

HISTORY

<p>Paper 2147/12 Structured Questions</p>

Key messages

Candidates need to read the question carefully before starting their response to ensure that they focus on the issue in the question.

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 continuous prose. In **part (b)** and **(c)** questions, candidates should look to explain separate points in distinct paragraphs - otherwise, points can become blurred together or, alternatively, candidates can lose focus on the question set.

General comments

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

Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, showed difficulty in applying their knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts lacking explanation. Other weaker responses included incorrect factual details. Some of the weakest responses were very brief and generalised, with little supporting factual detail.

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

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

Part (a) responses reward recall and description. Explanation is not required. Most candidates recognised that responses to **(a)** questions could be short and concise. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and write in continuous prose, rather than using a 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'Why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Two relevant explanations with supporting contextual detail are required. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Some less successful responses included narratives about the topic and neglected to address the question.

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argued both for and against the focus of the question and reached a balanced judgement. A valid conclusion should avoid repeating points already made in the essay and should try to explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some of the best answers consisted of two good, supported explanations (one on each side), and a valid reasoned judgement. However, some candidates found that they were better able to provide a valid top-level judgement having provided more than two valid

explanations to draw upon. Weaker responses often provided well organised explanations but only on one side of the argument. These responses could have been improved by the inclusion of relevant explanations, supported with contextual examples on both sides of the argument, in order to produce a balanced response. Responses which included narratives about the topic without addressing the question were also seen.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was the most popular question of the Core content questions.

- (a) This question was well answered. Candidates needed to name four relevant pieces of land which Germany lost in the Treaty of Versailles. For example, Germany lost Alsace-Lorraine, North Schleswig, Saarland and Upper Silesia. Credit was also gained for naming other land lost, including West Prussia, overseas colonies, Eupen and Malmedy. Weaker responses were characterised by general statements such as, 'Germany gave land to Poland' or 'Germany lost a lot of land'. Some responses included incorrect information, such as Germany lost the Sudetenland and the Rhineland. A small number of responses were overly long, as a result of explaining who received the land and other terms of the Treaty of Versailles, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) Two explained reasons were required from candidates. The strongest responses identified one of the Fourteen points and then explained why Lloyd George and Clemenceau were suspicious, for example, 'Lloyd George and Clemenceau were unhappy because of Wilson's point on 'self-determination' because Britain and France both had large empires and it could mean colonies deciding to become independent.' A second explanation commonly included was, 'Wilson's point on 'reduction of armaments for all countries' was not well received by Clemenceau because, although he wanted Germany's armed forces to be destroyed, he did not want France's forces reduced as a precaution against a rejuvenated Germany in the future, with the potential to attack France again.' Weaker responses gained credit for identifying some of the fourteen points and could have been improved by the inclusion of some valid explanation. Some responses drifted from the focus of the question and provided detailed accounts on what each of the 'Big Three' wanted from the Treaty of Versailles, with little or sometimes no reference to Wilson's Fourteen Points.
- (c) Overall, this question was reasonably well answered. Most responses gained credit by identifying that there were problems in paying back the reparation payments or the government leaders were called 'the November Criminals'. Strong responses were well structured and produced a balanced response by explaining whether, up to 1923, the economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles were more important for Germany than the political consequences. A good example of the economic consequences would be that, 'Germany had to pay enormous reparations and in 1922 did not pay anything. France and Belgium went into the Ruhr and took what they were owed in raw materials, which was legal under the Treaty. The German workers went on strike and the government printed money in order to pay the strikers, leading to hyperinflation. The consequences being that money became worthless, with people losing the value of their savings and pensions, and prices of everyday items rocketed.' A common explanation used on the other side of the argument was, 'The political consequences were that the Weimar Republic was nearly brought down by the hostility shown to the government over the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles through the Kapp Putsch, the Munich Putsch and the political assassinations. The Kapp Putsch nearly succeeded because the army refused to intervene and defend the government and it was only the German workers who defeated the coup by a general strike.' Stronger responses produced at least one well developed explanation on each side of the argument and then a judgement on how far they agreed with the statement. A few responses drifted from the main focus of the question to include details on all the terms of the Treaty of Versailles without making any link to the question. Others included post-1923 details, which lacked relevance to the question.

