HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

Firstly, the title given to candidates is crucial. Candidates have to assess significance and the best way of providing them with a fair chance to do this is to use appropriate terms in the title itself, thus making it clear what they have to do, for example 'Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch.'

Secondly, it is important that candidates realise they are required to assess significance in its broadest sense. In other words, they need to use a range of criteria to judge how far their event or individual was significant in different ways and for different reasons.

Thirdly, candidates need to assess significance, rather than just describe or explain it.

Fourthly, they need to assess whether their development, event or individual was more significant in some ways than in others, explain why, and then try and reach an overall assessment of the significance of that event or individual.

Finally, it is important that candidates do not confuse 'failure' with a lack of significance or 'success' with significance. For example, actions that failed can still be significant.

Assessing significance often requires two moves on the part of the candidate. They need to, for example, explain the consequence, result or outcome of the event or the actions of the individual. Then they need to make a judgement about how far the consequence, result or outcome mattered at the time or later.

General comments

Some excellent work was produced, with most of the titles used giving candidates full opportunity to accomplish what is required. Titles that make clear that an assessment of significance is required were common and worked well, for example, 'Assess the significance of Martin Luther King.' However, using the words 'assess' and 'significance' in a title does not by itself ensure that it will be suitable. For example, 'Assess the significance of the Depression in the rise to power of Hitler' is a causation question about the relative importance of different factors in Hitler's rise to power. The title limits candidates to Hitler's rise to power and therefore does not allow them to assess the significance of the Depression in its broadest sense. The significance of the Depression can only be assessed in relation to its role in helping Hitler rise to power. 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' is a much better significance title, as it will allow candidates to consider different ways in which the Depression was significant.

The subject matter chosen for an assessment of significance is also important. The development, event or individual chosen must have the potential of being assessed for significance in different ways. It should also provide potential for assessment rather than just explanation. In other words, it must be a development, individual or event where judgements about significance are provisional and debatable, rather than clear-cut.

Comments on specific questions

The best answers were those where the candidates had asked themselves how their development, individual or event could be significant in different ways. In other words, they asked themselves different questions about significance (something that cannot be done if the outcome is identified in the title, as in the example mentioned above about Hitler's rise to power). This was often achieved by the use of criteria. These are varied and some will be less or more appropriate depending on the topic. For some developments, individuals or events, criteria such as political, social and economic might work well. For others, duration and

breadth of impact might work better. Long and short term can also be useful for some topics, while for others the idea of 'turning point' might give candidates' useful possibilities. The criteria should not be used in a mechanistic way and it should be left to individual candidates to choose which ones they think are useful to use.

Some answers did use a range of criteria but were limited because significance was just described or explained but not assessed. Others were limited because they made few connections or comparisons. The best answers pursued links between the different ways in which a development, individual or topic was significant. Another useful approach was to compare the different ways in which the development, individual or event was significant and make assessments about whether it was more significant in some ways than in others or whether it was more significant for some people than for others. These types of approaches then open up for the candidate the interesting and challenging question about the overall significance of their development, individual or event. Many of the better responses adopted this approach.

As mentioned earlier, when assessing significance, it is not enough to explain the outcome or impact. The best answers did this but then went on to assess how much the outcome or impact mattered at the time, or later, or to different groups of people or in different ways. Some candidates used other approaches very effectively by, for example, considering how far an event, development or individual was remembered or commemorated, or by considering whether something was a turning point or was merely part of an existing trend. It is important to note that the best answers about 'turning point' were those that looked backwards as well as forwards and considered the event or the individual in a line of development.

Candidates do not have to use all the approaches mentioned above but the careful use of some of them led to many interesting and excellent answers.

The generic markscheme should be used in a holistic way by considering answers as a whole and focusing on knowledge and understanding, relevance, how well significance has been dealt with and how satisfactorily the title has been addressed. Overall, the marking of candidates' answers was accurate. Most work was carefully and usefully annotated and summative comments referred to key parts of the markscheme. Some marks were adjusted but overall, the marking of candidates' work was of a high standard.

HISTORY

+-------------------------------+
| **Paper 0470/11** |
| **Paper 11** |
+-------------------------------+

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are focused and relevant.

It is important that dates given in a question are duly noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.

General comments

A number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the question set. Parts **(b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but they needed to go further and develop these identified points into explanations. Better responses focused upon using 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. Some were able to use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they made; others set out a clear argument but were unable to support this argument with relevant factual knowledge. In other instances responses were a very detailed narrative of events; these needed development into explanations focused clearly upon the question set. There were some rubric errors; some candidates chose parts **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)** from different questions. Some answered fewer than the required number of questions, and some answered more than three questions. On the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with the majority completing the paper.

Candidates need to ensure they label questions clearly. Some responses gave the question number only, and then wrote one long paragraph to answer all three parts, without indicating where each question part ended and the next began.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Question 1

(a)   Some candidates identified Mazzini's role in the 'Young Italy' movement and identified its aims relating to the unification of Italy. Many responses were generalised in nature.

(b)   There were a number of relevant identified points made, highlighting the strength of the Austrian army and the diversity of opinions in Italy as to whether there should be a monarchy or a republic. These identifications needed to be developed into explanations.

(c)   Some responses identified Cavour's reaction to Garibaldi's invasion and Cavour's agreement with Napoleon. These answers would have benefited from development into explanation. A number of responses were generalised in nature.

Question 2

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

Question 3

(a) Some candidates were able to state a number of relevant details about events at Harpers Ferry in 1859. These mainly focused upon who accompanied John Brown, the actions they took and what happened to John Brown and those who helped with the raid on the arsenal at Harpers Ferry.

(b) Effective answers to this question identified and explained several reasons for the South's failure to win the Civil War; these usually included the North having more men, larger armies and the advantage of manufacturing industry. Many candidates were able to identify such points; these points needed to be developed into explanations.

(c) Responses to this question identified that ex-slaves were now free, and that these ex-slaves still faced much prejudice. More responses could have developed such points into explanations. Many responses were generalised in nature.

Question 4

(a) Responses identified that British ships transported opium from India to the Chinese coast, that there were a growing number of opium addicts in China at this time, that crime increased as people tried to find money to pay for opium, and that the opium trade partly led to the first Opium War.

(b) There were some clearly explained answers to this question, focusing upon the economic reasons for nineteenth century European imperialism. Some responses also focused upon imperialism adding to a country's prestige.

(c) Detailed descriptions of the events of the Indian Mutiny of 1857 were given; better ones were developed into explanations. A number of responses focused upon the situation in India after independence was gained in the twentieth century, which was not relevant to the question.

Question 5

(a) A variety of relevant points were given in response to this question, including the International Labour Organisation's attempts to fix a maximum working day and working week, the banning of poisonous white lead from paint, the limits imposed on the hours small children were allowed to work and the role of the International Labour Organisation in gathering and publishing information about working conditions across the world. Some responses did not differentiate between recommendations made and actual legislation that was enforced. A number of responses wrote about the aims of the League of Nations and its wider work, with no mention of the work of the International Labour Organisation.

(b) Effective responses to this question explained that the requirement for unanimous decisions in the Assembly and Council made taking decisive action very difficult, and that unanimous decisions meant that states were able to put their own self-interest above wider considerations. Many responses identified relevant points such as unanimous decisions causing delays in action, sometimes preventing any action being taken at all, and both large and small states having the power to prevent decisions being made.

(c) There were a number of clearly structured responses to this question. Clear explanations of Mussolini's role in the destruction of the League's authority were given, focusing upon his actions in Corfu and Abyssinia. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained that Japan's actions in Manchuria, the League's lack of a standing army and the absence of America all contributed to the destruction of the League's authority. A considerable number of responses described incidents in Vilna, Corfu, Manchuria and Abyssinia and/or gave lengthy descriptions of the League's structure; such responses needed to develop these points into explanations demonstrating how they contributed to the destruction of the League's authority.

Question 6

(a) A number of responses demonstrated an in-depth factual knowledge of events in the Saar in 1935. Relevant points made included the holding of a plebiscite, the options given to the voters, the results of the plebiscite and its significance for Germany. A number of responses wrote about events in the Rhineland in 1936 and Austria in 1938, rather than the Saar in 1935.

(b) There were a number of clearly explained responses to this question, with explanations focused primarily upon the risk involved in breaking a term of the Treaty of Versailles and the response this could elicit, and upon the risk of failure and how this would affect Hitler's position. Some responses demonstrated an awareness of the risks involved in Hitler's remilitarisation of the Rhineland; the identifications made needed to be developed into explanations.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained how Germany was responsible for war in 1939 given Hitler's desires to destroy the Treaty of Versailles, create a Greater Germany and his invasion of Poland. Responses then explained the other side of the argument, showing how other factors such as the ineffectiveness of the League of Nations, the policy of appeasement and the actions of Mussolini and Stalin were also responsible for war. Some candidates identified numerous factors and would have improved their answers by developing this into explanation. Some candidates wrote much about German grievances about the Treaty of Versailles and the details of the Nazi-Soviet Pact; this information needed to be explained to show how these factors were responsible for war in 1939. A few candidates wrote less relevantly about Germany's attack on Russia and Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Question 7

(a) Most candidates were able to identify at least two of Stalin's achievements at the Yalta Conference, usually focusing on Stalin gaining a zone of occupation of Germany and a zone of occupation of Berlin. Other points made included Eastern Europe being made a Soviet sphere of influence, the agreement to hunt down war criminals and Germany's eastern border being moved westwards. Some responses focused upon Stalin's aims at Yalta, rather than his actual achievements.

(b) Some responses highlighted the instability of Poland after the Second World War, the differing beliefs of the Western Allies and Stalin on the future of Poland, and Poland being within the Soviet sphere of influence. A small number of responses gave a developed explanation focused on the differing opinions of the Western Allies and Stalin and the situation regarding the Lublin Poles and the London Poles.

(c) Responses to this question tended to give stronger arguments disagreeing with the statement in the question. Explained arguments included the Berlin Airlift, the establishment of the Federal German Republic (West Germany) and the German Democratic Republic (East Germany). Arguments in agreement with the question were mainly identifications based on the USA joining NATO. Some responses were focused entirely on the causes of the Berlin Blockade rather than its consequences. Other responses gave lengthy descriptions of the events of the Berlin Blockade, therefore lacking focus on the question.

Question 8

(a) Responses to this question gave a variety of relevant points, focused mainly upon Eisenhower's desire to prevent the spread of communism, domino theory and what this meant, and the military and economic aid given to the south of Vietnam. Some candidates wrote answers focused upon policies in Korea.

(b) There were some highly effective responses to this question, with clear and developed explanations focused upon the USA losing influence and control over Cuba and Castro's friendship with the USSR. Most candidates who attempted this question were able to give at least one identified reason for the USA being unhappy with Castro's changes.

(c) Effective responses to this question gave clearly developed explanations on both sides of the argument. Arguments agreeing with the statement in the question were focused upon South Korea remaining free from communism, and communism being contained in Cuba. On the other side of the argument, explanations focused mainly upon the USA's failure to contain communism in Vietnam. Most candidates were able to at least identify countries in which communism was

contained and those where it was not. Some responses lacked clear focus on the question set; there were some long descriptions of guerrilla warfare in Vietnam and the reactions of the American public to war in Vietnam, for example.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Successful responses to his question focused primarily on the assumption that Russia would take six weeks to mobilise, that Germany would not have to fight war on two separate fronts, that Belgium would offer no resistance and that France would be quickly defeated. Most candidates were able to give at least two valid points.

(b) A number of responses showed a clear awareness that the Germans wanted to capture the Channel ports to prevent British troops landing in northern France and also to stop supplies and ammunition reaching the British troops who were already in northern France. Some responses would have been improved if identifications had been developed into explanations.

