www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 1

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully to ensure that their responses are focused and relevant. When a question asks 'why' a particular event happened it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than a description of what happened. It is also essential that candidates read the dates in the question to ensure that they are writing about the correct period. Candidates should avoid lengthy narratives and focus on explanation, analysis and evaluation.

Good answers were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study. Many of these candidates were able to use their knowledge to good effect in writing well developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions.

General comments

Part **(a)** answers should focus on relevant details. Explanation is not required. A small number of candidates wrote a lengthy response to part **(a)** which resulted in them not having enough time to fully develop their responses to part **(b)** and **(c)** questions.

Both parts **(b)** and **(c)** require explanation. The narrative style, or long introductions which 'set the scene' which featured in some answers, should be avoided.

In part **(c)**, candidates need to give a balanced answer in which they argue both for and against the issue in the question in order to reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should not be a summary of points made earlier but should address 'how far' or 'to what extent'. The stronger responses were well organised, included detailed arguments on either side of the hypothesis and were evaluative. Weaker responses were very descriptive and often included information that was inaccurate and/or irrelevant to the question

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was answered by a high number of candidates.

(a) Most candidates had a very good knowledge of the Treaty of Saint Germain and many performed strongly. A small number of candidates confused the Treaty with the Treaty of Sevres or the Treaty of Versailles. Good answers showed that the Treaty of St Germain meant that the Austrian Hungarian Empire was broken up, the union between Austria and Germany was forbidden and territory from the Austro-Hungarian Empire was transferred to Czechoslovakia and Poland. Candidates could also have stated that Austria had to pay reparations, agree to the war guilt clause, reduce its army to 30,000 men and recognise the independence of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland. A few candidates' answers were very long. They had gained full marks in the first two lines but went on to write well over half a page.

© 2019

(b) In answering this question, the focus was on the thoughts and attitudes of the German people towards the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Successful responses included explanations as to why the Germans were outraged at particular terms. Two well explained reasons for their outrage were required. It was sufficient to take just two terms and explain why the Germans were upset. The most successfully explained term was the reduction of the German army, which was reduced to 100 000 men with no conscription, leaving the people upset because of the pride that they previously had in their army, the large amount of unemployment caused and the fact that it left Germany vulnerable to attack. Another term that was well explained was the German outrage at the 'war guilt clause'. Candidates needed to explain that the Germans were adamant that they were not totally responsible for causing the War and, therefore, should not have to pay such high reparations. They claimed that at the beginning Austria had attacked Serbia and Russia had mobilised its army before Germany had taken action. Weaker responses were characterised by a listing of the terms, with no explanation as to why they caused outrage. They understood that the payment of reparations was a cause of outrage but gave no further explanation. To gain credit for such an explanation, they needed to explain that it was difficult for Germany to pay such a huge sum when the economy was in crisis after the War and they were deprived of important industrial areas such as the Saar, which would have provided the resources to pay the reparations

(c) To perform strongly on this question, candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Candidates needed to explain how Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson went into the peace negotiations in Paris with similar *and* different aims. Weaker responses wrote about the separate aims of the three individuals, with no comparison with one of the others. Many answers were unbalanced. On common aims, many candidates just mentioned the punishing of Germany and wanting to keep the peace in the future; these answers lacked real explanation. Good answers were characterised by an explanation of the direct comparison between two or three of the personalities' aims. Answers which gained credit explained that Clemenceau wanted to treat Germany harshly by economically destroying Germany and reducing its armed forces to safeguard France, whereas Lloyd George didn't want the treaty to be too harsh as he realised that Germany had been Britain's second biggest trading partner before the War and he wanted to resume trading with Germany to safeguard British jobs. Other answers gaining credit explained that Wilson wanted self-determination worldwide but both Clemenceau and Lloyd George objected because Britain and France both had large empires which could come under threat if Wilson's ideas on self- determination were put in place.

Question 6

(a) This question was well answered, with most candidates having a good understanding of events that took place in the Rhineland in 1936. Candidates achieved high marks by including that Hitler broke the Treaty of Versailles when German troops marched into the Rhineland, large crowds welcomed the German soldiers and Britain and France took no action. Some candidates strayed away from the focus of the question and wrote at length on reasons why Hitler remilitarised the Rhineland and/or why Britain and France did not take any action. These background details lacked relevance to this question.

