HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Structured Questions

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question and structure their responses accordingly.

Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted so that responses only include details within the time span of the question.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in full sentences. In the more extensive responses of **parts (b)** and **(c)** candidates should organise their ideas into distinct paragraphs. This should help to avoid points being mixed together and maintain the focus on the question set.

In p**art (c)**, the best responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond stating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important' or 'how successful', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

There were many strong responses, which reflected sound understanding and good knowledge in both the Core and Depth Studies. These responses included a wealth of factual detail and 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.

There were very few rubric errors, and most candidates used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper. Candidates were able to put their knowledge to good use when answering the **part (a)** questions, where there is no need for background information, explanation is not required and many answered in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

Most **part (b)** questions ask 'Why' something happened or was important. The strongest responses identified and explained the reasons using supporting contextual detail, rather than giving a description of what happened**.** These strong responses were well-organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Some weaker responses included narratives about the topic, without addressing the question.

Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply 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. Other weaker responses included incorrect factual details. A few of the weaker responses were brief and generalised with little supporting, relevant factual detail.

There were many good quality responses to **part (c)** questions. The most effective responses applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or including information which was not relevant. These strong responses included explanations both for and against the focus of the question and reached a balanced judgement. A valid judgement 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. Weaker responses to **part (c)** often provided well organised explanations but only on one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including relevant explanations, supported with contextual examples on both sides of the argument, in order to produce a balanced response. Other less successful responses included narratives about the topic, with no addressing the question.

© 2025

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 of the Core Content questions.

(a) This question was well answered, and many candidates were able to identify four relevant points relating to Wilson's aims at Versailles. These included his wish for a moderate treaty and for his Fourteen Points to be used as the basis of the peace settlement. Any single point of the Fourteen points was acceptable, including his wish to establish the League of Nations and for all countries to disarm. Some candidates spent time on 'setting the scene', by describing who was at the meeting and explaining the aims of Clemenceau and Lloyd George, in addition to those of Wilson. It is important to keep responses relevant to the question.

(b) Strong responses to this question identified Clemenceau's aims at Versailles and then explained his disappointment by linking them to the terms of the Treaty. Many were able to explain two reasons for his disappointment. One common argument was that he was disappointed that he did not achieve his aim of making France secure against future threats from Germany by making the Rhineland an independent state. This did not happen as he had to compromise with Wilson and Lloyd George, and the Rhineland was only demilitarised. Other examples developed were Clemenceau's disappointment with the military terms and the size of the reparations. Weaker responses were characterised by identification of his aims and explanation of why he wanted these aims, but they neglected to make any link to the terms of the Treaty to explain his disappointment. A few responses confused Clemenceau with Lloyd George.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. The strongest responses were secure in their knowledge and understanding of Lloyd George's aims and were then able to link them to a specific term from the Treaty of Versailles to explain if Lloyd George got what he wanted from the negotiations. For example: 'Lloyd George aimed to safeguard British naval dominance and remove the threat from the German navy. Prior to the First World War, Germany had been challenging Britain's position by increasing their navy, especially with the building of dreadnoughts. Lloyd George's aim was achieved because the Treaty of Versailles severely restricted the German navy, conscription to the German navy was banned, submarines were forbidden, destroyers were limited to 12 and only six battleships could be built.' Another common argument included to demonstrate Lloyd George's satisfaction with the Treaty was his wish to acquire German colonies which would benefit and extend the British Empire. This was achieved when he received German colonies in Africa. In order to produce a balanced argument, strong responses also explained why he did not get what he wanted. For example: 'Lloyd George was not pleased by some features of the Treaty because he believed in self-determination in Europe and he was not pleased that Germans in Alsace-Lorraine would come under French rule and the Germans in Danzig would come under Polish rule.' Many responses also mentioned his position between the British public, who wanted a harsh treaty, and his own leaning towards a more moderate treaty, so as not to cause another war, and his desire to maintain trade links with Germany. The best responses included at least one explanation from each side of the argument and came to a valid judgement on 'how far'. They came to the conclusion that Lloyd George achieved most of what he wanted because the British Empire was strengthened and naval supremacy retained, reparations were not as harsh as they could have been and although trade was not as strong as it had been before the war, trading links were still maintained. Others used the point that the British Parliament had voted overwhelmingly to approve the Treaty and generally the British people were happy that Germany had been punished. Less assured responses spent an overly long time on identifying the aims of Lloyd George and why he wanted these aims without linking them to a term in the Treaty to explain whether he achieved what he wanted or not.

Question 6

This was also a very popular question among those in the Core Content.

© 2025

(a) This question was well answered, with many candidates being very familiar with how the League worked to improve public health. They mentioned the Health Committee and its work on diseases, sometimes identifying diseases, for example malaria and yellow fever. Most candidates' knowledge was strong, with many identifying research work, public education and cooperation with the Red Cross. The work of the ILO in outlawing the use of white lead in paint was also rewarded. Some candidates included information about other humanitarian agencies of the League (notably the Refugee Committee), but this fell outside the scope of the question.

(b) Many candidates could identify some of the reasons why the League failed to introduce sanctions when Japan invaded Manchuria. Few were able to turn these into fully fledged explanations, but some managed to explain or one reason. More of a clear link with contextual detail would have benefited candidates' responses here. For example, many candidates were able to identify that the USA not being a member of the League was a factor, and most also knew that the League took a long time to report on the issue. However, explanations as to how these factors were linked to the failure to impose sanctions were often missing. Strong responses were able to explain that it was pointless introducing sanctions on Japan as the USA had very important trade links with Japan in both imports and exports and, as they were not members of the League, could just carry on trading with Japan, making any sanctions the League may want to introduce ineffective. A number of candidates assumed that China was a communist country, which meant that the League felt Japanese action was justified, whereas China did not become communist until 1949.

(c) This question produced a number of different responses. Many candidates struggled to make more than one explained or unexplained point on the French desire to maintain Italian friendship as a reason for the failure of the League over Abyssinia. The strongest responses were able to explain that Italian friendship mattered to France (and Britain) because France wanted Italy as a potential ally against Germany in the wake of Hitler's rearmament and the setting up of the Stresa Front. Consequently, France (and Britain) only imposed limited sanctions on Italy, the Suez Canal was kept open, and the Hoare-Laval Pact was agreed and each factor contributed to the failure of the League over Abyssinia. Some Weaker responses were limited to saying that France was dependent on Italy as a trading partner. Most candidates were more confident in explaining general factors that were not central to France's concerns. These included, the impact of the Great Depression, the absence of the USA, the lack of a League army and the League's inability to make quick decisions. Weaker responses did not always make direct and clear links of these factors to the failure of the League over Abyssinia. Other less successful responses asserted that because the League had failed before (Vilna, Corfu, Manchuria), then it was also bound to fail over Abyssinia.

Question 7

(a) This question was well answered, and credit was given to the agreements reached at Yalta which were reaffirmed at Potsdam, especially regarding the zones of occupation and the denazification of Germany. Candidates were also able to demonstrate knowledge of the agreement on the Polish/German border, reparations and the establishment of the Council of Foreign Ministers. Weaker responses often included detail on the change in leaders between Yalta and Potsdam, which was not the focus of the question and gained no credit.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. Many candidates were able to identify at least one reason why the Warsaw Pact was established in 1955 but were less successful in developing these identifications into an explanation. Most responses recognised that the Warsaw Pact was created in response to the creation of NATO in 1949 and the joining of West Germany in May 1955 but did not explain why the creation of NATO threatened communist countries, which meant that they would need the collective security offered by the Warsaw Pact. Strong responses were able to explain this and also develop a second explanation around the idea that the Warsaw Pact would mean that the Soviet Union could have control over the armed forces of Eastern European states and ensure that they remained loyal to the USSR. A few candidates demonstrated no knowledge of the Warsaw Pact, with others attributing it to Stalin, who died in 1953.

(c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question in which candidates were secure in their knowledge on the causes of the outbreak of the Cold War. The difference in ideologies was well understood by many, who were able to demonstrate a good appreciation of the main features of capitalism and communism, and show how the desire of both the USA and USSR to spread their ideology led to increased tension between the two of them. It was also considered that Truman took a much tougher line than Roosevelt had done towards Stalin and this increased

© 2025

the rivalry and tension between the two men. The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan were often used as evidence to show how the USA tried to stop communist expansion, increasing tension with Stalin and the USSR. Strong responses tended to be balanced by explaining other causes for the outbreak of the Cold War, most commonly including how Stalin had broken the agreements made at Yalta. Strong responses included the actions of Stalin in Poland to explain that, despite having promised at the Yalta Conference to guarantee free elections in Poland, this had not happened. Rather than hold elections, Soviet troops arrested and murdered Polish politicians who were not Communist. Questions began to be raised by the USA on the motives of Stalin, leading to distrust and tension, escalating into the Cold War. The development of the atomic bomb by the USA and the break-up of wartime alliances were also used to demonstrate the building tension between the USA and USSR. Less successful responses tended to be more confident when explaining the role of the difference in ideologies than they were on the other causes of the Cold War, where they tended just to identify reasons without any explanation. Some responses would have been improved by providing sufficient focus to the outbreak of the Cold War, rather than moving on to describe events, for example in Korea, Cuba and Vietnam.

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. Responses demonstrated a very good understating of the Munich Putsch and candidates often included several relevant facts, such as: it took place in 1923; it was led by Hitler; it was an attempt to overthrow the Weimar Republic; it ended in failure and led to Hitler's imprisonment.

(b) The majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of why the world economic depression was important for the Nazis and clear links between the rise in unemployment and support for Hitler were frequently made. The strongest responses compared the performance of the Nazis in the elections of 1928 and 1930 and explained how Hitler benefited from the rise in support for the KPD (triggering support for the Nazis among some fearful business leaders) and showed how a desperate German population rapidly became disillusioned with the Weimar politicians. Hitler's oratory and Nazi propaganda were frequently identified as important, with the strongest responses explaining the impact of these. Weaker responses conflated Germany's economic woes during the world economic depression with those of 1922-24, emphasising problems caused by hyperinflation (for example, loss of savings). Others included details of how Hitler rose to power but neglected to mention the world depression and/or included information on the political deal through which Hitler became Chancellor in January 1933, which lacked relevance to this question.

(c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question in which candidates were able to demonstrate which was more effective to Hitler's consolidation of power: the Enabling Act or the Night of Long Knives. The Enabling Act was well understood by many candidates who were able to show a good appreciation of how the Act was important to Hitler because it allowed him to pass laws without going through the Reichstag, giving Hitler the ability to rule as a 'legal dictator'. The banning of political parties to create a one-party state and the destruction of the trade unions were highlighted as other important consequences of the Act, enabling Hitler to consolidate his power. Weaker responses on this side of the argument sometimes featured a lack of clarity about the events of early 1933, with a number of candidates confusing the Enabling Act with the Reichstag Fire Decree. Strong responses produced a balanced answer by explaining how he removed the threat of the SA in the Night of Long Knives and thus gained the support of the army, which was necessary for him to remain in control. These responses explained why Rohm was a threat to Hitler's position and why there was a need to keep the army on his side. In weaker responses, a

© 2025

number of candidates identified the fact that Hitler's action removed Rohm as a rival but did not go on to explain the danger presented by Rohm or the need for Hitler to keep the army on his side. Some less successful responses confused the SA with the SS in the events starting in late June 1934. The best responses produced at least one explanation on each side of the argument and used their contextual knowledge to support a valid judgement on 'how far'. There were differences of opinion as to whether the Enabling Act or the Night of Long Knives was more important, but many used the point that despite the terms of the Enabling Act and everything that Hitler had achieved by 1934, he was still not secure. To be secure he needed to win the support of the army, but the SA was about four million strong and, under Rohm, becoming a rival to the army. However, once the SA were removed as a threat, the army were prepared to swear an oath of loyalty to Hitler, which gave him ultimate power - much more so than the Enabling Act.

Question 12

(a) There were some very good responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating good knowledge of the ways in which the Nazis controlled literature and the media in Germany. Such responses were able to show that Goebbels led the control in many ways, including burning books that the Nazis disapproved of, censoring newspapers, having no foreign radio channels and that all films in the cinema had to carry a pro-Nazi message. Weaker responses tended to describe the different forms of literature and media, rather than relate to how they were controlled.

(b) The responses to this question were mixed, with many candidates able to give one explanation as to why the Nazis persecuted minority groups in the 1930s, whilst others were unclear on the meaning of 'minority groups', providing responses about children, women and communists. The most commonly explained reason was Hitler's desire for a 'Master Race' and how he believed that the Aryan race was superior to all other races, which meant separating Germans from all other groups such as the Jews or Roma. Candidates often recognised other reasons for their persecution, such as the Jews being blamed for Germany's defeat in the First World War or the disabled not being able to play a useful role in German society but were unable to support these reasons with contextual knowledge, to produce an explanation. Weaker responses drifted from the focus of the question and often wrote at length about how Hitler persecuted the Jews, details of which lacked relevance to this question.