Overall, most candidates demonstrated more confidence when explaining the economic consequences, compared to the political consequences.

Question 6

This was also a popular question.

- (a) This question was answered very well. Most candidates knew the circumstances in which the Saar plebiscite was held, the choices available to those who voted, the pressure and propaganda applied by the Nazis and the result. In many cases responses demonstrated more than enough information to secure full marks here. A small number of responses confused the geographical location of the Saar and either wrote about the plebiscite in Upper Silesia involving Germany and Poland or about the plebiscite in Austria at the time of the Anschluss in 1938. There was also in a very small number of responses confusion with the Ruhr or the Sudetenland. In some weaker responses there was also uncertainty and inaccuracy about Hitler's role, for example, asserting that Hitler decided to call the plebiscite or that Hitler marched his troops triumphantly into the Saar, confusing the event with the remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936.
- (b) Strong responses to this question explained two valid reasons for Britain's decision to go to war. The reasons most commonly used were the failure of appeasement as shown by events after the Munich Conference, the Anglo-French Guarantee to Poland and the greater readiness for war achieved by Britain (and France) in 1938-39. Many responses included much contextual information to support the first of these reasons, citing Hitler's takeover of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, and the change in British public opinion as Hitler proved his untrustworthiness. Strong responses then explained one of the other two reasons listed above and some were able to give examples of Britain's efforts at rearmament, especially with regard to the air force. Some responses demonstrated confusion in some candidates' understanding of events. Some asserted that Hitler had been handed the whole of Czechoslovakia at the Munich Conference. Others wrote that that Britain's guarantee to Poland was made at the time of the Munich conference. A small number thought Churchill was Prime Minister in the period 1938-39.
- (c) The question was well answered, with many candidates able to identify and explain important motives behind the signing of the Nazi- Soviet Pact. Most also clearly stated on which side of the argument ('surprising' or 'unsurprising') these factors fell. The points most commonly identified on the 'surprising' side were the different ideologies of the two countries and Hitler's intention to take Russian territory in the quest for Lebensraum. On the 'unsurprising' side, responses frequently referred to Hitler's wish to avoid a war on two fronts, Stalin's lack of confidence in Britain and France, the need for Russia to prepare for eventual war with Germany and the interest of both powers in gaining land in Poland. The ideological point was often the one least well explained. This was because responses tended to simply identify Hitler's hatred of communism or pointed to a mutual antipathy between the two leaders, while neglecting to provide evidence of this antipathy. The best explanations referred to Hitler's treatment of communists in Germany, to German participation in the Spanish Civil War and to the creation of the Anti-Comintern Pact. Where responses attempted to explain Stalin's need to prepare Russia for future conflict, this was usually put down to difficult economic circumstances. The purge of the high command of the Red Army in 1937-38 was very rarely mentioned. There were some very strong responses which included at least one explanation on either side of the argument and included a valid judgement as to how far the Pact between Germany and the Soviet Union was 'surprising'. Less successful responses would have benefited from a more certain chronology and more accurate information. Some thought that Hitler wanted to recruit Stalin as an ally in a future war with Britain and France, or (in a small number of responses) a war had already started.

Question 7

- (a) This question was well answered. Most candidates were able to name the two sides in the Greek Civil War, the monarchists and communists, and some understood that Britain and the United States of America supported the monarchists. More responses could have described the events, for example, 'There was a civil war in Athens which the British put down' and 'In 1946 an election was held, and the King was restored.' Others also cited that 'the British pulled out in 1947 because they could not afford the cost' and 'the United States stepped in and paid for some of the British troops to stay in Greece.'

- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why Stalin was worried by the introduction by western powers of a new currency in Germany in 1948. They were rewarded for identifying and explaining two reasons, most commonly the economic and military threat to the Soviet Union from a rejuvenated Germany. Other responses drifted from the question to write about the differences between communism and capitalism, without mentioning the impact of the new currency. A few responses included details of the Berlin Blockade, but this was not relevant to this question. Some credit was given for the Allies breaking their promises at Potsdam. A few acknowledged that the main reason a new currency was introduced was because after the destruction of World War II, there was economic chaos in their zones, and it was clear to the Allies that things would get worse, so the real reason for doing it was not to threaten Stalin.
- (c) Strong responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The best responses explained the purpose and details of the Truman Doctrine and emphasised why it was a threat to Stalin. Then, to produce a balanced argument they did the same for the Marshall Plan. Most responses were more confident explaining the threat from the Marshall Plan, for example, 'The Marshall Plan was much more of a threat, because Truman believed that Communism succeeded when people faced poverty and hardship, so he provided aid for European countries to recover after the war. Stalin viewed Marshall Aid with suspicion, in his view the anti-Communist aims behind Marshall Aid would weaken his hold on Eastern Europe.' Weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons such as, 'The Marshall Plan would weaken Stalin's position,' 'It was based on dollar imperialism' and 'The Truman Doctrine would contain Communism.' Supporting contextual details were needed to develop these identifications into explanations. There were also some responses which would have been improved by greater clarity on the differences between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

Question 8

- (a) This question was well answered, with most candidates demonstrating a good understanding of Alexander Dubcek. Relevant points made by candidates included, 'He was the Communist leader of Czechoslovakia in 1968', 'He introduced 'Socialism with a human' face', 'He allowed freedom of speech' and 'His period of reforms was called the Prague Spring'. Credit was also awarded for his insistence that his reforms were not a threat to Communism and he did not want to pull out of the Warsaw Pact. A few responses mistakenly thought that he was the leader of Hungary and wrote about events there.
- (b) The best responses tended to include two explanations as to why the Soviet Union responded violently to opposition in Hungary in 1956. The most common reason identified and explained was the fact that Nagy wanted to take Hungary out of the Warsaw Pact. The importance of the security aspect of the Warsaw Pact was emphasised and what worried Khrushchev was that if Hungary was allowed to leave, others may have followed and this would have weakened the Soviet Union's defensive barrier against the West. Another creditable explanation put forward was related to the increasing resentment of the Soviet Union towards Nagy's reforms in Hungary such as free elections and private ownership, which seemed to undermine Communism. Weaker responses, although demonstrating some understanding of the question, tended to just identify reasons, rather than develop them into an explanation, for example, 'Nagy planned to leave the Warsaw Pact', or 'There were huge anti-Soviet demonstrations.' Some responses drifted from the focus of the question to give details of the events of the Soviet invasion of Budapest in November 1956.
- (c) This question was well answered, and strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of the roles played by both Walesa and Gorbachev in the collapse of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. Candidates identified the ways that Walesa was important to the collapse of Soviet control, most commonly through the setting up of Solidarity and the fact that it showed that the Communist governments could be challenged by people power. Ways in which Gorbachev was responsible for the collapse of Soviet control in Eastern Europe were identified, including how his policies of Glasnost and Perestroika in the USSR made people in Eastern Europe expect and demand reform. Specific contextual knowledge was used to support both Walesa and Gorbachev's reasons, resulting in a sensible, structured response. Weaker responses, whilst often acknowledging reasons why both men were responsible, would have benefited from including the contextual information needed to develop a convincing explanation.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies

- (a) This question was well answered, and most candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of the events in 1932–33 that led to Hitler's appointment of Chancellor in January 1933. Four relevant points were required, such as, 'In the July election the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag', 'Hindenburg refused to appoint Hitler as Chancellor', 'Von Papen failed to find support as Chancellor' and 'Von Schleicher became Chancellor but he failed to find support'. Many responses demonstrated awareness of the machinations behind the scenes which led to 'Hindenburg being persuaded by Von Papen to appoint Hitler as Chancellor with him as Vice-Chancellor' and 'In this way they thought they could control him'. A small number also gained credit for noting the results of the presidential elections of 1932. Weaker responses were confused regarding the chronology and often included detailed descriptions of events which occurred after Hitler became Chancellor, such as the Reichstag Fire and The Night of the Long Knives. Such events were outside the scope of the question.
- (b) There were some very good responses to this question which explained two reasons why the Nazis had little success before 1930. The two reasons most commonly identified were the economic prosperity under Stresemann and the failure of the Munich Putsch. Strong responses then included plenty of contextual information to support these reasons such as, 'Stresemann brought hyperinflation under control by introducing a new currency and negotiating the Dawes Plan to provide loans to support German industry, resulting in a higher standard of living, which meant that that there was no reason to support extremist parties like the Nazis.' Others explained the impact of the cultural revolution and the recovery of Germany's international reputation on German society and how people were happy with the Weimar Republic, again giving them no reason to support the Nazis. The violence linked with the Nazi party, the failed Munich Putsch, Hitler being put in prison and the Nazi Party being banned was another explanation as to why they had such little success. Weaker responses tended to switch the focus of the question and explain how the Nazis gained success due to the Great Depression caused by the Wall Street Crash, many going beyond 1930.
- (c) This question was well answered, and many responses demonstrated a good understanding of both the Night of the Long Knives and other factors in Hitler's consolidation of power 1933–34. Strong responses were well structured and often first explained how and why Hitler carried out the Night of the Long Knives. Strong explanations included details of Ernst Rohm, including his aims for the SA, the threat to Hitler's position and the fears of the army. They then assessed the impact of the murders on Hitler's position: 'As a result of the murders of Rohm and key opposition members, the SA was now under Hitler's control, the army was pleased and Hitler's position was much more secure'. On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained alternative reasons for Hitler's consolidation of power, most commonly the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act. Some mentioned other events from 1933–34 which helped to consolidate his power, such as purging the Civil Service of Jewish and Nazi opponents, the banning of trade unions and the death of Hindenburg. Having included at least one valid explanation on either side of the argument, some candidates went on to make a judgement supported with evidence, as to the most important factor in Hitler's consolidation of power. Many suggested that the Night of Long Knives was the most important factor, 'Because by March 1934, Hitler, as result of the Enabling Act, had achieved many extra powers and was almost like a dictator. However, the army was still very suspicious of Hitler and the Nazis. By dealing with Rohm and the SA, Hitler won the support of the army and in August 1934 everyone in the army signed an oath of loyalty to Hitler. Only then was Hitler truly secure.' Less successful responses, although showing some understanding of events, tended to struggle with the chronology. Some had the misconception that Hitler did not become Chancellor until after the Reichstag Fire and they sometimes confused the Emergency Decree with the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives with the Night of Broken Glass. It is important to read the question carefully as a small number of candidates wrote in detail on the reasons why Hitler rose to power, rather than his consolidation of power.

Question 12

- (a) Many candidates were well informed on the ways in which women helped the German war effort and made four relevant points such as, 'They filled in men's jobs who were conscripted to fight', 'They worked on the land in agriculture', 'They became nurses' and 'They worked in factories making armaments'. Marks were also awarded for other specific jobs that they did including their work as air-raid wardens, drivers of trains and fire engines, and administrative jobs in the armed forces.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most responses identified increasing the birth rate and producing more soldiers as being the main reason why Hitler attached much importance to the German family. Some responses would have been improved by the inclusion of contextual details in order to develop the identification into an explanation. Some weaker responses also went into much detail about Hitler's tempting financial incentives for married couples to have children without explaining why this was so. Strong responses included details as to why he wanted to increase the number of soldiers, including his aims of a greater Germany and to spread eastwards in order to provide Lebensraum, adding that this could only be achieved through war, and for that he needed more soldiers. Some candidates struggled to explain a second reason, though successful responses did make a strong case that the family was important for achieving Hitler's vision of a superior race and the traditional ideal family could be used as part of Hitler's propaganda campaign.
- (c) Strong responses demonstrated a very good understanding of the Hitler Youth by including clear explanations in response to the question. Most responses were able to identify reasons for its popularity, including the numbers who joined, the varied leisure activities on offer, the socialising with friends and the sense of belonging being a member of the group gave to them. Most commonly explained were the varied activities which were on offer, including camping, hiking, athletics, map reading and firing guns, which were enjoyed. A second valid explanation was often built around the parades and how those taking part felt excited by wearing a uniform and marching with loud bands, resulting in a feeling of belonging to a great nation. The most successful responses then explained reasons why the Hitler Youth was not popular and were very familiar with the activities of the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement. Some also explained the change in nature of the movement once it had become compulsory in 1939 and the start of the war. In particular, they mentioned the changes in the leadership of the Hitler Youth, as the experienced leaders were drafted into the army and replaced by keener Nazis, who rigidly enforced Nazi rules, with the main focus now being on the war effort and military drills. A number of responses were able to include at least one valid explanation on either side of the argument and assess and weigh up the extent of the Hitler Youth's popularity. Weaker responses found it difficult to differentiate between school routine and the after-school activities of the Hitler Youth and included a lot of details about the different subjects studied at school.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