(c) Confident responses to this question gave clearly structured explanations of Belgium's resistance and how this meant that the Schlieffen Plan failed. On the other side of the argument, explanations of the contribution made by the BEF, the Russians mobilising more quickly than anticipated and the exhaustion and lack of supplies suffered by the German troops, were all cited as being instrumental in causing the failure of the Schlieffen Plan. Some would have benefited from more focus on the question, instead giving detailed descriptions of life in the trenches.

Question 10

(a) A number of candidates were able to state four relevant points in response to this question, mostly citing 'No Man's Land' being the area between the enemies' front-line trenches, the area where there were most casualties in trench warfare, and the area having barbed wire, shell holes and, in wet weather, being extremely muddy.

(b) A small number of candidates were able to explain that the French fought to save Verdun because it was essential to French morale. Other candidates were able to identify that Verdun was both important for French morale and a stronghold of French defences. Some candidates answered in generalised terms only.

(c) Competent answers to this question explained the success of tanks in breaching the German lines in some areas, and the panic they induced in the German forces. On the other side of the argument, the successes of machine guns, gas and aircraft on the Western Front were clearly explained, with some responses also highlighting the problems involved in using tanks. Some responses described the physical appearance of tanks; this needed to be developed into explanation of why this made them a successful innovation on the Western Front.

Question 11

(a) Many candidates answered this question confidently, stating methods such as the use of propaganda, the use of pamphlets, posters and film, rallies being held and Goebbels arranging for Hitler to make rousing speeches as often as possible. Some responses missed the dates in the question, and therefore focused their answers solely on Goebbels' methods from 1933. Whilst there is some overlap with the period 1929–1932, this meant that some responses included material that was lacking in relevance to the time period specified in the question.

(b) Competent answers to this question stressed that Germany was actually doing well before 1929 and therefore did not need the Nazi Party; explanation focused on Germany's improving economic, political and international situation under Stresemann. Further explanations explored the banning of the Nazi Party and the dislike of the Nazi attempt to take power by force. A number of candidates wrote at some length about why the Nazi Party was successful from 1929, which was not required by the question.

(c) Responses gave clear explanations of the role of the Depression in Hitler becoming Chancellor of Germany, together with explanations of the use of propaganda and the fear of communism to

disagree with the statement in the question. Arguments agreeing with the hypothesis could have been more clearly argued. Many candidates could identify that von Papen and von Schleicher could not form stable governments, and that von Papen and Hindenburg thought they could control Hitler; these points needed to be developed into explanation. Some responses focused solely upon events after when Hitler became Chancellor, which was not required by the question.

Question 12

(a)   A number of candidates were able to identify that the Communists were opposed to the Nazi regime in its early years, and a small number of candidates identified opposition from the Church and from groups of young people such as the Edelweiss Pirates. Other candidates wrote in general terms, stating just that people didn't like Hitler.

(b)   Most candidates were able to identify that the Gestapo was important to the Nazis because it dealt with opposition and because it induced fear in ordinary German citizens. A number of responses had clear development of these identifications into explanations.

(c)   There were some highly effective responses to this question. Clearly structured arguments were given, explaining how the school curriculum was used to control the German people by indoctrinating young Germans and securing their support for the future. The role of the Hitler Youth in educating and controlling young people was also explored effectively. The use of mass media was also clearly explained, with reference to the German people only being exposed to material favourable to the Nazis in newspapers and on the radio. A small number of responses then evaluated 'how far' the hypothesis in the question was valid, clearly considering the relative merits of education and mass media in controlling the German people. Some responses were mainly descriptions of the school curriculum and Hitler Youth activities; further development of these points into explanations was needed.

Question 13

(a)   Many good responses stated that Stalin's image could be seen everywhere, and that he was portrayed as a god-like figure. Further points included books, films, plays and art being required to conform to a given format, where only Stalinist beliefs and positive images of Stalin could be portrayed. Other responses simply restated the question.

(b)   Effective responses explained that the Purges rid Stalin of any political rivals, such as supporters of Trotsky, and that they scared the Russian people into obeying Stalin. Some candidates also identified other points, such as Stalin's purging of the kulaks and the Armed forces; these points could have been developed into explanations by more candidates.

(c)   There were some confident responses to this question, giving clearly structured and developed explanations on both sides of the argument. Explanations mainly focused upon Trotsky's arrogance, his lack of popularity and support within the Party, his underestimation of Stalin, Stalin's skilful political manoeuvring and his idea of 'Socialism in One Country'. Also, Stalin managing to trick Trotsky into missing Lenin's funeral and thus damaging Trotsky's reputation, featured in answers. Some candidates gave detailed descriptions of Lenin's Last Testament and Trotsky's failure to attend Lenin's funeral; these descriptions needed to be structured to explain how and why they enabled Stalin to achieve success in the leadership contest.

Question 14

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

Question 15

(a)   Most responses identified that governments in the 1920s introduced tariffs and that these tariffs encouraged Americans to buy American goods as they were cheaper than foreign imports. Some candidates also identified the name of a specific tariff, the Fordney-McCumber tariff of 1922. Some responses wrote in detail about Republican policies generally; such responses would have benefited from being tailored to the specific focus of the question set.

(b)   Competent responses to this question explained that hire purchase enabled greater numbers of Americans to purchase goods without having to wait until they had the full purchase price, and why

this was important to the economic boom. Responses then explained that advertising enabled the promotion of consumer goods to a wider audience, and thus increased sales with a clear positive effect on the economy. Some responses described the details of hire purchase and the nature of advertising in 1920s America, without explaining why these were important to the economic boom.

(c)   There were a number of effective explanations of the ways in which over-production was a problem for the American economy in the 1920s, with focus upon over-production in both farming and consumer goods. On the other side of the argument, candidates gave competent explanations of other problems such as tariffs and the unequal distribution of wealth in 1920s America. A number of responses to this question consisted of lengthy descriptions of farming, speculation on the stock market and the poverty endured by some Americans; candidates do need to ensure they focus their answers clearly on explaining with reference to the question.

Question 16

(a)   Most responses identified at least two effects of racial intolerance faced by black Americans in the 1920s. The effects identified included the Ku Klux Klan's violence towards black Americans, segregation under the Jim Crow Laws, the poverty faced by black Americans, limited educational opportunities, poorly paid jobs and inadequate housing.

(b)   There were some highly effective answers to this question, with responses clearly explaining the challenge Scopes' teaching of evolution made to the Fundamentalists, and the differing views between Fundamentalist Christians based primarily in rural areas, and Christians in urban areas. Some responses contained a variety of identified points; these needed to be developed into explanations. Some candidates would have benefited from greater contextual knowledge about the 'Monkey Trial'.

(c)   Competent answers to this question explained that prohibition was good for the USA because the consumption of alcohol declined in some areas and this had positive effects on health and work. These answers then gave clear explanations on the other side of the argument, focused on the increase in crime with the rising influence of gangs, the corruption amongst law enforcers and the large numbers of Americans who simply ignored the prohibition laws. A number of responses gave arguments disagreeing with the hypothesis only. Most responses demonstrated knowledge of the main factors involved on at least one side of the argument.

Questions 17 to 20

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

Question 21

(a)   Some responses identified the members of the Arab League and stated some of the Arab League's aims, including the aim to consider and protect the interests of Arab countries. A number of responses identified one point only – that the Arab League was an organisation of Arab countries.

(b)   Responses to this question identified a number of reasons why the creation of a Jewish homeland was likely by the end of the Second World War; points identified included sympathy for the Jews due to the Holocaust, support from the US and British governments and the support of international public opinion for an independent Jewish state. A few candidates gave a developed explanation relating to the effects of the Holocaust creating sympathy for the Jews.

(c)   A small number of candidates explained that the Israeli state was secure by 1949 due to the confidence of Israeli military forces. Some candidates identified relevant points, including Britain, France and the USA agreeing to protect Israel against any incursions. Other candidates missed the 'by 1949' part of the question, and wrote about events in the decades after 1949.

Question 22

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

HISTORY

+-----------------------------+
| **Paper 0470/12** |
| **Paper 12** |
+-----------------------------+

Key messages

Successful responses require a careful reading of the questions to make sure responses are focused and relevant.

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

General comments

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

Parts **(b)** and **(c)** demand explanation. Narrative sections or long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

In part **(c)**, candidates need to argue both for and against the focus of the question to reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should address 'how far', or any other formulation used in the hypothesis ('how successful' etc.). Less successful responses tended to rely on re-iterating the narrative and often included information lacking in relevance.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2 and 3

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

Question 4

(a)   This question is about threats to peace at the beginning of the twentieth century; however, some responses mentioned at least one of the following: the naval race; Moroccan crises; formation of the Entente Cordiale. These events were outside the time-frame specified by the question. More relevantly, most candidates referred to the Triple Alliance and some named the countries which comprised it. Other valid points such as the Kaiser's policy of 'Weltpolitik', Germany's desire for a 'Place in the Sun' and the existence of the Dual Entente could have been mentioned by more candidates.

(b)   Some candidates confused the two Moroccan crises. This question was about the 1911 crisis and required two sound explanations. Most candidates were able to identify that the Kaiser sent the gunboat 'Panther' to Agadir but fewer were able to explain why this caused a crisis. Candidates needed to explain that this made the British fear that the Kaiser intended to set up a naval base in the Mediterranean. Some candidates mentioned that the Kaiser was testing the recently formed Entente Cordiale. More candidates were able to identify this reason than to explain it. The most successful answers explained separately how the actions of the Kaiser and the respective reactions of Britain and France led to the crisis.

(c)   Candidates needed to offer explanations on both sides of the argument and evaluation. Nearly every candidate referred to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and most used it as an explanation as to why Serbia was responsible for the outbreak of war. Few other explanations giving the blame to Serbia were offered. Credit would have been given if candidates had explained the rise of nationalist groups in Serbia as a threat to Austria-Hungary, or the support which Russia offered Serbia. On the other side of the argument, many candidates gave the 'unfairness' of Austria-Hungary's ultimatum to Serbia as a cause of the war. Some candidates also explained how Germany had given Austria-Hungary a 'blank-cheque'. A large number of candidates explained why other countries (including France and Britain) were to blame for the outbreak of war but this did not relate to the question set. Most candidates offered conclusions; many of these would have been improved by the avoidance of repetition of previous arguments and the inclusion of genuine evaluation.

Question 5

(a)   Many candidates provided strong responses by clearly stating the main aims of the League of Nations when it was set up in 1920. These included: to achieve world peace, to encourage disarmament, to improve living and working conditions and enforce the Treaty of Versailles. Some candidates lost time on this question by including too much detail on the background of the League of Nations and how they were going to achieve their aims, both of which lacked relevance to the question.

(b)   Successful responses to this question identified two countries and explained why they were not in the League of Nations when it was set up. Most candidates were well versed in the fact that the USA, Germany and USSR were not initially in the League of Nations and most could identify why, for example, the American Congress did not ratify the treaties and therefore America never joined the League. Both Germany and the USSR were not invited to join the League. Better answers then went onto explain why the American Congress did not ratify the treaties or why Germany and the USSR were not invited. For example, Germany was not invited, as at first, all defeated powers were excluded and, as it was considered that Germany had started the First World War, they were not allowed into the League of Nations until they had proved that they were a peace loving nation. Some responses included information which, although correct, was not answering the question, including dates when countries left the League and why.

(c)   There were some well developed responses to this question, yet there were other potentially good answers in which facts were muddled, for example, Norway and Finland both wanting the Aaland Islands. In addition, the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises were outside the dates set in the question. Good answers gave a balanced argument, usually explaining the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia and Greece-Bulgaria conflicts as examples of how the League successfully kept the peace. They then went on to explain the disputes in which the League was not as successful, most notably Corfu and Vilna. It was important in these cases for candidates to give an explanation for their lack of success. For example, in 1920 Vilna was made the capital of the new state of Lithuania but its population was largely Polish. In 1920 a Polish army took control of Vilna; Lithuania appealed for help from the League. Poland was clearly the aggressor; the League protested to Poland but they refused to withdraw. In the end the League did nothing because the French were not prepared to upset Poland because they saw Poland as a possible ally against Germany in the future and Britain was not prepared to act alone. To achieve the highest marks, as some candidates did, they needed to use the evidence in their response to evaluate how successful the League was at preserving peace in the 1920s.

