the events of the crisis. A possible alternative approach was to look at apparent internal inconsistencies within the source – why, for example, does Hoare claim to be taking military precautions when it is clear that he is doing everything in his power to meet France's desire for peace? The best answers, though, understood exactly what was going on in this speech to the British Parliament. Hoare was being forced to resign because of his part in agreeing the Hoare-Laval Pact and was therefore engaging in

an attempt at self-justification. Whether or not one believed what he said had to be judged in relation to the context and purpose of his speech.

Question 6

In this question, candidates are given a hypothesis, and have to check it against the evidence offered by the sources. Many candidates did this well. Another feature of this question is that the sources will always offer opportunities both to confirm and to question the hypothesis; it was noticeable how many candidates answered just on one side of the hypothesis, generally to agree that Britain and France were indeed jointly responsible for the failure of the League. This was so even where the source very clearly offered an alternative. A good example of this was Source C, which was used by almost all candidates as indicating blame on Britain/France, whilst Mussolini was rarely seen as being to blame. Another requirement of this question is that sources have to be used to explain how they relate to the hypothesis. On this question the issue of blame was central, so the task was to show how the content of each source illustrated the issue of blame. Some strong responses achieved this. In others the content used did not do this effectively, so for example on Source A an answer might include 'Source A blames France for the failure of the League because it says its policy was in line with French national interests'. It does say this, but this does not indicate blame. In some responses, candidates agreed with the hypothesis (Britain and France equally to blame) but then only illustrated one of them being to blame.