(c) There were many strong responses to this question which demonstrated a very good understanding of what was more important in securing Nazi control: propaganda or terror. Candidates were confident in their knowledge of propaganda. Many were familiar with the role of Goebbels, who centrally co-ordinated all aspects of German media and culture, to promote Nazi ideology. The impact of the censorship on books, newspapers and films and the widespread use of the radio to broadcast Hitler's speeches and ideas was clearly explained. Propaganda was seen by most as being a strong tool to keep Germans under control by 'brainwashing' them and making them proud to be German and accept German ideas. Candidates were less confident in explaining other forms of propaganda, although some did explain how mass rallies were used to promote propaganda and subsequently increased Nazi control. They highlighted the Nuremberg rallies which were large, spectacular, emotional gatherings with marches and torchlight processions. Here people listened to Hitler's passionate speeches, which gave them a sense of belonging and convinced them to support him. In order to produce a balanced argument, strong responses demonstrated a very good knowledge of the different forms of terror that the Nazis used to secure control, especially the role of the SS and Gestapo. The impact of their activities on the German population was clearly articulated especially the fact that they dealt with anyone who opposed the Nazis, detained them without charge and often tortured and killed them; activities such as these terrified the German public and kept them in line. The best responses included at least one explanation from each side of the argument and came to a valid judgement on 'how far'. Most came to the conclusion that terror was more important in securing Nazi control because people were terrified of being sent to prison or worse and, as a result, most people kept their critical comments to themselves. Propaganda was used to gain consent and active support, but terror ensured control over those who were not convinced. Weaker responses were able to identify forms of propaganda but were less certain in showing how it secured Nazi control. They were more confident when dealing with the use of terror to keep people in line and often explained the 'fear' factor here.

Questions 13 and 14

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

© 2025

Question 15

(a) This question was very well answered. Responses demonstrated a very good understanding of the state of agriculture in the 1920s and were able to show that agriculture was in a poor state, characterised by overproduction, falling prices and widespread debt and poverty for farmers. They were also able to show that they faced cheap competition from Canadian wheat and that prohibition had reduced demand for barley and wheat crops. A small number of weak responses wrote about the 1930s and included information about the 'dust bowls', which lacked relevance here.

(b) Most responses were able to provide one explanation as to why mass production was important for US industry, often using their knowledge of mass production techniques in the car industry as an example of importance. These techniques included the introduction of the assembly line, which led to more goods being produced more quickly, resulting in a fall in prices, which meant people could afford consumer goods such as cars, fridges and radio. This led to industrial growth and profit. Many candidates found it challenging to provide a second explanation, but strong responses did produce two explanations, and some included the effect of mass production on job creation and subsequent changes in employment. Other responses were able to identify features of mass production, including the rise in consumer culture and cheaper goods, but they needed to go on to support these identifications with contextual knowledge to explain the importance for US industry.

(c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question in which candidates were able to demonstrate to what extent women's lives were transformed by the boom. The best responses explained several changes including their dress, hairstyle and make-up, their freer lifestyle and the different career opportunities open to them. On the other side of the argument, they explained that these changes did not affect all women and those in rural areas were quite happy to continue with their traditional way of life. Other, middle-class women were still very conservative and although they watched the new films and liked the new movie stars, they had no wish to copy them. Stronger responses often made reference to the fact that, although women had the vote, they were still not equal in politics, as they could not be a political candidate. The best responses gave at least one explanation on each side of the argument and came to a judgement. Most agreed that the lives of some women had changed dramatically but mainly the lives of young women, who lived in the towns, and those who could afford the changes. At the time, most women workers were still paid less than men and could not afford the labour-saving equipment that would have given them more time to enjoy a freer lifestyle. In weaker responses, candidates were more confident in explaining the changes and there were a number of one-sided answers. Less successful answers also tended to 'list' all the changes together in one paragraph rather than identifying a change and providing some contextual details to develop an explanation.

Questions 16, 17 and 18

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

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Structured Questions

Key messages

Answers to **part (a)** questions should be succinct and focused on the question. Over-lengthy descriptions are not required. Answers to **parts (b)** and **(c)** should be focused on explanation, rather than on narrating events. For **part (c),** analysis is also required, and the best responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement in a substantiated conclusion. A valid judgement will be evaluative and go beyond stating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important' or 'how successful', depending on the actual question set.

Candidates should carefully note any dates included in a question to ensure responses only include details relevant to given time span.

General comments

Candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding in both the Core and Depth Study topics. Many answers contained good supporting evidence, which was accurate and detailed and used in well-developed explanations and arguments in response to **parts (b)** and **(c)** of the chosen question. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. These candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but they needed to go on and develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers, candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers to these questions. Candidates need to ensure that they then use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make. Candidates also need to focus carefully upon the question set; in some instances, candidates wrote in considerable depth about the main topic of the question but would have improved their responses with a clear focus on the particular question set.

There were some rubric errors seen. The most common was candidates who answered more than the required number of questions, particularly in the Depth Study. Time management was generally good, and very few instances were seen of candidates who did not finish or had to shorten their final answers.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was the most popular question in the Core Content.

(a) Some very good answers were seen, with most candidates secure in their knowledge of events in the Ruhr as a consequence of the Treaty of Versailles. Candidates understood that after the failure by Germany to pay reparations, French troops invaded the Ruhr to gain the raw materials as compensation. Stronger answers were also aware that Belgium was also involved, or able to state the nature of the raw materials seized, such as timber. Many candidates also stated that a strike

© 2025

was called, leading to violence, deaths, and the expulsion of some Germans. Weaker answers confused the Ruhr with the Rhineland or wrote generally about terms of the Treaty of Versailles, such as territorial loss.

(b) There were some effective answers that were able to identify at least one impact that Wilson's policy of 'self-determination' had on Germany, and to support their answer by providing an example of this. These answers were able to explain, for example, that this led to the loss of land such as Alsace-Lorraine or the Polish Corridor, meaning that some Germans now lived in other countries. Other reasons explained included that territorial loss also had a financial impact on Germany, particularly in the context of the reparation payments demanded by the Allies. Some strong answers were seen that argued that Wilson's policy increased bitterness in Germany since it was seen as unfair for other countries such as Poland to be given self-determination when this was not achieved for Germany. Less successful answers were able to describe self-determination but were unable to link this to how it affected Germany.

(c) Some excellent responses to this question were seen. Many candidates were able to produce balanced responses that considered both the ways in which the Big Three were and were not satisfied by the outcomes of the Treaty of Versailles. Several different approaches were taken by candidates when answering the question. For example, some responses adopted an approach which considered the relative satisfaction of the Big Three with the military, economic and security terms. An alternative approach was to consider the members of the Big Three individually, assessing their satisfaction with the terms. Another approach was to assess the satisfaction of all three before considering the terms which they were not satisfied about. A particular strength of all these approaches was the level of support provided in the answers, with candidates very secure in their knowledge and understanding of the terms of the Treaty. As a result, many strong, balanced responses were seen, with some achieving an evaluative conclusion, for example by arguing that the differing aims and intentions of the three meant that none of them could be completely satisfied. Weaker responses often featured lengthy essays about the aims of the Big Three but would have been improved by attempting to link this to the outcomes of the Treaty and therefore focusing on the specific question.

Question 6

(a) Candidates were mostly confident in some of the ways in which the League campaigned to end slavery. Good knowledge was displayed about the establishment of the Slavery Commission and the freeing of slaves in Sierra Leone. Another common response was to describe the reduction of the death rate of the Tanganyika railway. Stronger responses identified that countries had to stop slavery before being admitted to the League, or that they worked against forced prostitution. Other responses wrote more generally about the work of the League Commissions, for example by describing how the ILO stopped the use of lead in paint, which was not valid.

(b) There were some good answers to this question, with candidates confident in their ability to explain why the Depression made it difficult for the League to keep the peace. The most common explanation seen was that economic problems made countries more aggressive, invading countries in order to gain raw materials. Support used in evidence for this was the Japanese invasion of Manchuria or the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. Linked to this but sometimes used validly as a separate explanation were that the Depression caused extremism amongst populations desperate for change, leading to Hitler's rise to power, with his expansionist policies. Few inaccuracies were seen, although some responses were able to identify reasons but not support them with specific evidence.

(c) There were many well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates able to assess the extent to which the League was a success in the 1920s. Arguments agreeing with the question often initially considered success in crises such as the Aaland Islands and Upper Silesia, showing not just what happened, but why it could be considered a success, for example through the acceptance of the decision over the former by both Sweden and Finland. Some strong responses also considered the success of the commissions to improve living and working conditions, for example through its work to combat epidemics such as malaria and typhus. In order to provide balance, candidates argued that the League failed in both the Corfu crisis and when attempting to stop Poland's actions in Vilna. Some of the strongest responses could use this explanation as part of an evaluative conclusion considering the countries involved in these disputes, and why this meant that the League was not effective, for example by arguing that even when the League's actions could be considered unfair or weak, overall the League's main aim of

© 2025

peace was maintained during the 1920s. Weaker responses still showed some historical understanding, but took a descriptive approach of events without assessing why these could be considered a success or a failure. Some responses went outside of the given timeframe, describing events in Manchuria and Abyssinia.

Question 7

(a) Some good answers to this question were seen, with many candidates able to identify some points on what the Allies disagreed about at Potsdam. The most common factors stated were that they disagreed on how Germany should be treated, with some mentioning that Stalin wanted large reparations. Other reasons given were that Truman was reluctant to allow Stalin to extend his sphere of influence, or that they disagreed over Poland's government. Some less successful answers were very detailed about Germany but neglected to provide other factors for the disagreement.

(b) This question was answered very well, with many candidates able to achieve at least one explanation for why Marshall Aid was introduced. The most common reason given was to stop the spread of Communism by improving the economies of European countries, and the support often involved explaining the devastation and poverty in post-war Europe, leading to fears that communism would spread in these conditions. An alternative reason provided by many candidates was that the US realised that its economy would also benefit, as it would increase trade and make European markets dependent on it. Weaker responses described Marshal Aid but did not link this to the reasons for its introduction. Few errors were seen, with most candidates showing at least a basic level of contextual knowledge.

(c) A number of candidates found this question challenging, and even when some historical understanding was shown, candidates were often unable to support their assertions. The strongest answers, when agreeing with the given statement, were able to explain how this was achieved in several countries such as Poland, Hungary or Romania through the arrests and murders of opposition leaders, or control of the secret police. When providing balance, many candidates recognised that control was achieved through the Red Army which remained after liberation in Poland, amongst others. Other responses argued that it was through the use of rigged elections, for example in Hungary or the forced abdication of monarchies in Romania and Bulgaria. Weaker responses often identified the methods used by the Soviet Union but would have benefited from the inclusion of specific contextual support. Some candidates missed the word 'established' in the question and wrote sometimes lengthy responses about how the Soviet Union maintained control.

Question 8

(a) Some excellent answers were seen which were able to describe the involvement of the United States in the Korean War. Most candidates were able to gain marks through statements that the US supported South Korea, or that they supported them by sending troops and equipment. Some answers provided more specific examples of involvement, for example that MacArthur led the UN forces, or that Truman appealed to the UN to support Rhee. Other candidates concentrated their answers on the military involvement of the US by identifying the Inchon landing, the liberation of Seoul or the capture of Pyongyang. Very few errors were seen, although some candidates claimed that the US supported North Korea or provided examples from the Vietnam War.

(b) Mixed responses were seen to this question. It was answered well by some candidates, who clearly had a good understanding of what Vietnamisation was, and therefore could explain why it was important. These responses often argued that the American withdrawal from Vietnam led to North Vietnam's victory and the spread of communism to the South – the very thing that the US had been trying to prevent. Other candidates went further to show the geopolitical implications of the US withdrawal through consideration of the Domino Theory proving accurate, with the spread of communism to Laos and Cambodia. An alternative and valid approach focused on the importance of Vietnamisation to the US itself, explaining that this defeat had profound implications for future US foreign policy. Whilst these candidates were confident in their contextual knowledge, other candidates misunderstood the term 'Vietnamisation', explaining instead why America entered the war.

(c) Good responses were seen to this question, with many candidates able to successfully explain one side of the argument as to whether the Cuban Missile Crisis was a disaster for Khrushchev. When agreeing with the statement, the most common argument was that it was a personal disaster for

© 2025

him. This was supported by explanations considering the secret nature of the removal of US weapons from Turkey, which made it seem like Khrushchev had simply backed down without achieving anything. The strongest arguments then considered the political consequences of this, leading to his eventual removal from power. Some excellent responses were seen from candidates that explained that Khrushchev's actions without warning Castro had damaged the relationship between the two countries. The explanations providing balance were often not as well argued or supported, with comments or support being more generalised and lacking development. Candidates were able to identify that the US missiles were removed from Turkey, that Cuba remained a threat to the US, or that a hotline was established, but were less able to explain why these could be considered a success for Khrushchev.