Question 6

(a)   In general this question was very well answered, with candidates able to identify most or all the relevant points, identifying the countries whose German-speaking peoples Hitler wished to incorporate into the Reich. Lebensraum was well understood. In some cases candidates misunderstood the term 'Greater' in the context of Hitler's foreign policy and made points about autarky, re-militarisation, the elimination of communism and racial purity.

(b)   There was much material that candidates were able to use to relate to this question provided that attention was paid to the specific dates mentioned. Some candidates missed this requirement and concentrated on such events as the Anschluss with Austria or the annexation of the Sudetenland, both of which fall outside the confines of the question. The re-militarisation of the Rhineland was the most commonly mentioned success, with candidates generally clear about the preoccupation of

Britain and France (and the League), with events in Abyssinia and about Britain's willingness to let Hitler into 'his own backyard'. Some less successful candidates sought to explain the successes in terms of the general reasons for appeasement (Britain and France unprepared for war, impact of the Depression).

(c) Candidates were generally strong on the arguments in favour of appeasement, especially the impact on governments and public opinion of the First World War, the state of the British and French economies following the Great Depression, and the hope that Germany would be a buttress against Communism. In some cases the making of these points would have benefited from the inclusion of supportive evidence. Some argued successfully that Britain and France exaggerated Germany's military preparedness. The arguments against appeasement were less well explained by many candidates, especially when it came to offering clear evidence. Many candidates identified the arguments against appeasement ('emboldened Hitler', 'morally wrong') without referring to any of the events of 1938 – 39. The loss of Czechoslovakia (and its defences and armaments industry) as a potential ally was mentioned by only a few candidates, as was Stalin's anxiety over appeasement and the Munich agreement leading to the Nazi-Soviet Pact. The most commonly recited argument was that appeasement made Hitler too confident, but with many candidates not indicating what events followed from this.

Question 7

(a) Candidates answered this question well, enumerating very succinctly for the most part the reasons for Hungarians' dissatisfaction with their situation in the mid-1950s. Censorship, the Soviet military presence for which Hungarians were paying, religious restrictions, the low standard of living, hard working conditions and the use of the secret police were all frequently mentioned factors. There were very few answers that did not mention some or all of these points.

(b) This question was well answered for the most part. The main point made in answer to Soviet concerns about events in Hungary in 1956 was the fear of the impact of Hungary's wish to leave the Warsaw Pact, with most candidates explaining how this would weaken the Pact and also encourage other countries to follow suit. The other point most commonly cited was how this would weaken the Soviet Union's image in the West. A small but significant number of candidates thought that Stalin rather than Khrushchev was the Soviet leader at this time. A small number of candidates were clear on the importance of the changes of political leadership (from the Soviet loyalist Rakosi to the more liberal Nagy).

(c) This question produced some well developed answers, with candidates proving stronger on the focus on migration as the reason for the building of the Berlin Wall than on other possible reasons. There was plenty of detail in good answers on the ability of people to move relatively freely between the two zones before the Wall's construction, as well as a good appreciation of the loss of highly regarded professional workers ('the brain drain'). The other side of the question was less confidently dealt with. There was little mention of the pressure on Khrushchev from Eastern bloc leaders (with Ulbricht, the East German leader, not mentioned), while some candidates again believed that Stalin was still in power in the Soviet Union. Other reasons for the building of the Wall were less frequently explained. The intention to close down information about how life was lived in the West was the most frequently mentioned reason on the other side of the argument for the Wall's construction, while the increasing tension in East-West relations featured in only a small number of answers.

Question 8

(a) The majority of the candidates who answered this question were aware of how Saddam Hussein dealt with the Kurds between 1987 and 1991 and they gained very high marks for identifying the displacement of Kurds, gas attacks, destruction of villages and the killing of thousands of Kurds.

(b) Answers to this question were variable in quality and relevance. Weaker responses included identifications of reasons of why he rose to power, such as he had family connections or a strong personality. The stronger responses explained the reasons. For example, Saddam's relationship with President Bakr and how he was encouraged to resign in favour of Saddam. The strongest responses included two explanations.

(c) Candidates needed to explain the reasons why the Iran-Iraq War of 1980-88 was considered a success for Iraq and then also to give the other point of view and explain the reasons why it was

not considered to be a success for Iraq. Some candidates shifted the focus of the question to Iran and explained why they were successful. It is important for candidates to keep within the parameters of the question. Good answers were able to explain both points of view, success and failure for Iraq, supported by factual details from the war. For example, Saddam at the end of the war was still in power and claimed it had been a glorious victory for Iraq, so much so that an imposing monument was erected in Baghdad to recognise his achievement as he had halted the spread of the Islamic Revolution. On the other hand, it was unsuccessful for Iraq because there had been a large number of casualties and the economic damage was considerable because the annual oil revenues had been more than halved.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a)   Most of the small number of candidates who answered **Question 9** were able to identify that the Germans met the BEF at Mons and that the actions of the BEF slowed down the German advance. Fewer candidates were able to give further details about the action. Comments which demonstrated specific knowledge such as 'German troops stated that they first believed they were being shot at by machine guns – it was in fact British rifle fire' would have improved some responses. A small number of candidates wrongly identified the Belgians as holding up the German advance at Mons.

(b)   Greater knowledge of the battle and its importance would have benefited a number of responses. Although most candidates were able to identify reasons why the battle was important, for example, 'Paris was under threat', they needed to then go on and develop them into explanations. Some candidates mentioned the 'race to the sea' and the development of trench warfare but did not go on to explain how these developments were caused by the Battle of the Marne. Successful responses tended to explain why the battle left the Schlieffen Plan in ruins and created issues for the German army, as well as explaining the importance of the longer term implications that the Marne had on creating the start of trench warfare.

(c)   The majority of responses focused on examining the Schlieffen Plan in relation to the course of the campaign in the west. In other words, few responses focused solely on aspects of the Plan. Most candidates had a sound understanding of what the plan was and they were able to explain why France had to be defeated quickly and related it to the speed at which Russia could mobilise its army. More candidates could have identified and explained other important features of the Schlieffen Plan, such as the assumption that Belgium would not resist and that Britain would not immediately join the conflict. Some candidates offered limited conclusions

Question 10

(a)   The small number of candidates that answered **Question 10** were generally aware that the Hindenburg Line was a German defensive position and that it was on the Western Front. Few candidates were able to give further details, though credit was given if candidates provided information such as the particular features of the Hindenburg Line (concrete bunkers, fortified villages etc.), when it was built (winter 1916 – 17), or where it ran from (Arras to Laffaux).

(b)   A number of candidates would have benefited from better knowledge regarding the events in Amiens in August 1918. Candidates realised that the Germans were forced to retreat and many were taken prisoner. Supporting evidence was lacking, however, as was the ability to explain the actual importance of the events.

(c)   This question was generally well answered and candidates were able to demonstrate a knowledge of the importance of the British naval blockade and other factors. Candidates linked the naval blockade to the severe food shortages that Germans were facing by 1918, the consequences for morale and, thereby, the lack of will in fighting the war. On the other side of the argument, some candidates successfully explained the impact of the USA's entry to the German willingness to sign the Armistice. The best explanations of the USA's impact mentioned the increased military advantage of the allies as well as the effects on the morale of both sides. Most candidates provided a conclusion which recapitulated the points that they had made in their response.

Question 11

(a)   **Question 11** was popular with candidates and this part was generally well answered and understood. Most candidates grasped the facts that occurred following the Munich Putsch (for example, lots focused on short term impacts of imprisonment/trial, Nazi deaths, publicity and the writing of Mein Kampf, and many commented on longer term change in strategy such as Hitler's realisation that constitutional means were needed). Fewer highlighted that the Nazi Party was banned or mentioned the need to contest seats in general elections to build a powerbase in the Reischtag. Many candidates explained the Munich Putsch itself first before going into the results from it despite the question not requiring it. Quite a few candidates presumed that the Munich Putsch made the Nazis popular straight away, and a few candidates did not have the precise numbers of Nazis killed during the Putsch.

(b)   Many candidates were able to explain very well that the Reichstag allowed Hitler to ban/arrest the communists following the fire. Some were able to explain in detail. Focus was also put on the propaganda benefits of blaming the fire on communists and the value of Article 48 and the Emergency powers. Some candidates explained how it led to fear. Only a very small number of candidates wrote about the restrictions on personal freedom and increased police powers. Some mixed up the Enabling Act with the Emergency Powers, presuming that the Fire enabled Hitler to be made chancellor. Repetition of its impact on the Communists was quite common (sometimes this was linked to material in **(c)**) and weaker answers lacked development to the significance of the demise of the communists in the upcoming elections.

(c)   Many candidates were able to do well in this question. Very few candidates at all misread or could not find some degree of answer to the question. The majority of candidates offered one point from each side. They were able to explain clearly how the rallies and alternatives were able to contribute to Hitler's success in 1932. Most candidates who did well chose to focus on the sense of order and the ability of Hitler's speech making. Whilst many valid alternatives were given, the impact of other propaganda, negative cohesion and the depression (which led to economic problems and the rise of extremism) were the most commonly applied. Some candidates referred to the Nuremberg rallies and one or two candidates wrote about soup kitchens. Others struggled to develop their explanations of the importance of rallies in significant depth, with some limited to identification and description level. They particularly lacked supporting details when arguing for the significance of mass rallies. Some referred to control and order but few explained the importance of anniversaries, torch-lit parades or uniforms. A few candidates appeared to struggle within the date limitations of the question, linking alternative propaganda that could have only occurred after Hitler took power (most notably radio), or events linking to **(b)** or the role of the police state in Nazi Germany. Some candidates also put Hitler's speeches as an alternative to the rallies, and mentioned activities such as the Hitler Youth on non-voting Germans or the Gestapo. Little genuine evaluation was seen.

Question 12

(a)   **Question 12** was also popular with candidates and a lot of candidates were able to identify enough activities by the Hitler Youth; many were able to identify military exercises, sports, political indoctrination and the preparation of girls to be mothers and home-keepers, although quite a few went on to try and explain why they were doing this instead of describing. Some also mentioned loyalty to Hitler and the injustices of the treaty. Few referred to cooking, sewing or managing household budgets, simply referring more generally to the teaching of domestic duties to girls.

(b)   Many candidates were able to explain two valid reasons why the Nazis were changing education. The most commonly explained were future roles for gender, control and Nazi ideology (such as anti-Jewish indoctrination and reinforcing the superiority of the Aryan race). Most candidates were well aware of the changes the Nazis made to the History, Science and Maths curriculum to reinforce their messages, as well as to the promotion of sports. Far fewer commented on changes to religious education, teachers' allegiance and the state-controlling of all schools. More candidates could have mentioned the oath of loyalty to Hitler.

(c)   A number of candidates struggled with this question. Some misread it and felt that it was asking 'how did the Nazis benefit?' Most candidates were able to explain the reduction to unemployment, why this happened, and how this benefited workers. Some omitted the public works such as autobahns, railways etc.). Many also described the Beauty of Labour scheme and Strength through Joy but did not offer examples like holidays and leisure. They were also aware of the loss in trade union rights. Fewer mentioned the DAF by name or were able to explain how the demise of

communist party affected workers. More candidates could have written about conscription and how it affected the workers, and few mentioned how Jews were driven from the workplace. Most candidates stayed within the time period. Many responses would have been improved by the inclusion of more evidence and by answering the question in more specific terms. Although some were aware of the increasing hours and pay freeze as time went on, few mentioned the loss of ability to strike. Some stuck to more general comments about improvements in the standard of living and free trips, while others appeared confused by who industrial workers were, and gave accounts of the fates of farmers and business owners.

Question 13

(a) Among the key points identified about the Soviets by some candidates were membership and location.

