

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 2147/12**  
**Structured Questions**

## **Key messages**

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

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

If candidates are asked to compare two given factors or individuals identified in the question, answers should be focused on these specific factors or individuals.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose.

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)**, the strongest 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.

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 asked '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, without addressing the question.

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

### **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 and most candidates answered this question first in the examination.

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates misinterpreted the word 'colonies' and wrote about Germany's territorial losses in Europe, including details such as Alsace Lorraine went to France and West Prussia went to Poland. A number of candidates wrote generally about other terms of the Treaty of Versailles, including the reparations and military terms. The strongest responses demonstrated a good understanding of what happened to Germany's colonies in the Treaty of Versailles, differentiating between those in Africa and Asia, naming specific colonies and stating which country they were awarded to in the Treaty.

(b) The key to this question was clearly explaining what a 'diktat' was in relation to the Treaty of Versailles and why it was important to the Germans. A number of candidates either neglected to write about the 'diktat' or did not understand what it meant and wrote generally about why the terms of the Treaty were important. Others did understand that a 'diktat' was a 'dictated peace' but would have improved their responses by clearly explaining what this meant in the context of the Treaty of Versailles. Strong responses identified that a 'diktat' meant that the Germans had not been allowed to take part in the negotiations at Versailles and thus had no say in the decisions made. In the best responses, two explanations were provided. A variety of examples were used to explain the impact of the 'diktat', including the unfairness of the Treaty, as the Treaty was so harsh and they had agreed to an armistice in November 1918 and did not see themselves as a defeated power. Some included the fact that Wilson's 14 Points led them to believe that they would be treated fairly and this was not the case. Other strong responses stressed the sense of injustice and resentment of Germans towards their government for signing the Treaty ('the November Criminals'), which resulted in political unrest shown through the Kapp Putsch, Munich Putsch and political assassinations in the early 1920s.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. The strongest responses identified specific terms from the Treaty of Versailles and explained why Clemenceau and Lloyd George were satisfied or disappointed with them. For example, Clemenceau aimed for France to be secure against future threats from Germany and wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state. He was disappointed because this did not happen, as he had to compromise with Wilson and Lloyd George and the Rhineland was only demilitarised. Other examples explained were Clemenceau's disappointment with the military clauses and the size of the reparations. Candidates tended to be more confident in explaining why Clemenceau was disappointed with the Treaty and some candidates only gave explanations on his side of the argument. To produce a balanced argument, strong responses also explained Lloyd George's disappointment with the Treaty. Most referred to how Lloyd George wanted Germany to be able to continue to trade with Britain after the war as, previously, Germany had been Britain's second largest trading partner. As a result of the Treaty of Versailles, he was disappointed with the large reparations and the loss of German industrial areas, most citing the loss of control of the coal industry of the Saar region, which would lessen Germany's capacity to trade with Britain, and thus affect Britain's economy. In making a judgement, the majority came to the conclusion that Clemenceau was most disappointed with the Treaty because France had suffered great damage to the landscape and huge loss of life, therefore he wanted the terms to be much harsher on Germany, such as the complete destruction of its armed forces, so that it could

not invade France again, whereas Lloyd George did achieve the reduction of the German navy and was pleased with the additions to the British Empire. Weaker responses devoted much time to explaining the aims of the two men and why they had these aims, without specifying why they were disappointed with the Treaty. Some wrote out all the terms of the Treaty and then, at the end of the response, stated that Clemenceau found them too harsh, without specifically saying why. The best approach was to take a specific term of the Treaty and explain why each of the men were happy or disappointed with the term.

### Question 6

This was the second most popular question of the Core Content questions.

(a) This question was well answered, with many candidates being very familiar with German rearmament in the 1930s. Many candidates were able to provide more than the four relevant points required, including the initial secrecy and later openly rearming, the introduction of conscription and the remilitarising of the Rhineland. Most were also secure on the chronology of events. Weaker responses identified fewer points.