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) This question was generally answered well, with many achieving reasonable marks by describing what Hitler gained from the Enabling Act. Most candidates as a starting point identified that it allowed him to pass laws without using the Reichstag and were then able to describe the results of this, for example by stating that it allowed him to establish a dictatorship. Some stronger answers were then able to provide specific examples of how these powers were used, for example that political parties and trade unions could be banned or Germany made a one-party state. Others recognised that it gave him the power to merge the roles of President and Chancellor to become the Fuhrer after the death of Hindenburg. The most common mistake seen was from candidates who wrote about Hitler's actions during this period that were not explicitly linked to the Enabling Act, or were actually derived from the Reichstag Fire Decree, for example the removal of civil liberties.

(b) This question was answered well by some candidates, who were able to provide at least one reason why the support of the army was important to Hitler. The most common approach was to place needing support within the context of Hitler's foreign policy aims, with candidates arguing that Lebensraum would require aggressive expansion, and therefore Hitler needed to be able to depend on the army. Alternative explanations recognised the possible danger posed by the army, given their dissatisfaction with the actions of Rohm and the SA, and the fact that they were well armed and well trained. Weaker answers tended to be based around generalised comments stating that Hitler needed the army to keep control within Germany, or that they could overthrow him. Few were able to support these statements, for example through considering the historical importance of the army in maintaining control during the Spartacist uprising or the Kapp Putsch. The weakest responses described the importance of the SA or the SS, neither of which were the focus of the question.

(c) A good number of candidates struggled with this question. Their answers lacked focus on why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933, instead providing lengthy descriptions or explanations of the reasons for the electoral success of the Nazis. The most successful approach seen was from candidates who, when agreeing with the given statement, argued that despite not having a majority in the Reichstag, and with their seats dropping in the November elections, they were still the largest party. Hitler becoming Chancellor was therefore the only way to have a government that could control the Reichstag. The most common argument when providing balance was for candidates to explain that despite Hindenburg's reluctance to appoint Hitler, he was persuaded by Von Papen that Hitler could be controlled and therefore appointed him. Some evaluative conclusions were seen which, for example, argued that the electoral success was the most underlying reason, since without it the Nazis would not have been in a position to paralyse the Reichstag, and Hindenburg would have not eventually seen that Hitler was the only realistic candidate for Chancellor. Another successful approach seen was from candidates who argued that it could not have been electoral success, since despite this Hindenburg chose not to appoint Hitler earlier. Therefore, the most important reason must have been the backstairs intrigue which was used to overcome Hindenburg's reluctance.

© 2025

Question 12

(a) This question was answered well, with many candidates gaining good marks through their knowledge of Nazi measures against the Jews between 1933 and 1935. A common approach was to initially identify that the Nuremburg Laws were introduced, before identifying some of the laws and saying what they did. For example, candidates had good knowledge and understanding of the loss of citizenship, and that Jews and Aryans were no longer allowed to get married or have sexual relationships. Other responses stated that Jewish businesses were boycotted, and that the SA was used to enforce this. Few errors were seen, although weaker responses missed the timeframe of the question, writing about measures taken after the focus of the question.

(b) Some good responses were seen to this question, with most candidates able to provide at least one explained reason why the Berlin Olympics of 1936 were important to the Nazis. Some strong responses put the Olympics in the context of Hitler's racial policies, and the desire to showcase Aryan superiority by Germany leading the medal table. In contrast, but an equally valid approach, was to use the same context to explain the importance of Jesse Owens to undermine the Nazi race theories. Another common approach was to explain the importance of the Olympics as propaganda for the Nazis, through highlighting German regeneration, for example through the huge stadium that had been constructed. Some excellent answers also considered the importance to the Jewish community since the Nazis toned down the anti-Semitism whilst the Olympics were happening, for example by removing anti-Semitic posters and banners. Few errors were seen, but weaker responses described the Berlin Olympics without the importance to the Nazi regime.

(c) Candidates were confident in their knowledge and understanding of opposition to the Nazis and were able to use this to provide at least a one-sided argument. When considering that there was significant opposition, a variety of contextual support was provided, most of which was relevant. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach, perhaps considering religious or youth opposition as a whole. An alternative and equally valid approach was taken by other candidates who considered opposition from individual people or groups, such as the White Rose movement or Dietrich Bonhoeffor. Responses moved beyond description through considering the impact of this opposition, perhaps by considering the effect on the Nazi regime, or how seriously the Nazi regime acted against it. For example, many candidates explained that Galen's sermons against the euthanasia programme were significant since it resulted in the T4 gassing of adults being officially stopped, although some stronger responses recognised that a secret programme was continued. When providing balance, many candidates clearly explained the lack of significant opposition, either through the popularity of the Nazi regime, or the success of the regime in destroying what opposition there was, for example through the capture and execution of some of the Edelweiss Pirates. Weaker responses were often able to show contextual knowledge, but took a descriptive approach, rather than an analytical one.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) Some good responses were seen to this question, but many candidates lacked the depth of knowledge required to gain high marks. There was an overall understanding from most candidates that immigration was restricted, but very few responses were able to identify specific restrictions that were introduced. Some stronger responses identified the Emergency Quota Act or stated that immigration was banned from Asia, but few were able to provide more identifications. Some less successful responses described conditions in the cities facing immigrants.

(b) This question was often answered very well, with responses displaying a good level of knowledge and understanding of why prohibition was introduced, although weaker responses tended to be descriptive, rather than considering causation. A common explanation was that there was religious opposition to alcohol, or that arguments for prohibition stemmed from fears of the effect of alcohol on society, perhaps through violence within the family. Other responses considered the context of the prevailing anti-German sentiment post-World War One, and the link between this and the brewing industry. Weaker responses described the reasons accurately but would have benefited from linking these to how prohibition was achieved.

© 2025

(c) Many very good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to provide balanced answers considering whether gangsterism or the Ku Klux Klan posed a greater threat to American society in the 1920s. When considering gangsterism, candidates often argued that it was a threat because of the violence associated with it, and also that the corruption of both the police and the court system linked to it undermined the whole system of law enforcement. When providing balance, responses were confident in their understanding of the threat posed by the Ku Klux Klan, with many candidates able to explain how the violence against specific groups that were targeted created an unfair and unsafe society for these groups. More candidates could have provided an evaluative conclusion, with most attempts being summative. Few errors were seen, although some wrote descriptive responses which neglected to consider how society was threatened by gangsterism or the Ku Klux Klan.

Question 16

(a) Most candidates were able to provide at least some general material on the impact of the Wall Street Crash on the US economy, recognising that it had a negative effect, or that the economy suffered as a result. Stronger responses were able to provide specific examples of this, most commonly by stating that it caused banks to close, and that businesses were forced to close, leading to a rise in unemployment. Other responses lacked focus on the question, often providing descriptions of the reasons for the Crash happening, or describing the events of the Crash.

(b) This question was often answered very well, with candidates confident in their understanding of Hoover's reaction to the Depression, and therefore why he faced criticism for this. Many candidates were able to provide two distinct explanations. Initially most candidates explained that Hoover failed to take effective action, citing his belief in 'rugged individualism' to justify the laissez-faire approach that he adopted. This caused him to be criticised for failing to improve the economic hardships facing many people. Candidates also argued that, at times, what he did do was also criticised – most usually through explaining the backlash caused by his use of violence against the Bonus Marchers. Few errors were seen, with candidates secure in the historical context of the question.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. A number of candidates, while they were able to describe the events prior to the Wall Street Crash, for example the practice of 'buying on the margin', were less able to explain how this actually caused the Crash to happen. Stronger responses were the ones that managed to explain the links between the events prior to the Crash and the Crash itself. When explaining the role of speculation, these responses assessed its role in causing share prices to be overinflated, and that this was the trigger for people to start selling their shares, which caused panic on the stock market and its eventual collapse. Alternative causes often analysed the problems of overproduction, lack of regulation or the negative effect of overspeculation. Some attempts to provide an evaluative conclusion were seen, but these were often summative in nature.

Questions 17 and 18

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

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Structured Questions

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation, and analysis.

In **part (c)** questions, the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond restating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important' or 'how successful', depending on the question set.

General comments

A significant majority of answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and provided a great deal of information and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions. Many candidates answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

The best answers to **part (b)** and **(c)** questions were able to apply knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information lacking in relevance. In **part (b)** candidates gained credit for the identification of valid reasons, but the best responses went further and fully developed each of these, as explained reasons.

A significant number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given statement) but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. The best responses avoided repeating points already made in the essay and, instead, explained and analysed how far the argument both supported and disagreed with the focus of the question. Some less successful conclusions asserted 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other. Some responses presented two good explanations (one on each side) and a valid reasoned judgement to achieve the highest level. However, candidates were more likely to reach a valid judgement when they had more than two valid explanations upon which to draw.

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 a popular question. In **part (a)** candidates were able to score highly by stating four relevant points about the Treaty of Versailles which related to the Rhineland. Typically, that it was demilitarised – no German troops were allowed to be stationed there, that it was not permitted to build any fortifications in the Rhineland and the Allies were allowed to keep troops in the area for 15 years.

© 2025

Part (b), about the importance of the loss of Danzig, proved challenging for some candidates. Causal factors focused on the loss of a seaport which made economic recovery and the repayment of reparations more difficult, resentment over the loss of its German population, the denial of self-determination and the threat from the new state of Poland. The best quality answers identified two reasons and explained them, making use of good supporting detail.

Most candidates constructed good arguments in **part (c)** about the extent to which the Big Three agreed about the severity of the punishment inflicted on Germany. The best answers were characterised by balanced explanations. For instance, on the one hand, the Allies agreed that Germany should be punished severely and should be weakened so that it would not cause another war. That is why Germany was made to take responsibility for the war and accept the War Guilt clause. That was the legal basis for the reparations bill which Germany had to pay. Germany was not included in the discussions about the peace settlement and viewed what they were presented with as a dictated peace. They thought the punishment was very severe and unfair. On the other hand, candidates could explain ways in which there were disagreements between the Allies. This side of the argument was often addressed more strongly. For instance, Wilson wanted to try and make sure that there would never be another major war like the one that had just finished. He agreed Germany should be punished but was more interested in establishing the League of Nations. He did not want Germany to be punished so harshly that it became dangerous in the future. This was completely different from Clemenceau's views. He thought the best way to keep peace and protect France was to weaken Germany and so ensure that France could never be attacked and invaded again. Lloyd George agreed with Clemenceau initially, but realised that if Germany was too weak, Britain would lose trade, so he became less keen on severe punishment. The highest level was achieved by responses that substantiated a judgement to the hypothesis given in the question, rather than restating points already made in the answer. For instance, that the Allies agreed on the principle of punishment but not its extent – self-interest dictated their different attitudes.

Question 6

In **part (a)** most students knew a great deal about collective security. Points of detail included joint action by members of the League to prevent aggression, and references to military and economic sanctions, as well as moral disapproval.

Candidates knew surface details of the central role played by Britian and France within the League of Nations but could have improved responses by applying more precise knowledge to **part (b)**. The best answers focussed on 'importance'. For instance, Britain and France were important to the League because they were probably the most powerful countries in the League. They were victorious in the First World War and so appeared to be the strongest countries at the time. The other member of the victorious Big Three, the United States, had refused to join the League and so the responsibility for ensuring that League policies and judgements were followed through fell to Britain and France. A second explained point featured in the strongest answers, for example focussing on their status and influence as global, imperial powers.

In **part (c)**, candidates gained credit for explaining points for and against the proposition that the League of Nations achieved its aims in the 1920s. There were some strong answers which explained the League's failure to achieve its aims, such as discouraging aggression, through failures such as Vilna and Corfu. Answers on the other side of the argument included material on territorial disputes, as well as the work of the League's agencies. When dealing with the Commissions, the best responses not only described their work but also gave details of the scale of their impact on the problems they encountered.

Question 7

In **part (a),** most candidates knew a great deal about the way Germany was dealt with at Yalta. The best answers mentioned reparations, denazification, trials of war criminals and the division of Germany and of Berlin.

Good quality responses to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question which focussed on why the relationship between the Allies deteriorated between Yalta and Potsdam. Responses identified several causal factors, such as the impact of Truman and Attlee, the occupation of eastern Europe by the Red Army, tensions over Poland and the deployment of atomic weapons by the US. The best answers identified two points, explained them, using good supporting detail. An example of a valid explained reason in response to this question is: 'By the time of the Potsdam talks, Soviet troops had taken over Eastern Europe. The troops stayed there and it was clear that Stalin wanted countries in this area to be communist. A communist government had already been established in Poland, despite promises made by Stalin at Yalta. Britain and the USA wanted free elections in Eastern Europe. This did not help relations at Potsdam, especially when

© 2025

the USA did not accept that the Soviets had the right to set up pro-Soviet governments there.' It should also be noted that restating key words from the question is a helpful approach which helps candidates focus precisely on what is required and avoid just describing the events which took place

Part (c) required a response on how far the Cold War was caused by the Soviet Union. There were many good answers which compared Soviet intentions and actions in Europe following the end of the Second World War with the impact of US policies such as the Truman Doctrine and the implementation of the Marshall Plan. Responses tended to deal with both sides of the argument. The best answers substantiated a judgement on the hypothesis given in the question, going further than restating points already made in the answer. For instance, some maintained that Stalin, rather than the Soviet Union, was to blame for the escalation in tensions and start of the Cold War. His paranoia about security and determination to secure the borders of the Soviet Union against attack were cited. Also, that he exaggerated the threat posed by the West to strengthen his own position within the Soviet Union. Alternative views supported a different judgement, explaining how Truman had to accept some shared responsibility for the breakdown of relations with the Soviet Union.