(b) Many candidates were able to describe the Kornilov Affair. Most candidates successfully identified the impact of the Kornilov Affair, focusing on the effect on both the Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government. Some were able to explain clearly the importance to each of these groups that the Kornilov Affair had, such as the supply of weapons to the Red Guard, which were later used in the revolution.

(c) On the whole, candidates understood the desire for land reform by the peasant class in Russia. Some were also able to identify other factors that led to the downfall of the Provisional Government, such as the continuance of World War One, opposition of the Bolsheviks or lack of elections. Some candidates were able to explain why land reform or the opposition of the Bolsheviks led to the Provisional Government being overthrown. However, other factors were less well explained. This meant that answers were not always as fully developed as they could have been.

Question 14

(a) The candidates who attempted this question were not always able to clearly identify a wide range of factors that affected women during Stalin's rule. These factors could have been both positive and negative. The majority wrote that divorce and/or abortion were easier under Stalin, rather than harder. Most knew that crèches were provided, although few identified continuing problems or limits for women.

(b) Candidates tended to struggle with this question. Some were able to accurately identify relevant reasons but fewer were able to give full explanations of the issues. Some candidates struggled with the idea of national identities and were unable to explain clearly who or what they were. Some identified Russification but more could have made the connection between this and Stalin's aim of a Soviet state under his control.

(c) Many candidates were confident in their understanding of collectivisation and were able to easily identify one or two factors for and against the statement. Other answers were confused, muddling collectivisation and the Five-ear Plans. Most were able to describe the increase in production and linked it to both collectivisation and new machinery. Many candidates could also identify some failures, such as famine and the impact on the Kulaks, although some thought the Kulaks did well from collectivisation. Some candidates were able to develop their arguments into clear explanation, although fewer were able to express the impact for Stalin and the population overall in their analysis.

Question 15

(a) The majority of candidates who attempted this question were able to gain good marks with relevant points being made about what 'Prohibition' actually was, such as that it was introduced by the Eighteenth Amendment; that it banned the manufacture, transportation and sale of alcoholic drink; that it was enforced through the Volstead Act. However, some candidates went into considerable detail about the reasons why 'Prohibition' was introduced which was not required.

(b) There were some good answers to this question, with candidates explaining two reasons clearly, using relevant contextual knowledge support as evidence and, therefore, achieving very high marks. There was a range of possible reasons that could be used, including for example, the ready

availability of illegal alcohol; the increase in crime and gang activity and the failure of enforcement agents. Weaker answers tended just to identify reasons rather than explain them.

(c) This question produced a variety of responses, with good answers providing a balanced approach with more than one explained reason on each side, while weaker answers tended to focus on one side only or to show a lack of understanding of the word 'intolerant'. Intolerance in US society was well handled by most candidates. Possible examples were the Red Scare; racial discrimination against African-Americans and other minority groups; religion – the Scopes trial, and attitudes towards immigrants and immigration. The most common example used for a more tolerant society was the greater freedom afforded to women in terms of gaining the right to vote and their greater social and sexual liberation. The changes in entertainment and the new opportunities these provided to some black and female performers, particularly in jazz music and the film industries, was the other main line of explanation offered.

Question 16

(a) This question was well-answered by most candidates. However, the points made needed to relate directly to the 'Crash' and its immediate impact rather than the longer term causes and consequences, which some candidates focused upon.

(b) This question was quite well-answered by many candidates who were able to provide two explained reasons why many US citizens suffered severe financial difficulties. There were a number of possible factors that they could call on such as the money lost through speculation; the rise in unemployment; the inability to pay for food and household bills; the financial problems faced by farmers. Weaker responses were only able to identify or describe factors rather than explain them using specific contextual support as evidence.

(c) A strong answer to this question required a balanced argument with more than one explanation on each side of the debate. Many candidates were able to give a number of reasons why Hoover was responsible for his own downfall, such as his unwillingness to provide help and welfare for US citizens suffering from the effects of the 'Crash'; his insistence on maintaining the principle of 'rugged individualism' and his belief that ' prosperity is just around the corner' and his treatment of the 'Bonus Army', and they were then able to provide alternative explanations that usually focused on the personality and promises of Roosevelt. A few candidates lacked focus on the question asked and wrote about the impact of the New Deal, referring to several specific changes introduced under this programme. The weakest answers did not include contextual knowledge support and explanation.

Questions 17, 18, 19 and 20

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

Question 21

(a) This question was well answered by the vast majority of candidates who answered it. Answers did not only concentrate on the King David Hotel attack but wisely gave other examples of attacks on British facilities, such as on airfields, roads, bridges and railway stations and the attack on Tel Aviv, which resulted in the deaths of seven British soldiers. Many candidates achieved very high marks.

(b) This question allowed itself to be looked at from both the Arab and Jewish sides. There was plenty of information available to provide two well explained reasons. The Arab side was explained better and more fully. Most explained that the Arabs were not happy with the UN Partition Plan which gave them less land and yet they had the highest population. Candidates rightly explained that the Arabs were unhappy with the large influx of Jewish immigrants and the terrorising of Arab villages by the Irgun and Lehi. Most candidates who mentioned the unhappiness of the Jews explained their displeasure with the proposed arrangements for Jerusalem. Many candidates gained very high marks.

(c) Most candidates gave a good two-sided answer, showing Arab weaknesses and Israeli strengths. Most candidates concentrated on explaining the numerous Arab divisions, poor Arab leadership and the lack of Arab resources and resolve. Most explained the advantages the Israelis gained from fighting with the British during the Second World War and against the British after the War. There were many detailed answers which explained the superior leadership, weapons and airforce

of the Israelis and the Israelis also having the advantage of American support. There were some excellent, well explained answers.

Question 22

(a)   This question was well answered by the small number who chose **Question 22**. Most knew that Hezbollah was a fundamentalist Islamic group based in Lebanon and that it rejected the right of Israel to exist. Most concentrated on describing the violence used by Hezbollah, such as border attacks and rocket attacks, against Israeli forces.

(b)   Most answers were limited in length and content. Good answers explained that the UN struggled with this conflict because of the rejection of the UN Partition Plan and thereafter appeared to be weak in action. A few explained that the USA seemed to be the influence and power in attempting to deal with the conflict in the region more than the UN. Some candidates explained that the Israelis felt there was an anti-Israeli bias at the UN and, therefore, tended not to take much notice of UN resolutions.

(c)   This question brought some wide ranging answers analysing the problems concerning the Palestinian question. Most answers were one-sided and only briefly mentioned the possible return of Palestinian refugees, while tending to concentrate on many of the outstanding problems, such as the Jewish settlements in the Occupied Territories, the actions of Hamas and the prospect of an independent Palestinian state. Despite being mainly one-sided, there were some excellent explanations of outstanding problems.

HISTORY

| Paper 0470/13 |
| Paper 13 |

Key messages

Successful responses require a careful reading of the questions to make sure responses are focused and relevant.

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

General comments

Candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. It was clear that many candidates continue to communicate their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features, or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

Part **(a)** four mark questions require short, descriptive answers, and the most effective responses seen were no more than a paragraph in length. The emphasis is on recalling accurate details, rather than on explanation.

However, parts **(b) and (c)** demand explanation, and better responses avoided narrative or 'setting the scene', and were able to stick to the point of the question attempted, apply their knowledge to the precise requirements of the question, and develop each of the identified factors fully. Less successful responses tended to assert or state a reason which they identified as relevant, without adding explanation or ensuring that the assertion answered the specific question set. In part **(c),** candidates need to argue both for and against the focus of the question, and reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated, by addressing 'how far' or 'how successful' and so on. Weaker answers were characterised by a rewriting of earlier narrative and the inclusion information lacking in relevance. Some candidates misunderstand the point of questions, for example by focusing on one side of the argument only. The best answers focused on explaining both sides of an argument, in a balanced way, rather than just identifying points for inclusion.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was a very popular question. Part **(a)** answers sometimes lacked detail about the work of the Refugee Organisation. Better responses gained credit for mentioning prisoners of war, the building of refugee camps, geographical areas where refugees originated and the role of Nansen in helping refugees return to their homes. Part **(b)** was answered less confidently. Generalised answers identified factors such as the absence of the USA, the impact of the veto and the problems faced by the League when considering the imposition of sanctions. Candidates would have improved their responses if they had explained these points in relation to specific events. Responses to part **(c)** were well-developed and specific references were made to crises in the 1920s in which the League was involved. It is important to emphasise that, in questions of this sort, candidates should take notice of the dates, as events in the 1930s were not required by the question.

Question 6

Many candidates performed well on part **(a)**. They were capable of drawing on their knowledge of the Anschluss to describe what Hitler gained from it. Many also knew why Hitler was able to unite with Austria in part **(b)**, focussing on appeasement, Mussolini's tacit agreement and the reported attitude of the Austrian population. Answers to part **(c)** were sometimes unbalanced because there was a focus on disagreement to the detriment of arguing in favour of the proposition in the question; the contribution of the Munich Agreement to war in 1939 could have been better understood, so candidates explored alternative causes of war, such as the Nazi-Soviet Pact or Hitler's aggressive aims. Some responses would have benefited from developing generalised references such as 'Munich made Hitler more confident' or 'the rest of Czechoslovakia could easily be taken over', into explanations.

Question 7

Part **(a)** was well answered and candidates felt confident when describing the importance of the 38th Parallel for Korea. Credit was given for a line of latitude which separated communist and US spheres of influence, as well as the significance of the border during the military confrontations of 1950–53. In part **(b)**, quality answers dealt effectively with the reason behind US involvement in Korea following the invasion in 1950. Two developed points about containment, the Domino Theory and America's anti-Soviet policies were seen in the best answers. Part **(c)** required a good knowledge of chronology, confining responses to the specified dates of 1950–1973. Those who did so were able to write at length about the Korean War, Cuba and Vietnam. Explanations of the Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine pre-1950 were not required. Candidates who avoided a narrative of each feature, and instead focused on the extent of US success or effectiveness, generally performed strongly.

Question 8

This remains a popular topic, although answers tended to be quite brief. Some candidates struggled with part **(a)**: increases in food prices, strikes and capped wages increases were seen in more confident responses. In part **(b)**, most were able to write at length about Solidarity; some of these answers then needed to go further and explain its importance.   Strong responses to part **(c)** were able to go beyond narratives of Gorbachev and Solidarity by linking each precisely to the collapse of Soviet control.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

Most of the responses to part **(a)** were competent, while explanations of the British attack on the Somme (part **(b)**) accurately focused on the policy of attrition, attempts to weaken the German military and to relieve the French forces at Verdun. There were some weaker answers to part **(c)**; while a range of factors were identified, they were not always developed sufficiently to merit explanation. The alternative factors included tanks, aircraft and machine guns.

Question 10

Part **(a)** attracted some good responses about methods of recruitment during World War One; these included Kitchener's poster campaign, 'Pals' Battalions' and the introduction of conscription. In part **(b)**, candidates wrote at length about the impact of the introduction of mines and convoys. There was less coverage of Q-ships, mines, depth charges and long range aircraft. Part **(c)** answers were sometimes unbalanced as answers focused less on Russia and more on the idea of attacking Germany through what was often referred to as the 'soft underbelly' of Europe.

Question 11

Candidates knew many features of the Freikorps to perform well in part **(a)**. They recognised the part they played in the Kapp Putsch and against the Spartacist rebellion and Bavarian Soviet Republic. Part **(b)** gave an opportunity for candidates to explain why Germany was facing economic disaster by 1923. Many were able to attain high marks as they kept to the dates and explained, in detail, two issues such as hyperinflation and the difficulties Weimar faced paying the reparations instalments. There were many good responses to part **(c)**, which invited consideration of the nature of Weimar's 'golden-age'. Better quality answers approached the factor given in the question first, showing the importance of a range of cultural features. These included civil liberties, as well as the work of artists, writers, film directors and architects. Economic and foreign policy achievements were explained to develop a balanced argument.

