

HISTORY

Paper 2147/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions carefully to ensure that their responses only include relevant information. They should carefully note the particular focus of any given question and focus their answers accordingly. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to ensure that their responses only include knowledge within the time span of the question.

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

General comments

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

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

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

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

Part (a) responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Background information is not needed. Explanation is not required. Most candidates realised that responses to **(a)** questions could be short and concise. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and always write in continuous prose, rather than using a 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'Why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than to provide a description of what happened. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative answers or long introductions which 'set the scene' were 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. Less successful 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) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated understanding of how the Corfu incident of 1923 was resolved. The best answers typically featured four details such as, 'Greece appealed to the League of Nations', 'the League condemned Mussolini's invasion', 'Mussolini insisted the League refer the case to the Conference of Ambassadors' and 'Greece was made to pay reparations to Italy'. Credit was also gained for stating that, 'Greece was made to apologise to Italy' and 'the Italians left Corfu.' The focus of the question was on how the incident was resolved and lengthy descriptions of the build up to the incident were not needed. A number of candidates lacked knowledge of the Corfu Crisis and either left the response blank or confused it with another incident.
- (b) Successful responses included two well explained reasons why the Vilna dispute was a challenge to the League of Nations. They explained that the dispute was between Poland and Lithuania. Vilna was the capital of Lithuania and included many Poles, so Poland invaded Vilna. The League found this a challenge because they asked the Poles to leave Vilna and they refused. This made the League seem weak. A second explained reason was that one of the League's major countries, France, did not want to offend Poland as they wanted Poland as a future ally against Germany. Britain was unwilling to act alone therefore no sanctions were given to Poland and it retained Vilna. Less successful responses included general details about the failure of the League of Nations, with no specific reference to the Vilna dispute. There were also some blank responses to this question.
- (c) Most responses demonstrated some understanding of the weaknesses of the League of Nations. The strongest responses were well organised and produced a balanced answer by explaining why the absence of the USA was the main reason for the weakness of the League. They were able to explain that the USA's military and economic power, which had not been weakened by the First World War, would have given strength to the League when enforcing decisions. They were also able to explain that without the USA it would be difficult to effectively enforce economic sanctions because the USA would continue to trade with the offending nations, resulting in the limited impact of any sanctions. Responses usually included examples from the Corfu, Manchurian, or Abyssinian crises to emphasise these points. They balanced the absence of the USA with other factors that increased the weakness of the League, such as, the absence of Germany and Russia, the effects of the Great Depression, the self-interest of Britain and France and the weaknesses in the structure of the League. Most commonly explained was the self-interest of Britain and France, especially during the Abyssinian Crisis when they did not close the Suez Canal or impose sanctions on oil because they wanted to keep Mussolini as an ally against the rise of Hitler's Germany. Other responses were able to identify weaknesses in the structure of the League, such as the Assembly and the Council not meeting often, that votes had to be unanimous, a veto could be used in the Council and there was no standing army. These responses would have benefited from emphasising that these weaknesses resulted in slow decision making and meant a lack of decisive action by the League because it was difficult to enforce decisions. Examples that could have been used included the crises of Vilna, Corfu, Manchuria and Abyssinia. Some responses included details of why the USA did not join the League and the successes of the League both of which lacked relevance to the question.

Question 6

- (a) This question worked well for most candidates, who were able to describe Hitler's preparations for war before 1936. Successful responses were confined to the time scale in the question, matching dates and events between these dates. Examples included Germany leaving the League of Nations in 1933, secret rearmament followed by a major rearmament in 1935, the introduction of

conscription and the naval agreement with Britain. However, some candidates focused on Hitler's aims (for example, tearing up the Treaty of Versailles) and used as evidence events outside the scope of the question, particularly the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, Germany's participation in the Spanish Civil War and the Anschluss with Austria 1938.

- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. The majority were aware that 'lebensraum' meant 'living space' but few were able to explain that this would involve taking over land to the east of Germany at the expense of Poland and Russia, with a view to resettlement and exploitation of resources in these areas. Some strong responses also alluded to the racial entitlement (belief in Aryan superiority) implicit in this policy. More responses could have considered what lebensraum would mean for the populations of the lands to the east of Germany. Some responses conflated 'lebensraum' with the union of Germany and Austria or the annexation of the Sudetenland or saw it as part of Hitler's aim to overthrow the Treaty of Versailles. Other candidates appeared to be unfamiliar with this term, for example regarding it as part of Hitler's domestic policies. A small number of responses were left blank.
- (c) Though most candidates were familiar with and understood these two agreements, responses tended to be rather general in nature, and could have been improved by the inclusion of specific detail which could have turned an identification into an explanation. For example, most were able to say that after the Nazi-Soviet Pact was agreed, Hitler had cleared the way to invade Poland. Stronger responses developed these points by referring to the secret nature of the Polish clause and the subsequent enhanced Anglo-French commitment in Poland. They also linked the invasion of Poland to the collapse of the Munich Agreement caused by Hitler's takeover of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. To balance the argument strong responses could explain the impact of the Munich Agreement - the boost given to Hitler's confidence that Britain and France presented no threat and, often less exactly, the impact of Hitler's breach of the agreement in March 1939. Strong responses were also able to explain how the Munich Agreement brought war closer because it led to Stalin being receptive to making the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Weaker responses often muddled the chronology of events around the Munich Agreement. Some candidates found it difficult to give two explanations of the significance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, the most common explanation being the avoidance of war on two fronts, providing Hitler with a green light to attack Poland. Some confused the Munich Agreement with the Munich Putsch of 1923.

