www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 1

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions carefully before they begin their responses, in order to understand exactly what is being asked and to ensure that only relevant information is included. They should carefully note the particular focus of any given question and structure their answers accordingly.

Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to ensure that responses only include knowledge within the time span of the question.

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

General comments

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

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

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

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

Part (a) responses require recall and description. There is no need for background information. Explanation is not required. Most candidates realised that responses to **(a)** questions can be short and concise. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

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

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should avoid repeating points already made in the essay and should try to explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions just asserted 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other. Less

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

successful responses often focussed only on one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was the most popular question in the Core Section.

(a) This question was well answered and most candidates had some understanding of what happened to the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the Treaty of Saint-Germain. Strong responses tended to identify four terms of the Treaty, such as 'The Austro-Hungarian Empire was broken up', 'The Treaty dealt with Austria', 'Austria had to pay reparations' and 'The union between Austria and Germany was forbidden'. Credit was also gained for identifying countries which were made independent, for example Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and for identifying territory transferred from the Austro-Hungarian Empire to other countries, such as Southern Tyrol to Italy. A small number of candidates thought the Treaty dealt with Hungary or Germany. Sone candidates wrote that 'Germany was not allowed to re-unite with Germany' which was incorrect. Some weaker responses made very general statements such as 'they lost a lot of land'. It is important to include specific and relevant points in responses.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most responses identified reasons why President Wilson was such an important figure in the peace negotiations, such as 'He wanted just and fair treaties which would lead to peace', 'He was one of the Big Three', 'He presented the Fourteen Points' and 'He wanted The League of Nations set up'. Strong responses developed these identifications into explanations, for example, 'Wilson was important because he wanted just and fair treaties which would lead to future peace and, therefore, he acted as a mediator between Lloyd George and Clemenceau and tried to moderate, in particular Clemenceau's tough demands on Germany so that Germany would not want revenge in the future.' A second commonly explained reason was that 'Wilson proposed that the League of Nations should be part of all the peace treaties so that the treaties could be enforced and peace maintained, at the same time as trying to organise agencies to improve health, enable help for refugees and eradicate drug addiction and child labour.' Other responses sometimes lost focus of the question and in addition to identifying the aims of Wilson also included the reasons behind the aims of both Lloyd George and Clemenceau, rather than explaining Wilson's importance at the peace negotiations.

(c) Most responses were able to demonstrate some understanding why they were not surprised that Germany was so upset at the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. They were less confident in choosing evidence to show their surprise. The strongest responses were well organised and produced a balanced answer by explaining why the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were upsetting for Germany and then, on the other side of the argument, why they were surprised that the terms upset the Germans. The best responses identified a particular term and then explained why the Germans were upset. For example, responses often identified the reduction of the German armed forces as a cause of upset. They then developed this point by including details of the size of the army and navy and details of the elements of the forces which were banned. This led to comments such as 'This was a great blow to the Germans as they had great pride in their armed forces and, with these reductions, they now hadn't enough forces to defend themselves'. Other explained reasons for not being surprised that Germany was upset included the War Guilt Clause, territorial losses and the enormous reparations Germany had to pay. To balance the argument, strong responses put forward reasons why they were surprised that the Germans were so upset. The most common reason used was that they should not have been so upset because of the treatment the Germans gave to the Russians in the Treaty of Brest -Litovsk, the terms of which were much more severe than the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The strongest responses included some of the terms and the implications to the Russians in their explanation. Less successful responses often demonstrated detailed knowledge of the terms of the Versailles Treaty but without any explanation of why they caused upset. For example, 'The Germans were upset because they had

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

to pay reparations'. This statement could have been improved by including details of why they did not like reparations, including that they had to pay high reparations but the loss of Alsace Lorraine and the temporary loss of the Saar Basin, which both included valuable iron ore deposits and rich coal mines, made the repayment of reparations very difficult.

