

HISTORY

Paper 2147/12
Paper 12

Key messages

It is important that candidates read the question very carefully before they begin their response, in order to understand exactly what is being asked and thus only include relevant factual details. They should note the particular focus of any given question.

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

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

General comments

Strong responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study questions. These responses included a clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. These responses 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 essays.

In weaker responses candidates, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by description and lists of facts, with no explanation.

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 should focus on description and only include relevant details. There is no need for background information. Explanation is not required. Most candidates now realise that responses to **(a)** questions can be short and concise.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and always 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 a description of what happened. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Less successful responses often focussed only on one side of the argument. These could have been improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1,2,3 and 4

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

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most popular questions in the Core Section.

Question 5

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated good understanding of the territorial terms of the Treaty of St Germain. Credit was given for the naming of both countries which became independent and the territory that was awarded to specific countries. Knowledge awarded included that: 'The treaty dealt with Austria', 'The Austro-Hungarian Empire was broken up', 'The union of Austria and Germany was forbidden' and 'Hungary became an independent country'. Weaker responses included information on the non-territorial terms of this Treaty which were not relevant to this question. A number of candidates either confused the Treaty of St Germain with the Treaty of Versailles and discussed Germany's territorial losses or made very general statements, such as 'they lost land'. A common misconception was that 'Austria was not allowed to reunite with Germany'.
- (b) This question was well answered. Most candidates were familiar with the reasons why Lloyd George did not want to punish Germany harshly. Two well explained reasons were needed. Two commonly explained reasons were firstly, that prior to the First World War Germany had been Britain's second major trading partner and secondly, that there was also a concern that a weakened Germany may turn to communism. Strong responses supported their statements with clear examples, such as: 'Before the First World War Germany had been a major trading partner of Great Britain. After the War, Lloyd George didn't want Germany to be too crippled, as he wanted to resume trade with Germany in order to improve Britain's economy, whether it was importing or exporting materials, but especially providing British jobs. The German economy would not flourish and help the British economy if reparations were set high and industrial areas removed from Germany.' Weaker responses readily included identification of reasons such as: 'Germany would want revenge if it was treated too harshly' or 'Lloyd George didn't want France to become too powerful', without any explanation. It is important to support statements with factual details. Some responses drifted from the focus of the question to discuss the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and whether Lloyd George liked them or not which lacked relevance to this question. It is important for candidates to link the points that they make to the question set. A small number of candidates confused Lloyd George with Woodrow Wilson.
- (c) The strongest responses were well organised and produced a balanced answer by explaining how both Clemenceau and Wilson had to compromise during the peace negotiations in Paris. These strong responses usually identified an aim of either Clemenceau or Wilson and then linked a term to a specific aim to address how far it had been a compromise. For example: 'Clemenceau was concerned about French security and wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state and the German army to be disarmed completely, as France had been invaded by Germany twice in the last fifty years. In the final Treaty he had to compromise because Lloyd George and Wilson didn't agree and didn't want France to become too powerful. He had to accept that the Rhineland was only demilitarised and the German army was allowed 100 000 men.' Others stated that: 'One of Wilson's Fourteen Points was self-determination for all countries. However, this wasn't achieved and he had to compromise because of the imperialistic ambitions of Britain and France. They wanted to keep control of their empire and in the Treaty of Versailles former German colonies became mandates controlled by the League of Nations which effectively meant that Britain and France controlled them.' Weaker responses tended to include lengthy explanations of the aims of both Clemenceau and Wilson and the reasons behind these aims, without specifically mentioning the precise terms of the Treaty, which had led them to compromise. Others concentrated their answers on what Clemenceau or Wilson achieved in the Treaty, with no mention of compromise. Two common misconceptions were that Clemenceau wanted to split Germany into small states. This was the view of Poincare, not Clemenceau. The second one was that Clemenceau wanted the Rhineland to be demilitarised. In fact, he wanted it to be an independent state.