(b) In answer to this question, two well explained reasons were needed. There were many good responses to this question, especially when explaining why Hitler needed Stalin as an ally, as he did not want to fight a war on two fronts. Another well explained reason put forward was the importance of Poland to Hitler. One of Hitler's foreign policy aims had been to provide 'living space' in Eastern Europe for German citizens and the Nazi-Soviet Pact paved the way for Hitler to fulfil this aim. Weaker responses included general details of the agreement, often giving unnecessary facts on the background to the Pact in addition to why the Pact was important to Stalin. These details lacked relevance to this question.

(c) Effective responses to this question produced a balanced answer which explained why Britain and France were responsible for the outbreak of war in 1939, in comparison to other reasons for the outbreak of war, which could have included the Treaty of Versailles, the failure of the League of Nations, the effects of the Great Depression, Hitler's foreign policy and the impact of the Nazi Soviet Pact. Most candidates had a good understanding of the British and French policy of appeasement and were able to include Anschluss, the taking over of the Sudetenland and the invasion of Czechoslovakia as examples whereby Hitler had been left unchallenged, which increased his confidence and aggression. Often candidates used the Munich Conference to illustrate how the British and French had let down the Czechs by succumbing to Hitler's demands. Some candidates also linked the failure of the League of Nations to keep the peace as being partly

© 2019

the responsibility of Britain and France, whose self-interest came first. A few candidates lost focus on the question and wrote in detail on the reasons why the policy of appeasement was followed, which gained no credit. On the other side of the argument there were many good explanations, including examples of Hitler's foreign policy aims and the impact of his actions. These responses often mentioned that he was determined to break the Treaty of Versailles and achieve world domination. His actions included rearming, remilitarising the Rhineland, Anschluss and the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Many candidates included the fact that the invasion of Poland was part of his plan and this led to war breaking out in 1939 so, therefore, he was to blame for the outbreak of war. However, others also argued that had he been challenged earlier, he would not have become so confident and strong, so it was therefore the fault of Britain and France for not stopping him sooner.

Question 7

(a) The Warsaw Pact was well known and candidates gained good credit for including that it was set up in 1955 as a balance to the formation of NATO. It was an agreement between Russia and the communist states of Eastern Europe. Candidates could have stated that it was a defence treaty which included Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and other communist countries and that it ended in 1991. A common misapprehension of weaker candidates was that the Pact was formed by Stalin.

(b) The key part of this question was 'a source of dispute'. Weaker responses included details on what happened to Germany as a result of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, including that Germany and Berlin were split into four zones - American, French, British and Soviet – but no reference was made as to why this division was a source of dispute. Other responses included details of the results of the dispute, for example the Berlin Airlift, which were not relevant. Strong responses included two explanations. The most successfully explained reason was that Germany was a source of dispute because the Soviet Union had been devastated in the war, twenty million Russians had died and Stalin wanted to cripple Germany with high reparations and keep it weak. The American President, Truman, disagreed with high reparations and was determined not to let this happen as he did not want to repeat the same mistakes of the Versailles Treaty. He wanted Germany to recover economically because this was necessary for the European economy. Other explained reasons included that the different ideologies of the East and West made disagreement inevitable and the currency reform introduced by the West was unpopular with the Soviet Union.

(c) Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer which argued for and against the hypothesis. Strong responses showed a good understanding of the economic situation in post war Europe, the Marshall Plan and the reasons for its introduction. A strong theme in these responses was the argument against the hypothesis including the link between poverty and communism. Many people in Europe were starving, homeless and unemployed, and it was in conditions such as this that Communism spread, so Americans partly gave the aid to stop the spread of communism. Stalin refused to allow any of the Eastern European countries to apply for Marshall Aid because the anti-communist aims underpinning Marshall Aid would weaken his control over Eastern Europe. Strong responses also agreed that there was evidence that the Plan was designed to ensure the domination of the USA over Europe, with 'dollar imperialism'. Through the Marshall Plan the USA gave billions of dollars to Europe. This money was mainly spent buying US goods and so Europe became a marker for US exports. This meant that Europe became dependent on the USA. Weaker responses tended to include narrative on how the Marshall Plan originated, with little reference to the question.

Question 8

(a) There were variable answers to this question, with some responses including overlong detail on the options that President Kennedy had to choose from. Strong responses identified the following reactions: 'he placed a blockade round Cuba', 'he made a speech on TV to the American people explaining his plan', 'he got troops ready for an invasion of Cuba' and 'all American forces around the world were placed on DEFCON 3'

(b) Most candidates were able to explain one reason why developments in Vietnam in the 1950s were important to the USA, namely the domino theory. In 1954 the French left Vietnam and it was split into North and South Vietnam. North Vietnam became communist and the Americans were worried that if one country became communist, then the neighbouring country would be next, so they were concerned about communism spreading to South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. A number of

© 2019

www.dynamicpapers.com

responses struggled as they wrote about developments in Vietnam in the 1960s, including why the Americans failed to win the Vietnam War, which was not relevant to this question.

