www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 1

Key messages

Successful answers are dependent upon candidates reading the questions very carefully (especially where dates are involved) to ensure that their responses are focussed and relevant.

When a question asks 'why' a particular event happened, it is important that candidates direct their response to address and explain the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened.

General comments

Candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions. Many candidates 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. There were very few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

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

Parts (b) and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and write in continuous prose to do so, rather than using a 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Successful responses were generally carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative 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 and reach a balanced conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing the requirements of the question, for example, 'how far' or 'how successful'. Weaker responses often focussed only on one side of the argument. These answers could have been be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most popular questions in the ***Core content*** section.

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 5

(a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of the Treaty of Sevres and many achieved full marks. Such responses included four specific terms from the Treaty, for example, Turkey was punished harshly, the army was reduced to 50 700, they were allowed no aircraft and they had to recognise the independence of the Kingdom of Hejaz. Candidates could also have gained marks by describing the breakup of the Ottoman Empire by showing the movement of Turkish territory to other countries, for example, Thrace to Greece. Answers which showed the involvement of Britain and France in Turkish financial and economic affairs and the ruling of mandated territories from the Turkish Empire, also gained credit. Some candidates' answers to this question were too long. They had gained the maximum marks in the first few lines but went on to write nearly a page. This took time away from **parts (b)** and **(c)** which required explanation. There was a small number of candidates hat did not know the Treaty and left the space blank or confused it with the Treaty of Versailles.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. The terms of the Treaty of Versailles were well known and often recalled in great detail, but less successful responses focussed on why Germans hated the Treaty and the economic impact on Germany, rather than emphasising the damaging political effect. Other responses included information from after 1923, which was not relevant. Successful responses explained two damaging political impacts. First, by linking the harsh terms of the Versailles Treaty to Ebert's Government, which was blamed for signing the Treaty and referred to as 'The November Criminals'. The Germans felt that they had been 'stabbed in the back' by the new Weimar Government. Secondly, these responses then explained how the government had to face rebellions from left- and right-wing groups including the Communists and the Kapp Putsch, or it had to face an invasion because of the failure to pay reparations.

(c) Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer explaining why Clemenceau and Wilson were satisfied and dissatisfied with the Treaty of Versailles. Many responses included detailed explanations of the aims of both leaders and the reasoning behind these aims, with no reference to the terms. The most successful responses linked an aim to a term in the Treaty and then explained the feelings of the leader. For example, Clemenceau's main aim was to ensure that Germany could never threaten France again. He was therefore pleased with the restrictions on the German forces, including the limit of the army to 100 000 men and the banning of conscription. Although the Rhineland was demilitarised which made France's eastern border more secure, Clemenceau was disappointed that it was not made into an independent state. Many candidates were also able to explain that Wilson was happy with the setting up of the League of Nations and that some people got self-determination, which saw the recreation of Poland and creation of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. To achieve a very strong response, two explanations of one of the leader's reactions and at least one reason from the other were required. Some weaker responses included the feelings of Lloyd George, which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 6

(a) This question worked well for most candidates, who understood the way in which the League of Nations dealt with Upper Silesia. The best responses stated that the League, being asked to settle the dispute between Germany and Poland, arranged a plebiscite and as a result in 1921 divided Upper Silesia between Germany and Poland. Successful responses could also have included that rail links between the two parts were safeguarded, as well as that arrangements were made for water and power to be supplied from one side of the border to the other. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of factual knowledge, often confusing the events in Upper Silesia in 1921 with Hitler's role in the Saar plebiscite in 1935.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. Good answers were characterised by the identification and explanation of reasons as to why Haile Selassie was unhappy with the way the League dealt with the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. The most common reason explained was the self-interest of Britain and France, supported by details of the inconsistency in imposing sanctions, the failure to close the Suez Canal and the Hoare-Laval Pact, which gave most of Abyssinia to Italy. Other responses included details of the background to the invasion, including reasons why Mussolini launched the invasion, which lacked relevance. Alternatively, they included general information about why the League of Nations failed, with no specific reference to Abyssinia.