(b) A small number of candidates omitted this part question entirely (while often answering the other two parts satisfactorily). Others struggled in their responses. Most were able to identify the anti-communist purpose of the Pact but could not always explain this fully enough. Hitler's hostility to communism was best known, but that of Japan was less understood, with some candidates asserting that Japan was under threat from communist China. The strongest responses explained the common ideological links between the three signatories of the Pact and also identified and explained the imperialistic ambitions of all three powers. These responses often displayed good contextual knowledge, such as the impact of the Spanish Civil War on relations between Germany and Italy, and the way in which Hitler's designs on Austria played into this developing partnership. Some candidates omitted one of the Pact members in their responses, concentrating on Germany's links with either Japan or Italy, but not both. Some described it as a formal military alliance. Where candidates struggled with their knowledge of the Pact, responses took different directions. Several wrote about an anti-communist pact involving Britain, Germany and France (and in some instances, the USA). A small number of responses asserted that Soviet Russia was expanding into Eastern Europe in the 1930s.

(c) This question produced some strong responses. The most successful responses to this question were well organised and identified and explained which was more important - the Nazi Soviet Pact or the Munich Agreement. Most candidates were able to identify two relevant points on either side of the argument, and many were able to support these with convincing explanations. While a few candidates wrote a narrative of the events of 1938-39, most concentrated on 'importance' as the key word in the question and provided a balanced response with sufficient detail and contextual knowledge to attain high marks. The strongest responses, regardless of which agreement they saw as the more important, were able to explain how the Munich Agreement led onto the Nazi-Soviet Pact, especially focusing on Munich's effect on Stalin's thinking. Some candidates were strong on explanations on one side of the question only, but most could provide explanations on both sides and come to a judgement. Some weaker responses still identified relevant points, but explanations would have benefited from the inclusion of firm contextual knowledge. Overall, candidates tended to be rather more secure in their understanding of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Where explanations faltered on the Munich Agreement, there were some common misunderstandings, for example about the extent of what was agreed, with a number of candidates thinking that Britain and France gave Hitler access to the whole of Czechoslovakia, or that, far from this being seen by many as a great success for the policy of appeasement, the western powers ended appeasement at this point because Hitler had demonstrated at Munich that he could not be trusted, rather than after he proved this by taking over the whole of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. A small number of candidates believed that discussions at Munich were being conducted by the League of Nations or that Hitler was testing the League, whereas the League was not involved. The most common misunderstanding on the Nazi-Soviet Pact was the belief that this was a mutual defence pact which would mean that Britain and France would find themselves at war with both Germany and Soviet Russia if they declared war on Germany over an invasion of Poland.

### Question 7

(a) This question was well answered. The strongest responses identified four features of the Tet Offensive such as: it occurred during the Tet New Year celebrations; it was a surprise attack;

communist/Vietcong attacks took place across Vietnam; the Americans and the South Vietnamese won back the territory that they had lost; it was seen as a defeat by the US media. A common misconception was that the US embassy in Saigon was captured, while very few candidates mentioned the capture of Hue. Weaker responses did not recognise the Offensive and either saw it as a US attack or an event in Europe during the Cold War.

(b) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding as to why the Cuban Missile Crisis was important. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons, most commonly, the threat of nuclear war and the respective fortunes of Kennedy and Khrushchev, with Kennedy's reputation enhanced and Khruschev's diminished. For example: 'The crisis did damage to Khrushchev's reputation because although he appeared to be a responsible peacemaker by removing the missiles from Cuba, he appeared to have backed down because, although Kennedy removed the missiles from Turkey, this was done in secret. There were many in the Soviet government who were unhappy with this and the damage it did to the reputation of the Soviet Union. It did lead to Khrushchev's removal from power in 1964'. Weaker responses readily identified the reasons for the importance of the crisis, such as the introduction of the 'Hotline' and the 1963 Test Ban Treaty, but they needed to include contextual details in order to develop their response into an explanation. A small number of candidates confused the Cuban Missile Crisis with the Bay of Pigs invasion and less successful responses contained much narrative and description of the crisis, rather than stressing its importance. It was rare to see responses which examined the impact of the crisis on Cuba.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question as to how far the United States failed to achieve its aims in the Korean War. The strongest responses were from candidates who explained that the original aim of the US was to implement its policy of containment and to remove the North Koreans from the South, but that it subsequently changed its aim to defeating the North. The former aim was achieved because North and South Korea remained separated at the 38th parallel but not the latter, because China's entry into the war forced the US to retreat. Candidates were more confident in explaining how the US contained communism, often including the support of the United Nations. The involvement of the UN was sometimes identified as an aim of the US, partly to show that the UN could succeed where the League had failed and partly because it provided legitimacy for the US cause. The role of General MacArthur featured prominently in many strong responses to good effect. The expansion of the Cold War to Asia was rarely recognised as an unintended consequence of the war in Korea, but many candidates were able to explain that it strengthened, rather than weakened China, and by extension made communism more secure in North Korea. Many responses referred to the human cost of the war, particularly the impact of the war on civilians which was relevant, but this point could have been enhanced by addressing the duration of the war, which was not expected to last for as long as it did, especially after the battle lines had stagnated into stalemate in 1951. A few weaker responses muddled events in Korea with those of Vietnam and some thought that North and South were divided as a result of the war.