Question 8

Candidates were secure in their knowledge of Imre Nagy in **part (a)**. The main points included Nagy's policy of 'far reaching democracy' for Hungary, his aim to promote a Hungarian form of socialism and his announcement that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact.

The next question, **part (b)**, asked why Czechoslovakia was invaded by Soviet troops in 1968. Some answers included generalised narratives of Dubcek's reforms. However, an example of how identified points can form the basis of a good explanation is: 'The USSR invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968 because it felt that Dubcek's reforms undermined their control over the country. Dubcek introduced freedoms like abolishing censorship and gave people the right to criticise the government. Workers were given more rights in controlling how industry was run and the trade unions were given more power. The USSR saw this as a threat to their control, since they had concerns that these ideas would spread to other parts of the Soviet bloc and undermine its control of satellite states. Therefore, they invaded to bring down Dubcek's government.' Second explanations were sometimes seen, for example dealing with the threat posed by the potential loss of Czechoslovakia's contribution to the Soviet economy.

The **part (c)** question enabled students to construct valid arguments about the declining influence of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe after 1985. On the one hand, good answers dealt with the stated factor, arguing that Solidarity was important in the decline because it showed other countries in the Eastern bloc that oppressive Communist governments could be threatened if people stood together. In the 1989 elections in Poland, anti-communist candidates won a convincing victory. This inspired peaceful anti-communist revolutions in Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia; they followed the example set by Solidarity in Poland. The other side of the argument offered alternative explanations, typically about Gorbachev's reforms, and the impact of a failing economy in the Soviet Union. For example, Gorbachev's reduction of Soviet defence spending meant that the Red Army would no longer be used as a military presence to maintain control of countries in the Eastern bloc. If there was resistance to communism in these countries, each individual country would have to deal with the situation and Red Army troops would not be sent to restore order. This meant that people in the Eastern bloc felt more confident about resisting communist rule. Some responses reached the conclusion that, while Solidarity contributed to Soviet decline in the 1980s, the economic and military weaknesses of the Soviet Union were deep-rooted and therefore played a more important role.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

The best answers to **part (a)**, that described use of poison gas on the Western Front during the First World War, typically included that poison gas was first used by the Germans, resulting in panic amongst enemy troops. There were also many valid references to the effects of, for example, mustard gas on the lungs, skin and eyes.

Candidates presented largely descriptive information about machine guns during the First World War in **part (b)**, although the best answers met the key point of 'importance'. For instance, the advantages they gave to defenders in particular contexts, such as the Battle of the Somme or that strategies had to be developed to overcome their contribution to stalemate on the Western Front.

© 2025

In **part (c)**, responses were stronger when agreeing with the proposition in the question – that the Somme was fought to relieve pressure on Verdun. Alternative reasoning in some responses argued that Haig was keen for the Battle of the Somme to take place because he regarded it as the 'Big Push', which would bring a decisive victory. If the Germans could be defeated at the Somme, their morale would be affected, their forces would be weakened, and it might lead to further defeats, which would end in Allied victory in the war. A conclusion which built on at least one valid explanation on either side of the proposition and included a valid judgement, for example appreciating that the attack on the Somme was already intended as part of the 'Big Push', but the Allies brought it forward to relieve pressure, would achieve the highest level.

Question 10

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

Question 11

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**. Responses included points related to the Locarno Treaty and its terms, Germany joining the League of Nations and the advantages brought by the Dawes and Young Plans.

In **part (b)**, many candidates displayed good knowledge of Weimar culture in the 1920s and the best answers went beyond description by developing explained reasons for considerations of 'achievement'. This included references to civil liberties, the end of censorship and experimentation with new ideas. An extra explained point could have included the rejection of traditional ideas, and how Germany was trying to come to terms with its post-war society and government.

Part (c) was characterised by some unbalanced answers. There was often good knowledge of the political extremism, and many responses went beyond descriptive knowledge and attempted to explain the extent of the threat to the Weimar government. The main alternative factor was economic – responses focused on details of reparations and hyperinflation. These responses would have been improved by a closer focus on the challenge they posed to Weimar. Treatment of this side of the argument was often descriptive. The best responses explained both sides of the argument and then attempted a valid judgement which went beyond restating points already made. For example, it could be argued that the main challenge was not political extremism as the Weimar Republic survived challenges from both the Spartacists on the left and the Freikorps on the right. The main problem was the situation in the Ruhr and its impact on the economy. If the economy had collapsed completely in 1923 then extremism may have been more of a threat.

Question 12

In **part (a)**, candidates clearly knew a great deal about the SA, and the question was answered very well. Typically, there was a focus on its formation and paramilitary activities.

Responses in **part (b)** often included general information about Hitler's rise to power during the Depression. Good answers focussed on 1932 elections. For example, Hitler stood for President against Hindenburg in March 1932 and, even though he did not win, it helped him to gain support and spread the Nazi message. During the presidential campaign, Hitler flew to many cities in Germany to spread the Nazi message. Sometimes he visited five cities in a day. He made speeches in each city and huge crowds flocked to see him. This meant that when the July elections happened, the Nazis were able to increase their share of the vote and become the largest party.

A number of candidates found it difficult to apply relevant knowledge to the **part (c)** question about Hitler's consolidation of power and the importance of securing the support of the army. Good answers argued about how the Night of the Long Knives not only eliminated the challenge from Rohm but also won the support of the army, which felt threatened by Rohm's ambitions. On the other side, responses discussed alternative factors with more confidence, such as the burning of the Reichstag and the Enabling Act. An example of a valid judgement candidates could make was that the Night of the Long Knives was critical because, without it, Hitler would never have been able to secure the support of the army – essential if he was to retain power.

Question 13

This question was answered by a small number of candidates, who coped well with each part. **Part (a)** asked about the 'Whites', and responses reflected much knowledge about their aims and how they were made up of many different groups which left them weaker during the Russian Civil War.

© 2025

For **part (b)**, candidates understood the importance of War Communism – a good answer explained that it enabled the Bolsheviks to defeat the Whites. Industry was nationalised and the government ran the factories. This gave the Bolsheviks power over what was produced and over the workers, who were shot if they went on strike. This meant that the Red Army could be supplied with the equipment it needed to win the Civil War. Some responses also contained consequences – the hardships suffered by peasants or the fall in output of heavy industry.

Part (c) was well answered, as there was a secure understanding of the failures of the Provisional Government, such as continuing the war or failing to secure food supplies. Alternative factors encompassed the growing power of the Bolsheviks. Candidates wrote effectively about how they became the group that people turned to when they became increasingly unhappy with the situation. Their promises to end the war, improve food supplies and pass social reforms made them very popular. They did very well in elections to the Soviets. By September 1917, they were a real threat to the Provisional Government. Some responses mentioned the irony that the Provisional Government itself contributed to the success of the Bolsheviks during the defeat of Kornilov.

Questions 14

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

Question 15

In **part (a)**, candidates were able to name a wide range of consumer products which were available because of the 'boom' in the US during the 1920s.

Part (b) asked why some women did not benefit from the boom. An example of a valid explained reason provided in some responses was: 'Many of the workers in the cotton textile industry were women. This was a traditional industry which failed to benefit from the boom. New fabrics like rayon were more popular than cotton and so demand fell. This meant that the wages of these female workers, which had never been high, did not keep pace with those of workers in other industries. Women working the cotton textiles were often paid less than $10 a week at a time when it was thought that $48 was the minimum required to maintain a basic standard of living.' Other factors included the plight of women in rural areas, where farming did not benefit from the boom, and/or that many women focused on traditional domestic roles.

For **part (c)**, it was important to balance the impact of Republican economic policies with other factors which helped the development of the boom. Candidates wrote more confidently about Republican policies such as low taxes, high tariffs and lack of regulation. On the other hand, explanations of other factors were less developed and were dealt with in a more descriptive way. However, some effective explanations dealt with the car industry, for example: 'A great deal of America's success was based on the motor car industry. By 1929, one American in five owned a car, which was a huge increase. The car factories employed half a million workers, and they had money to spend. The increase in the number of cars also led to the building of roads, hotels and petrol stations, as well as to the development of industries such as glass, steel and leather. All this led to more jobs and to people spending money, which stimulated the economy and led to the boom.' Other responses explained the impact of advertising, hire purchase and assembly line production. Some answers which could argue from both sides were seen, although it was more common to read unbalanced responses. An example of a valid judgement was that Republican policies made an important contribution, but the real reason why progress was so rapid was because of technical developments such as assembly line production.

Question 16

A small number of candidates answered this question. In **part (a)**, responses included a number of valid points about the Emergency Banking Act of 1933.

Part (b) asked about why the Supreme Court opposed some parts of the New Deal. Strong responses developed their ideas about Republican domination of the Court, why the New Deal was unconstitutional, objections to the President acquiring so many new powers and the way local states' powers were undermined. For example, 'Some parts of the New Deal were opposed by the Supreme Court because most of the judges were Republican and they did not like some of Roosevelt's ideas. The New Deal encouraged government intervention in a way which had never been seen before and this challenged Republican laissez-faire beliefs. For instance, they thought the National Recovery Administration was interfering too much in business and therefore they declared it to be unconstitutional.'

© 2025

Part (c) asked if the New Deal had been a success in helping farmers. On the one hand, credit was given for arguing that it was a success because incomes from farming had dropped in the 1920s. Large-scale farmers benefited from the policies of the AAA, which brought an increase in prices. Between 1933 and 1939 farmers' incomes doubled. Farm workers were helped by the Farm Security Administration, which was set up in 1937 to help them to buy their own land. On the other hand, it was argued that little was done for small-scale farmers and farm workers. The AAA saw prices increase but this was at the cost of ploughing up sown land and cutting back livestock production. This meant that farm workers and sharecroppers had no livelihood and many became unemployed as a result. American farming was increasingly controlled by big business and small farmers struggled to complete. In making a concluding judgement, answers might have explained that while the New Deal helped some farmers, those who needed most help, such as sharecroppers and small farmers, did not benefit.

Question 17

This question produced a low number of responses. Of these, **part (a)** was answered well; responses included much valid information about the attack on the Soviet Union by German forces in 1941.

For **part (b)**, candidates wrote about why the British evacuated their troops from Dunkirk in 1940. For example, this included that the British Expeditionary Force had been despatched in 1939 to help defend France against attack by the German forces in 1940. Along with French forces, the BEF was stationed alongside the Belgian border. However, German forces broke through to the South and the BEF and French troops were forced to retreat to the sea at Dunkirk. The BEF numbered over 300 000 troops, but these were the only trained soldiers Britain had. Therefore, it was important to evacuate the troops, rather than allow them to be captured by the German army.

Answers to **part (c)**, about the importance of Stalingrad in the defeat of Germany, were characterised by general and descriptive writing. Candidates should begin the question by explaining the impact of the factor stated in the question. A valid case was made that Stalingrad was important because it was one of the most decisive battles on the Eastern Front in the Second World War. The Soviet Union inflicted a catastrophic defeat on the German Sixth Army. Hitler had launched the attack in summer of 1942 in an attempt to capture the Caucasus oilfields. The initial advance went well and by October much of the city was occupied by German forces. However, Soviet resistance was much stronger than expected. General Zhukov launched a counterattack in November, eventually forcing the Sixth Army to surrender in February 1943. This was important because it showed that the Wehrmacht could be defeated. The alternative side of the argument tended to be less well developed. Credit was given for the inclusion of other wartime fronts which made significant contributions to German's defeat – the Allied invasion of Italy and the D-Day landings, meaning that the Nazis were fighting on several fronts, which weakened their forces.

Question 18

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

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Document Questions

Key messages

- Candidates should read all the sources before attempting any of the questions and take time to familiarise themselves with what the sources say/show. Knowing in advance what all the sources show can be a help in answering each of the questions.
- The question which is set is the one that should be answered. If the question asks whether candidates are surprised by something in a source, they should remember to say *yes* or *no* and explain why. If the question asks why someone said something, reasons why should be given. Some candidates struggled to give a direct answer.
- When asked about cartoons, a consideration of what the cartoon means, and not just what it shows, is needed. Rather than just describing the cartoon, candidates should be interpreting it.
- When using source content in an answer, candidates should give it in full. Using ellipses could leave unclear the point they are trying to make.