Question 6

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Most responses gained some credit for including the failure of the 1932 Disarmament Conference and Hitler's unwillingness to disarm unless the other countries did too. Strong responses identified other attempts made by the League of Nations to encourage disarmament. They included specific events such as the 1921 Washington Conference at which major powers agreed to limit the size of their navies. Credit was also awarded for details of the 1932 Disarmament Conference, at which they agreed to limit the size of artillery and tanks, to ban the bombing of civilian populations and chemical warfare. Weaker responses were often very brief and included vague, unsupported points on disarmament.

(b) Many responses were able to pinpoint reasons why Japan withdrew from the League of Nations in 1933. The most commonly cited reasons were the Japanese disappointment with the Lytton Commission Report and the expansionist ambitions of Japan to further invade China. Strong responses explained that Japan had invaded Manchuria looking for more resources and markets for its manufactured goods. China had appealed to the League of Nations and the Lytton Commission was sent by the League to investigate the Japanese invasion. Its report criticised Japan for the invasion and in 1933 the League supported the report. This upset Japan and as the army leaders were dictating Japanese politics, they left the League and proceeded with their invasion. Some responses included too much background information and detail on why Japan invaded Manchuria and also details on why the League did not take any action against Japan, which lacked relevance. It is Important to ascertain the focus of the question before beginning a response.

(c) There were some strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the Italian invasion of Abyssinia and were able to explain how far Britain was responsible for the league's failure to effectively deal with the invasion. They examined Britain's motives in not wanting to annoy Italy, explaining that Britain wanted to be on good terms with Italy in order to have an ally against the growing threat of Germany, therefore they did not close the Suez Canal, an important supply route for Italy. Britain was also reluctant to impose sanctions because of the damage they would do to the British economy. Strong responses produced a balanced argument by linking other factors to the League's failure over Abyssinia. These commonly included an explanation of both France and Britain's role in the secret Hoare-Laval Pact and how the reputation of the League was destroyed as a result of the Pact. The absence of the USA was highlighted as a reason for failure, as the USA continued to supply the Italians with oil and even increased supplies after the Hoare-Laval Pact. Weaker responses, although often secure on the role Britain played in the League's failure to deal effectively with the invasion, were often not as focussed on the other reasons for failure. These responses tended to list general reasons for failure of the League of Nations, with no specific reference to the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. Other responses spent much time explaining the background to the Italian invasion of Abyssinia, especially discussing why they invaded, which lacked relevance to this question. A small number of candidates confused the chronology of the invasion.

Question 7

(a) This response was well answered and most candidates had a good understanding of the Allies reaction to the Berlin Blockade. They gained credit for relevant reactions such as, 'They airlifted supplies into Berlin', 'Planes flew into West Berlin every few minutes' and 'The Allies would not give in'. Marks were awarded for the type of supplies which were flown in, including food, coal, petrol, clothing, medical and building supplies. The focus of this question was on the reaction of the Allies to the Berlin Blockade and did not require lengthy descriptions of how Berlin was divided and why Stalin blockaded Berlin.

(b) Strong responses to this question explained two reasons why there were disagreements between the Soviet Union and the West at the Potsdam Conference. Most candidates highlighted the different personalities attending the conference as a reason for disagreement. They explained that Stalin was the only survivor of Yalta and that Truman had replaced Roosevelt, while Atlee replaced Churchill. There was tension because Truman was very anti-communist and did not trust Stalin. To develop a good explanation, responses explained why Truman and Stalin disagreed with each