## Question 8

A small number of candidates answered this question.

(a) Knowledge and understanding were variable in response to this question. Strong responses identified four key elements of the role played by Jaruzelski in Poland in 1981, such as in February 1981 he was Prime Minister of Poland; he had negotiations with Walesa to form a government of understanding; these negotiations broke down; in December he introduced martial law; he arrested Walesa; he arrested thousands of other Solidarity supporters. Weaker responses often confused Jaruzelski with Walesa and wrote about the Solidarity Movement, which lacked relevance. Others often referred to events before or after 1981. It is important to read the question carefully, especially the dates, to ensure that only relevant information is included.

(b) This question was well answered, and most responses were credited with one valid explained reason as to why Soviet policy towards Eastern Europe changed after 1985. Most responses demonstrated a good understanding of the changes that occurred when Gorbachev became leader of the Soviet Union, including the introduction of new policies such as Glasnost and Perestroika. Another creditable explanation revolved around the economically weak state of the Soviet Union and highlighted the problems of the increased costs faced in respect of maintaining control of the satellite states of in Eastern Europe. As a result, they chose to stop propping up communist regimes because it was costing far too much money. The protests of Eastern European peoples due to poor economic conditions, the growth and actions of Solidarity and the tearing down of the

Berlin Wall in 1989 were other factors explained that led to a change in policy towards Eastern Europe after 1985. Some responses would have been improved by the inclusion of contextual detail.

(c) There were many strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of events in both Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Most were familiar with the reforms that Nagy wanted to make in Hungary and highlighted that the real threat to Soviet control was the idea that Hungary should leave the Warsaw Pact. They explained that this was a military alliance of communist countries, and it was important for keeping the communist bloc secure and putting down anti-Soviet risings. If one country like Hungary left, it would make all of the communist bloc less secure and could encourage other countries to follow. To produce a balanced response, the threat from Czechoslovakia was explained, including the reforms proposed by Dubcek and the Prague Spring ideas, such as allowing other political parties and free speech, were discussed. The implication of these ideas was a real threat to communism and to Soviet control. The best responses included a valid judgement, with many responses choosing events in Hungary to be the most serious threat because, although the ideas put forward in these two countries were similar, there was a crucial difference. In Hungary it was proposed to leave the Warsaw Pact, and this could seriously weaken Soviet control over Eastern Europe. Whether candidates chose events in Hungary or Czechoslovakia as the greater threat to Soviet control, it was important that responses were supported by contextual knowledge. Weaker responses were usually able to identify events in one or both of the countries, but their responses were limited to a description of events, rather than explaining why the events were a threat to Soviet control in Eastern Europe.

## **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 many candidates described what Stresemann did in 1923 to deal with hyperinflation, for example: he ended the passive resistance in the Ruhr; he restarted reparation payments; he burnt the worthless marks; he introduced a new currency, the Rentenmark. A key part of the question was 'in 1923'. A number of responses drifted into 1924 and discussed the Dawes Plan. Others spent time describing the effects of hyperinflation, both of which lacked relevance to the question.