(c) Very good understanding was shown of the humanitarian work of the League and many responses were very strong on this side of the argument. These responses separated the different agencies

into paragraphs and gave detailed explanations of their work and impact on society. A number of responses could have been improved by some balance and the inclusion of some detail on the League's failure over Manchuria, and not by not concentrating on why Japan invaded Manchuria, which was irrelevant. Some answers wrote generally on why the League of Nations failed, with no specific reference to Manchuria. Successful responses used details of the events of the Manchurian Crisis to explain why the League failed to handle the crisis successfully. Most included that the League's decision making was slow and when the Lytton Committee reported back, citing that Japan had acted unlawfully, Japan resigned from the League and invaded Jehol Province. The League's failure to stop Japanese expansion showed Mussolini and Hitler that they could also get away with aggression as well. Successful responses explained both the impact of the humanitarian work of the League's agencies and the failure over the Japanese invasion of Manchuria.

Question 7

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. It is important that candidates read the dates in the question carefully as a number of responses included details from the Soviet response to the Prague Spring in 1968, which lacked relevance to this question. Effective responses included four accurate factual details, of how the Communists took over Czechoslovakia between 1945 and 1948, for example: elections were held after the war, which gave Communists powerful positions in a coalition government. The Communists gradually took control of key parts of the government and arrested and imprisoned political rivals. The role of Benes and the murder of Jan Masaryk also gained credit.

(b) Good understanding was shown of the Marshall Plan and why many Western European countries welcomed it. The two most common reasons identified and explained were that it would help them recover economically after the war and that it would help to prevent the spread of Communism. Some candidates shifted the focus of the question and wrote lengthy accounts of why Truman introduced the Marshall Plan and the benefits it brought to America which was not the focus of the question.

(c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates assessing how far Stalin's policy towards Europe was defensive between 1945 and 1949. Stronger responses explained that, to some extent, Stalin's policy could be considered to be defensive as the Soviet Union had suffered such terrible losses in the war and Stalin's greatest fear was another future attack by a recovered and strong Germany. His suspicions of Western Europe dated back to western interference in the Russian Civil War and he wanted a ring of Communist countries in Eastern Europe to protect the Soviet Union from future attack. On the other side of the argument, responses argued that Stalin's policy could be seen as aggressive as he did not keep to the agreements made at Yalta and Potsdam and his blockade of Berlin was another aggressive move, designed to get the west out of Berlin. Weaker responses included details of events outside the time span, including the setting up of the Warsaw Pact, the events in Hungary in 1956 and the building of the Berlin Wall.

Question 8

(a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of the Shah's programme to modernise Iran. They were many examples to choose from, including his introduction of the White Revolution, the abolition of feudalism, women gaining the vote and his health and education reforms. Weaker responses were characterised by general statements such as his programme made 'things better'.

(b) The importance of protecting oil supplies to the west was recognised by the majority of candidates answering this question. Strong responses were characterised by the explanation of two reasons why several Western Powers supported Iraq in the Iran-Iraq War, one of which was the issue of oil. The other most common reason explained was that they were worried about Iran becoming too powerful in the Gulf region and they could get on much better with Iraq than the anti-western Islamic regime in Iran. Some responses included information on how Western Powers supported Iraq during the course of the war which lacked relevance to the question set.

(c) This question worked well for most candidates. Successful responses to this question included contextual examples to produce a well-balanced answer by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Most responses started by supporting the assertion, that Saddam was right when he declared victory for Iraq in the Iran-Iraq War. They included details on the strength of Iraq at the

end of the war, the poor economic situation in Iran and the fact that it was Khomeini who had wanted a ceasefire. On the other side of the argument, candidates were able to explain that despite Saddam claiming victory, he was wrong, usually using the economic devastation within Iraq at the end of the war to substantiate their argument. Many responses also concluded that neither side had won, as both sides were devastated by the war. Less successful responses included details on the causes of the war, with no reference to the question.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies

(a) The majority of candidates gained full marks for this question as they had a good understanding of the events of the Munich Putsch. Most included that it was an attempt by Hitler to overthrow the Weimar Republic in 1923. He hijacked a local government meeting in Bavaria and announced he was taking over and was joined by Ludendorff. Responses also included a wide range of other relevant features, such as Weimar government forces hitting back, Nazis being killed, and Hitler being arrested. Some responses were unnecessarily long as a result of including the background and results of the Putsch, which were nor needed.