General comments

The great majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option. Almost all scripts were complete, and there was little evidence of misunderstanding of any of the sources, though some misinterpretation of them in context did occasionally occur. The general level of attainment was reasonably good, though a good number of responses would have benefited from a more effective application of skills, especially on questions that demanded comparison. A valid comparison can only occur where two sources are judged by a common criterion. Also, when comparing, candidates need to bring the pieces of the comparison directly together. Comparison should be direct: Source A says (for example, Hitler was dangerous) but Source B is different because it says (for example, Hitler was not dangerous). A good number of responses would have been improved by valid source evaluation - assertions about provenance were often used, whilst analysis of the possible purposes behind the author's claims could have featured in more scripts. Answers to **part (e)** sometimes neglected to use the sources properly to test the hypothesis. This included selecting content that lacked relevance, omitting the content in favour of commenting on the sources' reliability, altering the hypothesis, or writing about the hypothesis rather than the sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

(a) The two sources gave plenty of opportunities for comparison, particularly to spot agreements, though disagreements were also present. Agreements included slavery being important for the Southern economy, slavery reducing the chances of class warfare among white people, and slavery giving white people a sense of superiority. Disagreements were fewer and more challenging to identify – for example, in Source A it says that Southern justifications for slavery were not difficult to understand, whilst Source B says Southerners' justifications were unreasonable. The best candidates were able to include examples to set alongside the agreements.

(b) Some answers took the cartoon at face value and thought the message was that slaves could not care for themselves. Most answers understood that the message was sympathetic towards the slaves, but the quality of the response then depended on how far this sympathy was developed and explained. It was important to consider what the cartoon was suggesting both about the white

© 2025

people and the black people. The main idea is that idle, useless slaveowners thought that capable, hard-working slaves could not look after themselves. Responses that took this understanding and applied it to the cartoonist's attitude – critical of slavery – provided the best answers.

(c) Although this question was generally well answered, it was important to note that the cartoon was produced in the South and thus concerned Southern attitudes. A few candidates thought that it was sympathetic towards the slaves, which led to invalid reasons being suggested. The basic element of most responses was that the cartoon was published because of the rebellion. Often answers also included messages the cartoonist wanted to transmit about the nature of the rebellion – for example, that the slaves were brutal or the white people were heroic in resisting it. The best responses understood the purposes the cartoonist might have had in representing events in this way to a Southern audience – perhaps to ensure harsh punishment of the slaves, or that in future, slaves were repressed more effectively.

(d) Although the two sources were sharply contrasting, many answers struggled to understand the different points of view. In effect, the provenance was often missed, or even misunderstood, and answers were then based solely on what the sources said. It was common for answers to claim to be surprised on the basis of the difference between the two sources – even though both sources made claims that were very predictable, given who was making them. In better responses, candidates were able to explain the differences using the provenance to explore the possible purposes of the two authors or even cross-referring to other sources to establish the accuracy or otherwise of their claims in order to judge the issue of trust.

(e) The hypothesis was about justifications for slavery used by Southerners. However, a good number of answers focused mainly upon whether or not black Americans were capable of looking after themselves, and not on justifications for slavery. Such answers sometimes provided some confirmatory material on the actual hypothesis, but the disconfirmation was not properly done. In general, candidates struggled with this question.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 2

(a) The question asked why Hitler made this speech at that time. A few answers were based on reasons which made no mention of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, referring instead to other matters mentioned in the source, such as the Locarno Pact. A small improvement on this was to see the remilitarisation itself as the reason for the speech, but, on its own, this was to miss what Hitler had to say about it, and why he would want to say it. The main message was that Hitler wanted to justify what he had done, which explained his effort to blame France for breaking Locarno by agreeing the treaty of mutual support with the Soviet Union. By arguing this, he may have had various purposes, depending on which of his audiences he had in mind. For the Reichstag, he would have been hoping to ensure their support and agreement with his actions. For his international audience, he would have been hoping to moderate their reaction and minimise the possibility of an armed response. The best answers were based on understanding and using these purposes in context.

(b) This question proved challenging for many candidates. Many of the attempts to base responses on the content similarities and differences between the two sources did not produce valid comparisons. For example, a number of responses stated that both said that remilitarisation would cause war, which is in Source C but not in Source B. Some answers neglected to address the specified issue – whether Source B made Source C surprising – either by missing the issue of surprise or by explaining whether Source B was surprising. Even when a valid comparison was made, it was still essential to reach a valid conclusion (on whether the difference was surprising or the similarity unsurprising), and often candidates missed the point they were trying to make. Perhaps the most straightforward valid point identified in answers was that what Source B predicted had actually come about in Source C, which was therefore unsurprising. Others were surprised that an outcome, about which the British were apparently relaxed in Source B, would be perceived as so threatening by the French in Source C. The limitation on basing answers solely on content, however, was that it omitted contextual explanation. The best answers were, then, able to make valid comparisons, but also use contextual awareness – can it really be a surprise that the French would be alarmed by the remilitarisation? – to explain why they were not surprised.

© 2025

(c) The two cartoons offered plenty of opportunities for comparison, but first they had to be accurately interpreted. Here, some candidates struggled with Source D, taking it literally and believing that Hitler genuinely wanted peace. For those candidates that avoided this, much could be said both about Germany and about the French/Russians, though trying to bring the League into comparisons did not work, as it was not shown in Source E. The most common comparison was on the depiction of Germany as threatening/dangerous in both cartoons, though Source E was sufficiently ambiguous to allow a difference between the sources on this issue, as it could be seen as showing Germany constrained and under the control of the French and Russians, and so not particularly dangerous. Similarly, France could be seen either as strong or weak in Source E, allowing both similarity and difference with its weakness in Source D. The best answers, taking notice of the reference to the 'cartoonists' in the question, based their comparisons on the opinions of the two cartoonists, and on who or what they were criticising.

(d) A number of answers to this question trusted Neurath's account (Source F). Some of these responses literally accepted his words as truth. Others, more sceptical, tried to back up his claims from what they knew. Sometimes this made sense, as when they suggested that Hitler really did not want war because he had instructed the troops going into the Rhineland to withdraw if the Allies showed signs of resisting. Better, though, was to understand that overall, Neurath was not trustable, since most of what he claimed was capable of being contradicted by reference to what Hitler actually believed and did. Only a limited number of answers made use of the fact that Neurath was on trial for war crimes when he made the speech. To those responses that grasped this point, it was clear that, at the very least, he would try to give testimony that would increase his chances of acquittal, or a less severe sentence. He might actually have had another motive, of trying to justify what the Nazis had done. These motives would themselves have made him a questionable witness.

(e) Two main points emerged from answers to this question. First, and most important, testing the hypothesis must be done by using the source content to explain whether or not it offers support. There must, therefore, be reference to specific and relevant content from each source used, and there must be explanation of how this relates to the hypothesis. Many answers quoted from a source but needed to then go on and explain how this indicated whether or not the remilitarisation was justified. For example, they might say 'Source C shows the remilitarisation cannot be justified because it says that if you do not stop Germany now, it will all be over.' Some explanation of this is needed if its relevance to the hypothesis is to be demonstrated, for example 'The author thinks that letting Hitler take the Rhineland will mean that war will inevitably follow, which would definitely make it unjustified.' Second, it is not essential to address the reliability of what a source says. If this is going to be considered, then it should only be evaluated once the content has first been dealt with. Some answers went straight to assertions about the provenance of the sources without considering what the sources said. An answer might say 'Source F is a speech by a Nazi at his trial for war crimes. This cannot provide convincing evidence because he will lie to get himself off.' But what did he actually say? The provenance only becomes relevant once the claims made in the source are related to the hypothesis. Then it would be appropriate to evaluate these claims, taking into account the author's possible purposes in making them – but only as a way of answering the question of whether the source provides convincing evidence about the hypothesis.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Document Questions

Key messages

- Candidates should read all the sources before attempting any of the questions and take time to familiarise themselves with what the sources say/show. Knowing in advance what all the sources show can be a help in answering each of the questions.
- The question which is set is the one that should be answered. If the question asks whether candidates are surprised by something in a source, they should remember to say *yes* or *no* and explain why. If the question asks why someone said something, reasons why should be given. Some candidates struggled to give a direct answer.
- When asked about cartoons, a consideration of what the cartoon means, and not just what it shows, is needed. Rather than just describing the cartoon, candidates should be interpreting it.
- When using source content in an answer, candidates should give it in full. Using ellipses could leave unclear the point they are trying to make.

General comments

It was rare to see unfinished scripts. Where this does happen, it is generally due to overly lengthy answers to the first questions answered. Overall, although performance on this paper was good, three of the questions required a comparison of two sources and some candidates struggled with this. On the other hand, the question that invited source evaluation (**Question 2(c)**), produced many responses that analysed the purposes of the sources' authors. Contextual knowledge on the topic was used appropriately, particularly when interpreting the cartoons on **Questions 2(a)** and **2(d)**, but there were also instances of candidates writing about context in an unfocused way, tending to just add such knowledge to their response about the source.

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 2

(a) Most candidates were able to provide some valid interpretation of the cartoon. The few who misunderstood it thought the message was that Baldwin was going to take action against the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. In general, though, candidates saw that the discarded proposals, or the warning not to go down the Rhine, signalled the exact opposite – that Baldwin was going to take no action. Contextual awareness of the British public's views on the remilitarisation informed many answers and ensured that the interpretation was sound. Indeed, many inferred that Baldwin was not going to take action because of the opposition of the public to it. The best answers, though, brought the cartoonist's opinion into their explanation to make out an argument either that the cartoonist approved, or disapproved, of Baldwin's inaction.

© 2025

(b) Some candidates struggled to make valid comparisons. The question asked how far the two sources agreed, which made the skill of comparison central to providing a valid answer. Valid comparisons can only be made if based upon a specific common criterion applied to both sources. Thus if, as many answers did, it was pointed out that Source B argued that France broke the Locarno Treaty, a comparison with Source C would have to be on the basis of whether or not France broke the Treaty, or on whether it was another nation that broke it. Given what Sources B and C said, either of these comparisons was feasible. It would not though, be a valid comparison to say that Source B accuses France of breaking the Treaty, whilst Source C says the Treaty gives France the right to assist the Soviet Union, as this lacks a common basis of comparison. Nor is it valid to summarise the content of one source, then the other, without bringing together content from the two sources on a point of comparison. As there were many possibilities offered by the sources, the most effective answers were able to make a series of valid matches and contradictions. However, many answers, even if making one or two valid comparisons, contained mainly unmatched material. Another factor was the nature of the comparisons made. Given that the question asked 'How far' the sources agreed, answers that considered both agreements and disagreements were better that those that only looked at one side. However, those that understood the context, and used this to explain how the sources showed disagreement of opinions about the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, were best of all the responses.

(c) Although focusing on the issue of surprise, this question again involved comparison of two sources. Candidates did not experience the same difficulties with this as seen in responses to **Question 2(b)**. A majority of candidates decided they were surprised by the fact that Source D appeared to suggest that France would not fight any attempt to remilitarise the Rhineland, whereas in Source E it suggested an apparent willingness to fight. Other similar but less specific comparisons based on France seeming to be reluctant to act in Source D, but prepared to act in Source E, were also valid. A very small number of answers expressed lack of surprise based on comparison of Germany's possible actions – resentment of the Franco-Soviet pact in Source D, with Eden envisaging a German invasion, compared to the actual invasion in Source E. A good number of answers did not limit themselves to such content comparisons but also concluded they were not surprised by the contradictions since they applied to different times, with Source D being before the remilitarisation and Source E after it. The best approach was to evaluate one or both of the sources, most commonly Source E, on the basis of the author's purpose, seeing Sarraut's broadcast as being politically motivated, with a view to reassuring or encouraging the French to react, and thus unsurprising.

(d) This was another question based on two sources and again it invited comparisons. First, though, the cartoons had to be interpreted, rather than just comparisons of surface details, such as you can see weapons in both cartoons. A number of answers struggled to give an entirely accurate interpretation of Source F, seeing the soldiers marching into the Rhineland as 'the watch' whose duty it was to offer protection. Alternatively, the weapons in the background were seen as being part of the invasion, or as European forces coming to challenge the German forces. These misunderstandings did not always prevent some valid points being made, but they were suggestive of less than complete understanding. Source G was, in one sense, more straightforward, in being obviously about Franco-Russian efforts to restrain German aggression. The challenge was on whether or not these efforts were being successful. As the cartoon is not conclusive about this, either interpretation was permitted. Once the interpretation had been carried out, answers then had to attempt comparison, which is where misunderstandings of Source F could hinder attempts to provide a valid answer. Genuine comparisons were possible both on Germany – for example, that both cartoons show Germany to be aggressive/militaristic – and on Germany's opponents – for example, that their efforts to control Germany were unsuccessful in Source F but successful in Source G. A few candidates were able to provide valid comparison both on Germany and its opponents, which was better than dealing with just one side. Best of all were responses which engaged with the cartoonists' opinions on who was to blame for the situations depicted. The cartoons offered material that could support the idea that either Germany or its opponents, or indeed both, were being blamed.