Question 7

- (a) Responses to this question were mixed. Stronger responses gained credit for identifying the agreements made at Potsdam. Examples included 'Germany was divided into four parts', 'the Nazi Party was banned', 'Nazi leaders were to be tried as war criminals' and 'Germany had to pay reparations'. Less successful responses confused the agreements made at Potsdam with those made at Yalta a few months earlier, although credit was given for responses which stated that 'some of the agreements made at Yalta were confirmed'. There were some responses that discussed why there were disagreements at Potsdam, which was not the focus of the question.
- (b) Strong responses to this question tended to explain two reasons why Stalin imposed a blockade on Berlin in 1948. They demonstrated a good understanding of the division of Berlin, after World War II, between the Soviet Union, the USA, France, and Britain, and how the Western Allies had joined their zones together and introduced a new currency. The western powers were trying to make West Berlin strong, and Stalin felt threatened by this. They went on to explain that he blockaded Berlin because he wanted to remove the western powers from West Berlin and control all of Berlin, as it was deep inside Eastern Germany. Weaker responses often included details of why the blockade failed, which lacked relevance to the question, and/or confused the geography of Berlin and which side had East and West Berlin. Some responses detailed reasons why the Berlin Wall was built.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, 'Which did more to damage relations between the USA and USSR: disagreements over Poland or Marshall Aid?' Candidates were more confident explaining the impact of Marshall Aid on relationships than they were on the explaining the damage inflicted on relationships as a result of disagreements over Poland. Responses identified that Marshall Aid was part of the USA's policy of containment and was designed to prevent countries falling to communism. The strongest responses were then able to develop paragraphs explaining the impact of USA's action. For example: 'The USA had interpreted the Soviet take-over of Eastern Europe as the start of the spread of communism around the world. Marshal Aid was a package of financial support which was to help strengthen vulnerable European economies suffering from the effects of war. Stalin felt threatened by this policy and forbade any of the eastern European states

to apply for Marshall Aid.’ On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained that Stalin had not done what was agreed at Yalta and allowed free elections to be held in Poland to choose the government that they wanted. He had fixed elections in order to achieve a provisional government of pro- Soviet Lublin Poles and exiled London Poles. His failure to do what was agreed had angered the USA. Weaker responses often included general comments on the differences in ideology and would have benefited from showing more understanding, especially of the disagreements over Poland.

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

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies among candidates.

- (a) This question was well answered and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the demands of the question. They were able to identify four aims of the Spartacists, most commonly the overthrow of the Weimar Republic, the establishment of a communist state, using the Bolshevik Revolution as an example, the establishment of a more equal society and the common ownership of property. Some candidates, whilst often making one or two relevant points, drifted into a description of the Spartacist rising, describing the role of the Freikorps and the fate of the Spartacist leaders, which lacked relevance to the question set.
- (b) Some candidates struggled to focus on the importance of the Kapp Putsch for the Weimar government. Candidates were often knowledgeable about the events surrounding the putsch but could not relate these into implications for the Weimar government. Strong responses were able to point to the strength of the anti-democratic and pro-monarchical feeling, the fragility of the Weimar Republic when it could not rely on the loyalty of the army and the general support for the Weimar government amongst the workers and population of Berlin. Some less successful responses confused the putsch with other insurgencies.
- (c) There were some strong responses to this question in which candidates had a good understanding of why proportional representation was a serious weakness of the Weimar constitution. These responses explained how proportional representation worked and how it led to a string of unstable governments in the 1920s. They also referred to the foothold that the system gave to extremist parties. Some also included the lack of a threshold which allowed such extremist parties to gain seats. On the other side of the argument, responses included details of the problems caused by Article 48 of the constitution. In most cases explanations here were less certain than for proportional representation and usually only one explanation on this side (most commonly that the president alone could decide what constituted an emergency) was included. Strong responses included a second explanation, showing how Hindenburg used these powers during the critical period of 1930 – 1933, and how this facilitated Hitler’s grip on power in 1933. It was evident from weaker responses that the word ‘constitution’ was not clearly understood and these responses drifted from the question to write about the weaknesses and failures (mainly economic) of the Weimar government.

Question 12

- (a) This question was well answered and most responses identified four features of the Hitler Youth such as, it had separate sections for boys and girls, it was used to indoctrinate the youth with Nazi ideas, the activities it offered were to turn boys into good soldiers and it was made compulsory in 1936. Others gained credit for saying that the members wore uniform and that it was established in the 1920s.

- (b) Most candidates could identify that the Nazi regime provided jobs and better working conditions for the workers. Stronger responses to this question identified and explained two reasons why many workers were happy with life under the Nazi regime. They explained that under the Weimar Republic, as a result of the Great Depression, there had been massive unemployment. One of Hitler's aims was to provide employment for workers which he did by providing jobs in the armed forces, in public work schemes, in building the Olympic Stadium and numerous autobahns. A second valid explanation was an explanation of the benefits brought to the workers through 'The Beauty of Labour' and 'Strength through Joy' programmes. A misconception among some candidates was that Hitler gave them higher wages.
- (c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. Candidates needed to produce a balanced answer by explaining how far Nazi policies towards women were successful. The strongest responses stated clearly what the policy was, Hitler's view on the role of Nazi women and the impact of his policies. Most candidates had a good understanding of the Nazi policy towards women, including encouraging women to give up their jobs, stay at home, get married and have lots of children. Weaker responses were limited in that they understood the role of women but there was no assessment of the success of the policy. Stronger responses were able to explain that, as a result, the population would rise, which the Nazis believed in the long term would provide more soldiers for the armed forces. Some linked the increase in population to the domination of the Aryan race, which Hitler so desired. Strong responses explained that this worked until about 1937 when, with men joining the army, there was a shortage of labour and therefore women were increasingly required to return to work, and Nazi policies now had become contradictory.

