HISTORY (MODERN WORLD AFFAIRS)

> **Paper 2134/01**
> **Modern World Affairs**

Key messages

- Candidates should select questions where they can answer both parts of the question.
- Candidates should avoid writing lengthy introductions to part **(a)** questions.
- Candidates should explain both sides of a balanced answer to part **(b)** questions.

General comments

Candidates overall seemed to be well prepared for the examination, many demonstrating detailed knowledge on a number of topics. Most candidates seem to have selected questions thoughtfully.

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 very small number of candidates did not complete their last answer. Some less successful responses wrote lengthy narratives where more time planning evaluative Part **(b)** answers would have served them better. Candidates should take care when reading questions: some misread the League of Nations in the 1930s as the League of Nations in the 1920s **(Question 2)** and the February/March Revolution was sometimes taken to be about the October/November Revolution **(Question 16)**.

Questions are divided into sections labelled part **(a)** and part **(b)**. Part **(a)** questions require candidates to construct historical narratives in answer to a knowledge-based question that require 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. Some candidates 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. Some less successful candidates responded to the question about the Jazz Age **(Question 11)** with information about all developments in America in the 1920s, or started their answer to the work of the League of Nations **(Question 2)** with details of its origins. These additional details could only be rewarded where they were used to inform a point about either subject. 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 offered information about the activities of the League of Nations in the 1920s **(Question 2b)**, where they did not apply knowledge of the international agreements of the 1920s **(Question 1b)**, or where the answer about treatment of Jewish people in Germany up to 1938 **(Question 6)** saw them focus on the years after 1938.

Part **(b)** questions require candidates to provide evaluative responses as they consider the given factor in a question and assess its importance relative to the given factors or other factors selected from their knowledge of causes, effects, similarities or differences. Successful answers considered both sides of the argument in a balanced way, accepting the given factor and then considering alternatives before reaching a conclusion. The conclusion should be a judgement, supported by the evidence provided.
Most candidates explained the given factor in the context of the question, many offering evaluative comments that partially answered the question. Some candidates tried to address the question by arranging all the factors on the side of the given factor. For example, in **Question 2b**, some candidates saw the actions in Europe that tested the League of Nations as all about poverty. A few candidates struggled to extract explanations from the narrative of the subject. An example of this was in **Question 3**. On part **(b)**, moderately successful candidates began by detailing the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and then often went on to explain other factors. An increased number of candidates were rewarded for concluding effectively. For example, **Question 7b** saw a small number of candidates conclude 'that the failings were more important' as they caused the economy to downturn/led to the invasion of Abyssinia, reflecting on the importance of that event. **Question 11b** saw some candidates looking at short term and longer-term effects when considering the urban/rural divide in changes in the role of women in American society.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

A significant number of candidates answered three questions from **Section A**.

Question 1

Part **(a)**: Most candidates knew the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Many candidates were able to select aspects of the treaty and the ways in which these weakened Germany. Some candidates offered vague statements that detracted from their mark, e.g. Germany lost lands. Some linked it to the Ruhr Crisis. Some candidates attempted this question, drawn by Part **(a)**, without reasonable knowledge to support an answer to Part **(b)**.

Part **(b)**: Most candidates knew and could explain the Treaty of Rapallo. Many knew the terms of the Locarno Pact and its importance to Europe. Some knew the Dawes and Young Plans, but many were confused about the terms of them or what they achieved. What countries signed up to in the Kellogg-Briand Pact was understood, but candidates struggled to express its importance. Where there was a justified conclusion, it was about the Locarno Treaty, and how and why it brought hope after so many difficult years.

Question 2

Part **(a)**: The strongest answers were seen where candidates accurately focused on the roles, the bodies that undertook the work and its achievements. A small number of candidates looked just at the peace-keeping role through case studies. Some answers offered simple facts about its work, e.g. it helped to improve health. Offerings about the 1930s, unlinked to knowledge given from the 1920s, were not awarded marks.