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

other throughout the conference, such as Stalin wanted to weaken Germany by imposing massive reparations so that it could never threaten Russia. Truman did not want to be so harsh in order to avoid the sorts of problems which arose after the First World War with the Treaty of Versailles. A second reason explained by some candidates was that both Truman and Atlee disagreed with Stalin in his interpretation of Russian influence in Eastern Europe because Stalin had left his armies in Eastern Europe when the Nazis had been removed, which was against the agreement made at Yalta. Weaker responses lacked supporting detail, and although they often identified the different personalities of Stalin and Truman, they did not use any specific issue to highlight their disagreement.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, 'How surprising was the USSR's rejection of the Marshall Plan?' Candidates were more confident explaining why the USSR's rejection was not surprising than they were on the explaining their surprise at the rejection of Marshall Aid by the USSR. Some responses were one-sided and did not produce any evidence to support the view that their rejection was surprising. Most responses demonstrated good understanding of the Marshall Plan and described the key points. Weaker responses did not develop the key points of the Plan to explain why they were not surprised that Stalin rejected the Plan. Strong responses explained that Stalin was suspicious of the Plan because it seemed like the Americans were trying to gain economic control over Europe by making European states dependent on America and its dollar. A common explanation was that Stalin knew that the Marshall Aid was part of the USA's policy of containment and was designed to prevent countries falling to communism. He felt that if he accepted the Plan, he would lose control over Eastern Europe and Communism would be under threat. On the other side of the argument strong responses also expressed their surprise by explaining that after World War II the USSR was in a terrible state and needed some help. The money would have created much needed investment, particularly in the infrastructure of the USSR and Eastern European States.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

(a) This question was well answered and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the main features of the Weimar Constitution. Many identified four features, such as 'The Reichstag was elected every four years', 'The Reichstag was elected by proportional representation', 'Both men and women could vote' and 'There was an elected President'. Responses also gained credit for highlighting that proportional representation would mean governments would be coalitions and that extremists parties could become elected. Successful responses also referred to Article 48, when the President could suspend the constitution and rule by decree, which could give him dictatorial powers. A small number of responses confused the Weimar Constitution with the Weimar Republic and wrote about the challenges facing the Republic, which lacked relevance.

(b) Most candidates demonstrated a very good understanding of why Stresemann's policies were important to Germany. Stresemann's economic and foreign policies were most commonly identified as two important policies for Germany. Strong responses explained that Stresemann's economic policies helped Germany to recover from the hyperinflation which had occurred as a result of the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr. His actions included ending passive resistance in the Ruhr, calling in the old currency which had become worthless and replacing it with a new currency called the Rentenmark. Candidates used features of the Locarno Treaties and Germany being allowed to join the League of Nations as examples of how he managed to get Germany accepted as an equal internationally. The cultural advances made under his leadership were also used as an example of an important policy. Some strong responses referred to the 'double-edged sword' of the Dawes Plan of 1924 whereby Stresemann negotiated to receive American loans which helped to

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

sort out Germany's economic chaos and meant that by 1928 Germany finally achieved the same levels of production as before the First World War. The downside was the economic boom in West Germany was precarious as the US loans could be called in at short notice which would cause ruin to Germany. Some weaker responses contained much background information on why French and Belgian troops occupied the Ruhr.

(c) There were some strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the threat to the Weimar Republic from both Wolfgang Kapp and Rosa Luxemburg. Wolfgang Kapp was considered by some to be the major threat because he was supported by the Freikorps, who were ex-soldiers disillusioned with the Weimar politicians because of the signing of the Versailles Treaty. They knew how to fight and had helped Ebert put down the Spartacist rebellion in January 1919. As the army refused to fire on the Freikorps it looked as if Ebert's government was doomed. However, the threat was lessened as the Republic was saved by the German workers, who declared a General Strike in Berlin which brought the capital to a halt, with no transport, power or water. The fact that he took over Berlin in 1920, declared himself Chancellor and forced the Weimar Government to move to Dresden was often developed into a second explanation. On the other side of the argument, the activities of Rosa Luxemburg were familiar to many. Detailed explanations included that she was the communist leader of the Spartacists who wanted to overthrow the government and set up communist-style soviets all over Germany, just like Russia had done in 1917. These changes would have destroyed the Weimar Republic. A second explanation often included that the uprising, which involved strikes and violence, triggered other uprisings in Bavaria and many suggested that she was more of a threat because even though the Spartacists were put down by the Freikorps, communism remained a powerful anti-government force in the early 1920s. The most successful responses included at least two explanations on both sides of the argument. Some weaker responses drifted from the question and included other opposition to the Weimar Republic, most often the Munich Putsch, which was not relevant to this question. A small number confused the left and right-wing groups and included incorrect description.