(b) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of why the Kapp Putsch took place in 1920. Strong responses identified two reasons most commonly. Firstly, that they hated the Treaty of Versailles and secondly, they wanted to overthrow the Weimar Government and bring back the Kaiser. To develop the first reason into an explanation, strong responses referred to the military terms of the Treaty, especially the restrictions to the size of Germany's armed forces, which had resulted in out of work ex-soldiers joining the Freikorps. Their anger had increased when the government announced that the Freikorps would be disbanded. Details to support the second reason included that they blamed the Weimar Government for signing the Treaty, especially when they believed that the German army had not been defeated and the sense of injustice fuelled the Dolchstoss, as well as the label of the new government as 'November Criminals'. Weaker responses spent much time describing the events of the Kapp Putsch, which was not the focus of the question. Other weak responses confused the Freikorps with the Spartacists.

(c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question in which candidates were able to demonstrate whether the Weimar Republic was stable in the period 1924 to 1929. Arguments for the Weimar Republic being stable revolved around economic prosperity, international acceptance, cultural revival and lack of support for extremist parties. On the other side of the argument, candidates put forward reasons why the Weimar Republic could be considered unstable during this time including nationalists being against joining the League of Nations, traditional Germans seeing the advances in culture as 'moral decline', unemployment still being high and farmers facing problems due to overproduction. The most successful responses included explanations on both

sides of the argument and then came to a valid judgement, with many stating that the Weimar Republic was stable during these years and this 'Golden Age' was enjoyed by many Germans. However, this stability was not built on firm foundations; its economy was built on US loans and if these were withdrawn, which they were, in October 1929, Germany would be in trouble. A number of responses included information from before 1924, including the French occupation of the Ruhr, the economic results of hyperinflation and the Kapp and Munich Putsches, which were all outside the scope of the question. Others included details of how Hitler used the Depression from the Wall Street Crash to rise to power, which also lacked relevance. Weaker responses would have benefited from the inclusion of relevant information to support the statements made.

### Question 12

(a) Candidates struggled to name any churchmen and to describe anything specific as to why they opposed the Nazi regime. However, some strong responses named two churchmen and gave reasons why they opposed the Nazi regime. For example, Bishop Galen led a popular protest against the Nazi policies of killing the mentally ill and physically disabled people; Dietrich Bonhoeffer preached against the Nazis and helped Jews escape. Some responses drifted away from the focus of the question and included details of the Concordat with the Catholic Church in 1933.

(b) This question was well answered, and most candidates were very familiar with the reasons why the Nazis persecuted the Roma. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons. Most commonly explained was Hitler's belief that the Aryan race was superior to all others and thus he saw the Roma as an inferior people, a threat to German racial purity. A second creditable reason put forward was that the Nazis regarded the Roma as criminals and vagabonds who were also lazy and did not contribute to German society. Less successful responses drifted from the focus of the question and often wrote much about how Hitler persecuted the Roma, with details of the concentration camps.

(c) There were many strong responses to this question which demonstrated a very good understanding of how far mass rallies were the most important reason why the Nazis were able to keep control of Germany. The best responses identified and explained how mass rallies were important for keeping control, including the huge Nuremberg rallies, the marches, bands, speeches, torchlight processions and flying displays. They emphasised that these were huge emotional events, with people caught up in the atmosphere, and this helped strengthen their loyalty to the Nazi state; these rallies gave them a sense of belonging and convinced them to support Hitler. Responses were more confident explaining other reasons why the Nazis kept control, most commonly citing the fear produced by the 'police state' ordered by Hitler and the role of the SS. The role of the SS was well known and 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. Evidence of the role of the different branches of the SS was also seen in responses, such as the Death Head Units and the Waffen. Most candidates were very familiar with other ways in which the Nazis kept control and considered the fear of the Gestapo, the control of the youth population through education and the Hitler Youth, the distribution of radios, control of the media and control of the courts as effective forms of control. Weaker responses, although showing some understanding of the ways in which the Nazis kept control, were characterised by long sections of description, and would have benefited from emphasising how the identified ways helped Hitler keep control.

### 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 candidates were very familiar with the industries which did not benefit from the boom in the 1920s. Many included details such as the coal industry did not benefit because they suffered from competition from new industries like oil and electricity; the traditional textile industries of cotton and wool suffered from new materials such as rayon. Reference to other industries which suffered including farming, leather and shoemaking also gained credit.

(b) Knowledge and understanding of why the developments outside the United States affected American farming in the 1920s was varied; some wrote about problems inside the United States, rather than outside. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons. The two most common reasons identified were the competition from the highly efficient Canadian wheat producers and the lack of European markets, due to the ending of the First World War. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of supporting factual details.