Question 6

- (a) This question worked well for most candidates, who were able to describe Germany's relationship with the League of Nations between 1920 and 1939. There were lots of relevant examples that candidates could have included in their responses. Relevant points included: 'Initially Germany was not allowed to join the League of Nations, until it proved it was a peaceful nation. After the Locarno Treaties in 1926, Germany was accepted into the League of Nations.' Marks were also awarded for examples of Hitler's relationship with the League of Nations, including his withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference and subsequent leaving of the League of Nations. Weaker responses included generalised terms such as: 'They had a bad relationship'. It is important to support a general statement with a specific fact, for example a name or a date.
- (b) Weaker responses showed limited knowledge of Haile Selassie. They also confused the chronology and assumed that Haile Selassie addressed the League of Nations at the start of the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935, whereas the date in the question was June 1936. There were often in answers lengthy details of the background to the Abyssinian Crisis, including why the Italians invaded Abyssinia, which lacked relevance to this question. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons. The reasons explained included: the ruthlessness of the invading Italians, the demand for more sanctions, including the closure of the Suez Canal, and the outrage at the contents of the leaked Hoare-Laval Pact.
- (c) Most responses demonstrated some understanding of the League of Nations handling of the Manchurian Crisis. Strong responses were well organised and considered both sides of the argument. There was a strong feeling that the League of Nations did as much as they could in view of their limitations. The most common reason for this view was that they did send an investigation to find out what had happened, the Lytton Report fed back their results and they morally condemned Japan for the invasion. These responses then explained that, although the Japanese ignored the advice of the League and withdrew from the League of Nations, they could not have done much more because the USA and Russia were not members of the League. If they had imposed sanctions these would not have been effective because the USA, not being in the League, would continue to trade with Japan. In addition, the League had no army and without the powerful American and Russian armies it would be very difficult to beat the Japanese army. Strong responses also explained reasons on the other side of the argument for the League not doing as much as it could, most notably the self-interest of Britain and France. Responses highlighted that it was a good excuse that Japan was too far away, as they did not want to annoy Japan as they wanted to continue trading with their colonies in the Far East. The Lytton Report could be used on either side of the argument because, despite the sending of officials to Manchuria to assess the situation, it was a full year after the invasion before they presented their report. Weaker responses were less secure on the chronology of events and often drifted away from the question to include general details why the League failed, often including examples from other failures, such as Corfu, which lacked relevance to this question. Some also wrote in detail the reasons why Japan invaded Manchuria, which was not relevant to this question. A common misconception was that sanctions were imposed on Japan.

Question 7

- (a) Responses to this question were varied, with the stronger responses able to identify key areas of disagreement at the Potsdam Conference. Reparations, Germany, Poland and Eastern Europe were the most frequently mentioned. Candidates gained marks for including details such as: 'Stalin wanted to cripple Germany with steep reparations, whereas Truman did not want to make the same mistakes as the Treaty of Versailles. The future of Poland also caused disagreement as Stalin wanted it to be under the Soviet sphere of influence, rather than to have free elections as Truman wished'. Stalin's wish to become involved in the war against Japan gained credit in a small number of scripts, while de-Nazification was rarely included. Weaker responses tended either to set the scene (covering Roosevelt's death and the succession of Truman, as well as Atlee replacing Churchill) or to focus less on the contentious issues and more on broader matters such as Truman's antipathy to communism or Stalin being informed by Truman of the USA's development of an atomic bomb. These may have contributed to the atmosphere but were not specific subjects of dispute at Potsdam. A small number of candidates wrote about the decisions taken at Yalta, rather than the differences evident at Potsdam.