(b) This question was well answered. Successful responses contained two detailed explanations for the Nazi success in the elections in the years 1930 to 1932. Most usually identified reasons such as: the significant impact of the Great Depression, the use of propaganda and the impact of negative cohesion. Candidates then had the opportunity to explain why and how the Nazis' policies became popular, in contrast to those of the Weimar Government. A successful and significant area to explain was the use of propaganda by Goebbels and the abilities of Hitler as an orator during his tours round the country during these elections. It is important to note the date limits of the question. Weaker responses included details of the impact of the Munich Putsch and described events after Hitler became Chancellor.

(c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses to this question, which explained whether the Enabling Act or the Night of Long Knives was more important in Hitler consolidating his power. Strong responses explained that the Enabling Act allowed Hitler to pass laws without going through the Reichstag, which basically gave him dictatorial powers. This meant that he could now deal with his opponents. He banned other parties and trade unions and controlled local government. They then explained the impact of the Night of Long Knives and the removal of Rohm, who had been a particular threat to Hitler. Further credit was gained when candidates explained that army leaders were especially pleased with Hitler's actions over the SA and the reasons why they were pleased. Some candidates spent time including other ways in which Hitler consolidated his power, which lacked relevance to this question. Less successful responses either had no knowledge of the Enabling Act or confused the Act with the Emergency Decrees, while some other candidates confused the Night of Long Knives with Kristallnacht.

Question 12

(a) The majority of candidates were familiar with the activities of the Edelweiss Pirates and gained full marks by stating that they were teenagers who liked to go camping and hiking and they attacked members of the Hitler Youth and even the Gestapo. A common misconception was that the Edelweiss Pirates and the 'Swing' Movement were the same group. Weaker responses wrote in general terms about the Edelweiss Pirates, for example who they were, without mentioning their activities.

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) Good understanding was shown of at least one reason why the Nazis introduced the 'Final Solution'. The most common reason identified and explained was Hitler's hatred and distrust of the Jews, including his 'Master Race' Theory. Some candidates encountered challenges explaining a second supported reason and instead wrote at length about how the Jews were rounded up and the conditions in the concentration camps, which lacked relevance to this question.

(c) Successful responses were characterised by at least two well-explained arguments on both sides of the debate. Most candidates found ample evidence to show how Hitler won over young Germans through the Hitler Youth by providing activities such as hiking, camping and marching in exciting parades, whilst at the same time indoctrinating them with Nazi ideas to ensure that their first loyalty was to Hitler. Credit was also given for responses which included that not all young people were members of the Hitler Youth and that it had to be made compulsory in 1936. Good understanding was shown of the changes that Hitler brought into the curriculum, most notably in History, Biology and Physical Education, in order to indoctrinate children with Nazi ideas from a very young age. Some responses included other ways in which Hitler won over the German youth, including propaganda and the work of the Gestapo, which were not relevant to this question. Weaker responses included long descriptions of the Hitler Youth activities and the subjects that the Nazis wanted taught in schools, with no assessment as to how effective they were. A number of candidates could have improved their responses by focussing on the key words in the question, including, in this case, 'effective'.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of the new methods used by the car industry to build and sell cars. Very strong answers were achieved by those identifying the following features: use of the assembly line, mass production, introduction of hire purchase and the use of widespread of advertising.

(b) Good understanding was shown of one reason, most notably, overproduction, as to why farmers did not benefit from the economic 'boom'. Strong responses explained that now the war was over, Europe could grow the food it needed and did not need such large imports from America. This meant that large amounts of grain were being produced that nobody wanted, resulting in prices dropping, leaving farmers with less income and many of them leaving the land, as they could not pay their mortgages. Weaker responses struggled to explain a second reason and although they could identify reasons, such as Canadian competition and mechanisation, there was often no explanation provided.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with many being one sided. Candidates were more familiar with the ways in which American industry did well in the 1920s than they were with the industries that did not do well. Successful responses were able to explain the demand for certain industries including car, steel, building and construction, and consumer goods. They also noted that the expansion of these industries was helped by developments in advertising, hire purchase and Republican policies. Strong responses also challenged the assertion by including examples of industries that did not do well - usually the older industries such as coal, cotton and wool, and reasons for this. Weaker responses tended to include all the industries which boomed in one paragraph but no explanation as to why.