(c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question, in which candidates were able to demonstrate whether credit was more important than Republican policies in causing the boom of the 1920s. The best responses explained that the widespread availability of credit fuelled a consumer boom, allowing Americans to purchase goods like cars, vacuum cleaners, radios and washing machines on hire purchase schemes which significantly boosted demand and economic growth. This 'buy now pay later' system made previously expensive items accessible to a wider population, helping businesses boost their sales and profits, thus creating new jobs and driving the growth of various industries. Weaker responses usually included details of the meaning of credit but were unable to make a link to increased production and profits for firms to reinvest into their industry. Most candidates were familiar with, and identified at least one of the Republican policies, including laissez-faire, low taxation, tariffs and trusts. The most successful responses explained how the policy caused the boom, rather than just listing the policies. For example, the government were keen to protect domestic industry by placing high tariffs on goods from abroad. As a result, foreign goods became more expensive. These tariffs protected businesses from foreign competition and allowed American companies to grow even more rapidly. The strongest responses gave at least one explanation on each side of the argument and came to a valid judgement. Most agreed that although the Republican policies were important, it was more important that the American people could afford to buy the new consumer goods which were being made, like cars and fridges. Credit enabled large number of Americans to buy these goods, which stimulated industry; it would have been pointless for industries to increase production of goods if Americans could not afford to buy them. A few candidates strayed away from the focus of the question and wrote about other factors prevalent in America which caused the boom, for example industrial strength, advertising and new methods of production.

**Questions 16, 17 and 18**

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

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 2147/13**  
**Structured Questions**

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

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 2147/22**  
**Document Questions**

## **Key messages**

Candidates should plan their answers before writing them. This will help lead to focused, relevant and well-organised responses. When candidates start writing their answers, they should know what they want to say.

A direct response to the question in the first sentence of the answer should be made, for example 'He made this speech then because...', 'Source D does not prove that Mussolini was lying because...', 'These two sources disagree because...'. Responses can then move on to reasons, explanation and argument.

Candidates need to read the questions through carefully and decide which ones require an evaluation of the sources. Proper evaluation constitutes using relevant knowledge or cross reference to other sources to support arguments.

When quotations are used in answers, they must be given in full. When ellipses are used the quotation often loses its meaning and relevance.

When answering the final question, candidates must test the hypothesis given in the question and refer to key parts of the sources that support and clinch their arguments.

Candidates should use their knowledge of the topic to help them interpret and evaluate the sources.

## **General comments**

A large majority of the candidates opted for the twentieth century option. Nearly all candidates understood the requirements of the paper and only a very small number struggled with the language of the sources. The majority of candidates demonstrated sound contextual knowledge and a good range of source skills. Many candidates interpreted and evaluated the sources well, although some struggled with comparing sources in **2(a)**, and with explaining why sources disagreed in **1(a)**. The final question in both options showed that some candidates were not sure how to use the sources to support their answers.

Very few candidates failed to complete all five questions and only a very small number attempted both options in error. One general weakness was the excessive length of many answers. Some candidates wrote at great length about many aspects of the sources, rather than producing focused answers that were direct and concise. Stronger answers tended to be provided by candidates who had clearly thought about the questions and planned their material before responding. This was clear from the opening sentences of their answers which directly addressed the questions. The rest of their answers provided relevant supporting analysis and argument.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Option A: Nineteenth century topic***

##### **Question 1**

(a) The best answers were based on a careful reading of the question. It is about why the two sources disagree, rather than how they disagree. These answers used the background information and relevant knowledge to explain that both sources were announcements made on the day the Franco-Prussian War began. Having established this, they then explained the purpose of both the French government and William I. Slightly less successful answers just used the context as an explanation of why they disagree. A number of candidates neglected to read the question carefully and just explained what the disagreements between the sources were.

(b) A reasonable number of candidates showed understanding of the two cartoons and explained that the cartoonists would not have agreed. They understood that, in Source C, 'Death' is Napoleon's friend. The clear suggestion is that Napoleon was responsible for the carnage shown and for war, famine and ruin. In Source D, 'Death' is pleased with Bismarck, who is shown to be responsible for the war and the killing. A number of candidates suggested an alternative reading of Source D – that it is predicting a disaster for Prussia and Bismarck. This interpretation was credited. The remaining candidates often understood parts of the cartoons (sub-messages) but were unable to construct valid overall interpretations. This was sometimes due to not using the information provided. This led some candidates to not recognise Napoleon in Source C and Bismarck in Source D.