- (b) This question was well answered, with most responses able to provide at least one explanation as to why the blockade of Berlin failed. Nearly all identified and explained how the Allied airlift was the main reason for failure. Responses included details of the types of things that were flown in and the number of journeys the planes made. Strong responses were then able to develop paragraphs either exploring Stalin's reluctance to escalate to full scale war by shooting down planes or explaining the counterproductive effects of the blockade in terms of propaganda and/or the impact on East Germany. Weaker responses often included details of why Stalin blockaded Berlin or confused the blockade with the building of the Berlin Wall and the events of 1961.
- (c) There were many strong responses to this question, which demonstrated a good understanding of both sides of the argument. In support of Stalin's policies being defensive, the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine were well discussed, as were the genuine Soviet fears of invasion following Hitler's attack in 1941 and of US military capabilities, following the use of atomic bombs at the end of the Second World War. On the other side of the argument, Stalin's salami tactics, his use of rigged elections and the breaking of previous promises were all used effectively to demonstrate Stalin's expansionism and aggression. The strongest responses were able to offer specific cases of countries affected, such as Czechoslovakia where the events of 1948 were often used convincingly and succinctly as evidence of Soviet aggression. Strong responses often included Cominform and Comecon on one or other side of the argument but there was occasional confusion about the purpose of each of these and of their starting dates. Other responses strayed outside the parameters of the question to include the formation of the Warsaw Pact (though some thought this was an instant reaction to the formation of NATO in 1949) and the quelling of the Hungarian Uprising (1956). It is important to read the dates given in the question to ensure that only relevant details are included in the response.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) The majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the Dawes Plan and gained high marks. Appropriate factual knowledge included that in 1924 the Dawes Plan was arranged between Charles Dawes, an American banker, and Stresemann. It gave loans to Germany to help relieve their economic crisis and helped them in the payment of reparations. It did mean, however, that Germany was heavily reliant on these loans and when the Wall Street Crash occurred in 1929, it impacted hard on the German economy. A small number of responses confused the Dawes Plan with the Young Plan.
- (b) There were many strong responses to this question, which demonstrated a good understanding of the reasons why Germany introduced a new currency in 1923. Two explanations were needed. Most responses considered the reasons for and the impact of hyperinflation on the German economy. They explained some of the events leading up to hyperinflation including Germany's failure to pay reparations resulted in the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr taking what was owed to them in the form of raw materials and goods. The German workers went on strike and the Government printed money to pay the workers, which led to hyperinflation. The most commonly used second explanation was that of the impact of hyperinflation, which included savings becoming worthless and the price of goods skyrocketing. Stresemann introduced a new currency in 1923 to stabilise the economic situation.
- (c) There were some one-sided responses to this question, as candidates were more familiar with the effects of the people's reaction to the Treaty of Versailles on Germany than they were to the effects of the 1918 Revolution on Germany. Some thought that the 1918 Revolution was the Spartacist Uprising. Strong responses to this question were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. These responses considered the events and effects of the 1918 Revolution,

highlighting that the sailors mutiny in Kiel had led to the abdication of the Kaiser and the setting up of a new democratic government headed by Chancellor Ebert. This had led the way to increasing voting rights and fundamental changes in the way Germany was governed under a new constitution. This was opposed by extreme groups like the Spartacists who were Communists and tried to lead a revolution to overthrow the government, which had to be rescued by the Freikorps. On the other side of the argument, most responses were familiar with the people's reaction to the Treaty of Versailles and the effect on Germany. These responses explained how the terms of the Treaty had created hatred and resentment leading to the 'stab in the back' myth and that those responsible were labelled as the 'November Criminals', as they were believed to have betrayed their country having accepted such harsh terms. Strong responses included some of the many different impacts of the Treaty on Germany, including the growth of extremism, the Kapp Putsch and the Munich Putsch. Responses often included the high reparations to emphasise the outrage of the Germans and how the non-payment of reparations led to the occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 by French and Belgian troops, which resulted in Germans being willing to take part in passive resistance in the Ruhr. Others detailed how the terms of the Treaty of Versailles led to outcry and the rise of the Nazi Party, as one of Hitler's main aims was to reverse the terms of the Treaty. Weaker responses drifted from the main question and included extensive description of the terms of the Versailles Treaty, without including any emphasis on the importance for Germany.