Question 12

(a) Some candidates were unfamiliar with the term 'war economy' and wrote generally about Hitler's economic policies, with no link to war. Other responses gained some credit for identifying the increase in military production and the idea of preparing for a future war. Strong responses made reference to specific features such as self-sufficiency or autarky and the introduction of the 1936 Four-Year Plan to get the economy ready for war. Credit was also given for women being drafted in to replace men who had gone to war and Germany taking raw materials and goods from conquered countries.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses alluded to the general activities of the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates but they found it more difficult to pinpoint why the opposition to the Nazi regime from young people increased after the start of the Second World War. Strong responses used the changes in the Hitler Youth from 1939 to explain increased opposition from young people. They explained that from 1939 membership of the Hitler Youth became compulsory and, with their usual group leaders being conscripted, the replacement leaders were much harsher. The rules and regulations of the Hitler Youth were enforced more strictly and they focussed increasingly on the war effort and military drill, which young people disliked. Other reasons identified and explained included the opposition of young people to the war and that they were also against the increasing persecution of the Jews.

(c) There were some good responses to this question. These responses were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. To achieve a very successful response, candidates needed to produce a balanced answer by challenging the hypothesis 'There was little consistency in Nazi attitudes towards women in the period 1933-45'. The strongest responses stated clearly what Nazi attitudes were towards women, usually including that Hitler had a very traditional view of the role of the German woman as wife and mother. Most candidates had a good understanding of these Nazi attitudes towards women, including encouraging women to give up their jobs, stay at home, get married and have lots of children. They supported their arguments with the reasoning behind Nazi attitudes, most commonly that Hitler wanted to increase the birth rate to provide more men for the armed forces. Strong responses explained that these attitudes came under pressure when the war started as women were now encouraged to go back to work to take the place of the men who had been conscripted to war. They emphasised that this was an 'about turn' in Nazi policy and it was inconsistent with pre-war policy. Nazi policies had now become contradictory. The

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

best responses tended to conclude that despite the change in policy throughout his time as Fuhrer, Hitler's objective of women having lots of children to increase the birth rate remained constant. The only difference was after 1939 they had to work as well.

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

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

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 2

Key messages

Candidates should try to work out what the answer is going to be before they start to write it. This will enable them to directly address the question in the opening sentence, for example, 'This source was published then because'.

All of the questions are about the sources. Answers must also be about the sources. Candidates should only write about the events of the time if this helps them to interpret, evaluate or use the sources.

Candidates need to answer the question set. If asked why a source was published, they need to explain a reason why it was published and not just write about the source. If you asked about usefulness, candidates should ensure they use what they are writing to support a judgement about usefulness.

When asked to compare sources, candidates should look to try to compare them point by point, rather than describing or summarising each source separately.

It is usually important to consider the provenance of a source, but this needs to be used in conjunction with what the source says.

When a cartoon has to be considered, candidates need to think about the point of view of the cartoonist.

When answering **Question 6**, the sources must be used.

When a quotation from a source is given, candidates should avoid leaving out parts of the quotation by using ellipses. Quotations need to be given in full to ensure that they are properly supporting the argument being made in your answer.