(e) Most answers managed to use some sources to test the given hypothesis, but a number of responses would have been improved by better technique on this question. Candidates are asked to use the sources to explain their answer. This means that relevant source content has to be selected, with some explanation of how this confirms or questions the hypothesis. Some candidates gave source content without fully explaining it. For example, many answers saw that Source B was an attempt to justify the remilitarisation. They tended to state: 'Source B justifies the remilitarisation because it says France has replied to friendly offers from Germany by breaking the

© 2025

Locarno Treaty'. This is certainly relevant material, but why it is relevant needed to be explained. The answer would benefit from more development to relate it to the hypothesis. For example: 'This means Hitler had the right to go into the Rhineland because the Locarno Treaty no longer applied.' Some candidates grouped sources and then made claims about what the sources said. To be valid, claims need to be relevant and genuinely apply to all the grouped sources. The best approach was from candidates who dealt with the sources individually. Other answers first dealt with the sources in the normal way, testing them against the hypothesis, but then worked through them all again on the basis of whether or not they were reliable. Many of these attempts at evaluation were mainly comments on provenance and not related to testing the hypothesis. The better answers demonstrated that a properly evaluated source can be related to the hypothesis and may lead to a conclusion about its relation to the hypothesis that is different from a conclusion based on taking the source at face value. This should be integral to the consideration of the source's relation to the hypothesis, rather than separate from it.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Document Questions

Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and all the sources before attempting to answer any of the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main focus of the paper and the range of perspectives under consideration. This understanding should then inform their answers and help them to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. If the question asks whether candidates are surprised by something in a source, they should remember to say *yes* or *no* and explain why. If the question asks why someone said something, reasons why should be given. Candidates should directly address the question in the very first sentence of their answer, for example, 'Source E does/does not make Source F surprising because' or 'Source G can/cannot be trusted because'.
- There were a small number of scripts where candidates had not attempted to write responses to all five questions. In most instances, answers to **Question 2(d)** or **Question 2(e)** were missing. Candidates should be mindful of writing overly lengthy responses to some questions and leaving themselves insufficient time to effectively answer **Question 2(e)**.
- On **Question 2(e)**, candidates must ensure that the sources form the basis of the answer. They should not write a general commentary using their own knowledge. Candidates need to engage with the content of the sources, and it must be made explicitly clear whether a source is being used to agree or disagree with the given statement. Answers must explain how the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question. Candidates should also ensure they make it clear which source is under consideration, for example by reference to its letter and by explicit reference to its content. This could be, for example, in the form of a quote or by relaying what can be seen in an image. To achieve the higher marks, it is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support and challenge the given hypothesis, rather than only addressing one side of the argument.
- If quotations from the sources are used, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of quotation that misses out some of the words and replaces them with ellipsis points. The words that are used must make sense and support the point the candidate wants to make, so giving the quotation in full is crucial.

General comments

The great majority of the scripts were on the twentieth century option. There were too few responses on the nineteenth century option for any meaningful comments to be made. There were very few instances of rubric errors, where candidates had attempted both options. In general, the sources were understood well, and candidates demonstrated a good level of contextual knowledge with which to support their answers, where appropriate. Some successful source evaluation was seen on **Questions 2(c**) and **2(d).** In most cases this involved a cross reference to knowledge or another source on the paper, rather than a consideration of the authors' purpose.

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 2

© 2025

(a) This question produced many strong responses. The two sources under examination offered several agreements and disagreements of detail and most candidates managed to successfully match the sources for at least one of these. For example, Sources A and B agree that the French army was in a poor state and that the British would not act. Disagreements included reference to the 22,000 German troops in Source A compared to the 30,000 in Source B, and that in Source A, the Germans are ordered to retreat, whereas in Source B, they are ordered to resist. The best answers looked beyond the detail of the two sources and considered instead the opinions or points of view of the two authors, noting that the writer of Source A holds the view that the British and French should have intervened to stop Hitler's remilitarisation of the Rhineland, whilst the writer of Source B believes that they were right not to have acted. There were fewer instances of candidates struggling to make matches by writing about the sources one by one in this examination session. What was crucial on this question was the explicit matching of detail from both sources.

(b) On this question candidates were asked to consider two visual sources and draw a conclusion about how similar they were. What is important in a question like this is that candidates consider the opinions of those who created the sources. In this case, the opinions about the remilitarisation of the Rhineland are similar. While the specific groups depicted are different - we see the British Government in Source C and European diplomats in Source D, the cartoonists are both criticising these European powers for failing to stop Hitler in 1936, when his troops entered the Rhineland. The best responses explained this agreement and used details from the sources to support it. In many other responses, reasonable marks were achieved by comparing common sub-messages. For example, Hitler is powerful, Hitler is not being stopped, or the European powers are weak. Slightly stronger responses compared the big messages of the two cartoons but fell short of addressing the cartoonists' points of view - in other words, they noted that the cartoons are similar in that the European powers are not stopping Hitler from remilitarising the Rhineland. Less successful responses included those that could explain a message or opinion relevant to one or both sources without the necessary comparison, as well as those that just compared the sources' provenance or subject matter. In all but a few instances, the question - that is the issue of similarity between the cartoons, was directly addressed. However, there were numerous answers that neglected to include any mention of the Rhineland or remilitarisation.

(c) On this question candidates were asked whether Source E, Flandin's account of his conversation with Eden on 27 January 1936, makes Source F, Eden's account of the same conversation, surprising. Many candidates were able to achieve good marks after identifying disagreements about the attitude of the French. For instance, many compared Flandin's determination to act in Source E – he states that they 'will resist', with Eden's portrayal of the French as having not yet decided their approach or that they are unlikely to act. Eden notes that Flandin's attitude was hardly that of a 'man determined to fight for the Rhineland.' Such a comparison would lead candidates to be initially surprised. In the best responses, candidates compared the sources for differences and evaluated at least one of them. A small number of responses successfully achieved this; one approach was to evaluate Source E with reference to Flandin's purpose – that is to say, he is justifying his action and/or protecting his historical reputation, while Eden could be argued to be shifting the blame onto the French. While most responses did answer the question and clearly addressed the issue of surprise, a number of candidates were surprised 'to a certain extent' or 'barely surprised'. Such an approach can often result in an unclear argument and there can be a lack of clarity as to whether or not a candidate is arguing that they surprised or unsurprised. Candidates should state clearly whether or not they are surprised and then explain the reason for this based on the content of the sources and their contextual knowledge, as appropriate.

(d) This question proved a challenge for many candidates. A small number of answers were based on repeating or paraphrasing the source. Others neglected to address the crucial issue of trust in the response. There were also a number of candidates whose assessment of trust was based on an undeveloped use of the source's provenance; such responses either dismissed the source as untrustworthy as it was written by Churchill, who did not become prime minister until 1940, or because it was not published until 1948. Alternatively, there were also arguments that Churchill's account can be trusted as he was a politician, so he would have had an insight into discussions at the time. Some responses made a decision about whether the source could be trusted based on what it said and then just quoted from the source, without explanation. There are reasons to both trust and not trust Churchill's account and for these to be properly addressed candidates needed to cross reference to their knowledge or the content of other sources on the paper to check the claims made. The strongest responses demonstrated this and then evaluated Source G by consideration of Churchill's purpose in 1948. Churchill arguably had several motives in writing his account of events. He was seeking to shape his legacy and history's view of him by appearing to have been

© 2025

the one who had the right idea in 1936. He could also have been writing in an attempt to validate the British response or to blame the French for the failure to stop Hitler.

(e) There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved high marks by carefully explaining how some of the sources (A, B, D, F and G) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that France could be blamed for the lack of action over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, while some (A, B, C and E) argue that they were not justified. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Other candidates would have improved their responses by making it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question (e)** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement. Candidates can then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement, before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given. A clear example of this could be: 'Source B agrees that France can be blamed for the lack of action over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland as it states that the French were 'determined not to act', they asked the British for support they knew they would not give because they 'wanted an excuse for French lack of action' and they 'attempted to shift the blame from themselves to Britain'.' On the grouping of the sources, it is advisable to always examine the sources one by one as any comment about a group must be valid for every source in the group. Any quotations used in answers should be given in full, in order to provide valid support for points being made.

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

The coursework is an assessment of the historical significance of an event, individual or development. It is essential that the title set invites candidates to *assess* significance, rather than just explain or describe significance.

It is important to assess how far an event, individual or development was significant in different ways and for different reasons. Assessing significance involves reaching a judgement about why the impact of the event, individual or development mattered. Candidates should also be aware that judgements about significance are provisional and can change if, for example, significance is considered from a different perspective.

Candidates should be encouraged to identify suitable criteria for measuring significance.

In order to assess significance, candidates should be encouraged to use arguments and counterarguments.

When marking the coursework, centres must use the generic mark scheme, which can be found in the syllabus booklet.

General comments

Most centres used a suitable title that enabled the candidates to assess significance. The generic mark scheme was also used by most centres, as is required. In general, this was used well, and the marking of the coursework was sound.

Comments on specific questions

Most titles were appropriate. They were based on one of the syllabus Depth Studies and avoided the content of the Core. Most commonly used was the Germany Depth Study, although other Depth Studies were also used successfully. Appropriate titles used included:

Assess the significance of Ernst Rohm to Nazi Germany.
How significant was the film industry for the USA, 1919 – 1929?
Assess the significance of the Battle of Stalingrad.
Assess the significance of the Great Depression for Germany.

The choice of subject is important. Some individuals, events or developments provide more opportunities to discuss significance than others. There should be scope for candidates to consider several ways in which the subject could be significant, such as for different groups in society, or from a social, political or economic perspective, or in the short and long term. It is also advisable to also select a subject that is not too large to cover in 2000 words.

Titles directing candidates towards one particular outcome are less appropriate for the assessment of significance, for example ‘How significant was the Reichstag Fire in Hitler’s consolidation of power?’. A title of this type is likely to result in candidates limiting their argument about the significance of the Reichstag Fire and encourages them to use various causes of Hitler’s consolidation of power as counterarguments. The answer then becomes a causation answer, rather than an assessment of significance.

The best answers focused on arguments about significance and rarely lost sight of this focus. A range of ways in which the subject is significant were explained and the extent of significance was measured using

© 2025

criteria, such as how many people were affected or how much change it caused. There was also assessment through the use of argument and counterargument, and an understanding that something or someone may be more significant in one way than in another. Finally, a supported judgement was made as to the degree of significance.

Reasonable answers explained ways in which their subject was significant but would have been improved by the inclusion of counterarguments. However, they did explain why the impact of their subject mattered. Less successful answers were those that explained the impact of their subject but neglected to explain why this mattered. They just concluded that any impact was significant. These answers also often drifted into narrative or description. The weakest answers described what happened but did not engage with the idea of significance, apart from assertions.

The marking of the coursework was generally well done. The generic mark scheme was used accurately and both marginal and summative comments were helpful. It is important to remember that a ‘best fit’ approach should be used when using the mark scheme. Candidates should not be expected to match every statement in a level. Their work will often contain elements of one level and elements of another. The crucial question to ask is – which level in the mark scheme best reflects the qualities of this answer as a whole?

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Responses to **part (a)** require a logically sequenced account of a specific event or time period and **part (b)** responses require an extended answer that explains the importance or impact of multiple facets of a discussion. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach a conclusion.

General comments

A 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 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. A significant number of candidates attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945 to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses to **part (a)** of the question gave logically sequenced accounts with in-depth contextual knowledge and precise examples to support the descriptions. The very best answers tended be thematic or chronological in approach. Less successful answers often lacked specific contextual knowledge of the event or time period or missed the chronological parameters of the question. Good responses to **part (b)** questions explored more than one facet of the discussion and used well-selected examples to support explanations and judgements. Less successful answers often provided only general material on the topic or struggled to fully focus on the discussion posed in the question. Many candidates were able to provide more than one facet of the given discussion but would have improved their responses by properly explaining the impact or importance in sufficient depth or detail. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both of the questions from the Depth Study choices or multiple Depth Studies. Candidates must read the questions carefully before answering and ensure that their response keeps within the time period.

Comments on specific questions

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

Questions 1 and **2** both received a reasonable number of responses.

Question 1 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates were able to provide accurate and sometimes detailed accounts of the campaign on the Eastern Front in 1914. The strongest accounts included in-depth historical knowledge and were able to organise events chronologically. Many of these responses began with Russian mobilisation and its invasion of East Prussia in August 1914 and the subsequent German diversion of troops from the Western Front. There were many mentions of specific key battles such as Tannenberg and Galicia and, in some cases, precise statistics regarding casualties suffered by both sides. Less successful responses lacked detailed historical knowledge, providing only generalised comments, often in no specific order. A small number of candidates examined the Western Front instead of the Eastern Front or went beyond the cut-off date of 1914 and looked at events later in the war.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to identify and describe more than one facet of the discussion on the impact of Russian mobilisation in 1914. The strongest discussions often considered the impact Russian mobilisation had on the Western Front, particularly as it contributed to the failure of the Schlieffen Plan when Germany was forced to defend its Eastern Front. Many candidates also considered the strategic impact Russian mobilisation had, such as leading to a war on two fronts. A few candidates also examined the impact Russian mobilisation had on Germany's allies such as Austria-Hungary, which was occupied with the

© 2025

Eastern Front for much of the war, reducing support for Germany on the Western Front. Weaker responses often gave only descriptive answers and provided a narrative account of Russian mobilisation, rather than considering its impact. **Part (b)** questions require a discussion on impact or importance, rather than an account of the event.