Question 12

- (a) This question was well answered and most responses gained high marks for identifying features of the League of German Maidens (BDM), such as, it was a youth group for girls, which taught them Nazi values, including their role as homemakers and mothers. Others included the various activities which were set up for them including camping, marching and physical education. Some responses demonstrated no knowledge of the League of German Maidens and thought it was about women and the issue of medals for procreation.
- (b) Strong responses to this question identified reasons why the Nazis made changes to the school curriculum, most commonly, that they wanted to indoctrinate children at a young age with Nazi ideas, including those of race and the role of girls and boys in the future of Germany. They then supported these identifications with examples such as eugenics on the timetable and the increase of physical education in order to make the girls healthy to be mothers and the boys to be strong soldiers. Weaker responses tended to describe the changes to the school curriculum, rather than emphasise why these changes were made.
- (c) There were some good responses to this question, which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. Candidates needed to produce a balanced answer by explaining how far racial theories explain why minorities were persecuted in Nazi Germany. Then, on the other side of the argument, they needed to explain other reasons why minorities were persecuted. Responses tended to be stronger on the side of racial theories, with the majority of responses outlining clearly Hitler's view on the superiority of the Aryan Race and how the Jews especially were considered as outcasts. On the other side of the argument, the most commonly used explanation was the view that minorities like mentally handicapped and disabled people, drunks and beggars were weakening the Nazi state. They were persecuted by the Nazis because they believed they were undesirables who were not contributing to society and were a drain on German resources. Some responses included the Jews on both sides of the argument due to Hitler's hate and jealousy of the Jews who were often rich and successful business people. Weaker responses were characterised by long descriptions of the treatment of the Jews and could have been improved by an explanation of why they were persecuted. Others identified minorities but would have benefited from explaining why they were persecuted.

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, with most responses describing four ways in which the lives of many young women in cities changed during the 1920s. Women gained the vote, they could smoke and drink in public, their fashions changed and they no longer needed a chaperone to go out were some of the examples used.

- (b) The majority of responses identified reasons why restrictions on immigration were introduced in the 1920s. Most commonly used were the Red Scare and the fact that Americans thought that immigrants would take their jobs. The best answers supported these identifications with factual detail. For example: 'Restrictions were introduced because the Red Scare made many more Americans afraid of immigrants. The rise of communism in Russia made them worry about these ideas coming to America and they thought that immigrants from Eastern Europe were bringing these ideas into the country. These fears were made worse when there were a number of bomb attacks in America by anarchists.'
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question and some were one sided. Candidates were more confident discussing the other problems caused by prohibition, rather than the corruption of police and judges, with weaker responses not developing identifications to explain ways in which the police and judges were corrupt. Others tended to list the problems together in one paragraph, rather than taking a paragraph to explain each problem. Strong responses produced a balanced argument by explaining that the gangs running the production and selling of alcohol bribed the police and judges with money. This meant that many in the police would ignore what the gangs were doing and the judges would let them off if they appeared in court. On the other side of the argument, strong responses were able to identify and explain other problems caused by prohibition. The growth of gangs and the resulting increase in violence in the cities, people making their own illegal moonshine which was often poisonous, and the growth of speakeasies were the most frequently mentioned. Other responses lost focus on the question set and included details such as why prohibition was introduced.

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 2147/13
Paper 13

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

HISTORY

Paper 2147/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Candidates should read through all the sources and plan their answers. Questions need to be answered directly, starting in the first sentence of the response. Sources should not be summarised or described. Knowledge and understanding of the topic can be used to help interpret the sources. When interpreting written or pictorial sources, it is important that candidates consider the overall point that is being made. Knowledge and understanding of the topic should help them explain why sources were published, or when evaluating sources. When quoting from a source, candidates must avoid using truncated versions of quotations. If a quote is worth using, then to make it work it needs to be given in full. When answering **Question 6**, candidates need to use the content of sources to explain **how** they agree or disagree with the hypothesis.

General comments

There were many more scripts on the twentieth century option than on the nineteenth century. The overall standard was good, with very few candidates struggling with the sources or unclear about what it was they had to do. Almost all candidates comfortably completed all six questions. Very often, sources were sensibly interpreted and candidates cross-referencing of sources was effective. Many candidates also understood when it was appropriate to evaluate sources. In some instances, candidates needed to directly address the question earlier in their answers. They tended to write about the sources and only gradually come round to the question towards the end of their answers. However, overall, the performance was strong, with a wide range of source skills being demonstrated, all set in a sound grasp of the historical context.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates managed to find agreements between the two sources by explaining that they both state that the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) was mysterious and that people at the time thought it was doing some good. In terms of disagreements, many candidates spotted that Source A claims the KKK was organised, while Source B says it was not organised. This question was answered best by planning the answer first. Candidates need to go through both sources carefully making matches and mismatches. Once they are clear about these, they can explain both. This avoids the need to produce long summaries of both sources which can distract from clear and direct point-by-point comparisons. Some candidates made it harder to produce point-by-point comparisons by summarising the two sources and stating that the summaries did somewhere contain agreements and disagreements. A number of candidates managed to produce strong answers by explaining that Source A is generally favourable towards the Klan, while Source B is more critical. This needed to be supported with examples from the sources.