Question 12

In part **(a)** many good answers covered the following features: propaganda to encourage motherhood, loans and rewards for large families, the work of the League of German Maidens and legislation to stop abortion. Part **(b)** brought detailed responses, although some tended to be descriptive. The key was to explain why rearmament, the National Labour Service and public works, as well as social and racial policies, reduced unemployment. Careful treatment of two factors produced high marks. Part **(c)** also tended to be descriptive. Candidates described Nazi youth policies at length but did not relate them clearly to the concept of 'success'. On the other hand, details of 'youth revolts' were effectively used by some to answer the question set.

Question 13

In part **(a)**, many candidates possessed some good knowledge of Stolypin's work, focussing mainly on his 'stick and carrot' approach. It was important in part **(b)** that candidates kept to the point of the question and applied detailed information to the reasons for opposition to the rule of the Tsar. Responses might have included explanation of opposition to autocracy, the Secret Police, Russification and the privileged classes, as well as the lack of social and economic reform. In part **(c)** answers tended to lack balance; good explanations of the responsibility of Rasputin and the Tsarina for the collapse of Tsarism were placed against descriptive paragraphs about Nicholas II's command of the army. The best responses seen presented two or three explained factors on either side of the argument.

Question 14

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

Question 15

The ways in which new products helped to boost the US economy in the 1920s in part **(a)** proved challenge for some candidates. Better responses focused on particular products such as rayon and Bakelite. However, part **(b)** was the focus of many good answers, explaining the importance of the motor industry for the 1920s boom. Two good explanations were featured in the best answers. There were also many strong part **(c)** responses which covered the impact of over-production on US agriculture in the 1920s. Balance (showing agreement and disagreement) was achieved by those candidates who not only explained the factor given in the question, but also included the effects of a declining US population, tariff policies, less demand from Europe, the collapse of rural banks and foreign competition.

Question 16

Although a less popular question, it was rare to see a weak answer to part **(a)**. The reasons for the opposition to the New Deal from the American business community, asked for in part **(b)**, produced generalised descriptions about fears that Roosevelt was moving towards socialism, and that laissez-faire and free enterprise were being undermined. Candidates might then have developed each point by explaining why the US business community were so critical of Roosevelt. Part **(c)** responses included sound arguments about the successes and failures of the New Deal. Candidates seemed to know a great deal about this and were able to deploy information successfully to argue both for and against the statement. Dealing with the named factor in the question first, i.e. unemployment, appeared to be the best approach for most answers.

Question 17

A small number of candidates attempted **Question 17**. Part **(a)** was handled well; a significant number of candidates gained very high marks by deploying four pieces of information about the 1937 Marco Polo Bridge incident. For instance, they made reference to the Japanese invasion of China which followed, the fall of Beijing, Shanghai and of Chiang Kai-Shek's capital, as well as the nature and scope of the fighting. There were good answers to part **(b)**, covering the reasons for the increasing strength of the Communist Party during the Second World War. Relevant factors were related to their popularity with the peasants, their perceived patriotism in taking the fight to the Japanese, their success in organising local resistance forces and the way in which they reduced rents for peasants and increased taxes on the rich - two developed explanations featured in the best answers. Part **(c)** answers were balanced, with a range of factors about the success of the Communists in the Civil War identified and explained. Candidates were able to discuss at length the impact of peasant support on the one hand and the failures of the KMT, as well as Mao's popularity, on the other.

Questions 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

An answer must be a response to the question that was asked. So, for example, if the question asks why a source was published, then the answer must include a reason for publication. If the question asks whether a source can be believed, then the answer must make clear whether it is believed or not. The best way to achieve this is for candidates to begin their answer with a form of words that directly addresses the question: *'The source was published because….', 'I do believe what the source says….'.* There is, though, another dimension to all of the questions that should be taken into account; they all ask for the answer to be explained. This means that the answer must make clear how or why a particular conclusion has been reached. Indeed, the quality of this explanation is very important. So, for example, on a question asking whether one is surprised by what a source says or shows, just identifying what is or is not surprising would barely answer the question. It would be explaining why it was found surprising or not that would gain the credit.

General comments

Generally, candidates are more comfortable interpreting sources than they are in evaluating them. There were encouraging signs this year that the quality of evaluation has started to improve. A key requirement of successful source evaluation is the ability to think beyond a simple 'can I believe it?' judgement, and to move towards an understanding of why people might, in the specific historical context of the source, want to represent events in a certain way. Why might Woodrow Wilson want, in September 1919, to put the best possible gloss on the Treaty of Versailles? Why might Lloyd George want to do much the same when speaking in the British Parliament in July 1919? Being aware of the purposes people have behind their words is bound to enrich candidates' answers to those questions that invite source evaluation, and there were plenty of signs that candidates were beginning to use such awareness.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

Although better candidates possessed sufficient contextual knowledge to make full sense of the sources, it was notable that many answers were based on source content alone, with explanation of a commonsense, rather than historical, nature. The sources dealt with events in several countries, and many candidates found it challenging to cope with this range of material. For example, many answers to **Question 4** seemed unaware that the authors of Source F wanted some form of German unity, rather than simply to save money.

Question 1

Most answers managed to detect at least one agreement between the sources, more often than not that the ruling classes lost control of events. Disagreements were harder to spot, though many saw that the middle classes were seen as revolutionary in Source A, but not interested in politics in Source B. Some candidates struggled with the variety of references to different social classes across the two sources, and attempted matches based on what one source said, whilst the other source did not quite provide a clear agreement or disagreement. The overall 'Big Message' – that the towns/cities were the stage on which the revolutions played out –sometimes led to the mistaken conclusion that both sources saw urbanisation as the cause of the revolutions.

Question 2

Many candidates had contextual knowledge on Radetsky, and this made it much easier for them to detect his purpose in writing the letter. Knowing that Austria was facing a deteriorating situation in Italy, and that Radetsky would want to alert the authorities in Vienna to this, so that they would take the necessary action, was the key to successful answers. Weaker answers could detect messages in the source – things that Radetsky wanted to tell Vienna – but could not see the context behind the source, and so had no pointer to his purposes. Some candidates misunderstood the source in various ways, often seeming to conclude that Radetsky was Italian, or supported the Italians, and wanted to tell Austria that Italy was ready for a resurgence.

Question 3

This question was another good example of how grasp of the context made all the difference to the answers. The cartoon is a comment on the 1848 revolutions, and shows the useless rulers of the ancien regime about to be overthrown by the overwhelming forces of liberty. A few candidates were even able to identify some of the rulers, such as Louis Philippe. The way the rulers are depicted provides a strong clue to the cartoonist's opinion that getting rid of them would be a good thing. The best answers included all these elements; other candidates' answers dealt only with individual points – the strength of the forces of liberty, say – which, although valid, missed an overall interpretation. The weakest answers, lacking contextual awareness, were mainly face-value descriptions of what the cartoon showed.

Question 4

Some candidates struggled with their understanding of Source F, and therefore found it hard to address the issue of whether or not the weavers in Source E would have been pleased by what it said. Their answers therefore depended on commonsense reasoning based on what they took the sources to mean. So Source F was often seen as a group of government ministers meeting to discuss financial and administrative arrangements, and the conclusion about the weavers might then be that they would be pleased by all the money to be saved since this could then be spent on them. In effect, unless the candidate could understand that there was something revolutionary going on in Source F, they could not make much progress. For candidates who did understand this, various possibilities arose. Source E argues that the weavers were not interested in politics, which would lead to the conclusion that they would not be pleased by the political developments in Source F. A slightly better approach would be to see that the weavers probably would be pleased with the prospect of any change, since their plight was so serious. Finally, those candidates who really understood Source F could see that the middle-class nationalists would have nothing to offer the weavers, who would only be interested in measures to tackle their distress.

Question 5

Candidates who knew something about what happened in Berlin during March 1848 were best placed to explain whether or not Source G was surprising. Others offered no explanation for finding aspects of the source surprising or not. Some provided generalised explanations that would have applied to any king in this situation. Valid explanations had to be supported, preferably with contextual knowledge about revolutionary events in Germany or elsewhere in 1848, but if not, then by use of what other sources on the paper could provide.

Question 6

Some of the sources showed that the response of existing regimes to the 1848 revolutions was weak, and other sources offered alternative explanations for what caused the revolutions. Some candidates would have benefited from being able to sort the sources into these two categories. Instead, they saw other causes as a result of existing regimes' weaknesses. This produced unclear reasoning, which served to obscure the much more straightforward approach. Some candidates seemed to have difficulty with the idea of 'existing regimes'. However, most answers managed to produce some valid source use on both sides of the hypothesis, though a small number of candidates did not use the sources at all.

20th century topic

The level of contextual knowledge shown on this option was very good, and, as mentioned above, this had a highly beneficial effect on many candidates' answers. This sure grasp of context also helped ensure that there was very little miscomprehension of the sources.

Question 1

With the two sources offering a good range both of agreements and disagreements, most candidates were able to find some valid matches, though there were also examples of attempts to match that lacked a common criterion on which the comparison could be based. Some candidates would have benefited from reading the sources more closely – for example, on whether the Treaty was harsh or not. Source A says Wilson claimed the Treaty was harsh. Source B says Lloyd George feared the Treaty was too harsh. So a valid agreement would be that the Treaty was thought to be harsh – but not that it was thought too harsh, which is what some candidates concluded. There was an overall disagreement which the best answers included: not that Source A regards the Treaty as a success and Source B sees it as a failure, which is what some answers said, but something more nuanced. Overall Source A thought that the Treaty was generally a good thing, whilst Source B saw it as fraught with problems.

Question 2

Questions asking why a source was published invite consideration of three aspects: context, message and purpose. With Source C, generally candidates concentrated on context and message; better responses went on to perceive the underlying purpose too. Interpretations of the cartoon were generally sound and led to a range of messages based on the idea that the Treaty or the peacemakers were unpleasant. Given how the peacemakers were depicted, better answers understood that the judgment on the Treaty given by the cartoon was extreme – not just that it was harsh, but that it was something beyond harsh – evil, repugnant, insane. In better answers this led to consideration of why the cartoonist would want to have such an image published – for example, to stimulate opposition to the Treaty or to attempt to have its terms modified. Many other answers would have been improved by using this approach.

Question 3

The essential building block of a successful answer to this question was to notice that House and Wilson expressed contradictory views on the Treaty. For perhaps a majority of candidates this difference was a reason to be surprised. Alternatively, some noticed the difference but concluded they were not surprised by it since the provenance of Source D told them that Wilson and House had fallen out and never spoke together again. To make further progress it was necessary to move beyond the comparison, and to seek a contextual explanation for the difference, not forgetting that the question required a conclusion about Source E. This could simply be using other sources or contextual knowledge to judge the accuracy of Wilson's claims, or, best of all, using contextual knowledge to analyse Wilson's purposes in making his speech. A good number of answers related Source E to Wilson's campaign to have the US Senate ratify the Treaty and approve the USA joining the League.

Question 4

Answers to this question could be split broadly into two groups: those that understood that it was criticising the Allies, and those that did not. There was also a small subset of the latter who thought it was approving of the Allies' behaviour, but these were regarded as misinterpretations. Another way of slightly missing the focus in an answer was to assume that the cartoon was about the Treaty of Versailles, rather than the treatment of Germany after the Treaty. There were plenty of valid sub-messages that fell short of detecting criticism, for example that Germany had been weakened by the Treaty, or that the Allies had total power over Germany. However, even within those that spotted the criticism, some answers were better than others. Some candidates wrote that the message was that Germany was being treated unfairly by the Allies, but this still stopped short of noticing that what the Allies were really being accused of was hypocrisy, and specifically over the issue of disarmament. Better responses picked up on this.