Part **(b)**: Candidates who earned the highest marks were most often those who were able to explain the impact of poverty on Japan and Italy as well as on the role that the League of Nations was expected to take in those years. The strongest answers set these against clearly defined weaknesses of the League, explained in the context of the crises of the 1930s. Some were knowledgeable about the impact of the USA not having a role in the League of Nations, either in making sanctions ineffective or in giving military strength to the west of America in the Manchurian Crisis.

Question 3

Part **(a)**: Less successful candidates offered a philosophical answer to this question, making it difficult to place it in the appropriate time period. Strong answers detailed appeasement in action, i.e. crisis by crisis and how decisions were justified, and why.

Part **(b)**: Many candidates found it difficult to establish a causal link between the Treaty of Versailles and the outbreak of the Second World War. Those who did usually managed it by virtue of the anger many Germans felt at how they had been treated when they believed that they were winning the war but were forced to sign a treaty that included war guilt. The link through Hitler and popular support could then be established. Of the other causes, it was the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that enabled many candidates to gain higher marks.

Question 4

Part **(a)**: Most candidates were able to explain other reasons for the outbreak of the Second World War. Popular themes were the plans of Hitler, alliances and the failure of the League of Nations. Less successful candidates found it difficult to link the Treaty of Versailles to the outbreak of the Second World War. Those candidates found the hatred of other European countries through the forced acceptance of the War Guilt Clause, or the damage to lifestyles caused by the reparations demands as their way into the question.

Part **(b)**: Some candidates found this to be a straightforward question, discussing the difficulties caused by revelations about the atom bomb and the Polish question. Some showed awareness of the role of Russia in the supply of food to Europe. Some candidates were unclear about the content of talks at Potsdam and mixed topics from Yalta into their discussions.

Question 5

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

Section B

Question 6

Part **(a)**: Very clear answers considered the ways the lives of Jewish people in Germany changed up to 1938, examining the impact of changes to lives. The best answers kept to the dates in the question and answered in detail. Less successful answers carried beyond the bounds of the question, usually without dates, but looking at the Holocaust.

Part **(b)**: Less successful candidates put all power into the hands of the secret police, from propaganda to managing the processes in the Reichstag. Stronger answers considered three or four factors in depth as well as judging the impact of all factors. Some candidates described ways of keeping control but did not say how these methods worked.

Question 7

Part **(a)**: Many candidates had a clear understanding of the timeline to the established Fascist dictatorship, from the strikes following the First World War to the impact of the Acerbo Law.

Part **(b)**: The strongest answers explained their response by considering the strengths of key policies such as the Battle for Grain, and then revisiting those policies looking for shortfalls or detrimental effects on Italy. This was a question where a small number of candidates were able to justify a conclusion, either in terms of short term/long term, or by looking at links between economic difficulties and foreign policy decisions.

Question 8

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

Question 9

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

Question 10

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

Section C

Question 11

Part **(a)**: The best answers saw candidates focused on the musicians and their origin, on how the jazz scene developed and how radio contributed to people's knowledge, understanding and enjoyment. Some made links to dance and film effectively.

Part **(b)**: Candidates usually offered a balanced answer to this question, and were able to explain new urban changes to rural opportunities. Some effective conclusions looked at the short/long term nature of changing lives and of the types of opportunities that enabled change in rural areas.

Question 12

Part **(a)**: Candidates who selected this question had been well prepared for it. They stated its aims and described what they meant and for whom.

Part **(b)**: Most answers to this question were focused ones. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was well understood, candidates explaining what it said, why it was necessary and what it achieved. This was one of the questions where a balanced answer was well achieved, candidates explaining the losses as food was

destroyed and the impact on farm labour. One justified conclusion considered how other legislation mitigated the harmful effects of the law.

Question 13

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

Question 14

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

Question 15

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

Section D

Question 16

Part **a)**: The best answers saw candidates able to offer detailed knowledge of events, from the strikes resulting from hunger, to the Tsar's abdication. The role of the Soviets and the complexity of early arrangements was well understood. A small number of candidates got the revolutions mixed up.