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

Candidates should ensure that answers for **part (a)** questions are succinct and focused on the question. Very lengthy descriptions are not required. Candidates should ensure that their answers for **parts (b) and (c)** are focused on explaining the particular question set, rather than on narrating events. For **part (c)**, analysis, balanced explanations, and substantiated conclusions are required. The conclusion should go beyond repeating points made earlier in an answer, and instead should address the command words such as 'How far do you agree'.

Candidates should pay particular attention to any dates included in a question and restrict their answer to the dates provided. This should help to ensure that their answer is fully relevant.

General comments

Candidates demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding in both the Core Content and Depth Study topics. Many answers contained good supporting evidence which was accurate and detailed, and used in well-developed explanations and arguments in response to their chosen question.

Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. These responses identified numerous factors/reasons, but they needed to go on and develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced responses. Candidates need to ensure that they then use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make. Candidates do need to focus carefully upon the question set; in some instances they wrote in considerable depth about the main topic of the question, but would have improved their responses with a clear focus on the actual question.

There were some rubric errors seen. The most common was candidates who answered more than the required number of questions, particularly in the Depth Study. Time allocation was generally good, and very few instances were seen of candidates who failed to finish or had to shorten their final answers.

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) Some good answers were seen, with candidates secure in their knowledge of what happened in Vilna in 1920. Candidates recognised that the dispute was between Poland and Lithuania after Poland invaded Vilna. These answers also recognised that the League failed to solve the problem, since the Poles refused to leave. Weaker answers often confused this dispute with other disputes that faced the League in the 1920s, such as Corfu.

- (b) There were some effective answers that were able to identify a reason why the League was slow to react to aggression, and to support this by providing an example. These answers were able to explain, for example, that since the League was based in Europe, when Japan invaded Manchuria the Lytton Commission was slow to respond. Other reasons explained were linked to the economic situation facing Britain and France which delayed the imposition of sanctions in the Abyssinian crisis. Other answers were able to identify reasons such as the lack of an army but were unable to explain how this resulted in the League's slow reaction.
- (c) Some very good responses to this question were seen. Many candidates were able to produce balanced responses that considered both the role of Italy in the failure of the League, and also the role played by Britain and France. When considering the role of Italy, responses often discussed the impact of the Abyssinian invasion in undermining the League since it showed that the League was reluctant to impose sanctions or protect smaller powers. Some candidates also considered the invasion of Corfu or looked at Italian aggression as a whole. In order to provide a balanced response, candidates often argued that Britain and France were responsible due to the Hoare-Laval Pact, or their reluctance to impose sanctions on coal in order to protect their own economies. Weaker responses were often able to provide a description of the events such as the invasion of Abyssinia but neglected to explain how these events led to the failure of the League. Few inaccuracies were seen.

Question 6

This was the most popular question in the Core Content.

- (a) This question was answered well by many candidates who were able to describe Hitler's policy of 'lebensraum'. These answers were able to identify that it was Hitler's aim of living space, and that this would mean expanding into Eastern Europe through the invasion of countries such as Poland and Russia. Most candidates were able to provide reasonable responses. In some responses there was a confusion between lebensraum and Grossdeutschland, with some candidates stating that it was to unite German speakers, or that claims made on Czechoslovakia were part of the policy.
- (b) There were some good answers to this question, with candidates confident in their ability to explain why Stalin agreed to the Nazi-Soviet Pact. The most common explanation given was that Hitler had made it clear that his foreign policy aims included the eventual invasion of the Soviet Union and that by signing this Pact, Stalin had achieved the necessary time to strengthen his armed forces, which had been weakened by the Purges. Other responses explained that it allowed Stalin to regain land lost to Poland, and some strong responses were seen that were able to explain Stalin's disillusionment with the Allies after the signing of the Munich Agreement, which led him to seeking an alliance with Hitler instead. Few inaccuracies were seen, although some responses attempted to answer it as a **part (c)** question, also giving reasons for Hitler signing the Pact.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates able to assess whether Chamberlain's attempts to appease Hitler were justified. Arguments agreeing with the question often considered the impact of the previous war on Britain and the British people, explaining that Chamberlain was fulfilling the wishes of the people, determined to prevent another costly and deadly war. Consideration was also often given to the nature of the early instances of appeasement, such as the Rhineland, which could be justified as Hitler only marching into 'his own backyard.' Arguments that appeasement was not justified were often centred around the idea that it gave Hitler the confidence to continue with his foreign policy aims, with this line of argument supported by the reoccupation of the Rhineland and the order to retreat if they met resistance. Whilst this is a valid argument, some weaker responses did not provide support in their answers, instead making general claims that it gave Hitler confidence. Some strong responses were also seen that argued that appeasement was not morally justified since Czechoslovakia was not consulted during the Munich Conference, resulting in the Sudetenland being handed over to Germany without Czechoslovakia's agreement. Some responses erroneously stated that the Rhineland was an invasion, and that the Sudetenland had previously belonged to Germany and was taken away by the Treaty of Versailles.