Question 5

This was a question where the proper use of contextual knowledge to evaluate the claims in the source made a big difference to the quality of the answer. Lloyd George is clearly trying to argue that the Treaty is pretty tough and has done a good job of punishing Germany. One way of judging whether he can be trusted is to match these claims against what is known about his true beliefs on the Treaty, or about his possible purposes in making these claims to Parliament. Alternatively, there were other sources on this paper (such as Source B) which could have assisted this process of evaluation. Many candidates answered competently in this way. Source G offered an alternative, but less effective approach, as aspects of it could be used either to question or to support Lloyd George's claims. This was less effective since the agreement or disagreement between the two sources could not ultimately be a true basis on which to decide the issue of

trust. Less successful candidates tended to just make assertions using the provenance – for example, that he would be bound to try and make himself look good in a speech to Parliament, thus he was untrustworthy.

Question 6

The sources offered plentiful evidence both of people being satisfied with the Treaty, and of them not being satisfied. What was essential, however, was that the sources were used to show the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of specific people or groups of people in those sources. In other words, taking something mentioned in a source – say, for example, reparations – and then inferring that people would or would not have been satisfied by that, was not accepted. The source itself had to indicate the satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Some attempts at source use struggled with this. Fortunately there almost always would be other sources used in the valid manner, with people in the source identified, and an explanation given of how the source indicated their satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Some less successful responses appeared to dislike the given hypothesis and substituted an alternative, for example, 'Was the Treaty successful?'

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Firstly, it is important that candidates provide a clear answer to each question. For example, if a question asks whether one source makes another source surprising they need to clearly state whether they think it does or does not, if they are asked if they believe the author of a source they must make it clear whether they believe him or not. A number of candidates carried out the necessary analysis or evaluation but were unable to provide a clear answer to the question. It is good practice to use the opening sentence of answers to clearly address the question. The rest of the answer should be used to provide support and explanation.

Secondly, all the questions instruct candidates to 'explain your answer'. This means that candidates need to explain and support their answers by using one or more of the sources. This source use should be precise and specific. Candidates need to use either particular parts of sources, the overall message of sources or the provenance of sources. The latter should always be used together with what the sources say.

Thirdly, many of the questions require candidates to use their knowledge to explain their answers. Contextual knowledge can be used in different ways according to the particular question. It can be used to help explain the message of a source, to help explain the purpose of the author or artist, to provide the reasons why one should be or not be surprised by a source and to evaluate whether a source is useful or reliable. The best answers use contextual knowledge briefly and succinctly to support a point being made about a source. Weaker answers sometimes contain long sections of contextual knowledge with little reference to the source or to the question.

Finally, some candidates begin writing their answers before they have worked out what they want to say. This usually results in confused answers which lack clarity and relevance to the questions. The best answers are those where candidates have thought through the questions carefully and have decided what their answers are going to be before they begin to write them. They can then directly address the question in the first sentence of their answers.

General comments

A small number of candidates attempted the nineteenth century option. The overall standard was strong. The twentieth century questions were answered slightly better than the nineteenth century ones. Answers ranged from outstanding to weak but the majority of candidates performed strongly. Nearly all candidates coped well with the written sources and there were few examples of written sources being misunderstood. Most candidates had good knowledge of the two topics and made effective use of this knowledge in interpreting the sources and placing them in context. A very small number of candidates attempted both options, while almost no candidates struggled to answer the required number of questions in the time allotted.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

Question 1

When comparing sources it is important to base comparisons on common criterion. For example, Source A states that a big problem for the revolutionaries was weak leadership. For a comparison with Source B to work, it is necessary to focus on what this source says about leadership. At the beginning of the second paragraph it also indicates that there were problems with the leadership, 'The mutual suspicions of their

leaders'. Good answers were those where candidates compared the two sources in this way across a range of common criteria, for example, do they agree about how much support there was for Italian nationalism or about whether Charles Albert was decisive? Weaker answers made mismatches, in other words candidates tried to compare points that were about different things, for example, 'Source A says that Cavour had contempt for the defenders of Rome and Source B says that he thought the working class crowds which defeated the Austrians were a 'mortal menace'.' The best answers rose above the detail in the sources and understood that the two sources fundamentally agree that the revolutions failed because Italians were divided.

Question 2

'Are you surprised?' questions usually require candidates to base their answers on contextual knowledge or on cross-references to another source. This question was no exception. A good number of candidates used the reference in Source A to Charles Albert's 'indecisiveness' to argue that that they were surprised by his apparently decisive proclamation in Source C, while others went further and explained how there are good reasons for being both surprised and not surprised. Less strong were those answers that used evidence internal to Source C, for example they were not surprised Charles Albert offered his leadership because Source C tells us that the people had risen up against the Austrians. There were a number of candidates who wrote good answers which would have been improved by stating whether they were surprised by Source C. It is always a good idea for candidates to begin answers by directly addressing the question, such as 'I am surprised by this source because'. There was also a tendency for some candidates to identify what is surprising about Source C but not provide an explanation.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well, with many candidates able to compare the impressions of the revolutions given by the sources. Better answers were informed by what happened in Milan and Venice in March 1848. A feature of less strong answers was not comparing the sources or a focus on the details of the sources rather than on impressions.

Question 4

To answer this question well it is important to be clear about what Garibaldi is saying in Source F. He claims that Rome should become a republic. It can be inferred that he is also suggesting that this was the right form of government for the rest of Italy and that the Italian people would support such a move. A majority of candidates were able to explain that Vincenzo Gioberti was against the idea of a republic and thus proved Garibaldi wrong. However, better answers demonstrated an understanding that because Gioberti disagreed with Garibaldi the latter is not necessarily wrong. These answers either used the information provided with Source G about Gioberti being forced to resign or contextual knowledge about Garibaldi and the amount of support for republicanism in Italy. The question asks whether Source G means that Source F was wrong. Some candidates did not use Source G and simply wrote about Garibaldi and republicanism.

Question 5

This question was not answered as well as many of the others. Many candidates found it difficult to focus on the aims of the two authors. Instead, they compared the methods they advocated, while some answers just paraphrased the two sources. Better answers demonstrated an understanding that both authors wanted a united Italy or an Italy free from the Austrians. However, the best answers explained that while Pallavicino in Source I wanted to free Italy from Austria, Pisacane wanted to go further and change the social system.

Question 6

Some sources, for example B, C, D, E and F, suggest that popular support was important in the revolutions either because it did achieve something as in Sources D and E or because it was thought to be necessary by the authors of the sources, for example Sources C and F. Other sources, such as A, G, H and I, suggest that popular support was not enough or that other factors such as leadership or military might were more important. Candidates needed to sort the sources into these two groups and explain why they belong to one group or the other. Most candidates found this easier to do with those sources supporting the idea that popular support was important. It is crucial that candidates do explain why a source supports or disagrees with the hypothesis given in the question. The following is a good example of what is required and is typical of the stronger responses seen – 'Source I does not support this statement because it says that a popular rising was not enough and that the power of Piedmont and its army was needed.' A small number of candidates neglected the sources and wrote essays about the importance of popular support, while a

number of others organised the sources into groups of two or three and did not use the evidence in any individual sources. Better responses tended to write about each source individually.

20th century topic

Question 1

When comparing sources it is important to base comparisons on common criterion. For example, Source A states that much of the Treaty of Versailles was not enforced. For a comparison with Source B to work, it is necessary to focus on what this source says about enforcement. Towards the end it also suggests that enforcement was limited. Good answers were those where candidates compared the two sources in this way across a range of common criteria , for example, do they agree about Germany's attitude towards the Treaty, whether or not Germany was crushed, whether or not the Polish Corridor was a serious problem for Germany and whether or not the Treaty it was justified? Weaker answers made mismatches, in other words they tried to compare points that were about different things, for example, 'Source A says the Treaty was a failure but Source B says Germany was not crushed.' The best answers rose above the detail in the sources and understood that the two sources fundamentally disagree – Source A sees the Treaty as a disaster because it later caused problems for Germany, whereas Source B blames what happened later not on the Treaty but on future leaders. Better responses also tended to understand that disagreements need to be explained more fully than agreements. It is perfectly adequate to simply state that both sources claim that Germany was still the largest country, but it is not adequate to state that the source disagree over Germany's position after the Treaty. The latter needs to be explained a little more using the sources, for example, 'Source A suggests that Germany was weakened ('encircled by aggressive nations'), while Source B suggests it was not much weakened ('its strategic position was significantly better').'

Question 2

The important threshold for candidates to cross was to get beyond the details of the cartoon. The best answers did this by considering the overall point the cartoonist wanted to make about the treatment of Germany by the Big Three at the peace negotiations. There is a real edge in what the cartoonist has to say about the Treaty and candidates needed to convey this. The cartoonist is saying that Germany is being treated harshly or in a barbaric way or that the Treaty of Versailles was harsh or barbaric. Some candidates went even beyond this and explicitly added that the cartoonist is criticising the Treaty or is saying that it is wrong. It is important to remember that when the question asks about the cartoonist then a point of view explicitly stated will be required for the highest marks. Nearly all the candidates were able to suggest a valid message for the cartoon but many got sidetracked by the details in the cartoon and by their knowledge of the topic. This most often happened when candidates wrote at great length about the respective roles of Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd George. Sometimes this was based on the cartoon but some answers contained much more about their roles from contextual knowledge, with the cartoon being used simply as a starting point. Answers needed to be rooted in the cartoon all the way through and needed to focus on the overall big point that the cartoonist wanted to make. The best answers achieved this.

Question 3

A good number of candidates understood that Sources D and E agree and/or disagree. For example, Lloyd George suggests that a punitive treaty will only cause further trouble and calls for a fair settlement, while Count Brockdorff-Rantzau suggests that Lloyd George's warnings were ignored and that the Treaty is unfair. On the other hand, they agree that a tough treaty was not a good idea. Having got this far, it was important that candidates used this understanding to support a clear statement about whether they thought Source D makes Source E surprising. Of course, this question is not just about whether the two sources agree or not. For high marks some use of contextual knowledge and some evaluation of Source D and/or Source E were required. For example, the best answers went further and suggested that the two sources might disagree but Source D does not make Source E surprising because the Count's reaction is perfectly understandable and to be expected in the circumstances. Some less assured responses assumed that Lloyd George in Source D was commenting on the actual Treaty of Versailles, while others explained whether they were surprised by Source D or by Source E but did not explain whether Source D makes Source E surprising,

Question 4

This question required candidates to focus on the points of view of the two cartoonists. The cartoonist of Source F is clearly criticising the Treaty of Versailles, while the cartoonist of Source G is suggesting that the Treaty was not too harsh and that Germany is wrong to claim that it was (especially, as many candidates pointed out, in relation to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk). A reasonable number of candidates were able to make

this comparison. Some candidates misinterpreted Source G and claimed that it is criticising the Treaty as too severe, while a few did not manage to connect Source F to the Treaty of Versailles and thus lost the point of any comparison with Source G. The majority of candidates wrote reasonable answers by making valid comparisons of the sub-messages of the two cartoons, for example both suggest that Germany was unhappy with the terms or Source F claims Germany was treated harshly, while Source G claims the treatment was not harsh.

Question 5

The key claim of President Wilson in Source H is that the Treaty of Versailles was fair. Candidates who worked this out were usually able to go on and either use contextual knowledge or Source I to argue that they did not believe Wilson. Some candidates used specific knowledge of either Wilson's earlier doubts about the Treaty or of ways in which the final agreement fell short of his Fourteen Points, while others produced even better answers by explaining the purpose of Wilson's speech (for this they had to go further than the information provided about the source, for example the speaking tour was an attempt to get the Senate to support the Treaty). Other candidates used Source I as evidence for not believing Wilson – the two sources contradict each other on key points. Less strong answers focused more on the first paragraph of Source H and used contextual knowledge to check claims made there, for example two nations were left out of the League of Nations. Some candidates misunderstood Source H completely by focusing on isolated, and misleading, parts of the source, for example, 'this treaty is very hard on Germany'. It is always important that candidates try and understand the overall point being made by a source, whether it be a written source or a cartoon.