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

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

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 2

Key messages

All the questions are primarily about the sources. Contextual knowledge should be used to enable candidates to interpret and use the sources more effectively.

When candidates use quotations from sources, they must give the quotation in full. They should not use ellipses and omit words from the quotation.

Responses should not rely upon assertions. Candidates should support their answers with reference to source content or, where appropriate, relevant contextual knowledge.

It is important to do exactly what the questions asks e.g. if a question asks about the impression a source gives, it is not necessary to evaluate the source.

It is also important to give a clear response to the main issues in a question. For example, if a question asks whether candidates are surprised by a source, candidates must, preferably at the beginning of their response, make a clear statement about whether they are surprised or not. This then needs to be supported.

When comparing sources, candidates should attempt to produce direct comparisons from the beginning of their responses. It is not necessary to first analyse each source. The analysis should come naturally as part of the comparison.

General comments

There were many sound scripts and a small number that were outstandingly good or rather weak. It was clear that most candidates understood the sources and what the questions were asking them to do. There were some particularly good interpretations and use of cartoons. Candidates were also good at comparing sources. Contextual knowledge was adequate and was often used appropriately. Many candidates could have performed more strongly on **Question 6** (see the comments below relating to this question).

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question produced a wide range of responses. Nearly all candidates attempted to make a judgement about how useful the source is. The weakest responses mistakenly assumed that Source A is about the Cuban Missile Crisis. They explicitly stated that the events described in Source A are the events of the Crisis, for example, they thought the reference in Source A to Khrushchev acting in a hostile way is a reference to the placing of missiles in Cuba. The best responses demonstrated an understanding that although the source is not about the Crisis, it is possible to use it to improve our understanding of the Crisis. For example, Kennedy's concern in Source A that Khrushchev thinks of him as weak helps explain why Kennedy was so determined to stand up to Khrushchev during the Crisis.

A few candidates wrote sound responses by focusing on Kennedy's purpose in Source A and arguing that the source is not useful because Kennedy is trying to create a certain impression of either himself or of Khrushchev. The majority of candidates did not make the mistake of claiming that Source A describes the Crisis. Instead, they explained how some of the information in the source is useful in a general sense, without explicitly linking this explanation to events of the Crisis, for example, 'I think Source A is useful evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis because it tells us that Kennedy was inexperienced and needed to get Khrushchev to respect him.'

Question 2

In Source B Khrushchev attempts to give us very positive impressions of himself and his actions during the Crisis. A good number of candidates understood and accepted these positive impressions and used Source B to support their responses. They explained that Source B suggests Khrushchev was in control (for example, 'I started it', 'I take complete responsibility'), that he was reasonable and understanding towards Kennedy (for example, 'we have to look for a dignified way out of this conflict'), and that he wanted peace. However, more thoughtful responses realised what Khrushchev was up to in his memoirs and explained how he can be seen as condescending, boastful, self-promoting or someone who wanted to take all the credit. The best responses set Source B into a broader context and focused on Khrushchev's purpose. They realised that Khrushchev was trying to rescue his historical reputation after he was toppled from power or had, in the eyes of many people in the Soviet Union, been defeated in the Crisis. The weakest responses simply paraphrased the source and were unable to make any valid inferences or made inferences but did not support them with evidence from Source B.

Question 3

This question was answered well. In questions like this one it is important that candidates try to focus on what they think the cartoonist's point of view is. This involves going beyond the big message of the cartoon and explaining what point of view is suggested by this big message. This is why the question asks about the cartoonist, rather than just the cartoon. The big message of this cartoon is that the US has the upper hand in the Crisis but the cartoonist's point of view is pro-American – that it is a good thing that the US had the upper hand or that the US was in the right. A reasonable number of candidates managed to recognise this. The cartoon also contains many sub-messages, for example, the USSR is weak, the situation was tense, the US is strong and there were very few candidates who did not provide at least one of these.