Question 7

- (a) This was generally well answered, with a majority of candidates able to achieve good marks through their knowledge of what the Vietcong was. The most common points used to attain such marks were an awareness of the Vietcong's use of guerrilla tactics, that they were Communist and

that they fought against the US. Few errors were seen, although some responses contained lengthy descriptions of the guerrilla tactics that the Vietcong used, which was not the focus of the question.

- (b) Many candidates were able to achieve at least one explanation of why President Johnson increased American involvement in Vietnam. The most common reason given explained why the US policy of containment and the fear of the spread of Communism increased American involvement in Vietnam. Some were also aware of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, though responses did not always explain why this factor led to increased involvement by the USA. Less successful responses described American involvement without providing the reasons why it happened.
- (c) This was answered well by many candidates who were able to provide at least one-sided answers as to whether American popular opinion was more important than the tactics of the North Vietnamese forces as a reason for American withdrawal. The majority displayed good knowledge of the various protests within America against the Vietnam War. Many were then able to develop their explanation as to why public criticism led to the US government's withdrawal. There was also good, detailed knowledge of North Vietnamese tactics, though some answers were largely descriptive in nature and less successful in their attempts to explain how these tactics influenced the US government's decision to withdraw from the war.

Question 8

- (a) Some good answers were seen which were able to state what the Brezhnev Doctrine was. Many candidates showed an awareness of Brezhnev as leader of the USSR being its author, and that the intent was to tighten Soviet control over the Eastern European states. Few candidates were able to link the doctrine to the Czechoslovak context and the Soviet response to Dubcek's reforms. Weaker responses confused the Doctrine with the building of the Wall, and some did not attempt the question.
- (b) Whilst some weaker responses confused the building of the Berlin Wall with the events of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift, there were many good responses which were able to explain why the East German government's concern for the economy meant that it was keen to stop its skilled workers defecting to the West. Stronger responses were then able to explain a second factor for the building of the Berlin Wall, explaining that it was seen as a way to prevent the spread of Western ideas and the belief that standards of living were better in the West.
- (c) Mixed responses were seen to this question, with weaker responses struggling to show both agreement and disagreement as to whether resistance to Soviet domination broke out in Hungary and Czechoslovakia for the same reasons. Many candidates were able to explain one side, either by explaining the different stance taken on membership of the Warsaw Pact or the similarities behind the long-term resentment of Soviet control. A small number of candidates produced balanced answers, explaining both similarities and differences. Some weaker responses focused on how the USSR reacted to the resistance in both countries or what happened during the uprisings, rather than the causes of it. There was also some confusion as to what happened in each country.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Most candidates were able to provide some valid descriptions of 'going over the top', with candidates aware that it was an attack across no man's land, and that it was very dangerous, with heavy casualties. Stronger answers were also able to show that the soldiers faced machine guns, and that the soldiers walked across in formation.
- (b) Some good responses to this question were seen, with candidates able to provide at least one explanation of why the allied bombardment at the start of the Battle of the Somme failed to destroy the German defences. The most common reason provided was that the Germans had built strong underground bunkers, and this meant that they were not destroyed, and that once the bombardment stopped the German soldiers were able to return to their trenches prior to the Allied attack. Some candidates were also able to explain that the bombardment tangled rather than destroyed the barbed wire, but candidates often only attempted to provide one explanation.

- (c) This question was sometimes answered well, with responses able to show how both tanks and aircraft were used in the First World War, although in weaker responses the comparison of effectiveness was missing. Stronger responses often considered the psychological effect of tanks, whilst recognising that they often broke down, particularly in the early years. On the other side, candidates often argued that aircraft were used effectively for reconnaissance, but that their use in fighting was limited. Some responses would have benefited from evaluating their effectiveness, rather than describing their use.

Question 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was answered well, with candidates able to identify groups that supported the Nazis in the 1920s. Responses were able to identify groups such as farmers, anti-Communists, the unemployed and people who hated the Treaty of Versailles or the Weimar Government. Few errors were seen, but less successful responses described how the Nazis gained the support of these groups, which was not the focus of the question.
- (b) This question was generally answered well, with candidates confident in their knowledge of the topic, and able to provide at least one explanation of how the Reichstag Fire was important for Hitler. The most common approach was to explain how Lubbe provided Hitler with the opportunity to blame the fire on the Communists, leading to the arrest of many and their removal as an important opposition group to Hitler. Stronger responses were also able to explain that the Fire led to the Emergency Fire Decree passed by Hindenburg using Article 48, which allowed Hitler to remove many civil liberties such as freedom of the press, and privacy of communications such as the telephone. Weaker responses showed confusion over the details or chronology of the event, arguing that it gave Hitler the power to use Article 48, or pass the Enabling Act.
- (c) Some good responses to this question were seen, with most candidates able to attempt a balanced answer explaining how far the Munich Putsch benefited Hitler. Agreeing with the statement, responses often explained that the national publicity provided by the trial as a result of the newspaper coverage enabled the Nazis to become more well-known, or that it encouraged Hitler to rethink his strategies, concentrating on increasing the electoral popularity of the party through the establishment of local organisations. Balance was most often provided through a consideration of the aims and defeat of the Munich Putsch, although this point was more often described rather than explained. Whilst weaker responses had a good knowledge of the Putsch itself, they were less confident in the details of the consequences, meaning that such answers sometimes did not achieve an explanation. Such responses stated, for example, that the Munich Putsch benefited Hitler as he decided to change tactics but did not support these statements with details of what these changes were.