Question 6

Many candidates performed strongly on this question. They explained how some sources support the hypothesis that German anger at the Treaty of Versailles was justified and then explained how some sources disagree with it. It is important that there is clear explanation using the content of the sources, for example, 'Source F shows that German anger was justified because it shows an evil figure representing the Treaty of Versailles blotting out the sun and threatening the German people. The figure has chains which indicate that the German people are going to be enslaved.' It does not really matter whether the candidates go through the sources in the order in which they appear in the question paper or whether they write about the sources that support the hypothesis first and then write about sources that disagree. What does matter is that each explanation clearly relates to a particular source. Some candidates wrote about groups of sources, neglecting to use the sources individually. A general claim about a group of sources is not enough. There were still a small number of candidates who missed the sources altogether and wrote an essay about whether German anger was justified.

HISTORY

```
Paper 0470/23
Paper 23
```

Key messages

Firstly, it is important that candidates provide a clear answer to each question. For example, if a question asks whether one source makes another source surprising they need to clearly state whether they think it does or does not, if they are asked if they believe the author of a source they must make it clear whether they believe him or not. A number of candidates carried out the necessary analysis or evaluation but were unable to provide a clear answer to the question. It is good practice to use the opening sentence of answers to clearly address the question. The rest of the answer should be used to provide support and explanation.

Secondly, all the questions instruct candidates to 'explain your answer'. This means that candidates need to explain and support their answers by using one or more of the sources. This source use should be precise and specific. Candidates need to use either particular parts of sources, the overall message of sources or the provenance of sources. The latter should always be used together with what the sources say.

Thirdly, many of the questions require candidates to use their knowledge to explain their answers. Contextual knowledge can be used in different ways according to the particular question. It can be used to help explain the message of a source, to help explain the purpose of the author or artist, to provide the reasons why one should be or not be surprised by a source and to evaluate whether a source is useful or reliable. The best answers use contextual knowledge briefly and succinctly to support a point being made about a source. Weaker answers sometimes contain long sections of contextual knowledge with little reference to the source or to the question.

Finally, some candidates begin writing their answers before they have worked out what they want to say. This usually results in confused answers which lack clarity and relevance to the questions. The best answers are those where candidates have thought through the questions carefully and have decided what their answers are going to be before they begin to write them. They can then directly address the question in the first sentence of their answers.

General comments

There was a rise in the number of candidates attempting the nineteenth century topic this year. However, the majority of candidates chose to answer questions on the twentieth century topic. Concerning the candidates' overall performance and handling of both papers, there was a sound knowledge and understanding of the topics. The importance of constructing answers which respond to the specific wording of the question set cannot be overstated. This year it was noticeable that often answers contained detailed knowledge but struggled to direct this towards the actual question posed.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

Question 1

The responses of candidates who tended to summarise surface details from the sources would have been improved by making appropriate moves to compare relevant details of sub messages. Similarities of detail between the sources were plentiful, while the overarching comparison of the impression of complete disorder in the throne room of the Tuileries and the order and respect for religion in the procession to the church of Saint-Roch proved more elusive for many.

Question 2

The content and attitude of the description of the invasion of the Chamber of Deputies was generally understood by candidates. Weaker responses paraphrased the account and made assertions based on everyday empathy, either based on the actions of the mob or on the views of Lamartine. Higher order answers were able to explain their surprise, or lack of surprise, whilst offering support from contextual knowledge of the author Lamartine or the frustrations and desperation of the mob.

Question 3

The extract was taken from 'Recollections', a private journal kept by Alexis de Tocqueville. The romantic, idealistic tone of the passage was missed by some candidates and the better answers usually made inferences about the overall nature of the revolution, the lack of vindictiveness and the order inherent in the events described. Many candidates simply made unsupported or supported inferences that the people had taken control or that the revolution was not as fearsome as might have been expected.

Question 4

Some candidates struggled to recognise the contrast between the calm, reassuring words of the newspaper 'Le National', which was associated with the provisional government, and the disappointment in the new government expressed by Menard, a socialist republican. Agreements of subordinate messages were typically that in both sources the provisional government wanted the support of the middle classes or that reforms were expected.

Question 5

Some candidates wrote formulaic answers in which they judged the utility of the extract from the journal of Rodolphe Apponyi on simple provenance. Thus the source was or was not useful as he was the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in Paris at the time of the 1848 Revolution. Better responses considered how his position and background as the representative of a conservative, autocratic empire might have influenced the way he bore witness to the revolutionary overthrow of a monarchy. The best answers could explain Count Apponyi's purpose in writing his report.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A minority of candidates neglected to use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source links to the question, instead incorporating lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Grouping of sources, for example, 'sources A, C and G do not provide convincing evidence that the February Revolution was a real threat to the social order,' rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of less successful answers. A number of candidates struggled to understand the idea of 'social order' which was critical to answering the question. Successful evaluation of sources was rare and many candidates would benefit from just picking out one or two particularly worthwhile sources to say something meaningful about regarding purpose and audience.

20th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify and explain agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources. A few candidates were unable to make comparisons and just paraphrased or wrote out sections of the sources, listing them as agreements/disagreements. Some candidates identified agreements and/or disagreements without being specific e.g. A says this, B does not. The best candidates were able to explain the overarching 'big message' which was the disagreement over the causes of Germany's political and economic problems during the period 1919–1923.

Question 2

Some candidates misunderstand one or both sources. Generally, Source C was understood as Germany attempting to trick Britain and France by pretending to be 'drowning' and needing the help of loans in order to survive. Source D, however, was frequently interpreted as Britain and France helping themselves to German resources and Low's suggestion that Lloyd-George was beginning to question and consider the hard line over German reparations was overlooked. Without an understanding of the messages of both cartoons answers would have found it difficult to explain why C made D surprising/not surprising.

Question 3

Many answers concentrated on considering the provenance of the sources as the route to explaining whether Lloyd-George was lying when he spoke in the Houses of Parliament in July 1919. There were assertions that Lloyd-George was facing a General Election – he had been returned as Prime Minister after his coalition government's landslide victory as recently as December 1918 – and thus was seeking national support and lying, as well as speculation on the motives of the businessman author of Source F which made him unreliable. Evaluation using more secure contextual knowledge of Lloyd-George's private and public views on how to treat Germany in 1919, and the state of Germany's economy 1919–1922, was demonstrated in higher level responses.

Question 4

Some candidates offered knowledgeable interpretations of Source G without offering a reason for its publication in 1923. Thus, whilst demonstrating contextual knowledge and understanding of the cartoon, responses did not answer the question. Where candidates addressed the question of why the cartoon was published in 1923, many explained the subordinate messages of Germany not paying reparations or France threatening Germany, whilst overarching messages recognised the cartoon showing disagreements between Britain and France over how to deal with German reparations. The best answers explained the purpose of the cartoonist in 1923 at the time of the Ruhr crisis as either being critical of French policy or persuading the British audience that Germany should be given more time to pay.

Question 5

Less successful responses relied on undeveloped use of provenance to explain whether they trusted Hugo Preuss, the Weimar politician, and his views on the early years of the Weimar Republic. These included that 'he was German and there at the time' and a referencing of Preuss' role as an architect of the Weimar constitution to explain reliability or bias. Better answers successfully tested the content of his views or they evaluated Source H's main claims using contextual knowledge. More answers could have evaluated Source H on the basis of Preuss' purpose of persuading Germans it was worth saving the Weimar Republic despite its difficulties.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A minority of candidates did not use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source links to the question, instead including lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Some candidates appeared to forget the wording of the hypothesis being tested in the question, rewriting it as 'How far was the Treaty of Versailles harsh on Germany?' Grouping of sources, for example, 'Sources A, B. D and G do not provide convincing evidence that Germany was treated unfairly by the Allies in the period 1919–1923', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another feature of less successful answers. The successful evaluation of sources was rare and many candidates' responses would be improved by picking out one or two particularly worthwhile sources to say something meaningful about regarding purpose and audience.

HISTORY

Key messages and general comments

A range of depth studies was undertaken, with **Depth Study B**, Germany being the most widely answered, followed by the USA and Russia depth studies. There were some answers for **Depth Study A**, The First World War and **Depth Study G**, Israelis and Palestinians. The other options attracted few responses.

There was evidence that more answers are being planned in advance of candidates beginning to write. These tended to be the more successful responses. Strong responses were those which directly addressed the question and remained focused, with good supporting evidence. The best answers were able to discuss a variety of relevant factors and come to a judgement on significance\importance. These candidates had presented an argument in the introduction and had sustained this throughout. Knowledge of the events of the various periods was good but sometimes material could have been better selected and directed at answering the specific question set. Less successful answers produced only generalised comments and tended to be narrative in style. At times, answers missed the chronological parameters of the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were responses to both of the questions.

Question 1 was attempted by substantially more candidates. Many did not have a great deal of knowledge of what changes were made to the Schlieffen Plan but were able to discuss at length why it failed. Knowledge of the Western Front was good but the war against Russia less so. Many answers included lengthy explanations of the Plan but did not fully address why it failed.

Question 2 had fewer responses and these generally had a limited knowledge of the Eastern Front. Some candidates confused the fronts and wrote entirely about the Western Front.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most popular option with responses on both questions.

Answers to **Question 3** tended to be narrative with many candidates listing the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. There was a fairly good knowledge of the Freikorps and their role, although some candidates were confused between whether they were on the left or on the right in politics. The various rebellions faced by Weimar were generally well known, with some descriptions of the Spartacist Revolt, Kapp Putsch and Munich Putsch. Some responses would have benefited from a greater focus on reasons for the survival of the Republic in the face of such opposition. Some candidates missed the chronological parameters of 1919–23 and wrote instead about the rise of Hitler and the Depression.

More candidates chose **Question 4**. These answers also tended towards a narrative approach, with many references back to the Munich Putsch and Hitler's earlier career, concentrating less on the immediate events surrounding his appointment. More successful responses were able to write in detail about the actions of Papen and Hindenburg and explained how their choices were based around the inability of Chancellors to pass laws linking this to the large Nazi presence in the Reichstag. Less successful answers used the event of the Reichstag Fire to claim this was the reason for his appointment. Others went further and wrote about concentration camps and brainwashing through propaganda.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-1941

This option attracted a lower number of responses than the Germany depth study.

There were some very successful answers to **Question 5** which demonstrated a good knowledge of Russia before the 1905 Revolution. There were also descriptions of the Tsar's unsuitability for his role, some of these at length and not always focused. Most were able to describe poor conditions in the countryside as well as those in the cities. There was some confusion at times between workers and peasants and sometimes their grievances were combined. Less successful answers wrote about the impact or events of the revolution rather than its causes and so included material about the Dumas and other attempts at reform.

Question 6 also had some good answers, although many candidates did not have a detailed knowledge of the role of the Petrograd Soviet. There was evidence of a better depth of knowledge about the reasons for the failure of the Provisional Government but many answers lacked real balance.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This option was chosen by many candidates, with most attempting **Question 7**. There was a good level of knowledge of the period demonstrated, with many balanced and well supported answers. The causes of the boom were well known with only occasional answers which described the impact.

Question 8 was not as popular. The concept of radio and its impact on changes in society proved difficult for some candidates to grasp but other influences on society like the film industry and mass production were better explained.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930-c.1990

A small number of candidates attempted **Question 9**. These candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of the reasons for the success of the Communist Party and also understood the role played by the Nationalists in allowing this success.

There were too few responses to **Question 10** for meaningful comments to be made.

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

There were too few **Question 11** and **12** responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were too few responses to **Question 13** for meaningful comments to be made.

A number of candidates attempted **Question 14**. These answers demonstrated a good knowledge of the role of the UN but would have benefited from being less descriptive.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages and general comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. **Depth Study B:** Germany, 1918–45 and **Depth Study D:** The USA, 1919–41 proved the most popular choices among candidates. There were also a good number of attempts at **Depth Study A** on the First World War and **Depth Study C** on Russia, with very few candidates choosing the depth studies on China, South Africa or Israelis and Palestinians.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide-range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments, although more could have given supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. Some candidates wrote at great length about a particular depth study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates will benefit from reading the question carefully before answering and ensuring that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point is that this is a depth study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

A number of rubric errors were made by candidates, with the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the depth study or multiple questions from a number of depth studies. Candidates need to ensure that they read the instructions carefully before attempting their answer.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of candidate responses for both **Question 1** and **Question 2,** although **Question 1** proved the more popular.