General comments

Almost all the candidates answered the questions on the twentieth century option. There were few examples of candidates unable to complete all the questions or unable to understand the sources. There was a very small number of very weak scripts. There was a small number of very strong scripts. Most scripts showed solid performance, with candidates able to interpret and compare sources well. Attempts at evaluation could have been improved, and some candidates struggled to recognise where evaluation was required. Candidates understood the messages of the cartoons but found it more challenging to explain the points of view of the cartoonists. In **Question 5**, many candidates missed that judgements about usefulness needed to be based on some evaluation of the source. There were many good answers to **Question 6**, but some candidates would have benefited from making proper use of the sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well by many candidates. The best answers made a point-by-point comparison of the two sources. Agreements included Stalin being cautious about an alliance with Britain, and an agreement between Germany and the Soviet Union being reached in August. Disagreements included, Chamberlain not considering the Soviets as suitable allies in Source A, but seeking an agreement with them in Source B. The few weak answers seen summarised each source in turn and did not make any proper matchings. The following is an example of how to make a matching: 'They disagree over the response of the Soviet people to the Pact. Source A claims they were shocked, but Source B says they were relieved.'

Question 2

This question is about purpose – what was the purpose of publishing this cartoon in June 1939? Many candidates did not get as far as writing about the intended impact on the audience, but instead explained either the context or the message of the cartoon. These are reasonable ways of responding to the question, as long as context or message is being explained as a reason for publication. A sensible approach adopted by some candidates was to suggest that the cartoon was published at that time (late June) because of the situation then, for example, by this time Stalin had given up any hope of an agreement with Britain and was seriously considering an agreement with Germany. Another legitimate approach was to argue that the cartoon was published to convey a message, for example, a warning to Britain that if it does not conclude an agreement with the Soviets, Germany will, and this will a danger to Britain. The best answers dealt with purpose more satisfactorily. They explained a valid impact that the cartoon was designed to have on its audience. Most of these answers were based on the reasonable assumption that the audience was the British government or the British people, and that the cartoon was designed either to persuade the government to go ahead with an alliance with the Soviets or to persuade the British public to pressure the government to make such an agreement. Some candidates explained the context or the message of the cartoon but did not use it as a reason for publication. It is important that candidates directly address the issue of why the cartoon was published. Many candidates ensured that they did this by starting their answers as follows: 'I think this source was published because'. Most candidates were able to understand the cartoon, although a few thought it was praising Germany.

Question 3

Nearly all candidates realised that both sources are from Chamberlain. Most candidates were able to compare Sources D and E to find agreements and disagreements. Both sources suggest that Poland and Romania were suspicious of the Soviet Union. However, the disagreements are more important – in Source D, Chamberlain expresses mistrust of the Soviets, doubts their effectiveness and does not want an alliance with them, while in Source E he denies he does not trust them, says they are powerful and that he wants an alliance. Candidates needed to use an agreement and/or disagreements as an example of Chamberlain not lying or lying, rather than just explaining an agreement or disagreement. They must be used to support the view that Chamberlain was or was not lying. The best answers compared the two sources and then evaluated at least Source E to argue that he was lying. Some candidates missed what the sources said and compared their provenances. They argued that Chamberlain was telling the truth in Source D because it was a private letter, while he was lying in Source E because it was a speech in Parliament. This, by itself, is not enough and responses would have been improved by using the content of the sources to help construct a contextual explanation.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to understand and explain sub-messages of the two sources, for example, Germany and the Soviet Union are allies, and together, they threaten Poland. The question asks candidates to compare the two sources, but some candidates wrote about them separately and did not compare. A reasonable number of candidates realised that although the cartoons do contain similar messages, they also disagree about one important point – the relationship between Germany and the Soviet Union. These candidates wrote good answers by explaining both the similarities in messages but also the qualification about the relationship. The best answers were from candidates who compared the points of view of the two cartoonists – they are both critical of Germany and the Soviet Union, or the Pact, for threatening Poland. There were few misunderstandings of the cartoons, although some candidates missed the real attitudes of Germany and the Soviets towards each other.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 5

This question proved to be challenging for a number of candidates. Some candidates wrote about what Source H said but neglected to say anything about usefulness. Many other responses did address the issue of usefulness but uncritically accepted what Churchill said in Source H. They argued that the source is useful because of what Churchill claims. However, better answers demonstrated understanding that the source's usefulness depends on an evaluation of its claims. They used their contextual knowledge or other sources to check Churchill's claims. The best answers used their knowledge and understanding of Churchill to explain his possible purpose in writing Source H.