Question 12

- (a) This question was answered well, with many candidates demonstrating their knowledge of Nazi policies towards young people. Responses often focused on the changes to the education system, and the Youth Groups such as the League of German Maidens. Candidates were also able to show what was taught in these groups, such as loyalty to Hitler. Some responses ignored the question on young people and wrote more generally about policies such as propaganda and Strength Through Joy. Other responses answered accurately but wrote extensively on the topic of young people, which was not necessary.

- (b) Some good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to explain at least one reason why some women were unhappy with changes made by the Nazis. Candidates were confident in their knowledge of the impact on women, often concentrating on the restrictions on women working, or the emphasis placed on the role of the women in the home and as mothers. Stronger answers were able to explain these as two separate reasons. A few responses were also seen that provided convincing explanations for the changes made during the war, and that these were unpopular with women who had experienced years of propaganda telling them not to work, or the struggles they faced working with children and a husband away with the army. Weaker answers either only provided one explanation, or described Nazi policies – often very detailed, but without explaining why these policies were disliked by women.
- (c) This question was often answered well, with candidates able to produce balanced answers on whether the Nazis succeeded in winning support from young people. Opposition to the Nazi policies was often strongly argued, and good knowledge was displayed about the opposition groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose. Responses were therefore able to correctly identify their reasons for opposition, and the nature of their actions. To provide balance candidates used the indoctrination in schools and the youth groups to explain how successfully the Nazis gained their support. Weaker responses often were able to demonstrate sound understanding of both the support and opposition but provided descriptions, rather than showing what and how they were opposing.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates displayed a good general level of knowledge and understanding on this question, with most able to identify at least some of the impacts of the Russo-Japanese War on the Tsar's regime. Most commonly candidates were able to identify that the defeat was humiliating, and also that it contributed to Bloody Sunday. More responses could have shown that it caused the mutiny on the Potemkin.
- (b) This question was answered well, with many candidates providing at least one explanation why the Tsarist regime was able to survive the October Revolution. Most commonly candidates provided good explanations as to how the October Manifesto divided the opposition, enabling the Tsar to regain control. Other candidates were able to explain that the Tsar retained the support of the army and was able to use this to crush the opposition.
- (c) Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer explaining ways in which the Tsar taking personal control of the army caused his fall from power. Responses were most confident in agreeing with the question, arguing that it meant that he left the Tsarina in charge assisted by Rasputin, both of whom were unpopular, or that it meant the Tsar was blamed for military failures. Often, however, these points were not linked to the Tsar's fall from power, instead describing rather than explaining. Attempts at a balanced answer were rare, and a number of responses would have benefited from attempting to explain other reasons, such as the lack of political reform.

Question 14

- (a) Candidates secure in their knowledge of GOSPLAN understood that it was responsible for the administration of the Five-Year Plans, and that it was the organisation that set the targets for industry. A number of candidates either did not attempt the question or provided inaccurate answers.
- (b) Most candidates were able to provide at least one explanation for why there was a famine in the Soviet Union in 1932 – 33. Most commonly candidates explained the impact of collectivisation, with farmers destroying their crops, or that grain was still being exported despite the shortage. Weaker answers described the famine without focussing on the causes of it.
- (c) Some candidates struggled to provide balanced answers to this question, with explanations agreeing and disagreeing on whether industrial workers benefited from Stalin's rule. Responses often understood the policies, providing details of the Plans, but did not explain the impact they had on workers. Better responses did recognise that workers received some benefits, such as free medicine and that childcare was available, and also that these benefits came at the cost of harsh discipline and tough working conditions. Some responses concentrated on collectivisation, rather than industrial workers.

Question 15

- (a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of what the developments in cinema in the 1920s and many achieved high marks. Such responses recognised the number of films being made increased, and that the first talkie was introduced in 1927. Other valid identifications were the rise of movie stars such as Charlie Chaplin, and that this helped to popularise the cinema so that 100 million tickets were being sold each week.
- (b) This question was generally answered well, with candidates able to explain at least one reason why there was religious intolerance in the 1920s. Responses often considered the impact of the Ku Klux Klan and their intolerance of Catholics and Jews. Another common approach was for responses to consider the Monkey Trial, explaining how this showed intolerance of anything other than fundamentalist beliefs. Few errors in content were evident, but some responses would have been improved by the inclusion of two explanations, rather than one.
- (c) Many very good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to provide balanced answers considering whether women's lives improved in the 1920s. In support of the question, responses often considered the impact of the greater freedoms experienced by women such as the ability to work, or the lives of flappers, with explicit consideration of how this was an improvement to previous times. To provide balance, this was often contrasted with the lives of women in rural areas who experienced little change, or the inequalities women still experienced, such as their rate of pay compared to that of men. Less successful responses described the lives of women without explicitly considering whether this was an improvement or not.

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

It is important to answer the questions on either the nineteenth century or the twentieth century option. Candidates should not answer some questions from both options.

It is important to remember that all the questions are about the sources. All answers should therefore be based on interpretation and evaluation of the sources. All answers should be supported by using the content of the sources. This is important for all the questions. On **Question 6**, a number of candidates did not make use of the sources and wrote general essays.

Sometimes it can be useful to use a quote from a source to support a point being made in an answer. It is important to give the quotation in full. Ellipses should not be used as they often lead to crucial parts of the quotation being missed out.

When examining cartoons, especially for 'message' questions, candidates should be asking themselves, 'What is the point of view of the cartoonist?'

Candidates are advised to think about the questions and carefully plan their answers before writing their answers. This will help them understand exactly what the questions are asking and help them to directly address the questions in their answers. It will also help them avoid repeating or paraphrasing sources at the beginning of their answers.

