

HISTORY (MODERN WORLD AFFAIRS)

Paper 2134/01
Modern World Affairs

General Comments and Key Messages

Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge on a wide range of topics. All candidates met the requirement to answer a question from Section A: International Relations and Developments. Few selected questions where they could only answer one part of the selected question effectively. A small number of candidates failed to complete their last answer. Some candidates wrote lengthy narratives where more time planning evaluative part (b) answers would have benefited their responses. Candidates should take care when reading questions: some candidates misread questions, for example, 1929 instead of 1920s (**Question 11**) and cause instead of outcome (**Question 5**).

Part (a) questions require candidates to construct historical narratives in answer to a knowledge-based question that requires them to demonstrate sound and relevant factual knowledge. Most candidates did this very well, using strong, appropriate, supported information to keep their answers relevant to the question. Others made some attempt to use their knowledge to develop answers, but neglected to keep to the point or to avoid adding lengthy descriptions that were not appropriate to the question. Many candidates responded to the question about Lloyd George's aims at Versailles with description of what the main three negotiators wanted and why. These additional details were only worthy of credit where they were used to inform a point about Lloyd George's aims. Rarely did candidates select questions about which they had limited knowledge, or offer information not associated in any way with the requirements of the question. Where this happened, it was where they had confused the Cuban Crisis with the U2 Spy Plane incident (**4(a)**), or the terms of treaties and the work of the League of Nations towards disarmament (**2(b)**).

Part (b) questions require candidates to provide evaluative responses as they consider the given factor in a question and assess its importance relative to other factors selected from their knowledge of causes, effects, similarities or differences. Many responses gave supported answers that considered both sides of the argument in a balanced way, accepting the given factor and then considering alternatives before reaching a conclusion. Most candidates explained the given factor in the context of the question, many offering evaluative comments that partially answered the question. A number of responses would have been improved if candidates had managed to explain both the given factor and other factors.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

This was a very popular question answered by almost all candidates.

- (a) Many candidates were able to explain both what Lloyd George wanted from the peace negotiations and why, achieving high marks. Some candidates offered vague statements e.g. he wanted a harsher treaty than Wilson, but a less harsh one than Clemenceau. Occasionally, this was offered with a specific aim in mind, e.g. his preference that German foreign possessions should be supported within the British Empire conflicted with Wilson's aim for self-determination and with Clemenceau's aim to profit most from any break-up of Germany. In this case, as a supported comparison, credit was awarded.
- (b) The best answers saw candidates setting the scene with a brief paragraph about America's role in the First World War, without any reference to the 14 Points or peace treaties at that stage. They then addressed one side of their answer, supporting each point with relevant treaty detail, e.g. self-determination was a requirement set out in the 14 Points that Wilson developed before the war ended, requiring a nationality to be able to work towards its own aims through self-government. He

was therefore displeased to see Czechoslovakia created, a country inhabited by people of several different nationalities. Having given several points of dissatisfaction, such responses then turned to the other side of the question and considered the positives, e.g. the 14 Points were offered before the end of the war, but the treatment of Russia by Germany was so harsh in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that Clemenceau became keen to right the wrongs committed by Germany early in 1918, so he was satisfied when agreement was reached that lands unjustly gained should be removed from Germany, e.g. the lands that went to make up Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Simply writing that 'Wilson was pleased to see Alsace Lorraine returned to France' is not sufficiently explained to be awarded higher marks. Many candidates described one side of the argument and explained the other, thus achieving reasonable marks.

Question 2

- (a) The strongest answers were seen where candidates accurately focused on the League of Nations' Disarmament Commission and Conferences. A small number of candidates looked at the conflict between disarmament, in terms of Wilson's intentions, and the needs of the League of Nations in Manchuria and Abyssinia. Most candidates started on the disarmament clauses with the treaties of the Peace of Paris, which gained limited credit. Many did then go on to detail the Disarmament Conference of 1932 and the German response to it, achieving higher marks.
- (b) Better responses were most often those who separated out Britain and France acting in their own interests from the actions of the League of Nations, and the reasons for its inability to stop a major force in the 1930s. The former was explained through the need to trade and the refusal to countenance the closure of the Suez Canal. The latter was explained through the dependence of the League of Nations on the armies of Britain and France which were themselves suffering from the impact of the Great Depression, or indeed on America's absence from the League and the continuing trading, e.g. of coal, with Italy, that undermined the efforts of the League of Nations. More candidates could have mentioned the Hoare Level Pact to explain the needs of Britain and France.

Question 3

This question attracted candidates with specific knowledge.

- (a) Detail seen as relevant to this question included the German progress across Belgium and the reasons for the halting and the time that this gave Britain to manage the lift of soldiers from the beaches. Candidates were very knowledgeable about the size of the task, the significance of what had to be left behind and the impact of withdrawal.
- (b) Very clear answers to this question addressed Japan's progress early in the war and the degree of their retreat in the face of American retaliation. The incomplete nature of the American success was used to evaluate the response in relation the 'How successful?' demanded by the question.