(c) Good answers used the content of the two sources to explain that they disagree over who was to blame for the war. Source E contains Bismarck's claim that he cleverly engineered the war, while making it look as if France was the aggressor. Source F, on the other hand, clearly makes France responsible for the war. These answers took Source E at face value to argue that it does, therefore, make Source F surprising. The best answers, however, focused on evaluating Source E. They explained that E is from Bismarck's memoirs, published nearly thirty years later. In them, Bismarck was trying to show how he planned the unification of Germany, and how his manipulating France into declaring war was part of his plan. These candidates used this to argue that Source E does not necessarily make Source F surprising because Bismarck's account cannot be trusted. Weaker answers argued that both sources say that France was to blame, while others selected and tried to compare isolated details from the two sources. Some candidates did all the hard work with the sources but did not go on to address the issue of whether Source E makes F surprising.

(d) Candidates who answered this question well used their understanding of the context to explain Bismarck's purpose – to make France believe that Prussia had plans for a war. Almost as good, were those answers that explained that Bismarck's claims that he did not want a war with France were false. Weaker answers focused on the logic of some of Bismarck's claims in Source G, for example, it would not be a good idea to go to war with a good trading partner, while others just used the provenance of the source, for example, he would lie to a journalist.

(e) This question was answered quite well. A good number of candidates were able to explain how Sources A, D and E can be used to support the hypothesis, while Sources B, C, F and G can be used to refute the hypothesis. It is important that candidates make clear for each source they use, (i) which source they are referring to, (ii) which side of the argument that source is on, and (iii) how that source is supporting or disagreeing with the hypothesis given in the question. This last step was achieved by using a key part of the relevant source, for example, 'Source A states that Prussian attempts to make a Prussian prince the King of Spain were a threat to France and the general balance of power in Europe' and 'Source F tells us that France unexpectedly declared war.' There were some weaker answers where candidates did not use the sources so effectively or did not use the sources at all.

#### ***Option B: Twentieth century topic***

##### **Question 2**

(a) Most candidates were able to find and explain at least one agreement between the two sources, for example, Mussolini was sure the League would not act, and Italy faced economic problems. The

sources agree in several ways, but a number of candidates explained just one agreement. Many candidates found it harder to find valid disagreements. Some attempts were invalid, for example it cannot be argued that the sources disagree over why Mussolini invaded by stating that Source A says it was because of the lack of rewards after the First World War and that Source B says it was the defeat at the Battle of Adowa. The problem with this is that both sources give the peace treaties of 1919 as a reason. It is also important to understand that disagreements need more explanation. An agreement can simply be identified, for example, 'The two sources agree that Mussolini wanted to develop Abyssinia.' However, both sides of a disagreement need to be explained, for example, 'Source A says that Abyssinia was right for economic development, but Source B disagrees because it says Abyssinia was poor and without raw materials.' The best answers made point by point comparisons of the two sources, but some other responses summarised each source in turn, without identifying any particular agreements or disagreements. Another approach which was problematic was to list two or three points from one source and then claim a comparison with a list of two or three points from the other source. The approach which always works best is to go through the sources highlighting or underlining agreements and disagreements and then writing about each one separately. Some candidates tried to compare the overall messages of the two extracts, but this led to many referring to most of the points in the sources and not producing a clear and concise comparison such as: 'Source A does emphasise psychological motivations and Mussolini's need for 'a triumph and glory', while Source B focuses much more on Italy's internal problems.'

(b) This question produced many good answers. These responses used the date of the source and what Mussolini is saying to argue that he must have been speaking to the Italian people about the intended invasion of Abyssinia planned for the next day. This led them to use the content and tone of the speech to argue that he was either trying to persuade the people to support the invasion or he was trying to justify it. There is much in the source that can be used as support for the idea of justification. Mussolini refers to 'injustices' that have been inflicted on Abyssinia such as the peace treaties of 1919, and the fact that Abyssinia is 'barbarian' and 'unworthy'. The best answers took a further step and inferred from the attempt at justification and the reference to 'millions of Italians marching in unity', that he was trying to persuade them to support the forthcoming invasion. Among the weaker answers, some explained the context (some immediate and some general) but did not make any valid use of the content of Source C. Others used the content of the source but failed to relate it to the impending invasion. The weakest answers either paraphrased the source or neglected to use their answers as reasons for Mussolini making the speech. It is important when answering questions that candidates relate what they are writing to the question being asked.