It is important to answer the question which is set. For example, in **Question 2** in the twentieth century option, it is not enough to explain the message of the cartoon. Candidates need to explain that the message is the reason for publication. Similarly, in **Question 4** in the nineteenth century option, it is not enough to compare or evaluate the sources. Candidates need to use their analysis of the sources to explain whether they think Source E makes Source F surprising.

General comments

Most candidates answered the questions on the twentieth century option, although a good number attempted the nineteenth century option. A good standard of answers was seen but a number of candidates wrote generally about the sources or the topic and did not directly address the questions. Many candidates had the required contextual knowledge and were able to interpret and compare sources, but some were less ready to evaluate sources. Candidates need to decide when a question is asking them to evaluate and then decide the best method of evaluation for that particular question and those particular sources. Sources can be evaluated by using contextual knowledge or other sources to check the claims made by a source or by considering the purpose of the author of the source. A number of candidates on the nineteenth century option did not use the sources in their answers to **Question 6** and struggled to evaluate when tackling **Questions 3** and **4**.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well, with many candidates finding agreements such as Germany promising independence/sovereignty and demanding a conference. In terms of disagreements, a reasonable

number of candidates explained that Source A states that the Entente was under threat, while Source B disagrees with this. The best answers compared the two sources point by point. Some less successful responses summarised each source and then asserted that they agree or disagree.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to use parts of the cartoon (including the caption) to explain valid sub-messages, for example Germany was hostile towards Britain and France, and that Britain and France were allies. To explain the big message it is necessary to consider all the main parts of the cartoon. The title, 'The match-maker despite herself', is a big help. A small number of candidates put these elements together and were able to explain that the cartoon is suggesting that Germany's hostility towards Britain and France (aimed at testing and even breaking the entente) has been counter-productive and had brought the two closer together. It is important to note that the question is about the cartoonist's message. This suggests that the point of view of the cartoonist is required – he is showing approval of the fact that Germany's move has been counter-productive.

Question 3

A number of candidates struggled with their responses to this question. When evaluating a source it is often useful to consider the possible purpose of the author. In the case of Source D, the context (Germany's desire to destroy the entente), can be used to suggest the purpose of the German diplomat in writing the kind of account he has written. However, many candidates did not consider purpose. Instead, they attempted to evaluate Source D by checking details against other sources or their contextual knowledge. This was often a struggle, with candidates simply asserting that various details in Source D are not true. This was surprising as several sources, as well as the Background information, provide material that could be used, for example Source B states that the Kaiser stated his support for the Sultan's sovereignty, supporting Source D which tells us that the Kaiser described the Sultan as 'the free ruler of an independent country'. A number of candidates did reject the account in Source D because it was written by a German diplomat, but they needed to go on and develop their answers.

Question 4

A reasonable number of candidates found disagreements or agreements between the two sources and used them to explain surprise or lack of surprise. In Source E Fisher is keen on war and Grey in Source F does not rule it out. However, Fisher is keen on an alliance with France and on war with Germany, while Grey is much more cautious and does not want to act too early or go beyond the terms of the entente. A number of candidates wrote about the sources without addressing the question in a meaningful way. The best answers used the provenance and the content of the sources to argue that it is not surprising that Fisher was more keen on war because he was a military man, while Grey was a diplomat.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to provide a valid sub-message for Source G, for example the Kaiser is threatening Morocco, France and Britain are worried about the Kaiser's actions. For Source H, a reasonable number explained how the Kaiser appears to be a threatening figure. A number of candidates interpreted both cartoons but would have improved their answers by producing a comparison. Many of those that did manage a comparison were able to explain how the Kaiser appears to be up to no good or to be causing trouble in both sources. A small number of stronger responses got to the cartoonists' points of view – they both appear to disapprove of the Kaiser and what he is doing. A few candidates struggled to move beyond surface descriptions.

Question 6

This question is based on use of the sources. It is primarily about the sources, as well as the motivation of Germany in its actions over Morocco. However, a good number of candidates missed the sources and just wrote about the Moroccan Crisis or the details in the sources, without identifying any particular sources. Candidates need to test the hypothesis given in the question (Germany's aim in interfering in Morocco was to break the Anglo-French Entente) against the evidence in the sources and explain which sources support the hypothesis, and which do not. In doing this they need to clearly identify which sources they are using, clearly state whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis, and make specific use of the content of sources to support their answers, for example 'Source C supports the statement because Germany is looking disapprovingly at the close relations between France and Britain. The caption says about Germany that it has been the match-maker, despite itself, meaning that it meant to break the relationship between

France and Britain but has achieved the opposite.’ To ensure that proper use is made of individual sources, candidates should be encouraged not to group the sources. This often led to very general statements being made about the group as a whole, with no use of particular sources in that group.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to find agreements between the two sources and a good number also found disagreements. For example, both sources state that Lloyd George kept changing his mind, that Clemenceau was not interested in the League of Nations and that there were difficulties in the negotiations. There are also disagreements over whether or not Wilson and Clemenceau were able to work together and how far Wilson engaged with the other leaders. A small number of candidates summarised both sources without making any point-by-point comparisons. The best answers were those that went beyond the details of the sources and looked at them in the round. They explained that, on the whole, Source A suggests the Big Three got on fairly well, while Source B suggests the opposite.