Question 4

This was one of the few questions which confused some candidates, who saw a question about the overall Cuban Crisis instead of a U2 Spy Plane incident.

- (a) The strongest answers contained good detail on Peshawar, Gary Powers, Eisenhower and Khrushchev, and the Paris Summit. The prisoner exchange featured in most detailed answers.
- (b) A wide range of factors featured in responses. Some cited Stalin's hostility to the USA from the post-war negotiations, determining that Stalin needed to halt US progress across Eastern Europe on one side of the argument, and Stalin's needs from the sector he controlled in making good the damage done by the Second World War. Some took a capitalism-against-communism approach. Others saw a determined attempt to attract East Berliners to the West against a determination from Stalin not to lose key workers/resources. All were equally acceptable and usually well balanced.

Question 5

There were too few answers to this question for analysis to be helpful.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) Very clear answers considered what happened to each sector of young people. Older young men were seen with 'exciting' military futures; young women were seen in the role of housewife and mother – viewed as safe but also as limiting. Young children and their clubs, and then the Hitler Youth/League of Young Maidens followed, and candidates also considered the rebels and attitudes towards them. Many well-rounded answers were seen.
- (b) Many candidates introduced their answer with the setting of harsh laws against Jews and other groups, but they needed to say how these impacted negatively upon the lives of adults. They then considered employment, opportunity, living space, pride in Germany, optimism about Germany's place in the world.

Question 7

- (a) Starting with Mussolini's opposition to the strikes across Italy, candidates offered strong narratives, many ending with the impact of the Acerbo Law.
- (b) Stronger answers took each of several factors, e.g. law and order, the economy, and argued what changed and what stayed the same for them. Some strong answers considered the reinstatement of law and order to pre-Depression levels or the continued state of monarchy as their conservative answer, and the changing constitutional status and his drives, e.g. for wheat, as their alternative answer. Many candidates read success and failure instead of change and similarity in the question, limiting the marks that could be awarded.

Questions 8, 9 and 10

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Section C

Question 11

- (a) Most candidates who attempted this question showed understanding of rural life, discussing the lack of availability of the things that were making the 1920s 'roaring' in cities, e.g. electricity, new jobs, machinery in the home and a lively social life. Stronger answers also discussed how attitudes to life in the cities hardened as people heard what they thought of as disgraceful developments, within the religious mindset of the time and place.
- (b) Candidates usually answered about how intolerant society in cities in the USA was: immigration, race, opposition to change and limitation of the women's suffrage movement featured. More answers could have considered the other side of the argument, showing freedoms for women and the beginnings of the Jazz Age, with the embryonic social change that was seen.

Question 12

- (a) Most candidates who answered gave detailed narratives of the reasons for the March, the reception of the Marchers, events during the encampment and the impact on Hoover. More knowledge of the Bonus Marchers would have improved responses.
- (b) Many candidates explained both sides of this question, seeing Hoover's unpopularity/lack of action against promises from a man in whom people felt confidence. Evidence presented to support arguments was usually clear and well used.

Questions 13, 14 and 15

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Section D

Question 16

- (a) This was a very well answered question, candidates being able to offer detailed knowledge of industries and quantities produced, against targets. The process of planning for production was well understood, as was the way employment law was altered to make the Five Year Plans successful. The same can be said for how the organisation of food production changed to meet the growing demand for food.
- (b) Candidates answered this question well on the whole. Kirov and the purges/show trials were linked by most candidates and these were used effectively to show how they increased Stalin's power. Positive messages to the public/use of media were selected by most candidates to show how else support for his dictatorship grew. Some candidates introduced their argument with a narrative of Stalin's rise to power without using their knowledge to address the question.

Question 17

- (a) Successful answers saw candidates narrate events from the approach of the German army towards Stalingrad to their defeat and the decisions that led to it.
- (b) Few candidates could see two sides to this question and demonstrate what actions Stalin took and what decisions he made that led to Russian success in the Great Patriotic War and, therefore, to increased support from the Russian people.

Questions 18, 19 and 20

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Section E

Questions 21 and 22

There were too few answers to these questions for analysis to be helpful.

Question 23

- (a) Candidates who selected this question knew their subject well and answered with understanding about the Movement and the course of its successes and failures during the twentieth century.
- (b) One-sided answers to this question were often seen. Candidates used both the pressure from Jews to return to Palestine during a period of extreme danger in Europe, and the response of the Palestinian Arabs, as part of their Second World War response. A small number of candidates considered the factors responsible for ending the Mandate – the Second World War, the changing fortunes of Britain in managing a political solution before and during the war, the changing response of Arabs to Jews in Palestine. These were well balanced answers, allowing a conclusion to be drawn and supported from the evidence they had used.

Question 24

- (a) This question attracted some candidates with good knowledge about Yasser Arafat's aims.
- (b) Candidates used their knowledge about negotiations well to support their answers to this question.