- (a) This question was very well-answered, and most responses demonstrated a very good understanding of the 'Red Scare'. The best responses included four relevant points such as, 'It was the fear of immigrants coming in from Southern and Eastern Europe,' 'It was the fear of communism,' 'The USA had watched with alarm as Russia became Communist after the Russian Revolution,' and 'The fear of anarchists bringing in radical ideas.' Marks were also awarded for the evidence that the Americans saw around them to confirm their fears, such as the widespread strikes and bomb blasts in 1919 and the response of the American authorities to immigration.
- (b) Most candidates were very familiar with the reasons why the cinema grew in popularity during the 1920s and there were many successful responses containing two relevant explanations. The best responses identified and then explained the reasons. For example, 'In the 1920s Hollywood produced a large number of films. These films included comedy, daring adventures and romance. The introduction of sound and speech in 1927 made films much more exciting and people flocked to the cinema.' Many responses included the names of film stars with a high profile at the time such as Charlie Chaplin, Douglas Fairbanks and Clara Bow. Weaker responses identified reasons, most

commonly higher incomes, but did not include any supporting contextual detail such as the impact of the economic boom and increased leisure time.

- (c) There were many strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the problems caused to the United States in the 1920s by gangsterism and the Ku Klux Klan. Many responses identified problems caused by gangsterism, especially the increase in crime, corruption of law enforcers and violence, and then included plenty of contextual information to support these reasons and develop them into explanations. The activities of Al Capone and events of the St. Valentine's Day Massacre were well known and often used to explain the problems caused. A balanced answer was then achieved through discussing the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Problems identified and explained included the size of the movement, the support from politicians and the violence towards black Americans. A number of strong responses were able to include at least one valid explanation on either side of the argument and then to assess and weigh up which was more of a problem. Many considered the Ku Klux Klan more of a problem because, 'Although gangsters were a problem, especially in the cities because of Prohibition, in 1933 when Prohibition was abolished gangsterism was largely defeated. The Ku Klux Klan were much more of a problem because of the size of the group, the murders and the racist attitudes that they represented.'

Questions 16, 17 and 18

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

HISTORY

<p>Paper 2147/13 Structured Questions</p>

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

HISTORY

Paper 2147/22
Document Questions

Key messages

- Candidates should not write their answers before they are properly ready. They need to take time to think about the source – what point is it trying to make, who wrote or drew it and why? They should only move to the question once they think they understand the source. They should then spend some time thinking about the question and deciding what the answer is going to be. They should start writing the answer once they have decided what it is going to say.
- Candidates need to directly address the question in the opening sentence of the answer. They should be able to do this if they have thought carefully about the source and the question. This is particularly important in questions that ask if sources are surprising or wrong. Doing this will also help to give a shape and direction to the rest of the answer.
- When using a quotation from a source, it should be written out in full, and not abbreviated. Often, abbreviated quotations do not make the point that the candidate wanted to make.
- When comparing sources, candidates need to ensure that they produce clear and specific comparisons. They should not just summarise each source.
- Sources should not be used simply as straightforward and simple providers of information. Many of the sources need to be thought about carefully – what is the author or artist's purpose? What is the main point they are trying to make? What is their audience? Do they have reason to mislead this audience? But it is worth remembering that, if they do have a purpose or if they are biased, what they have to say will still be of use to the historian (and to the candidate).
- When answering **Question (e)**, it is important to use the content of the sources to support the answer and to test the hypothesis in the question, rather than a variant of it.