Question 2

This question produced a wide range of answers. It required candidates to use their contextual knowledge to interpret the intended message of the cartoon and to infer the purpose of the artist. Not using their contextual knowledge led some candidates to claim that the cartoon is about the Treaty of Versailles when it is about the negotiations. (The date of the cartoon is March 1919, while the Treaty was signed 28 June 1919.) Some answers were less clear, suggesting in places that it is about the negotiations, but also stating it is about the Treaty. This question asks about the reason for the publication of the cartoon in March 1919. It is therefore important to give and explain a reason for publication. Some candidates suggested it was published in March because that is when the negotiations were taking place. Better answers focused more on the messages of the cartoon. Some just explained that, for example in the negotiations France was demanding heavy punishments for Germany, but others went further and explained the big message – disapproval of France’s harsh attitude towards Germany. It is important to note that these messages must be presented by candidates as the reasons for why the cartoon was being published. It is not enough to simply interpret the cartoon. The following is an example of what is required, ‘This cartoon was published to tell people that France wanted harsh punishments for Germany in the peace negotiations and that such harsh punishments would be a big mistake.’ The best answers explain a possible purpose for the publication, for example to persuade MPs or the British public to oppose harsh punishments for Germany.

Question 3

This question also produced an interesting range of answers. The best answers rested on an understanding that the authorship of the source matters as much as what the source says. Candidates are told that Lansing was replaced by House as his chief advisor. A small number of candidates used this information to explain that they were not surprised by Source D because of his criticism of House. Other candidates focused on House and his position as Wilson’s chief advisor. They explained their surprise at House’s actions in Source D because of Wilson’s belief in the League of Nations. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to select an aspect of Source D and explain why they were, or were not, surprised by it. For example, it comes as no surprise that the French preferred an alliance with the United States and Britain to a League of Nations. Weaker answers often selected something that was, or was not, surprising, but neglected to produce a satisfactory explanation, while others produced perfectly good reasons for being surprised or not surprised, but did not state whether they were actually surprised or not. In questions like this it is crucial that candidates clearly state whether they are surprised or not.

Question 4

Some candidates struggled with this question because they focused on particular instances of Wilson’s behaviour, for example he resented the accusations or he got angry, rather than making an inference about the kind of man Wilson was from the evidence in Source E. Some candidates struggled with ‘impressions’ and copied the source or produced a paraphrase, and a few wrote about Wilson using their contextual knowledge, with no use of the source. However, there were many candidates who suggested and supported valid impressions, for example ‘idealistic’, ‘rational’, ‘short tempered’, ‘passionate’, ‘confident’ and ‘thin skinned’. In better responses, candidates supported one or two valid impressions by reference to the content of Source E.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to interpret at least the sub-messages of the cartoons, although some did not compare them. Both cartoons contain two elements: Wilson and the nations. Many candidates were able to use one of these to produce a sub-message, for example the nations were interested in their own interests, or Wilson wanted a just peace. Fewer candidates went on to use all the elements in the cartoons to reach and compare the big messages – in Source F Wilson is unaware of the problems facing him in his pursuit of a just peace, while in Source G he is aware. Two important points come out of candidates' answers: candidates should not interpret the cartoons separately, but should make a direct comparison of their messages, and try and use all the elements in the cartoon to reach an interpretation. Interpretations should not be based on just one part of the cartoon.

Question 6

Many candidates did well with this question. They used details of the sources to produce clear explanations of how some sources support the hypothesis and how some do not. The explanations must use the content of the sources, for example 'Source B does not support the idea that Wilson's difficulties were caused by Clemenceau because it says that Lloyd George caused difficulties because he changed his mind so much and so was difficult for Wilson to work with.' This answer contains the following crucial elements: it makes clear whether or not the source supports the hypothesis, it makes reference to specific content in Source B, and it explains how this content shows that Source B disagrees with the statement. Weaknesses in other answers included: not using the sources, not explicitly stating whether the source supports or does not support the hypothesis, and not referring to a specific statement in the source. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources and making a general assertion that is meant to apply to all of the sources in the group. Each source needs to be dealt with individually.

HISTORY

Paper 2147/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Starting the examination by carefully reading through the Background Information, the sources and questions is a good approach. There will be an overarching theme to the paper which is given in the title, and having a grasp of how all the sources relate to this theme will assist in answering the questions, not just by providing appropriate opportunities for cross-reference, but also in answering **Question 6**, which addresses the theme.

Time management is important. Some candidates lose time by writing without a proper focus on the question. There is no need to summarise a source or describe a cartoon. A direct answer to the question is required. Candidates should leave enough time to answer the last question, **Question 6**, which invites them to study all of the sources, fully.

All the questions require the use of a source or sources, and where written sources are concerned, this will mean quoting relevant parts of the content. It is important that these quotes are given in full, and that ellipses are not used. The reason for this is that an ellipsis might take the place material which might be relevant to answering the question.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option. In fact, there were insufficient answers on the nineteenth century for a meaningful report to be written. Candidates' answers demonstrated that the sources were generally well understood, and that the level of knowledge of the historical context was good. Candidates were strongest in skills that utilised comprehension and manipulation of source content, such as comparison. They struggled more with source evaluation. One of the characteristics of the best candidates' scripts was the ability to evaluate sources through the authors' purposes in representing events as they did. On at least three of the questions, analysing the author's purpose was a more effective method of source evaluation than cross-reference, as it looked at the source as a whole, rather than just checking the accuracy of details, which was the technique adopted by many candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well. On agreements, there were a good number of points to match, and most candidates could see that both regarded the Treaty as harsh, ignoring Wilson's principles, and likely to do Germany economic damage. A good proportion of candidates found at least one disagreement, generally that Germany was prepared to cooperate in Source A but would remain a menace in Source B. The best answers were able to provide examples of both agreements and disagreements. Only a few candidates summarised first Source A, then Source B, and then asserted agreements or disagreements. Almost all of the candidates understood that direct comparisons of content from the two sources were essential.