(c) The best answers explained how Sources D and E differ and then used their contextual knowledge, evidence from other sources or the provenance of one of the sources to evaluate at least one of the sources. The most straightforward way to do this was to use the fact that the Italians had carried out a terrible, brutal attack on the Abyssinians (either from Source F or the candidate's knowledge) to confirm that Mussolini was lying. Other answers explored the possibility that Mussolini was 'sugar coating' what he told the Grand Council to persuade it to support his future actions over Abyssinia. Some candidates tried to use the provenance of Source D by arguing that Badoglio would know what was happening because he was an experienced and senior soldier. These attempts were often quite generic in approach and not so convincing. Another way to provide a very strong answer was to explain that the two men are actually saying the same thing, but Mussolini is hiding what he means. There are hints of this when he talks about 'natural expansion' and not blocking the expansion of Fascist Italy. Candidates explained that this suggests that he probably meant the same as Badoglio in Source D. Most candidates were able to use appropriate parts of the two sources to explain how they differ and as proof that Mussolini was lying, for example, 'the complete destruction of the Abyssinian army and the total conquest of Abyssinia' in Source D, compared to 'no question of territorial conquests' in Source E. Better answers of this type also explained how the two men also appear to agree in places, but they did not go as far to suggest that fundamentally the two are saying the same thing. The least successful answers tried to compare the two sources but chose parts of Sources D and E that did not give agreements or disagreements. Other answers worked hard with the sources but missed the opportunity to address the issue of whether Mussolini was lying.

(d) A majority of candidates understood that the cartoon is criticising Mussolini and the Italians. They were able to explain how the cartoonist is claiming that Mussolini was a callous murderer who did not care about the suffering he was causing. A reasonable number of candidates went further and focused on the text below the cartoon. Many suggested that Mussolini is being shown to be a hypocrite. They explained that he is describing Abyssinians as 'uncivilised savages', while acting

as a savage himself. Demonstrating understanding of this led to good marks. To achieve a stronger response, candidates needed to explain how details of the illustration work with the text under the source to make a mockery of Mussolini. The cartoonist is not just saying what a dreadful person Mussolini is, he is also making fun of him. The best answers explained two points about the cartoon's message: Mussolini is an uncivilised savage, the Abyssinians are not. Some candidates wrote at length about the cartoon being a criticism of the League of Nations, while a few others attempted to argue that the cartoonist is showing how primitive Abyssinia was. However, it is clear that the cartoon is a criticism of Mussolini.

(e) A good number of candidates were able to use the sources properly to explain how some of them support the hypothesis and some do not. Most candidates knew which sources fell into which category but not all of them were able to use the sources in a valid way. It is important that candidates make clear for each source they use, (i) which source they are referring to, (ii) which side of the argument that source is on, and (iii) how that source is supporting or disagreeing with the hypothesis given in the question. The last stage is the one at which a number of candidates have difficulty. The best answers used key phrases from sources that clearly supported their argument. These were given as quotations from the sources or close paraphrases. For example, Source B supports the claim that Mussolini invaded Abyssinia because he thought it was uncivilised by stating that he tried to win over Italians to the idea of a conquest of Abyssinia by claiming it was their mission to help the country progress from its primitive state. On the other hand, several sources suggest other reasons for the invasion. Source B suggests that Mussolini wanted to 'turn the attention of Italians away from the dreadful state of their own country', while in Source C he claims Italy was let down badly after the First World War. Weaker answers referred to the sources generally and did not select key passages from them. It is important that candidates use the sources separately, rather than grouping them and making general claims about each group. It is possible that some individual sources can be used to support both sides of the issue. It will always be possible to use the set of sources to support both sides of the argument. Candidates should not stop after they have used sources on one side.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 2147/23  
Document Questions**

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