Question 4

This question was also answered well, with many candidates able to at least compare valid sub-messages of the two cartoons. There were few misinterpretations of the cartoons and few candidates neglected to make a valid comparison. Some candidates did explain the two cartoons separately but then managed to make a direct comparison in their final paragraphs. Sub-messages include that it was a personal struggle between the two Presidents, tensions were high, and they were on the brink of war. The best responses compared the big messages of the two cartoons – that Kennedy had the upper-hand over Khrushchev. This is indicated by the quotation in Source D which refers to Khrushchev (a reasonable number of candidates were familiar with this quotation), and by Khrushchev sweating in Source E. Some candidates attempted to argue that Kennedy has the upper hand in one cartoon but in the other the two leaders are shown as equal. This is not the case.

Question 5

Most candidates used the disagreement between Sources F and G to state that they were surprised by Source F. They explained that in Source F, Kennedy claims that the USA was in real danger, while Source G claims that the US had nothing to fear because of its overwhelmingly superior strength. Better responses were based on an understanding that to answer the question well, at least one of the sources needs to be evaluated. For example, it can be argued that Source F is not at all surprising because Kennedy wanted to alert Americans to the dangers posed by the missiles because he wanted their support for his actions. This means that even although it is possible to find disagreements between Sources F and G, these do not make F surprising. A reasonable number of candidates demonstrated this understanding and so provided strong responses. It is important that candidates make a clear statement about whether they are surprised or not. A number analysed the sources quite well but did not go on to reach a clear conclusion about the issue of surprise.

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 6

This question produced a range of responses. Some would have benefitted from keeping a focus on the hypothesis stated in this question. There was a tendency for candidates to write about the sources without using them to test the hypothesis. There was also a tendency to not make the best use of the sources, for example by using abbreviated quotations or by neglecting to focus on the crucial part of a source. The following is an example of an adequate use of a source for this question: 'Source F does not support the idea that the Crisis was about personal rivalry. This is because Kennedy is worried about the threat posed by the missiles of a nuclear strike against American cities. He is far more worried about this than any personal rivalry with Khrushchev.' Better responses tended to use the sources as directly and concisely as this, and others would have been improved by adopting a similar approach. Candidates found it easier to explain ways in which the sources supported the hypothesis. It should be noted that a reasonable number of candidates did provide good answers, although it was rare to see effective evaluation of the sources.

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates are required 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 reach conclusions.

General comments

A small range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41. Some candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E (China), Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study 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 supported judgements and conclusions, but many responses would have benefitted from a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote long narrative accounts of the topic or Depth Study in general instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1 much more widely answered, with only a small number of candidates attempting **Question 2**.

Question 1 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to focus on the requirements of the question and were very knowledgeable about the resistance Belgium put up in the initial stages of the German advance. Stronger answers explained how Belgian resistance was important in delaying the Schlieffen Plan and how it pushed Britain into joining the war. This was balanced by examining other factors such as the rapid Russian mobilisation, actions from the French military command, key battles at Mons, the Marne and Ypres, as well as the lack of effective tactics against the new weapons. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive rather than analytical, and often struggled to get to grips with the question, giving a narrative of the early stages of the war on the Western Front or going into too much detail about the origins of the Schlieffen Plan. A few responses strayed outside of the parameters of the question and examined post-1914 material such as the Battle of the Somme or even later, which lacked relevance. It is important not to go beyond the chronology set out in the question.