Question 6

There were many good answers to this question. Candidates were able to explain how some of the sources supported the hypothesis that Chamberlain was to blame for Stalin making a Pact with Germany, and some did not. It is important that candidates provide explanations that use the content of the sources. Assertions such as, 'Source C shows that Chamberlain was to blame for the Nazi-Soviet Pact', are not enough. However, the following would be acceptable: 'Source C supports the idea that Chamberlain was to blame for the Pact because it shows the German government waiting to sign an agreement with the Soviets.' The cartoon is suggesting that Germany will be given this chance by the British government not being keen on an agreement. This is suggested by the caption, 'If the British don't, maybe we will.' Candidates should also be careful to make clear which side of the argument the sources are on. Some candidates provided good interpretations and explanations of the sources but need to go further and state how these related to the hypothesis. It is a good idea to list which sources are on each side of the debate at the beginning of the answer, and to reinforce this when explaining each source individually. A small number of candidates either did not use the sources in their answers to this question or did not make proper use of them. It is important that candidates realise that this question, like all the other questions, is about the sources.

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

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

© 2023

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 narrow range of Depth Studies was undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41. There were also a number of responses to 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 answers with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions and a small number managed to provide 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 often wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to large 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

Both **Question 1** and **Question 2** produced responses. **Question 1** was answered by more candidates.

Question 1 was well answered by some candidates. The strongest responses were able to examine the importance of the use of poison gas as an aspect of trench warfare on the Western Front and balance this factor against other relevant factors, such as alternative weapons like the machine gun and artillery, and the conditions inside the trenches for the soldiers. Responses tended to have a good knowledge and understanding of poison gas weapons such as chlorine, phosgene and mustard gas, as well as other weapons used in trench warfare. However, some responses focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the weapons themselves, rather than the importance they had as an aspect of trench warfare, which resulted in descriptive narratives, rather than explanations and assessment.

Question 2 saw a small number of strong responses that were able to give some detail of the significance of the Gallipoli campaign of 1915 on the course of the war. These responses mainly examined the overall failure of the campaign for the Allies, the impact the war had on British and Commonwealth troop morale and the campaign's failure to aid Russia on the Eastern Front. This was then balanced against other events that significantly impacted the course of the war such as the Battles of the Somme and Verdun, the Ludendorff Offensive, US entry into the war and the impact of the British Blockade of German ports. Other responses consisted of detailed knowledge and narratives of the aims and events of the Gallipoli campaign in general. These answers would have been improved by linking the impact it had to the course of the war in order to fully address the question.

© 2023

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

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

Question 3 was generally well answered by candidates, and it was the most popular of the two questions available for this Depth Study. Candidates tended to have a very comprehensive knowledge of the importance of Stresemann's foreign policy achievements and how they helped to stabilise Weimar Germany between 1923 and 1929. Most commonly cited were the Dawes Plan, the Locarno treaties and the Young Plan. This was then balanced against other factors that led to stability, such as Stresemann's domestic policies, including the introduction of the Rentenmark and calling off passive resistance in the Ruhr, the stabilising effect of Weimar Germany's cultural revival and the election of President Hindenburg. The best responses gave convincing explanations of why each factor was important in stabilising the Republic, with many candidates able to make valid links and connections between the different factors and reach supported conclusions. Less successful responses would have benefited from greater depth and range in the examples provided. They tended to use more generalised and vague assertions in their arguments. A small number of candidates mistook Stresemann as President Ebert's successor in the office of Chancellor and, more commonly, asserted that Stresemann was personally responsible for the introduction of the new freedoms and liberties in Weimar Germany that led to the cultural revival experienced for many German citizens, particularly in the cities.