General comments

A large majority of candidates answered the questions on the twentieth century option. Across the options there were significant numbers of answers where candidates provided mainly contextual knowledge, simplistic readings of sources and little interrogation and evaluation of sources. However, there were also many outstanding answers, particularly in the twentieth century option, where candidates showed a mature understanding of sources, an ability to evaluate them and use them to produce clear and direct answers to the questions.

The contextual knowledge of candidates on both options was strong, although a few confused the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban Missile Crisis. The contextual knowledge of some candidates proved a hindrance when it dominated answers and pushed them away from the main thrust of the question. The correct roles of contextual knowledge are to help candidates make sense of, and evaluate sources, and to support arguments being made in answers.

An important factor that distinguished weak answers from better ones was their tendency to be based on straightforward and simple readings of sources. Better answers read sources more subtly. Instead of reading sources at a surface level, they made inferences. They also made more use of purpose to evaluate sources. Whether it be a cartoon, a speech or a newspaper article, it is always worth considering the following question: 'What was the author or artist up to?'

The other key characteristic of better answers was that they provided a clear answer to the question. For example, if a question asked about whether or not a source is surprising, they reached and supported a clear conclusion about that issue. If a question asked about whether two cartoons agreed or not, they produced

clear comparisons using the two sources together, all the way through the answer. Finally, in **Question (e)**, they tested the hypothesis named in the question, rather than a variant of it.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to find and explain some agreements and disagreements. Agreements can be stated simply, for example 'Both sources state that a larger German navy was seen as a threat by Britain.' Disagreements need to be explained more fully, for example 'In Source A William wanted Britain as a friend and thought that building a large navy would help, but in Source B he wanted a large navy to make Germany a great power.' The weakest answers wrote about the two sources but neglected to make any point-by-point comparison. The strongest answers went beyond the details in the sources and compared the overall messages of the two sources. Source A clearly blames Britain for the rivalry between the two countries, while Source B puts most of the blame on Germany. Top level answers needed to be supported from the sources. The candidates also needed to make clear that they were writing about the overall messages and not just making another comparison. This can be done by either clearly stating that the comparison being made was of the big or overall messages, or by only making this overall comparison and not attempting any comparisons of detail.
- (b) A good number of candidates were able to make valid comparisons of the messages of the two cartoons, for example many suggested that in both sources Britain considered that it ruled the seas. A few candidates went beyond this by comparing the points of view of the two cartoonists. Source C approves of the fact that Britain is in control, whereas Source D does not approve and regards Britain as arrogant. Whichever of these types of answers candidates gave, it was important that they used details in the cartoons to support their answers, for example 'In Source C the cartoonist seems to support the idea that Britain should continue to rule the oceans by saying that money was no object. This suggests it was so important that Britain was ready to spend any amount. But in Source D, Britain is shown as selfish, smug and arrogant, and greedily claiming that the ocean belongs only to Britain. This means that the cartoonist does not think Britain has a right to own the seas.' Less successful answers demonstrated some understanding of one or both cartoons but were unable to make any valid comparison. A very small number of candidates struggled to make any sense of the cartoons.
- (c) A number of candidates struggled with this question and were only able to give a sub-message of the source as a reason why it was published, for example 'It was published to tell people that Germany was against disarmament.' Other candidates explained the context of the naval race and suggested this as the reason for publication, without any further explanation. Both types of answers missed the fact that the source is about the Hague Conference. Better answers did focus on the Conference and stated that the report was blaming Germany for its failure. A very small number of candidates considered purpose. If more candidates had considered purpose they could, for example, have suggested that it was published to justify Britain building more warships (Britain had begun building dreadnoughts in the previous year).
- (d) These two sources show different attitudes from William. In Source F, he demonstrates an aggressive attitude towards Britain and appears to be ready to go to war while in Source G, he claims he wants to be on good terms with Britain and in favour of peace. They also agree about some important points, for example William does want to expand the German navy. A good number of candidates managed to provide reasonable answers by using the differences in attitude as a reason for F making G surprising. More could have gone on to explain how the sources also agree. It was rare to find candidates who realised that evaluation could be used to develop their answers. Knowledge of the international context could have been used to consider whether any of the attitudes attributed to William were surprising, while William's purpose in Source G could also have been used. A number of candidates demonstrated some understanding of the sources but did not make any statement about whether they were surprised by Source G.
- (e) A reasonable number of candidates were able to find some sources that supported the hypothesis and others that disagreed with it. These candidates were not all able to use the content of the sources as support. To answer **Question (e)** successfully, candidates need to do the following