Question 2

To answer this question well candidates needed to first understand that the cartoon is criticising the situation in the USA in the period after the Civil War. It is about the period of Reconstruction and is clearly suggesting that the treatment of black Americans was worse than before the war. Organisations like the KKK and the White League are being blamed for this state of affairs. Many candidates were able to use this understanding to explain how the cartoon is useful for telling us all this. Many candidates could have gone further by using their knowledge or by cross-referencing to other sources to support the situation portrayed in

the cartoon. The best answers showed an understanding that the cartoon's real use is as evidence that there were at the time people and magazines critical of the KKK or of Reconstruction. A number of candidates produced good interpretations of the cartoon but neglected to explain how this made the cartoon useful. A few candidates misinterpreted the cartoon or made assertions about it being biased and therefore not useful.

Question 3

The key feature of Source D that candidates needed to focus on is that it is a law being passed by a Southern legislature against the KKK. Some answers missed this central point and focused instead on the details of Source D. However, by using contextual knowledge and/or other sources, a large number of candidates were still able to provide strong responses. The best ones focused on the fact that a Southern legislature was taking strong action against the KKK and explained why this is surprising. A few candidates were not surprised. They were able to explain that by the late 1860s the tide had turned against the KKK and that much legislation was being passed against it. It is crucial in questions such as this one that candidates focus on whether they are surprised or not. A number wrote sensibly about the source and its context but did not use it to say whether they were surprised.

Question 4

A small number of candidates struggled to find any connection between the content of the two sources. However, most candidates were able to explain that Source E is supportive of the KKK while Source F is critical. This led to the conclusion that Source F does make us doubt the account in Source E, although a number of candidates did not address the issue of doubt. The best answers did not stop at the differences between the two sources and went on to evaluate at least one of them, for example, the account in Source E is questionable because it comes from Tennessee where there was much support for the KKK.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. A large number of candidates wrote that Forrest denied saying what is reported in the source because much of it shows him supporting outrageous actions. Better answers focused more on the possible consequences of these hearings for the KKK, while the best answers recognised the significance of the date and argued that by 1871 the tide had definitely turned against the KKK and that Forrest realised the weakness of his position. Less successful answers identified parts of Source G that Forrest might want to deny but were unable to suggest any valid reason for this.

Question 6

The task in **Question 6** is to use the sources to test the hypothesis, which was about whether people supported the KKK. Some weaker responses appeared to be based on a different hypothesis about whether the Klan behaved well. However, many candidates responded well to the actual hypothesis. When answering this question, there needs to be specific use of the content of a source.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

Candidates generally performed well on this question. Most were able to identify and explain agreements and disagreements. For example, the sources agree that Jaruzelski was expected to deal with the protests more forcefully, while they disagree over whether the Soviets had made any preparations for military intervention. This question is answered best by planning the answer first. Candidates need to go through both sources carefully making matches and mismatches. Once they are clear about these, they can explain both. This avoids the need to produce long summaries of both sources which can distract from clear and direct point-by-point comparisons. A small number of candidates produced weaker responses. Their difficulties were usually caused by starting with summarising the sources, rather than using a point-by-point approach. However, they usually managed to compare the provenance of the two sources. A small number of the strongest candidates managed to compare the big messages of the sources: Source A says that the Soviets did not want to intervene but Jaruzelski wanted them to, while Source B claims that they planned to intervene, while Jaruzelski did not want them to.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to extrapolate from the cartoons whether the cartoonists would have agreed with each other. There was a tendency for candidates to describe both cartoons. There is no need to do this.