Question 1 required candidates to focus on the importance of the machine gun in determining the nature of trench warfare. In the best answers candidates used some good knowledge of the machine gun, such as its rate of fire and use as a defensive weapon, to begin to explain its impact on trench warfare. This was then balanced against the importance of other weapons such as artillery and gas. A small number of responses managed to give well-developed explanations of the relative importance of these weapons. Other answers tended to be descriptive or one-sided. The weakest responses would have benefited from contextual knowledge of the machine gun or any other weapon used in trench warfare.

Question 2 was chosen by fewer candidates but generally better answered than **Question 1**. Some candidates had a good understanding of the significance of the convoy system and how it protected US merchant ships across the Atlantic. This was then compared against the significance of other aspects of the war at sea such as the U-boat campaign, the Battle of Jutland and the British blockade of German ports. The strongest answers were well-focused, had supported explanations that assessed the significance of the different aspects of the war at sea and reached convincing conclusions. Weaker responses tended to be undeveloped and lacking in terms of relevant contextual knowledge.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates, though **Question 3** tended to be the more popular choice.

Question 3 was the better answered out of the two questions available. Many candidates were able to identify the different ways minorities were persecuted in Nazi Germany, often citing a chronological story of the persecution of the Jews in particular. The best answers also examined the persecution of other groups such as gypsies, homosexuals and the disabled, amongst others. Strong responses explained how important this policy was to Nazi society – this was often achieved by explaining how this met the criteria of Hitler's own ideology or the impact it had on unemployment or the economy. This was then balanced by comparing the importance of other aspects of Nazi Germany – most commonly, solving unemployment, rearmament, destroying the Treaty of Versailles and foreign policy. Less successful responses, however, used minimal contextual knowledge to support their answers and arguments. There was also a tendency to include the Communists as a minority and sometimes the Church, which was inaccurate. A few answers were purely descriptive in nature.

Question 4 was less well answered than **Question 3**. Many candidates would have improved their responses with a greater knowledge of the impact of the Second World War on Germany and its effects on stability, and a few of the weaker answers misread the question and focused on the First World War. Strong responses were able to examine both the stabilising and destabilising effects of war on Germany – most commonly cited were the effects of the Allied bombing campaign, the impact of rationing and the increased propaganda and terror used by the Nazi regime. This was then compared with the significance of other stabilising aspects of Nazi Germany, such as the use of the Hitler Youth, the school curriculum, economic prosperity, as well as the use of propaganda and terror before the war.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study but **Question 6** was the more commonly attempted of the two.

Question 5 varied in the quality of response it received. The best answers tended to examine elements of Tsarist repression such as the use of the army, the Okhrana and the period of Stolypin's government and then balanced this by examining the importance of other factors that allowed for the survival of the Tsarist system up until 1914 such as the October Manifesto and the creation of the Dumas, as well as economic and agricultural reforms. Weaker responses tended to over-examine the importance of the First World War, which went beyond the chronological parameters of the question, or provided little relevant material that linked to the topic of repression, often misunderstanding the term itself.

For **Question 6**, many responses had a good knowledge of the different factors that allowed Stalin to emerge as leader of the USSR by 1928. The strongest responses were able to explain the significance of Lenin's death – most commonly by examining his Testament and the fact that Stalin was chief mourner at Lenin's funeral after the deliberately organised absence of Trotsky. This was then assessed against the significance of other factors that helped Stalin, such as his position as General Secretary, his political manoeuvrings between the left and right of the Bolshevik Party, as well as Trotsky's weaknesses, such as his arrogance and the fear of his command over the Red Army. Many candidates achieved good responses by developing their arguments convincingly and using well-selected contextual knowledge and appropriate examples to support their explanations and conclusions. Weaker responses tended to lack sufficient knowledge of the period or to wander from the chronological parameters of the question, and examine the period of Stalin's rule in the 1930s.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Both **Question 7** and **Question 8** were answered by many candidates. However, there were more **Question 7** responses.

Question 7 was generally well-answered. Candidates were often able to explain the importance of the film industry convincingly – most commonly cited was the impact of Hollywood, movie stars and 'talkies' on US society. Explanations often noted the impact the film industry had on women, music and morals in the 1920s and good answers contained well-selected and in-depth examples. This was then balanced against a range of other factors that changed US society. The best responses examined the importance of racism, immigration, the Red Scare and prohibition, as well as more positive factors such as the motor car, night life and jazz music. Many of these responses also managed to fully develop arguments and make supported

conclusions about which factors were the most important. Weaker responses sometimes tended to focus more on the economic boom rather than US society.

Question 8 saw some strong responses that showed a developed understanding of the significance of the loss of confidence in the US economy as a cause of the Depression in the 1930s – many of these answers focused on the over-speculation by banks, investors and speculators and then examined the significance of other factors such as overproduction, Republican policies, the problems in agriculture and the inequalities in income across the USA in the 1920s. Other answers lacked contextual knowledge and many focused their responses on examining the consequences of the Depression, as opposed to the causes of the Depression.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

There were too few responses for any meaningful comments on **Question 9** and **Question 10** to be made.

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

There were too few responses for any meaningful comments on **Question 11** and **Question 12** to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A small number of candidates chose this depth study but **Question 13** received too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 14 was generally well-answered. Strong responses examined the significance of Arab nationalism on the conflicts in 1956, 1967 and 1973, and even on Arab raids into Israel throughout the period. This was then balanced by investigating the significance of other factors that led to conflict – most commonly cited were Israeli aggression, the actions of the superpowers including Britain and France and the failure of diplomacy. The best responses were well-developed and balanced explanations that reached substantiated conclusions about the most significant causes of conflict in the time period. Some of the weaker answers lacked knowledge and understanding of the term 'Arab nationalism', which resulted in one-sided responses. A few candidates confused nationalism with nationalisation (often citing Nasser's nationalisation of the Suez Canal). Although this is relevant contextual knowledge to link to nationalism, some candidates then missed the wider aspects of Arab nationalism including the terrorism of the PLO and the actions of the Arab League nations, such as Syria and Lebanon.

HSITORY

Key messages and general comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. **Depth Study B:** Germany, 1918–45 and **Depth Study D:** The USA, 1919–41 proved the most popular choices among candidates. There were also a good number of attempts at **Depth Study A** on the First World War and **Depth Study C** on Russia, with very few candidates choosing the depth studies on China, South Africa or Israelis and Palestinians.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide-range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments, although more could have given supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. Some candidates wrote at great length about a particular depth study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates will benefit from reading the question carefully before answering and ensuring that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point is that this is a depth study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

A number of rubric errors were made by candidates, with the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the depth study or multiple questions from a number of depth studies. Candidates need to ensure that they read the instructions carefully before attempting their answer.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses for Depth Study A but **Question 2** was the most popular with too few **Question 1** responses attempted for any meaningful feedback.

Question 2 was generally answered well. Good responses were able to examine the significance of the USA to the outcome of the war and explain using well-selected examples to support this. Most commonly, candidates cited the USA's financial support to the Allies before 1917 and then the direct military support given to the Allies on the Western Front in 1917–18. This was then balanced against other significant factors, such as the impact of new technology, the development of Allied tactics, the British blockade of German ports, as well as the significance of key battles such as the Somme and Verdun. Less successful responses tended to be one-sided or descriptive, with a few answers giving a narrative of the war, rather than addressing the question.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by similar numbers of candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered by candidates. Good responses contained plenty of examples of the importance of the First World War to the development of the Weimar Republic up to 1929. Most commonly cited were the effects of the war on the economy, the impact of the Armistice and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. This was then balanced by examining the importance of other factors, such as the Weimar Constitution, political extremism, the Golden Years and the Wall Street Crash. In the best answers candidates developed their explanations with sufficient contextual knowledge and drew conclusions about the most important factor/s to the development of the Weimar Republic. Weaker responses tended to be narrative in style without directly addressing the question; some focused on the development of the Nazi Party rather than the Weimar Republic.

Question 4 was also generally well answered by candidates. The stronger responses were able to fully explain the significance of the threat of communism as a reason for Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in 1933. Candidates most commonly examined the impact anti-communism had on the ruling elites, including the President, industrialists and farmers. This was then developed by linking it to Nazi propaganda and the role of the SA in causing problems on the streets. This was then balanced by explaining the significance of other factors such as the effects of the Depression, Hitler's leadership qualities and the weaknesses of the Weimar governments. Weaker responses were often more descriptive or narrative in style, and would have been improved by better contextual knowledge. A few candidates went beyond the chronological parameters of the question and cited events in 1933–34 to write about consolidation of power, rather than about Hitler's appointment as Chancellor.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Candidates attempted both questions but **Question 6** was the more popular choice of the two, with only a small number of candidates attempting **Question 5**.

Question 5 saw some good responses but some candidates would have benefited from greater knowledge of the political demands before 1905 causing the Revolution. Good answers were able to examine the demands from liberals and radicals for a Duma, a constitutional monarchy and the end of the Tsarist autocracy. These were sometimes linked to socio-economic demands from workers and peasants. This was then balanced against other causes of the 1905 Revolution. Candidates most commonly cited the Russo-Japanese War, the land issue and Bloody Sunday. Other answers lacked sufficient contextual knowledge of the causes of the 1905 Revolution to write a convincing argument and some responses were overly short.

Question 6 was, in general, answered more competently. Good responses were able to explain the significance of the land issue after the March 1917 Revolution and particularly examined the events surrounding land seizures by peasants and returning soldiers. This was then assessed against the significance of other factors such as the ongoing socio-economic impact of the First World War, the problems created by the Dual Power system in Petrograd, the growing influence and popularity of the Bolsheviks and mistakes that caused the Provisional Government to lose support, such as Kerensky's Summer Offensive and the Kornilov Mutiny. The best answers were able to reach substantiated conclusions about the most significant factor/s and support these arguments with well-selected and in-depth examples. Weaker responses tended to lack knowledge of the land issue in Russia or were only able to provide limited material to support their answers.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was a popular topic among candidates, with more candidates choosing **Question 7** than **Question 8**, though both were attempted in substantial numbers.

Question 7 was generally well-answered. Most candidates understood the term 'laissez-faire' and how it was an important cause of the economic boom in the 1920s. A few candidates misunderstood the term, however, or included tariffs as part of the laissez-faire economics – most commonly confusing this with Republican policies as a whole. The best responses were well-developed and explored different elements of laissez-faire economics such as low taxation and low government intervention in the economy and explaining how this allowed business to profit and spending power to increase. This was then balanced by assessing the importance of other causes of the boom such as mass production, advertising and mass marketing, the First World War, the USA's natural resources and confidence, to name but a few. Some convincing conclusions were reached in the best answers and were substantiated with strong contextual knowledge and well-selected examples. Other responses tended to be more descriptive in nature and told the story of the boom without directly addressing the question of importance. A few candidates wandered into social aspects of the USA in the 1920s – while elements of this can be relevant, the focus of the question was the boom, rather than US society.

Question 8 was also well answered in most cases. Candidates were able to provide impressive evidence on the significance of organised crime as a reason for the failure of prohibition. Most commonly cited were the role of gangsters, particularly Al Capone, the bribery and corruption of officials and the inability of the federal and state governments to deal with organised crime. This was then assessed against other significant factors for the failure of prohibition including the growth in the popularity of speakeasies, the general public's lack of support for prohibition, the loss of government revenue, the impact of the Depression and the concerns over health from drinks like moonshine. The best responses were able to fully develop explanations and support their conclusions with solid examples. Weaker responses tended to be narratives of organised crime in the period which struggled to directly answer the question posed.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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