things: **(i)** make it clear which side of the argument they are using a source for, **(ii)** make it clear by source letter which source they are referring to, **(iii)** support their answer by using either a quotation that in itself does the job required and relates exactly to the hypothesis, for example 'Source A supports the idea that Britain was to blame because it says that it 'worsened relations with Germany by starting to build the first dreadnought' ', or by providing some explanation of how a source does or does not support the hypothesis, for example 'Source E disagrees. It suggests Germany was to blame because it explains how it had argued against disarmament at the Hague Conference and had encouraged countries to start building up their forces and prepare for war.' Other responses either neglected to refer to the sources at all or grouped them into two groups but then made general assertions about each group, without referring to individual sources.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 2

- (a)** Sources A and B gave candidates a good number of agreements and disagreements to use in their answers. For example, the sources agree that the whole episode was a fiasco, that Kennedy wanted to hide US involvement and that cancelling the second air strike was an error. On the other hand, the sources disagree about the effectiveness of the air strike, the reasons for the cancellation of the second air strike and the numbers killed. Most candidates were able to explain both agreements and disagreements.

It is important that candidates know how to organise and present comparisons. A number of candidates summarised one source and then the other one. This left their answers with no specific comparisons. Other answers appeared to be the result of candidates writing their answers before they were sure of what they wanted to say. This resulted in confused answers often trying to compare parts of the sources that were not matches. Better answers were the result of candidates carefully going through the sources and identifying agreements and disagreements before they started writing. For agreements, it was enough to identify the agreement, for example 'Both of these sources say that newspapers were reporting the planned invasion before it took place.' Disagreements need to be explained in rather more detail, for example 'Source A claims that Cuba controlled the skies but Source B says that it only had 8 planes left and so this was unlikely.' The best answers went beyond the details in the sources and compared the overall messages of the two sources. Although Source A does mention mistakes by Kennedy, its main message is that the CIA was to blame for the failure of the invasion. Source B, in contrast, clearly points the finger of blame at Kennedy. Top level answers needed to be supported from the sources. The candidates also needed to make clear that they were writing about the overall messages and not just making another comparison. This can be done by either clearly stating that the comparison being made was of the big or overall messages, or by only making this overall comparison and not attempting any comparisons of detail.

- (b)** Most candidates managed to explain valid sub-messages of the cartoon, and a reasonable number went on to explain the point of view of the cartoonist. When explaining cartoons, it is important that candidates start with a detail in the cartoon. This cartoon contains many details that could be used, such as the Soviet tanks, the US planes and ships and the imprisonment of 'liberty'. It is crucial that candidates make inferences from these details and do not use them literally. Often, use of contextual knowledge can help to make these inferences, for example a good number of candidates knew that by 1961 relations between Cuba and the USSR were becoming closer or that there was a lot of criticism in the US about the regime in Cuba and about communist regimes more generally. Candidates needed to use these different elements to suggest what points the cartoonist wanted to make. For example, many candidates suggested that the inclusion of Soviet tanks was done to suggest that Cuba was under the control of the Soviet Union or dependent on it or was becoming a communist state, and therefore a danger to the US. Many candidates also focused on the imprisoned woman and explained that this represented a lack of freedom in Castro's Cuba or in communist countries more generally. Better answers managed to use the quotation from Kennedy and the pictorial elements in the cartoon together and explained that the cartoonist was claiming that although the invasion had not succeeded, the Cuban people would continue in their fight for freedom. The best answers made explicit statements about the point of view of the cartoon – either that it is critical of Castro and his regime or that it is supportive of the attempted invasion. These statements had to be clear and explicit. The weakest answers either misinterpreted the cartoon, for example by seeing it as pro-Castro, or described its surface features.