Candidates need to spend a few minutes thinking about the cartoons and looking for instances where the cartoons make points about same thing. For example, they both have something to say about the intervention of the Soviets and about the strength of Solidarity compared to that of the Soviets. Recognising and explaining points of agreement or disagreement (sub-messages) took most candidates to a reasonable level of response. The best answers focused on the points of view of the cartoonists and explained how they were both criticising the Soviets or Brezhnev. Candidates should always try to consider the point of view of the person who produced the cartoon. These answers had to be supported. Answers that were almost as strong were those that compared the big messages of the two cartoons. They both show the Soviets being aggressive, while claiming not to be. In Source C the Soviets make the ridiculous claim that they are coming to the aid of the Polish government which is being threatened by Solidarity, while in Source D Brezhnev makes the equally absurd claim that they would never interfere in Poland's affairs. A small number of candidates misinterpreted one or both of the cartoons by taking at face value the claims of the Soviets and an equally small number only managed to describe what was happening. When trying to explain cartoons candidates should not first refer to the surface details. They should infer what the cartoon is saying about the people or organisations that are being represented in the cartoons. Reference to surface detail might then be useful to support their interpretations.

Question 3

The starting point for answering this question is to identify the crucial point that the two sources agree or disagree about. In Source E Andropov is clear that there will not be a Soviet invasion of Poland, while in Source B Strong is reporting that the Soviets plan to invade. Most candidates understood this and consequently were able to produce a reasonable response, as long as they used their understanding to address the issue of whether Andropov was lying. A large number of candidates understood that the disagreement between the sources did not necessarily prove that Andropov was lying. They realised that at least one of the sources needed to be evaluated. This was done well by many candidates. Some questioned Andropov, for example he might have been challenging Brezhnev, while others questioned Strong's motives. In the strongest answers, evaluation was carried out in a developed and informed way. A number of candidates would have benefited from stating whether or not they thought Andropov was lying, as required by the question. The best answers were those where the candidate had done planning and knew what their answer was going to be before they started to write it.

Question 4

There were many good answers to this question, with most candidates able to interpret at least sub-messages of the cartoon, for example Brezhnev is worried about Solidarity, the Soviets control Eastern Europe and Eastern Bloc countries might be attracted by Solidarity's ideas. Better answers explained the big message – that Brezhnev was worried that Solidarity could threaten Soviet control of Eastern Europe. The question is about the cartoonist's message, and this led the best answers focusing on the cartoonist's point of view – that the cartoonist is making fun of, or is critical of, Brezhnev for being scared of Solidarity. These answers were mostly carefully explained and supported by relevant contextual knowledge, although some lost control and wrote a lot about Solidarity. A small number of candidates misinterpreted the cartoon. They thought that the cartoonist was praising Brezhnev as the protector of Eastern Europe.

Question 5

There was a wide range of interesting answers to this question. Many good answers simply used contextual knowledge or other sources to explain whether they were surprised by the content of Source H. There is plenty of scope to be both surprised and not surprised, especially in relation to other sources, for example in Source H Jaruzelski gives the clear impression that he is against Soviet intervention, but in Source A he was demanding it. Less successful answers either made far more general claims (valid in a general way) or used everyday empathy to explain why they were surprised or not surprised by aspects of Source H. However, a good number of candidates realised the significance of the date of the source – 1995, a few years after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the fall of communism in Poland and the rest of eastern Europe. This helped many of them provide very strong responses by arguing that they were not surprised by the fact that Jaruzelski was attempting to rewrite history with himself as the staunch defender of Poland facing up to the bullying Soviet Union. Some candidates did not go quite so far and simply stated that they were not surprised he was writing this account of himself because he wanted to keep on the right side of the West. While a good number of candidates explained there were good reasons for being surprised and not surprised, a number of others would have improved their responses by remembering to address the issue of 'surprise'.

Question 6

There were many very good answers. The strength of these answers was the fact that they explained how each source they used supported or was against the hypothesis. A very small number of responses just asserted for each source that the Soviet Union wanted or did not want to send armed forces to Poland. The vast majority of candidates, however, avoided this and gave explanations specific to particular sources. Very few candidates failed to base their answer on the sources. The main weakness was attempts at evaluation. These were often assertions or added on in a way or in a section of the answer that was completely separate from the main arguments about the sources.

HISTORY

Paper 2147/23
Paper 23

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