Question 4 was also generally well answered by candidates. The best responses had a good, detailed knowledge of the details of the Nuremberg Laws, which included the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour, which banned marriages and sexual relations between 'Aryan Germans' and Jews, and the Reich Citizenship Law, which declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens. This was then balanced against other factors that were significant in the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews, such as anti-Semitic propaganda, including within the education system and youth movements, the boycotting of Jewish shops, the Night of Broken Glass and the Wannsee Conference and the Final Solution. Many answers contained a good depth and range of detail and used well-selected examples to support arguments and explanations to reach valid conclusions. Less successful responses fell short of specifically assessing significance explicitly. Some responses lacked specific knowledge of the Nuremberg Laws. Some also lost focus on the question of the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews and examined methods of control in Nazi Germany instead.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

A number of candidates responded to this Depth Study. **Question 5** was more popular, with **Question 6** receiving too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Question 5 was well answered by some candidates. Others found it challenging to assess how the event of Bloody Sunday changed the nature of Tsarist rule and, instead, focused on the 1905 Revolution partially born out of it. A small number of good responses were able to make valid comments on how the Bloody Sunday incident led to feelings of resentment towards the Tsar and the Romanov dynasty, and then link this with the spontaneous outbursts of strikes and riots across Russia in 1905, which ultimately led to the October Manifesto and the introduction of limited democracy in Russia for the first time. This was sometimes convincingly counter-argued by assessing how the Tsar used the Fundamental Laws to retain a large degree of power and control over the Duma, as well as his appointment of Stolypin as his Prime Minister to repress opposition. A small number of candidates also examined the importance of the Russo-Japanese War and the socio-economic impact it had on Russia and its population, including its military. Many responses lacked detail and were sometimes vague in the arguments provided, which resulted in very limited arguments overall.

Question 6 produced too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular Depth Study, with **Question 7** providing more responses than **Question 8**.

Question 7 saw some very strong responses, which demonstrated a breadth and depth of knowledge on the topic of the Roaring Twenties. Candidates' knowledge and understanding of the importance of the Jazz Age in the USA in the 1920s was often very detailed, with strong examples being cited in explanations of how it impacted society. This commonly included references to the flapper subculture which emerged, the new dances and trends jazz music gave birth to, as well as the increased exposure of black American culture and

© 2023

www.dynamicpapers.com

musicians to young, white, urban Americans in particular. This was then balanced against other important aspects of the Roaring Twenties such as the impact of Prohibition, the changing experiences of women, the intolerance faced by many American ethnic and religious minorities and the effects the motor car had on society. Some candidates would have benefited from less of a focus on the causes of the economic boom in parts of their answer and more on the social aspects that specifically defined the Roaring Twenties.

Question 8 saw some strong responses that were able to provide excellent details on the alphabet agencies and New Deal legislation that was introduced by Roosevelt to improve the lives of the workers during the Depression. Candidates were able to give full descriptions of the work of the NRA and list the provisions of both the Wagner Act and Social Security Act, and then explain how these New Deal reforms were aimed at improving living and working conditions for many American workers. This was then balanced against other aims of the New Deal, most significantly how the New Deal aimed to help farmers, the banking system and the unemployed. Many candidate answers gave a good range of exemplar agencies such as the AAA, WPA, PWA and TVA in their explanations and the most convincing conclusions were reached by candidates that assessed the relative significance of the varying aims of the New Deal through a comparative analysis. A small number of responses demonstrated confusion about the details of the various agencies and legislation of the New Deal, which resulted some errors and inaccuracies. The weakest answers gave only a narrative overview of the whole New Deal era, rather than assessing its significance for the various different groups it was aimed at helping.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

© 2023