Question 2 was generally less well answered by candidates. In **part (a)**, some candidates were able to give reasonably detailed accounts of the war at sea. The strongest answers took a chronological approach to the account, commonly beginning with a detailed description of the British blockade of German ports. Many then examined the first period of unrestricted submarine warfare in 1915 and the sinking of the *Lusitania*. There were some very detailed descriptions of the Battle of Jutland of 1916, many including precise statistics and detail on naval losses and casualties on both sides. Some candidates also examined British developments in antisubmarine warfare, such as the use of Q-ships and the development of the convoy system amongst others. Less successful responses would have benefited from better structure and the inclusion of specific details. A small number of candidates confused the war at sea with the 'race to the sea', which took place in 1914 on the Western Front.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to engage well with the question which required the discussion to consider the impact of submarines. Most responses considered the impact of unrestricted submarine warfare on the British Home Front and the war effort. There were some good explanations offered by candidates who considered the impact on morale, as well as the socioeconomic consequences such as the introduction of rationing in 1918. Many candidates also considered impact of the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915 and how it pushed the USA more closely to the Allied war effort. Some candidates suggested that this event led to American entry into the war, which did not happen until 1917. A small number of the best discussions resulted in some convincing judgements being made in the conclusion which were comparative and fully explained. Other discussions would have been improved by explaining the facets being identified. Some of these responses were descriptive, or accounts similar in approach to **part (a)** answers.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Both **Question 3** and **Question 4** were popular choices among candidates.

Question 3, generally, proved challenging to a good number of candidates. In **part (a)**, there was a lack of focus on the period 1932–33, and many accounts stretched back to the Munich Putsch of 1923. It is vital that candidates read the question carefully and take note of any chronological parameters set out. Some of the stronger accounts were able to focus on the period 1932–33 and gave detailed descriptions of the events from the July 1932 elections, when the Nazi Party became the largest in the Reichstag, up to Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in January 1933. There were often some chronological errors or confusion between when von Papen and von Schleicher were appointed by Hindenburg, however. These accounts did give much detail of the political manoeuvrings though and were able to provide a logically sequenced set of descriptions. Less successful accounts would have been improved by greater knowledge of the period. Some of these accounts focused either on Hitler's consolidation of power after January 1933 or the long period from the Munich Putsch up until 1932.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one facet on the importance of Hitler's leadership of the Nazi Party to its electoral success by 1932. Most discussions considered the importance of Hitler's oratory ability to stir up crowds and make promises, especially during the economic depression of the 1930s. A small number of candidates also examined the creation of the Hitler myth through the use of an effective propaganda campaign or Hitler's importance in gaining financial support from industrialists, to help fund the Nazi election campaigns in 1932. A few candidates were able to offer valid explanations of these facets and discuss why they were important to the electoral success of the Nazi Party. Other responses were unable to address the question precisely, and missed the focus of the question, resulting in generalised accounts of Hitler's leadership of the Nazis, with some starting their answers in 1919.

Question 4 saw some good answers. In response to **part (a),** candidates often organised their descriptions thematically by looking at propaganda, censorship and the control of the media on the one hand, and the use of terror on the other, which led to many logically sequenced or well-structured accounts. The strongest accounts contained some excellent detail in the descriptions, providing a whole host of examples of propaganda and censorship, as well as a depth of historical knowledge on the development of the police state in Nazi Germany, such as the SS, Gestapo and the creation of concentration camps. A small number of accounts strayed from the focus of the question, which was control, and began to examine Nazi racial policies and foreign policy amongst other aspects of Nazi Germany, but these aspects tended to be part of a more relevant overall account.

© 2025

Part (b) produced many responses which were able to identify more than one facet on the importance of the Gestapo in Nazi Germany. A small number of candidates confused the Gestapo with either the SS or the SA and this led to answers which focused on events pre-1933, which lacked relevance to this question. However, most responses were well focused and often discussed the political importance of the Gestapo and how it was used to root out opponents to the Nazi regime, as well as gain intelligence on potential threats to Nazi rule through the use of informers. There were some very strong explanations in many discussions, with some candidates able to make valid judgements in their conclusions. There were inaccuracies in some responses, particularly about when the Gestapo operated and the confusion between them and the SA or SS but overall, this question was answered well.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Both **Question 5** and **Question 6** were attempted.

Question 5 was sometimes well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a chronological account of the collapse of the Tsarist regime in 1917. Many began by looking at the failures of the Tsarist regime during the early years of the First World War but focused mainly on the events of early 1917 up to the March Revolution. The strongest accounts were chronologically precise and used specific details of the various strikes and demonstrations that led to the abdication of the Tsar. Less successful accounts focused too closely on events before 1917, with some examining events back as far as 1905.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. Some candidates were able to cite at least one facet of the discussion on the impact on Russia in early 1917 of economic problems. The best responses considered the impact on different social groups such as peasants, workers and the middle-classes. There were some good explanations of how economic problems caused chaos in the countryside and led to rioting against landlords, as well as some peasants supporting the radical Socialist Revolutionaries. There were also some good explanations of how workers faced inflationary issues due to food and fuel shortages in the cities, which led to widespread strikes and increasing pressure on the government, as more radical socialist groups became popular. A number of less successful responses were narrative accounts of the issues faced by Russia in 1917, with some describing a number of different events, rather than focusing on impact.

Question 6 received some very thorough accounts for **part (a)**. The best answers were able to give many details of how Stalin controlled the Soviet people and often organised the information thematically. Most began by examining the use of the NKVD and gulag system to instil fear into the population, with many candidates able to give some specific details on the purges of the 1930s and statistics on the numbers imprisoned in the gulags. Then, most candidates examined how Stalin used the mass media, propaganda and censorship to control information and promote his cult of personality to the Soviet people effectively. A few of the best accounts also considered how both forms of control were used to target specific groups in soviet society such as intellectuals, artists and authors, amongst others. Weaker accounts tended to lack examples and were often very generalised descriptions of the methods used by Stalin to control the Soviet people.

In **part (b)**, the quality of responses varied. There were some very strong answers, where candidates discussed multiple facets of the importance for the Soviet Union of Stalin's modernisation of agriculture. Most candidates were able to consider both positive and negative impacts of collectivisation and examine how the peasants were, on the one hand, provided with new farm machinery and tractor stations to improve farm yields whilst, on the other hand, forced to collectivise with the threat of arrest or execution by the Communist authorities. Many also examined how the process of collectivisation triggered famine in 1932 and was also an attempt by Stalin to liquidate the class of kulaks in the countryside, who were viewed as a class enemy by the Communist Party. The best discussions explained the importance of the facets precisely and often with good supporting knowledge. Other responses sometimes described modernisation more broadly and examined aspects of industrialisation without the focus on agriculture.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–1941

This was a popular Depth Study. Both questions were attempted by candidates.

Question 7 proved challenging for a number of candidates. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give some relevant knowledge of the problems faced by the textile industry in the 1920s. Some stronger accounts were able to examine the issues faced by the textile industry such as cotton and organise the information in a structured way, often thematically rather than chronologically. These accounts looked at the competition faced by the traditional textile industries from new synthetic fibres like rayon (not nylon which was introduced

© 2025

in the 1930s), the issues faced by the industries after the war which led to a drop in demand and therefore prices, and the impact of American tariffs, which led to foreign nations imposing their own tariffs on American goods, particularly agricultural goods like cotton. Many accounts would have been improved by greater focus and depth; some of the answers described the economy in the 1920s in general, rather than focusing on textiles, and some accounts misinterpreted the meaning of the word 'textile'.

In **part (b)**, candidates were often able to give at least one valid facet on the impact of the end of the First World War on the American economy, but overall, candidates tended to struggle with this question. Some candidates focused too much on the American economy during the war, which was not the focus of this question – candidates needed to identify facets on how the end of the war impacted the economy. A small number of stronger discussions considered how the end of the war impacted agriculture, which saw its foreign markets disappear and prices drop rapidly, leading to the loss of farms and unemployment in the countryside. A few candidates were able to consider how the end of the war resulted in a return to normalcy by the Republican governments, which resulted in a policy of isolationism and protectionism in the form of import tariffs, as well as a low tax economy. Others pointed to the banks, which had lent huge sums to the Allies in the form of war loans and were well placed to lend to American business in the 1920s, contributing to the economic boom. Less successful responses tended to identify just one valid facet in their discussions and, in some cases, missed the focus of the question and discussed the economic boom of the 1920s in general.

Question 8 was generally well answered, with some very good responses seen. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account which contained some of the most important details of Roosevelt's first Hundred Days as president in 1933. The best accounts organised their information either chronologically or thematically by categorising the New Deal reforms. Either approach worked and resulted in some very detailed and precise accounts of how Roosevelt dealt with the banking crisis, created jobs through alphabet agencies such as the CCC, PWA and CWA and helped farmers by setting up the AAA. Many candidates mentioned nearly every available agency in their accounts. Weaker responses tended to lack the precise detail of the stronger accounts or confused the work of the different agencies. A small number of candidates also confused agencies or legislation introduced in the Second New Deal with those of the first New Deal in 1933.

Part (b) was generally answered very well, with some outstanding responses. The best discussions contained well-supported explanations of multiple facets on the impact of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). They looked at various different social, economic and cultural impacts the TVA had. Many answers explained the economic impact well, giving accurate details on how it created jobs from the building of dams and hydroelectric powerplants, and how electrification of the region allowed new businesses to be set up. Candidates were also able to offer some good explanations of social impact, as flooding and drought decreased and the electrification of the region improved the quality of life in residential areas. Less successful responses tended to describe the TVA and its work. These responses, often more generalised accounts, would have benefited from trying to explain its impact.

Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945

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

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Responses to **part (a)** require a logically sequenced account of a specific event or time period and **part (b)** responses require an extended answer that explains the importance or impact of multiple facets of a discussion. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach a conclusion.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice among candidates, with a majority opting to answer **Question 3** or **Question 4**. This was followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41. A very small number of candidates chose to answer Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18 and only **Question 2** was attempted in numbers significant enough for meaningful comments to be made. A small number of candidates opted for Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41 and only **Question 6** produced enough responses for meaningful comments to be made. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945 to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses to **part (a)** of the question gave logically sequenced accounts with in-depth contextual knowledge and precise examples to support the descriptions. The very best answers tended be thematic or chronological in approach. Less successful answers often lacked specific contextual knowledge of the event or time period or missed the chronological parameters of the question. Good responses to **part (b)** questions explored more than one facet of the discussion and used well-selected examples to support explanations and judgements. Less successful answers often provided only general material on the topic or struggled to fully focus on the discussion posed in the question. Many candidates were able to provide more than one facet of the given discussion but would have improved their responses by properly explaining the impact or importance in sufficient depth or detail. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both of the questions from the Depth Study choices or multiple Depth Studies. Candidates must read the questions carefully before answering and ensure that their response keeps within the time period.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was very rarely chosen by candidates, although a number opted for **Question 2**.

Question 1 produced too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 2 was generally well-answered. In **part (a)**, candidates were often able to give reasonably detailed accounts of the development of British anti-submarine tactics in the war at sea. Many organised their information chronologically and in some depth which led to some very strong accounts. The strongest responses considered early developments such as the use of Q-ships in 1915 and the extensive use of mines and steel nets in the North Sea and English Channel in 1916. A small number of candidates also mentioned the use of depth charges and most responses gave some details on the use of the convoy system developed in 1917 to protect Allied shipping across the Atlantic Ocean. The best accounts were able to include precise examples to support their descriptions. Weaker responses were often overly brief or contained generalised material only. They would have been improved by the inclusion of specific historical knowledge.

© 2025

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to engage well with the question, which required the discussion to consider the importance of the British naval blockade of Germany. Most candidates discussed the economic importance it had for Germany's Home Front, as Germany was starved of vital resources for the war effort, as well as the inflationary problems caused by shortages of food and fuel. Many discussions also examined the social importance of the blockade, particularly the Turnip winter of 1916–17. A small number of the strongest answers were able to link the importance of the blockade to Germany's military decisions, such as the attempt by Germany to break it in the Battle of Jutland, or the political implications it had for Germany by the end of the war, as anti-war sentiment increased and revolution broke out. Many responses contained not only precise factual support for the facets but also convincing explanations. Less successful responses tended to be descriptive accounts which would have benefited from properly addressing importance.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Both **Question 3** and **Question 4** proved very popular choices among candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates often approached their accounts thematically and examined the various different military restrictions placed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. Most of these stronger accounts opted to describe the restrictions on the army first, with a majority of answers mentioning the reduction in the size of the army to just 100 000 soldiers and the banning of conscription. A few responses were also able to supply more detailed historical knowledge relating to the banning of tanks, armoured vehicles, artillery and chemical weapons. This was followed by descriptions on the restrictions placed on the air force and then the navy. A number of accounts examined the demilitarisation of the Rhineland as well, which was valid for this question. Some of the weaker responses missed the parameters of the question and looked at all of the different terms of the Treaty, particularly the territorial losses, which was not the focus of this question. Some accounts were also overly brief and would have been improved by providing precise or accurate historical knowledge about the military restrictions.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one or more facets of the impact of the economic terms of the Treaty of Versailles. A majority of candidates considered the impact on German morale, particularly when the sum of £6.6 billion was finalised in 1921. There were some good explanations of how this perceived sum of compensation would ruin Germany financially and led to increased anti-Weimar sentiment, especially amongst far-right groups. Most candidates also explained how the reparations led to the invasion of the Ruhr industrial region by France and Belgium in 1923 resulting in a general strike, collapse in trade and hyperinflation after the Weimar government and Reichsbank decided to print more currency. There were some excellent responses to this question, with many candidates able to explain more than one of their facets and reach convincing conclusions. Weaker responses tended to approach the response as more of an account and described all of the events from 1919 to 1923, sometimes in the incorrect order. **Part (b)** questions require candidates to explain the impact or importance of the facets they have identified, rather than describe the events linked to the facet.