Part **b)**: Candidates answered this question well on the whole, offering answers about the impact of the Kornilov Affair and, in the strongest answers, how it showed up the Provisional Government's weakness. Some then told the story without considering the factors within it. Some made explained points out of the Bolshevik's April Thesis, the determination of Lenin. Where they did so, it became a strong answer.

Question 17

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

Question 18

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

Question 19

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

Question 20

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

Section E

Question 21

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

Question 22

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

Question 23

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

Question 24

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

Question 25

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

Section F

Question 26

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

Question 27

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

Question 28

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

Question 29

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

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 Developments

Key messages

- Candidates should use contextual knowledge to support source analysis.

- Candidates should make direct attempts to address the question. For instance, where a question asked why a source was published at a certain time, the best answers were focused on giving a reason for publication.

- Candidates need to pay close attention to the command words in questions. For instance, in a question requiring candidates to compare sources, it is important to write about similarities and differences between the sources. Where a question asks 'how useful' a source is, answers need to address the utility of the source. They should consider what the source is being used as evidence for and whether it is a reliable account. Candidates can use their specific contextual knowledge to good effect by supporting or challenging the information in the source to assess its reliability.

General comments

There was evidence in many responses of sound knowledge and understanding of the beginning of the Cold War. Most responses showed an understanding of the source material and some used their knowledge to good effect to test the claims made in the sources. Some answered the question using the source(s) as required and then added a supplementary paragraph of contextual knowledge. While this was often accurate and detailed, it did not always support the development of the response. This approach was particularly noticeable in answers to **Question 5**. Some responses showed limited understanding of source-based skills such as assessing the utility or trustworthiness of a source. A minority of candidates took a formulaic approach to the questions and wrote about the message, purpose and likely audience of each source in turn, regardless of the specific wording of the question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates were required to assess the utility of a source as evidence to a historian studying the start of the Cold War. Successful responses were properly focused on whether the source was useful throughout. It is not enough to make a claim that the source is useful and then write about the context. Less successful answers simply wrote about what the source said without addressing its usefulness as a piece of evidence. Others assessed it purely by its provenance, without considering the content of the source. These responses often drew the conclusion that the source was useful because it was by an American journalist. Better responses considered the content of the source and argued that it was/was not useful based on the information it contained. Many such responses commented that the source gave a useful insight into US policy. Some commented on the tone of the source, noting that it was unusual in that it was an American source, but was highly critical of the US policy of containment. The most effective answers cross-referenced the content to another source (Source B was sometimes used to challenge the view in A) or to specific contextual knowledge, to decide whether it could be considered useful based on its reliability. This was only effective when the source was referred to events which preceded the date of the source. Some candidates tried to argue that the source was useful because the warning Lippmann gave of containment leading to involvement in future wars came true in the 1950s and 1960s. The source was written in 1947 and future events, such as the Vietnam War, were not known at that time. Better responses understood that the reliability of the source could be tested against events already occurring in Eastern Europe.

Question 2

The question required candidates to compare Sources B and C to assess their similarity. Many responses pointed out either a similarity of detail or sub-message, or a difference between the sources. The most effective comparisons were supported by details from both sources. Many responses recognised that both sources saw the Soviet Union as an expansionist power, that both considered the Russians as a threat and that they were employing dubious methods to extend their influence. The most effective responses considered differences as well as similarities, and commented on the difference between Kennan's confidence in his knowledge of what the Russians were doing, compared with Churchill's comment that nobody knew the extent of their ambitions. The best responses took an overview and considered the difference in tone of the sources. For instance, Source B portrays the Russians as determined to destroy the west and is entirely hostile towards them. On the other hand, in Source C, Churchill expresses some understanding of the Soviets' need for security and refers to the Soviets as 'friends'. Less successful responses generally did not have enough valid comparisons between the sources, often picking out a detail or message from one source, but mismatching it with information from the other. Some wrote general responses which concluded that the sources were about the same topic or from a similar date. There was no requirement in the question to evaluate the sources but some candidates challenged the points of view expressed in the sources.