- (c) The starting point for a good answer to this question is the understanding that Source D is clearly placing the blame for the disaster with the CIA, while Source E blames Kennedy and his government. This requires a comparison of the two sources, including some reference to the final sentence of Source E, which is the only part of the source which focuses on the failure of the invasion. Answers that explained this disagreement and concluded that either Source D or Source E was therefore wrong, achieved good marks. Better answers realised that something more was required to properly establish whether Source D or Source E could be believed. In other words, one or both of the sources, needs to be evaluated. This consisted of making use of the many problematic elements of the nature of either of the sources, for example the role of Robert Kennedy, the promotion of Taylor, the fact that Source E was written by the CIA's official historian, the claims made about the committee and the report in Source E, or using other sources in the paper or contextual knowledge. Answers that made appropriate use of comparison of the sources and evaluated at least one of them were able to achieve higher marks. However, a good number of responses were unable to make the comparison between Sources D and E. Good points were often made about the two sources, but they needed to be brought together. Other candidates compared the sources in regard to issues about the committee but would have been improved by making the essential move of comparing what the two sources have to say about who was to blame for the failure of the Bay of Pigs. A small number of candidates carried out some relevant analysis of the sources but neglected to conclude on whether D was wrong.
- (d) Most candidates were able to at least use the context to explain why Kennedy made the speech. They referred to the fact that the speech was made while the attempted invasion was proceeding but failing, or explained that Kennedy was justifying his actions, criticising Castro or even communism more widely, or arguing that the struggle against communism should continue. These answers were completed competently. Better answers dug more deeply. They demonstrated an understanding that Kennedy's purpose was to distance himself from the disaster of the Bay of Pigs. This is made particularly clear when the date of the speech is taken into account – by 20 April it was clear that the attempted invasion had failed, and Kennedy was desperate not to be associated with it. A few candidates further improved their answers by suggesting a valid reason why Kennedy's audience was a group of newspaper editors.
- (e) The majority of candidates managed to use the sources to explain how they either supported or disagreed with the hypothesis. A substantial number of these went on to achieve better answers by doing both elements. However, a number of candidates were unable to do either support or disagreement. Some candidates understood what they had to do and made a choice of sources that could have led to good answers. The weakness of these answers is that they did not use the sources properly – they did not explain how they supported or did not support the hypothesis. Some just asserted that sources were on one side or another, while others produced very general explanations that did not relate to specific sources, for example 'Source E proves that Kennedy was to blame because it says he did not do his job properly and did not want to be blamed.' If done appropriately, this explanation would read as something closer to: 'Source E proves that Kennedy was to blame because it says 'the major causes for the failure were the actions, or inactions, of the Kennedy Administration, including the President.' ' To answer **Question (e)** successfully candidates need to do the following things: **(i)** make it clear which side of the argument they are using a source for, **(ii)** make it clear by source letter which source they are referring to, **(iii)** support their answer by using either a quotation that in itself does the job required and relates exactly to the hypothesis (as the quote above from Source E does), or by providing some explanation of how a source does or does not support the hypothesis, for example 'Source C does not show that Kennedy was to blame because it shows a Soviet tank which suggests that Cuba was able to defend itself because it had strong military support from the Soviet Union.' Other responses either neglected to refer to the sources at all or grouped them into two groups but then made general assertions about each group, without referring to individual sources.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 2147/23 Document Questions</p>

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