Question 2

This saw candidates generally being able to compare the two sources effectively but not going further and providing the evaluation the question invited. Most candidates regarded agreements between the sources as 'proof'. Detecting agreements does involve comparing 'like with like', and some answers compared the issue of war guilt from Source C with what was depicted in the cartoon. However, the cartoon did not address war guilt. Successful comparisons could be made between the claims in Source C that the demands of the Treaty were beyond the powers of the German nation, that the Treaty could not work, or even that the Germans would have to pay. At this stage, better responses went on to address the issue of proof. The purposes of the authors of the sources were important here. Both Sources C and D had the purpose of putting the German point of view on the Treaty into the public domain, perhaps even hoping to have the terms of the Treaty modified. At the very least, this raises the issue of whether Source D could constitute proof of the claims in Source C, and the best answers made this point. Finally, it is worth mentioning that a small number of answers successfully compared the two sources but would have been improved by going on to deal with the issue of proof. A number of these answers would have benefited from directly answering the question; starting the answer with a sentence that does this would help, for example, 'Source D proves the claims made in Source C because'.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well, though there was a clear difference between those that used the publication date of the cartoon (1933) and those that did not. Given that the question asked why the cartoon was published, the answer needed to include a reason. Some answers did not include one and so did not really answer the question set. These answers often provided some effective interpretation of the cartoon which could have been turned into a message that the cartoonist wished to transmit to the audience. Most valid answers were, in fact, based on the cartoonist's messages, which were clearly protesting against the military restrictions imposed by the Treaty of Versailles. Better answers dealt also with why the cartoonist would want to send these messages, including the idea of purpose – the intended impact of the cartoon on the audience of arousing opposition to the Treaty. What characterised the best responses was to add contextual awareness to the answer. In 1933 the Nazis had just come to power, and high on Hitler's agenda were German rearmament and repudiation of the Treaty. Understanding the specific purpose that the cartoonist would have had of winning support for Hitler's plans was therefore the basis of the most successful answers.

Question 4

Candidates struggled with this question, problems arising from comprehension of what exactly William II was claiming. In the first few lines of Source F, William was putting forward reasons why Germany should not have been blamed for the outbreak of the war. In many answers candidates thought he was arguing that Germany should not have been treated so harshly at Versailles. This made a big difference when candidates tried to test the accuracy of the claims, as they attempted to use the attitudes of the Allies in the peace process to cross-refer against the Allies' behaviour in 1914 and before. Only the second half of the source moved on to the post-war period, and here candidates were able to do some effective cross-reference, usually on contrasting William's assertion that Germany would have treated defeated nations more leniently with Germany's treatment of Russia at Brest-Litovsk. Although some answers tried to assess William's trustworthiness by using the provenance, this was usually through generalised comments about memoirs or on his status as Emperor. A small number of stronger responses were able to go as far as providing plausible arguments on what William's purposes in 1922 might have been. By then he had been in exile for over three years, so arguments that he would have been trying to get the terms of the Treaty softened did not seem very realistic. Much the best approach was seen in responses which viewed the source as an exercise in self-justification, and an attempt to restore some of his reputation.

Question 5

For most candidates, the utility of Source G was determined by the information it provided. This could be about the Treaty; for example, that it was a Diktat which dealt a blow to the new German Republic. Or it could be about the Republic itself; for example, that it faced problems from the start. The information could be what the source said, or it could be something inferred from what the source said. The limitation of this approach was to assume that what the source said was reliable, and that the information could therefore be believed. Better responses included a check on this. This check could simply be on the factual accuracy of what Source G claimed, by using cross-reference to other sources or background knowledge. If the information could be believed, then it was useful. The best answers were prepared to explore the source's provenance, analysing Preuss's possible purposes in writing the source, to reach a conclusion about its

utility. As one of the authors of the Weimar Constitution, it could be assumed that Preuss might want to defend the Republic, especially in 1923, a year in which it faced so many threats. Source G could therefore be seen as justification for what the creators of the Republic had done, in the light of the difficulties the Treaty had made for them. In some responses this made the source unreliable, and therefore not useful, and in others reliable, and therefore useful, because of the insights it provided into the mindset of people like Preuss. However, the most important thing was the ability to evaluate the purpose behind the source to reach a conclusion.

Question 6

In **Question 6** candidates are given a hypothesis to test against the evidence provided by all the sources. They should be aware that the sources will offer evidence both for and against the hypothesis, and should be ready in their answers to show how the sources can be used. This means identifying relevant pieces of content in the sources and explaining how they constitute evidence. Responses were of mixed quality. There were many thorough and relevant answers, using a range of sources on both sides of the hypothesis. There were also many less successful responses. A number of them seemed unclear about the meaning of the War Guilt Clause, and attempted to argue that every source provided convincing evidence to support the hypothesis. These answers would have been improved by considering both sides of the hypothesis. Answers sometimes lost sight of the hypothesis, and began to focus on another issue, such as whether the Treaty was harsh or not. Some answers retained a focus on war guilt, but lost focus on what it was that Germans hated about the Treaty. These responses tended to become lists of what each source was about – reparations, military terms, war guilt and so on. Some answers identified the issue in the source that the Germans disliked, for example military restrictions, but then missed the opportunity to use the source content to explain and illustrate this.