Question 3

Candidates were given a source and asked to assess how trustworthy it was. A considerable proportion of responses wrote about what the source said; these responses would have benefited from mentioning whether it could be considered trustworthy. Others made an assessment based on provenance, often arguing that the source was not trustworthy, as it was from a Marxist organisation and was therefore highly likely to take a pro-Soviet line. Some responses took this approach further to good effect by using the source content to prove their point. They generally recognised that the language used was highly critical of the US, such as Truman being described as 'Roosevelt's pathetic successor', and very favourable to the USSR, such as Stalin being described as 'brave' and helpful towards Eastern Europe. Perceptive responses often argued that the source had too clear a propaganda purpose to be trustworthy. Many responses used their contextual knowledge to good effect to question or support the claims made in the source to assess trustworthiness. Stalin's 'aid' to Eastern Europe was most frequently challenged with detailed knowledge of events in Europe up to 1947. As in **Question 1**, it was not possible to test the source against events which had not happened, but some responses tried to argue that the source was not to be trusted because of later events such as the Hungarian uprising in 1955. Others accepted the view of the source on Marshall Aid and supported this argument with knowledge about the US drive for economic dominance. The most effective responses combined testing the source against relevant knowledge, with comment on its tone and purpose.

Question 4

Successful answers were based on a careful consideration of when the source was produced, and the context was the most frequently given reason for publication. Most responses understood that the cartoon was published at this time because of the Berlin Blockade. The best answers used the date of the cartoon and details contained within it to explain that the Berlin Airlift was the reason for publication. Another way to address the question was to consider what message the cartoonist wanted to convey. The most perceptive answers understood that the cartoonist was keen to show the Russians as aggressive and supported their answer with detailed reference to the cartoon. Some went on to consider the purpose of the cartoon. They generally concluded that the cartoonist was trying to warn Americans about Soviet aggression with the purpose of winning support for the policy of sending aid into Berlin to prevent its complete encirclement. Less successful answers often interpreted the source or the context in a sensible way, but stopped short of suggesting a reason for publication. A few responses confused the context and wrote about the building of the Berlin Wall.

Question 5

The strongest answers used evidence from the sources to support and challenge the statement that 'The Russians were to blame for the Cold War'. Some grouped the sources into 'support' and 'not support' sets. This approach was only effective if sources were considered individually within each section of the response. If sources are grouped and treated as a block, commenting on whether they support or challenge the statement in the question can only be successful if the comment can be applied to all the sources. For instance, many responses grouped Source B and C together, claiming that they both supported the statement because Russia was determined to destroy the American way of life. This was valid for B, but not

for C. A large proportion of responses took a source-by-source approach and this was often highly effective. To be credited, some evidence from the source was required, alongside an explanation of how the detail selected showed whether Russia was to be blamed. Generally, answers saw Sources B, C and E as evidence that Russia was at fault, with A and D being evidence that the US was to blame, or at least that Russia was not. It was possible to see both sides of the argument in Source C, as Churchill suggests a more understanding approach towards Russia's actions. Some answers considered the reliability of the sources. For instance, Source D seemed to offer the strongest evidence to challenge the statement, but was also considered the most unreliable source. It is worth noting that comments on the reliability of the sources must serve the needs of the question to be rewarded. Several responses wrote about the purpose or tone of the sources without considering how this affected their value as evidence in response to the question. Some responses worked their way through the sources and added a final paragraph, which either addressed the reliability of the sources or discussed the context. It is more effective if these comments are woven into the discussion of the sources. A small number of candidates wrote about the sources, but made no direct link between their commentary on the source and the question. Other candidates wrote an essay in response to the question with no reference to the sources.