(c) Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the events of the Korean War and strong responses were able to support their argument as to who won the war, using both the aims of the USA, North Korea and the United Nations and supporting details from the events. These responses included reasons for the success and failure of both sides and came to a well-supported conclusion. Successful explanations included that it was the aim of the USA to contain communism, so when Communist North Korea invaded the USA's ally, South Korea, troops led by US forces managed to push them back. Even when the Chinese helped North Korea the Americans were able to defend the South. The war ended with the border being on the 38th parallel, where it had started. The Americans claimed that they had won because they had stopped South Korea being overrun and becoming communist, therefore their policy of containment was successful. Weaker responses were characterised by a narrative of events of the Korean War with no reference to success or failure, other than simple statements such as 'the border remained the same'.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates misread the question and described why the occupation of the Ruhr took place and/or the actions of the French and Belgian troops in the Ruhr. The focus of the question was on the reaction of the Germans to the French occupation of the Ruhr. Strong responses identified German reactions: 'The German Government ordered workers to start passive resistance' and 'encouraged workers to go on strike' and 'The German government printed lots of money' which 'caused hyperinflation'.

(b) Some candidates wrote at length on the actions of the Freikorps against the Spartacist Uprising and the Freikorps' involvement in the Kapp Putsch. However, the focus of the question was on *why* the Freikorps attempted to take control of Germany in 1920. There were many good answers which got to the heart of the question by explaining how the Freikorps wanted to remove the Weimar Republic as they did not appreciate the democratic style of government but preferred the dictatorial rule of the Kaiser. A second reason often explained was that the Freikorps who were ex-soldiers thought that the country had been 'stabbed in the back' by the 'November Criminals' and were against the armistice, peace settlement and the resulting reduction in Germany's armed forces.

(c) Many responses showed a good understanding of Stresemann's work towards the survival of the Weimar Republic. Both sides of the argument were needed to gain high marks. There were good explanations of Stresemann's actions to overcome inflation and put the economy on a seemingly sound footing, with the introduction of a new currency and American loans. In strong responses the impact of his actions was emphasised. Cultural achievements and the progress made in foreign relations were also well explained. To achieve good marks, responses needed to avoid being narratives of actions by Stresemann. The impact of his actions, especially how they created the impression of recovery, needed to be explained. A number of candidates gave a one-sided answer and did not address the other side of the argument, that some Germans did not see the period as a total recovery. Candidates could have explained the poor unemployment record and the depressed agriculture sector throughout the period. The most successfully explained reason on the other side of the argument was that the German recovery was an illusion because the economic recovery was based on American loans and, if the loans were recalled in an emergency, as they were in 1929, then the German economy would be in serious trouble.

Question 12

(a) This question was well answered. Many candidates had a detailed knowledge of the work of the Gestapo and gained high marks for their response. They included that, 'They could arrest citizens on mere suspicion', 'they could send them to concentration camps without trial' and 'they used torture and executions'. Candidates could have improved their responses by stating that the

© 2019

www.dynamicpapers.com

Gestapo tapped telephones and spied on people by intercepting their mail. Some candidates included details on why the Gestapo was formed, which lacked relevance to this question.

(b) There were some strong responses to this question. Successful explanations included that a young Jew killed a German diplomat in Paris and the Nazis used this as an excuse to launch a violent attack on the Jews, as Hitler hated them. This was because they tended to be well educated and therefore held well-paid jobs or ran successful stores and businesses, and this offended Hitler and his idea of Aryan supremacy. A second explanation could also highlight the fact that Hitler blamed Jewish businessmen and bankers for Germany's defeat in the First World War. He claimed that they had forced the surrender on the German army. Weaker responses included a description of the events of Kristallnacht or confused the event with the Night of Long Knives.