Question 4 was also generally well answered, with some strong **part (a)** responses. Candidates often organised their responses thematically, although a small number chose a chronological approach. Either was valid, although a very strong knowledge of the period was required to successfully write a detailed account chronologically. The strongest accounts examined a number of different forms of mass media used by the Nazis, and Goebbels in particular, to spread Nazi ideology in Germany. Almost all accounts mentioned the use of the radio, especially the People's Receiver, and the use of cinema to bombard the German public with Nazi racial policies and antisemitism, as well as promote the Hitler myth. A good number of candidates also explored the use of newspapers, poster campaigns and rallies in their descriptions. Less successful responses tended to be quite narrow, often only covering one or two forms of media. The very best accounts were logically sequenced, with an impressive depth of historical knowledge about numerous forms of media used by the Nazis.

Part (b) proved challenging for many candidates in terms of identifying more than one valid facet on the importance of censorship in Nazi Germany. Weaker responses often confused censorship with other subject-specific terminology, leading to some discussions lacking relevance. Some of the stronger discussions were able to provide facets linked to the political importance of censorship for the Nazi Party, especially the ability to reduce any exposure to anti-Nazi material or information. Many candidates offered examples, although more could have developed these into convincing explanations. A small number of candidates expanded on this and considered how censorship impacted the public in terms of preventing access to literature, music and media from the West or how, during the war, the government censored information to raise morale and maintain support for the German war effort. Many responses, however, were descriptive or examined propaganda in general, when the focus of the question was the importance of censorship.

© 2025

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

On this Depth Study, only **Question 6** was attempted by enough candidates for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 5 produced too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 6 was generally well answered. Most candidates opted for a thematic approach to organise their information for the account. The stronger accounts looked at how Stalin heavily censored information through the mass media, especially in party-controlled newspapers and radio broadcasts. These accounts often examined the use of pamphlets, posters and public events to glorify Stalin and his achievements, like the Five-Year Plans, and create a cult of personality. The very best accounts contained high levels of precise historical knowledge to support their descriptions. Other accounts would have benefited from being fuller and more focused on the question, and from providing specific detail to support.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers in which candidates discussed multiple facets of the importance of the NKVD in Stalin's Russia. Many of these discussions considered the political importance of the secret police to remove Stalin's perceived enemies and opponents from within the Communist Party, with many responses citing the Great Purge and the show trials held for Old Bolsheviks, such as Kamenev and Zinoviev. Some candidates were also able to identify facets linked to the importance of the NKVD in reducing the potential threat posed by the military, particularly the purging of the officer class in the Soviet army. A small number of responses contained valid explanations linked to importance, but many answers were descriptive and generally provided a narrative of the period.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

Both questions produced responses from a good number of candidates.

Question 7 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account of developments in the film industry in the USA in the 1920s. Most candidates opted for a thematic approach, which worked well, and resulted in some logically sequenced or well-structured accounts. The strongest responses were detailed, often containing some impressive historical knowledge on the film industry. These accounts considered how mass electrification in urban areas allowed new cinemas to spring up at an incredible rate, allowing the media form to become the nation's most popular. Nearly all candidates mentioned the development of the talkie in 1927 and described how this led to the increasing popularisation of jazz music, amongst other new fashions. Many pointed to the growth of Hollywood and the film star and how this developed new attitudes towards women and relationships, especially amongst younger generations. Less successful accounts were often lacking historical knowledge or specific examples to support descriptions. Very few answers, however, strayed from the focus of the question.

In **part (b)**, candidates were often able to give a multi-faceted response to the discussion on the impact of radio broadcasting in the USA in the 1920s. Most of the stronger discussions considered the social and cultural impact of radio broadcasting. Many pointed to the impact new music like jazz had on younger generations or the widespread broadcasting of sporting events, especially baseball and boxing. Responses also mentioned the economic impact of radio broadcasting, and some explained well how adverts spread awareness of new consumer products and boosted sales and therefore company profits. The best answers were able to provide supporting examples in their explanations. A few candidates also considered the political impact of radio broadcasting, with some candidates correctly identifying that presidents and state governors using the radio to deliver campaign speeches and policies. However, many candidates that identified this facet inaccurately used Roosevelt's 1930s 'fireside chats' as an example, which was lacking in relevance to this question.

Question 8 responses to **part (a)** saw candidates able to give accounts which contained some of the most important details of the Wall Street Crash. Most correctly organised their information chronologically and began with the beginnings of the economic slowdown, as big investors started to show signs of a loss of confidence due to market saturation. The best answers were very good at focusing on the events of 1929 primarily and were careful not to stray too far into the events after the Crash, which was not the focus of the question. Many mentioned events such as the Babson Break, Black Tuesday and Black Thursday, with the best answers providing detailed examples or statistics to support their descriptions. Weaker responses tended be very generalised or spent too much of the answer describing the economy of the 1920s in the boom years; a few focused too heavily on events in the 1930s and just described the consequences of the Crash, as opposed to the Crash itself.

© 2025

Part (b) proved challenging for candidates in general. A small number of responses were able to accurately identify a number of facets on the impact of President Hoover during the Depression. Most of these focused on Hoover's lack of impact and missed the fact that Hoover did attempt a number of actions to tackle the economic depression, even though they may hay have had limited impact. Stronger responses were able to identify Hoover's limited economic impact and mentioned the new tariffs enacted to protect American businesses and the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan money to banks and railway companies, for example. Many of these discussions also included information on the public works projects like the Hoover Dam or the use of the Farm Board to increase food prices for farmers. Most candidates focused on Hoover's reputation as a 'do-nothing' president, which was a very valid line of argument, with some explaining how Republican economic policies were increasingly unpopular, especially as homelessness and crime increased. A few candidates explained how this and Hoover's actions against the Bous Marchers led to increasing support for Democrat F D Roosevelt in the 1932 presidential election. A good number of discussions would have been improved by the inclusion of valid explanation, however, and a few answers confused Hoover with Roosevelt or an earlier Republican president.

Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945

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

© 2025

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Part (a) gave candidates the opportunity to achieve marks through the recall and deployment of knowledge. To succeed, it is important to note the focus of the question, and any dates provided. Candidates should provide a logical structure, which could be thematic or chronological, and give accurate and detailed knowledge within this. Better responses took this approach. Less successful answers provided more general outlines which lacked depth. Some candidates focused on looking at causes and consequences, rather than on writing an account.

Part (b) was sometimes well attempted. Many candidates were able to provide and support the different facets relating to the focus of the question. Some were also able to explain these impacts and come to a judgement as to which was the most important. Others wrote more generally and missed the focus of the question. The focus should be on the specific event, development, organisation or person mentioned in the question.

Many candidates seem aware of potential facets such as social, political and economic but it should be kept in mind that although these types of facets are appropriate for some questions, they may not be appropriate for every question. Some candidates tried to find material to cover identified facets which lacked relevance to the particular question answered, leading to confused responses. Often in better answers, two facets were identified and explained. Some less successful responses tried to provide multiple facets without attempting to explain them.

Some candidates would have improved the focus of their answers by keeping in mind any start and end dates in the question selected. Others wrote very long answers to **part (a)** and, in some cases, had insufficient time to answer **part (b)**. Some candidates started with **part (b)** but did not complete **part (a)**. Starting with **part (b)** is not recommended. A small number of candidates wrote responses to more than one question. Candidates must answer one question with both **part (a)** and **part (b)** from the same question.

General comments

Very few candidates attempted Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939-c.1945. The most popular Depth Studies were Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45, Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41 and Depth Study D: The United States, 1919-41. A small number of candidates answered from Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18. Most candidates demonstrated some knowledge of their chosen Depth Study. A good number of responses would have benefited from being able to provide valid explanations in **part (b)**.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1

(a) The focus of this question was on the very early part of the war up to when the stalemate occurred. There were a limited number of responses to this question. Some candidates were able to outline the build up to the stalemate by outlining reasons for the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and the impact of the rapid Russian mobilisation and resistance in Belgium. Some of the major battles were outlined, for example the Battle of the Marne and the First Battle of Ypres. Some candidates

© 2025

continued to describe the trenches and included later battles which went beyond the parameters of the question.

(b) This question required a discussion of the impact of gas weapons and many candidates outlined the types of gases available during the war. Different impacts of the use of gas were outlined, for example the military impacts such as loss of life, and its use as a technique used during infantry offensives. Other facets explored were the psychological impact on troops and the technological advances such as the development of new gas weapons and gas masks. Some candidates focused too much on conditions in the trenches and tried to build their discussion around facets such as social and economic, which did not really address the question.

Question 2

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945

Question 3

(a) This question required a specific focus on the events of the Munich Putsch of 1923. This meant that the knowledge expected centred around the events in November when Hitler attempted to take over the Bavarian Government. Long accounts of the period of hyperinflation or of the period that Hitler spent in prison were not necessary. Some candidates spent too much time outlining such background information. Successful responses were able to focus on the events of the Putsch and write a structured account with accurate and relevant details, including names and dates. Some candidates were confused as to where the Putsch took place, with some believing it was in Berlin. Others confused this event with the Kapp Putsch.

(b) This question required a discussion of ideology with specific focus on how it developed the Nazi Party. The cut off date was 1930, so material from the formation of the party to the Depression was relevant. Some candidates did not pick up on the limitations of the date and instead wrote generally about the Nazi regime and its ideas. More focused attempts identified facets such as the importance of the change in approach from violent revolution to becoming an electable party, the importance of political violence in the early days, and the appeal of ideology such as nationalism, antisemitism and socialist policies in attracting different groups within German society. Some were also able to point out that ideology was also unimportant as promises were often flexible to make sure they appealed to the most people. Overall, Nazi ideology was not well known or understood, with some candidates looking at how the party gained support in general terms, rather than how the party developed.

Question 4

(a) The focus of this question was education in Nazi Germany. However, some candidates either overlapped this with youth groups or wrote exclusively about youth groups. There were some more focused responses which included a good range of detailed and accurate material about the education system, including references to changes in the curriculum, control of teachers and the increase in PE lessons. Some candidates were able to provide accurate and detailed knowledge to support accounts, but many did not provide specific detail, especially where there was an overlap between youth groups and education.

(b) Some candidates were able to look at different facets of the importance of the League of German Maidens. Others provided more generalised description of the role of women in Nazi Germany, including details of rewards for having numbers of children. This material was not totally focused on the importance of the League of German Maidens, although to an extent it could have been used in relation to the indoctrination of young girls. Other candidates wrote more generally about youth groups, which also was not fully focused on the question.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 41

Question 5

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

© 2025

Question 6

(a) Russia was not a very popular choice among candidates but there were some answers to this question. This question lent itself to a chronological approach, outlining events between 1924, with Lenin's death, to 1929, when Stalin can be seen as the undisputed leader in Russia. The contest for leadership between Stalin and Trotsky was well known and most pointed out how Trotsky was tricked into missing Lenin's funeral. Some candidates were also able to outline how Stalin manipulated the potential opposition of Bukharin, Kamenev and Zinoviev to achieve the leadership. There were a few quite generalised responses which would have been improved by the inclusion of specific detail or some structure. Some candidates also went on to discuss the purges, which happened once Stalin was in control.

(b) This question was focused on industrialisation, rather than on collectivisation. Some candidates wrote mostly about agriculture. Some of this had some relevance, for example collectivisation allowed the movement of peasants into the growing industrial cities, but often material was much more generalised. There was also some good knowledge of the impacts of the Five-Year Plans and identification of economic, social and political facets which had strong material in support. Most candidates were aware of the importance of industrialisation for defence and the human costs of industrialisation, with increasing pressure on workers and the creation of gulags.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41

Question 7

(a) There were some good outlines of the work of temperance movements, with a strong understanding of the reasoning behind them. Some candidates were able to name organisations such as the WCTU and the Anti-Saloon League and show how they attempted to change attitudes. There was limited reference to the impact of politicians, who saw prohibition as a vote winner. There were some generalised responses and some which went beyond the question by showing the impact of prohibition, rather than focusing on temperance movements. There were a few candidates who confused the term 'temperance movements' and wrote instead about the Ku Klux Klan.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify facets relating to the importance of the introduction of Prohibition. There was generally a good knowledge of Prohibition, with some detail in responses. The role of speakeasies, moonshine, bootlegging and gangsters was related in a lot of detail. Most candidates were able to show how this was socially important, as there was a rise in gang violence, or had the result of US citizens becoming criminalised through accessing alcohol. The economic importance was outlined, with large fortunes gained by gangsters like Al Capone being described, and the loss of tax revenue to the government identified as a result.

Question 8

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

Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939-c. 1945

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

© 2025