Question 25

There were too few answers to this question for analysis to be helpful.

Section F

Question 26

This was a consistently well answered question attempted by a large number of candidates.

- (a) Better answers considered both arms of the Communist armies and how each played a part in the war against Japan. Candidates considered traditional tactics and their impact and guerrilla tactics, and how rural residents supported the CCP. Weaker answers focused only on the CCP and the effectiveness of guerrilla tactics.
- (b) This was a question in which many candidates were able to offer both sides of an argument. Decisions made and their impact, tactics used and their relative success, support won and lost were all effectively analysed in search of a comparative answer.

Question 27

- (a) Candidates described the stepped changes in agricultural organisation and the relative effectiveness of them. Stronger answers set their narrative in a political/international context.
- (b) There were several pathways through this question that candidates identified. In some cases, candidates lost their plan and description took over, but many candidates explained at least one side of the argument well.

Question 28

There were too few answers to this question for analysis to be helpful.

Question 29

- (a) This question attracted candidates with good knowledge. The issue of separate electorates and the backing-down by Congress from the Lucknow Pact was the usual starting point. Stronger answers saw candidates taking the issues from the Nehru Report and Jinnah's 14 Points to show why disagreements happened, e.g. the future of governance when Britain withdrew, sovereignty of princely states, one country in two parts or Congress representing all India.
- (b) There were a few very strong answers that analysed the Act to show which clauses established bodies to give experience of government to local populations, and which kept control firmly in British hands. However, most answers saw only one side - that the 1935 India Act did create bodies through which local populations could demonstrate their skills in government.

Question 30

There were too few answers to this question for analysis to be helpful.

HISTORY (MODERN WORLD AFFAIRS)

Paper 2134/02

International Relations and Development

Key Messages

In better responses, candidates used the source material provided for the core of their answers.

General Comments

Most candidates deployed their time effectively and spent appropriate time on each question. A small number were unable to complete **Question 5** effectively. All candidates used the correct source or sources for the given question. The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Study Source A. What can we learn from the source about the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919? Use details from the source to explain your answer.

The best answers responded to the painting by making supported inferences. Some candidates were able to use the seating in the hall, the decoration, the positioning of the people present and the expressions of Wilson, Clemenceau and Wilson to show the significance of the Treaty. Less successful answers used mainly contextual knowledge and wrote about the events surrounding the signing of the Treaty.

Question 2

Study Sources B and C. How similar are these two sources? Use details from the sources to explain your answer.

Candidates were able to use source content to make contrasts and find similarities, although a number of responses would have benefited from candidates supporting their comments with specific detail from the two sources. The best answers used phrases from the sources. Many candidates were able to show that Clemenceau had the best interests of France at heart. Some responses were less clear on whether the sources favoured Wilson's ideas for the future of Europe. Candidates struggled more with differences than similarities; greater user of valid similarities and differences supported from the source material would have improved some responses. Some candidates wrote predominantly using contextual knowledge. Weaker responses made basic comments about similar views but then neglected to use the sources.

Question 3

Study Source D. Why was this cartoon published in May 1919? Explain your answer.

This attracted a range of responses. Many candidates realised that the message was about the harshness of the treaty and it was published to criticise the actions of the Peacemakers, although some responses indicated that the cartoonist wanted merely to publicise what was happening in Versailles. Some candidates missed the significance of the date. Others thought it was published after the signing of the treaty. However, many answers did try to use the figures in the cartoon, rather than just writing from contextual knowledge. The best answers understood that the cartoonist was advocating the alteration of the punitive clauses before the Peacemakers provoked another war.

Question 4

Study Source E. How surprised are you by what this source says? Explain your answer.

This was well answered. Better answers explicitly stated whether they were surprised or not surprised, supported by both the source and their contextual knowledge. Many candidates achieved high marks by validly showing surprise and non-surprise. Many used contextual knowledge of Lloyd George's election campaign and the economic relationship between Germany and Great Britain in their answers. Weaker responses struggled to show both sides of Lloyd George's thinking. Some did not show surprise or non-surprise.

Question 5

Use all the sources. 'The peacemakers wanted to create a fair peace for Germany.' How far do these sources support this judgement? Explain your answer.

The strongest answers used specific phrases from the sources to support a fair and non-fair peace. These answers tended to use the letter to identify each individual source used; some sources were used in a valid way to both support and go against the proposition, to gain high marks. Some candidates felt that the painting was negative about the signing of the Versailles Peace Treaty, when it should have been used to support the hypothesis. Weaker responses grouped sources, without providing support from individual ones. Some did not use the sources at all, or just used them as illustration in an essay. Source evaluation was not often seen. More candidates needed to question the reliability of the sources. Some attempts were made regarding assertions of bias, or that primary means it is more reliable than secondary but genuine and valid evaluation was rare. The best evaluation often comes from questioning the motives of the author or relating the source to what really happened.