(c) There were some strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed understanding of how effective Nazi propaganda was in winning the support of the German people. These responses were characterised by detailed examples of propaganda and how they led to increased support. For example, the Nuremberg rallies held every year, where there were bands, marches, flying displays and Hitler's brilliant speeches. These brought excitement into people's lives and made them want to support such a movement. Stronger responses then went on to develop the other side of the argument, explaining why propaganda didn't win the support of the people. These answers usually included the support for, and activities of, the Swing movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Both of these movements were well understood by candidates. Weaker responses wrote lengthy answers on different types of propaganda used by the Nazis without linking their points to how they increased support for the Nazis. In other responses, the focus of the question was changed from 'support' to 'control', which is a different answer to the one required.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) This question was well answered. There were lots of examples that could be used to answer this question. The majority of the candidates understood the 'Jim Crow' laws and were able to achieve high marks by including that they were racist, and were enforced in the southern states. There was also segregation on public transport and in restaurants.

(b) The reasons why gangsterism increased in America in the 1920s were well known. Good answers successfully explained that gangsterism increased because of prohibition, which meant that it was against the law to make or sell alcohol in the USA in the 1920s. Gangsters took advantage of prohibition and sought to control the liquor trade by supplying the speakeasies and showed that organised gangs could make huge profits from the sale of illegal alcohol. A second explanation often demonstrated that the number of gangsters increased due to the increase of corrupt officials among Chicago's police, local government workers, judges, lawyers and prohibition agents. Some responses focussed mainly on the violent activities of Al Capone, including the Saint Valentine's Day Massacre in 1929, which were not relevant to this question.

(c) There were some well-developed responses to this question, with most candidates being able to explain their arguments on both sides of the hypothesis. Good responses demonstrated clearly how women's lives had changed as a result of various different developments in the 1920s. Examples explained included women getting the vote, the introduction of labour-saving devices, changes in women's fashion and the introduction of the cinema, radio and motor car. A well-balanced answer then went onto explain the limitations of the changes. Successful explanations emphasised that most changes only affected young, middle class women living in the cities. The lives of women who lived in the countryside and on farms did not change much at all. There was a strong conservative element in American society and a combination of traditional religion and old country values kept most women who lived in rural areas in a much more restricted role than that of urban women. Weaker responses had a tendency to list the changes with no reference to the impact that they had on the lives of women.

© 2019

www.dynamicpapers.com

Questions 16–22

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

© 2019

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 2

Key messages

- It is important to give a direct answer to the question, candidates should not spend time repeating what the source says, describing what it shows or writing about the historical background. Answers should be based on the sources. All the questions are about sources and the content of the sources should be used to explain answers. Answers should start by directly addressing the question, for example, 'The message of this source is' or 'Source C does make Source D surprising because'.
- The sources should be read carefully, and the question thought about. Then the answer can be planned. Candidates can then write their answers when they know what it is that they want to say.
- When using quotations, the full quote should be given. Parts of the quotation should not be omitted. Candidates should not use ellipses and should not give just the first and last words of a quotation.
- Sources should be read and interpreted as whole. In many questions what matters most is the overall message that the artist or author is trying to give, rather than isolated details in a source.
- Knowledge of the historical events is important but it needs to be used in the right way. Sources should be read and interpreted in context. Knowing and understanding what was happening at the time of the creation or publication of a source will enable candidates to understand and evaluate it more effectively. Contextual knowledge should be used to analyse and evaluate the sources, rather than instead of them.
- Answers to **Question 6** must make use of the sources.

General comments

Candidates managed their time well and very few failed to answer all six questions. Many candidates had good contextual knowledge, although the need to use this in a relevant and concise way to analyse and interpret the sources is still a challenge for some candidates, who wrote more about the historical events than about the sources. The way they used their contextual knowledge hindered the answering the questions.

However, there were many responses that demonstrated the ability of candidates to interpret and evaluate historical sources in an informed way. The candidates were particularly good at making inferences from sources and comparing sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

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

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Many candidates had clearly gone through the two sources very carefully and had made a list of agreements and disagreements before writing their answers. As a result of this, they were able to compare the sources point by point. They had no problem in explaining agreements such as France giving Italy a free hand and Mussolini believing he had the backing of France, and disagreements such as Source A claiming that Mussolini had long considered action against Abyssinia, while Source B claims that he had not considered any action until after Wal Wal. Less successful responses summarised the two sources separately and did not make any direct point-by-point comparisons.