Question 2

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

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Question 3 and **Question 4** were both answered by many candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Many candidates were aware of the nature of informing in Nazi Germany and how it was used by the Gestapo and the SS police state to keep control of the civilian population by encouraging ordinary German citizens to spy and inform on their neighbours about anything they might consider anti-Nazi activity. Some of the stronger responses also pointed out that many children were also used by school and Hitler Youth leaders to inform on their parents if they grumbled about Hitler and the Nazi Party. This was then balanced by examining other important factors that allowed Hitler to control Germany after 1933 such as the Reichstag Fire decree, the Enabling Act and the banning of political parties and trade unions, the use of SA and SS violence, concentration camps, the Hitler Youth, propaganda and the extension of control over the different German churches. The best answers explained the relative importance of these factors and used good examples to support. Weaker responses tended to either give narratives of many aspects of Nazi Germany without explicitly linking it to control or became confused over the term 'informer'. A small number of candidates examined too much material pre-1933, with some extending the chronology of their answer back to the early Weimar Germany period and the beginnings of the Nazi Party, which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 4 saw some very strong responses, especially from candidates who had a wide and in-depth knowledge of how the Nazis dealt with the economic problems in Germany. The best responses focussed well on Schacht's New Plan and Goering's Four-Year Plan and the use of public works' schemes, rearmament, the reintroduction of conscription and the later striving for economic autarky. A few of the best responses also examined how the Nazis helped peasant farmers with the Reich Food Estate and provided workers with certain benefits through the Strength Through Joy and Beauty of Labour organisations. Balance was often provided by examining a plethora of alternative factors which were significant in strengthening Nazi rule between 1934 and 1939, such as the SS and police organisations, the Night of the Long Knives, the propaganda machine led by Goebbels, the Nazi policies imposed on young Germans, women and families and many others. There were some strong and convincing explanations provided by candidates, who measured the relative significance of the different factors and provided well-selected examples to support their conclusions. Less successful responses were, as in **Question 3**, often narratives of the whole Nazi period, with a few candidates examining the entire Weimar period. It is vital that candidates read the question carefully.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Several centres attempted this Depth Study. Only **Question 5** was attempted in any significant number.

Question 5 had some strong responses, although many answers could have been improved. A small number of candidates got to grips with the focus in the question and explained how important the Russo-Japanese War was in causing instability in Russia up to 1914. Many cited the socio-economic problems caused by the war and often included the Bloody Sunday incident as a direct consequence of this, explaining how this led to the increase in anti-tsarist feeling in the Russian population and the subsequent 1905 Revolution. This was then balanced by examining a range of other factors, including the nature of the autocracy, the peasant land issue, the authoritarian nature of Stolypin's premiership and the limits to the October Manifesto. Other responses would have been improved by much greater contextual knowledge and good supporting examples, and by explicitly assessing significance more in their answers.

Question 6

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

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular topic, with **Question 8** generating many more responses than **Question 7**.

Question 7 proved challenging for a number of candidates. Candidates, overall, appeared to see this question as a question on intolerance in general, as opposed to one specifically about why the Ku Klux Klan increased their popularity and membership in the USA in the 1920s. This led to many narrative and descriptive responses that lacked analysis and struggled to address relative importance. There were some stronger answers that demonstrated a good knowledge and understanding of the problems caused by increasing immigration in the early twentieth century, especially those that linked it to the competition for low

paid jobs, to organised crime and to corruption and the Red Scare. This was then balanced by examining how culturally embedded racism in the South and even increasing religious fundamentalism in the Bible Belt region also aided the growth of the Ku Klux Klan. A few also mentioned how the Ku Klux Klan used the modern media (making reference in particular to the film, 'The Birth of a Nation'), as well posters, pamphlets, radio broadcasts and parades to attract new members from across the social and political strata within the USA.

Question 8 was well answered by most candidates, with some exceptional responses seen this session. The very best answers were well-balanced, analytical and assessed the relative significance of the New Deal Alphabet Agencies in dealing with the problem of unemployment during the Depression compared to other factors, such as banking legislation (Emergency Banking Act) and social reform (Wagner Act and Social Security Act), as well as noting the limits placed on the agencies by opposition from both conservative (including the Supreme court) and radical groups and individuals. Explanations were often well-supported by detailed examples and statistics and this helped many candidates form strong arguments and reach convincing conclusions and judgements. Many of the best answers pointed out that unemployment was not really solved until the outbreak of the Second World War in Europe and went on to judge the significance of the agencies against this event in their concluding paragraphs. A few, less successful responses, confused what did and did not count as an Alphabet Agency, regularly including all of the New Deal reforms in their definition of agencies.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c. 1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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