© 2019

Question 2

The best responses were based on an understanding that whether Source C makes Source D surprising depends on more than just whether they agree with each other. For example, Source C can only make Source D surprising if it can be trusted as evidence, while disagreements between the two sources might not make Source D surprising because circumstances may have changed. There are several differences between Sources C and D. One that many candidates pointed out is that in Source C Italy is not seen as much of a threat, while in Source D the British are very worried about its use of gas. To achieve stronger answers, candidates needed to use their contextual knowledge and understanding. For example, Britain's failure to back the League and Abyssinia throughout the crisis, Britain and France's desire for a relationship with Italy and the Hoare-Laval Pact, can all be relevant when answering this question. Weaker responses usually fell into two groups – those that analysed the sources but neglected to directly address the issue of 'surprise', and those that identified what was surprising but did not explain why.

Question 3

Most candidates managed to at least explain valid sub-messages of the cartoon, for example Italy was aggressive or the League was weak. A good number went on to explain the big message – that the League was weak in responding to Italian aggression (both parts were required). When candidates are asked about the message of the cartoon, it is important that they try to consider the point of view of the cartoonist. The best responses did this and developed the big message to explain that the cartoonist was criticising the League. This must be explicit, rather than inferred. There were very few misinterpretations of the cartoon but some candidates simply described the cartoon, sometimes in great detail.

Question 4

The word 'impressions' in the question signalled that candidates needed to go beyond surface description of these two illustrations. Weak responses focused on describing Mussolini killing people with gas in Source F and the Italians feeding Abyssinian children in Source G. Better responses explained how Source F gives the impression that Mussolini (or the Italians) was, for example, mad, cruel or uncivilised, while Source G suggests that Italians were, for example, generous and kind. Most candidates compared the impressions of Mussolini and /or Italians, but credit was also awarded for comparing impressions of Abyssinians in the two sources. The best responses focused on the irony in Source F about Mussolini calling Abyssinians 'uncivilised', while showing that he was the uncivilised one. They compared this to Source G, where the Italians are shown as civilised.

Question 5

To answer this question well, candidates needed to directly address the issue of usefulness. This was attempted by a reasonable number of candidates. This source could be useful for a number of reasons, some better than others. It could be useful for the surface information it contains, for example that Abyssinia is a barbarous country. This involves an uncritical use of the source. It could be useful for what can be inferred from the source, for example about English attitudes towards race. Attitudes which, perhaps, help to explain Britain's policy towards Italy and Abyssinia. This involves reading the source 'against the grain'. It could be evaluated for its usefulness. For example, candidates might explain how Britain was trying to keep good relations with Italy because of fears about Germany, giving this source the purpose of justifying Italian actions.

What all these approaches have in common is that they address the issue of usefulness. Some candidates did not do this. They wrote about what the source said without explaining ways in which it was useful. Others made assertions about unreliability but did not use these to form judgements about usefulness.

Question 6

Overall, there were many good responses to this question. They contained three crucial elements. First, their focus was on testing the actual hypothesis named in the question. Second, they used the evidence in the sources to carry out this testing. Third, they used this evidence explicitly and effectively. In other words, they clearly explained, with reference to the content of the sources, how they supported, or did not support, the hypothesis in the question. Here is an example of how this was done: 'Source F does not justify Italian actions in Abyssinia because it shows Mussolini and the Italians behaving in murderous ways. They are using poison gas which had been banned by international agreement. The Abyssinians are shown suffering dreadfully. There is no way this source justifies what Italy was doing.' This response makes clear at the end whether or not the source supports the hypothesis. Some candidates used sources in a relevant way but did

© 2019

www.dynamicpapers.com

not make an explicit statement about whether each source considered supported the hypothesis. Candidates need to make it clear.

It does not matter whether candidates use the sources in the order they appear in the paper or first write about the sources supporting the hypothesis, and then about those disagreeing with it. What matters is that they explain sources on both sides of the argument and use the sources in the ways described earlier. Attempts to write about the sources in groups should be avoided. This is because what was said about the sources rarely applied to all the sources in the group. Candidates are better advised to use and analyse each source they look at separately. It is sometimes the case that some sources can be used on both sides of the argument. It is perfectly acceptable for candidates to do this.

© 2019

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This paper requires candidates to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth, and wide range of knowledge, is required to support arguments and conclusions.

General comments

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was comfortably the most popular among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41. There were some attempts at Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. There were too few attempts at Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments.

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 judgements and conclusions, but more could responses have provided a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description, or failed to properly address the question that was set. Many candidates wrote at great length about a particular topic or Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates would have benefited from reading the question carefully before answering and ensuring that their response focused on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was generally well-answered. The strongest answers demonstrated a strong knowledge and understanding of the Schlieffen Plan and its failures, including the changes made by von Moltke. Most commonly cited were Moltke's decisions to ignore the Netherlands and go through Belgium and to send too few soldiers to the Eastern Front. This was balanced well by many candidates who examined the role of new technology and weapons such as the impact of artillery and machine guns as well as the counter-offensive of the French and the role of the BEF. The best answers contained focused explanations and drew convincing conclusions about the most important reasons the Schlieffen Plan failed. Weaker responses tended to give a narrative, albeit often detailed, which did not directly address the question. Many of these answers tended to miss the specific changes made by Moltke.

For **Question 2**, there were too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3 was the most widely-answered question in this Depth Study, but there were also a good number of attempts at **Question 4**.

Question 3 was generally well-answered. Candidates tended to have a solid knowledge and understanding of the role the Gestapo played in maintaining Nazi control after 1933, and they were able to explain the fear and intimidation this caused for ordinary Germans. The best answers examined the role played by informers, the methods used by the Gestapo and their unlimited powers of arrest. Balance was often provided using a wide range of alternative factors – propaganda, the SS, concentration camps and the use of the Hitler Youth

© 2019

organisations, as well as political methods such as the Enabling Act. One or two candidates made valid links between the Gestapo and the SS as the organisations came under the control of Himmler after 1936 when he was made Chief of German Police, as well as Reichsfuhrer-SS. The best answers were by candidates who explained how important each method was in enabling the Nazis to maintain control and reached conclusions often based on a priority order. Weaker responses tended to lack contextual knowledge or started focused on the question but then drifted into light descriptions of too many alternative factors and neglected to explain their importance. One or two responses also went outside of the chronological parameters of the question and examined the Weimar period, which lacked relevance.

Question 4 was, in general, answered competently. The stronger responses were able to explain how the Hitler Youth organisations promoted Nazi ideas such as racial purity, physical fitness, nationalism and militarism to prepare young boys for future war and girls for future motherhood. Alternative methods of promoting Nazi ideas were then examined such as propaganda, schools and the changes to the curriculum, the Nuremberg Laws, the Berlin Olympics and even workers' organisations such as the RAD and DAF. Less successful responses sometimes lost focus on the question and explored the role of the SS and Gestapo as promoters of Nazi ideas – while there is some validity in this with the SS, most candidates that used this example tended to suggest that the fear and terror they created was the promotion of Nazi ideas, whereas it was more akin to a form of control. A very small number of candidates also made the common error of viewing the Hitler Youth organisations and the schools in Germany as the same thing.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Question 5 was generally not well answered. Most responses had a weak grasp of the role played by Trotsky. A few candidates mentioned his leadership ability in forming the Red Army and commanding them and then balanced this factor against the role played by Lenin, the use of War Communism, the Red Terror and the weaknesses of the Whites. Very few candidates went into detail or explained the relative importance of these different factors. Many of the weakest responses tended to be light description, much of it about the Bolshevik seizure of power in November 1917 which was not the focus of the question.

There were too few responses to **Question 6** for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was the second most popular topic, with both **Question 7** and **Question 8** answered by a god number of candidates. However, there were more **Question 7** responses this examination session.

Question 7 was generally well-answered. Stronger responses were able to examine how consumer goods affected the US economy of the 1920s and explored the importance of products such as the car, radio and refrigerator and the assembly lines that produced them. Many candidates then provided balance by looking at a range of other factors such as Republican policies, mass advertising, mass consumerism and the First World War. Good answers explained how each factor impacted the US economy and drew convincing conclusions about their relative importance. Weaker responses tended to lose focus on the question and often drifted into descriptions about US society and changes to people's lifestyles. It is imperative that candidates read the question properly and understand the difference between economy and society for Depth Study D. Another common problem was to go beyond the chronology of the question and examine the 1930s and the Depression era which is not relevant to this question on the 1920s.

Question 8 was well-answered, with some exceptional responses. The strongest answers demonstrated an extensive knowledge of the different radical opponents of the New Deal such as Huey Long, Dr Townsend and Father Coughlin. Some responses showed an extraordinary depth of accurate contextual knowledge and were able to cite precise statistical examples to support their explanations. Balance was most commonly provided by an examination of other forms of opposition to the New Deal such as the Republicans, big business and the Supreme Court. Once again, the best answers provided an outstanding depth of knowledge when supporting their explanations. This allowed a small number of candidates to draw very well-supported judgements and conclusions about the relative significance of the different forms of opposition. Some of the weaker responses tended to be more descriptive and, although the level of knowledge was often very high, explanations were implicit or missing completely.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930– c.1990

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

© 2019

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

© 2019