

# HISTORY PAPER 1

**Paper 1 of the IGCSE History 0470 exam focuses on core content. It assesses students' understanding of historical events, themes, and concepts covered in the curriculum. Below is an outline of the structure of the paper and the type of questions students can expect, along with guidance on how to approach them effectively.**

What is tested in this paper:

Assessment objectives A01 An ability to recall, select, organize and deploy knowledge of the syllabus content.

A02 An ability to construct historical explanations using an understanding of:

- cause and consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference
- the motives, emotions, intentions and beliefs of people in the past.

How to answer part (a) of a question [4 marks]

This question is purely knowledge-based; no analysis is at all required. In this question, you get 1 mark for each fact you have written. The facts should be presented in very brief statements. For developing one point, you may be awarded an additional mark for that point.

Tips - Write this answer in points - in 4 to 6 lines. Do not waste a lot of time on these and instead spend it on the structured essay questions. Although 4 points can get you 4 marks, it is recommended that you write 5 points and provide an example as these can carry additional marks. Make sure to include specific details, for example if the question asks "what was the berlin airlift" mention "27 500 trips to Berlin supplied 2 million tons of supplies"

How to answer part (b) of a question [6 marks]

This question tests both knowledge and understanding. Here you are required to explain 2 reasons in relation to the topic to get marks awarded for level 4 (6 marks).

A sample answer where 6 marks were awarded : ( this has been taken from Sample answers posted by CIE. If you wish to read more, you can find graded answers by school teachers on our website below graded past papers )

**(b) Why was Wilson unsuccessful in achieving his goal of self-determination for the peoples of Europe?**

**Level 4 Explains TWO reasons**

**[6]**

*5 b) Wilson negotiated the peace settlement with D Britain and France who both had empires so self-determination was directly against their a interests as it would mean losing control of their colonies. They also had interests in increasing the size of their empires. Wilson also faced the problem that Eastern Europe particularly contained a huge ethnic mix and there were no definite borders between the groups of people so it was inevitable that many people would be led by people from a different group. Wilson did not fully understand this and the Treaty created a number of new countries such as Poland which were very unstable because of the ettl mix.*

*Also the other leaders, especially wanted to see Germany punished Clemenceau wanted Germany to be punished so wo wanted to take away some of their pla land. As a result Germany lost 10% of its land and 12.5% of its population. Therefore German people ended up being ruled by non-Germans in the countries surrounding P Germany such as Czechoslovakia. Wilson's lack of understanding of Europe also led to the failure of self-determination because he did not appreciate the mix of ethnic and cultural groups and neither did Lloyd George or Clemenceau so it was inevitable that they made mistakes.*

**How to answer part (c) of a question [10 marks]**

This is an essay based question. Most questions ask for an evaluation of "how far" so it is mandatory to write both sides for an argument in order to achieve higher marks. You must show both why you AGREE with the question and why you DISAGREE with the question. Ideally, you can provide 2 arguments for supporting the statement and 1 argument for against or vice versa.

You then MUST also give a conclusion, which involves:

(i) Which one point is the most important and why (ii) Why you agree or disagree with the topic in the question.

Tips - Giving each point its own paragraph will help the examiner keep track of your points and appreciate their value the way you want them to.

A sample answer where 8 marks ( high) were awarded : ( this has been taken from Sample answers posted by CIE. You can find graded answers by school teachers on our website below graded past papers )

(c) **'The Treaty of Versailles was too harsh.'** How far do you agree with this statement?  
Explain your answer.

**Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'**

**[10]**

As Level 4 plus evaluation.

**Level 4 Explanation of both sides**

**[7-9]**

---

## Example candidate response – high

5 c) 'The Treaty of Versailles was too harsh'

On the one hand, it could be argued that the treaty was too harsh or due to the size of Reparations given to Germany. Reparation of \$6.6 billion were to be payed by Germany, and the country were already in economic difficulty after the First World War. Unlike Britain and France, Germany had not raised taxes during the War in order to pay off their war debt, ~~aa~~ ~~inste~~ instead they planned to pay it off with the reparations ~~money~~ from the defeated states. This meant that Germany was already in huge debt, and the huge sum of reparation meant that they were almost definitely going to enter into a depression, as the reparations imposed were just far too much.

Another reason the Treaty of Versailles can be seen as too harsh is because of the 'War Guilt Clause'. Article 231 of the Treaty stated that Germany must take full responsibility for the start of the war. This was unfair as Germany were not the only ~~states~~ countries that started war, Serbia and other countries contributed also. This ~~et~~ clause hurt Germany's pride more than anything and they felt that they were being scapegoated, when they weren't the only country involved.

Finally the treaty was also seen as too harsh as ~~Germany~~ in back the 14 points it stated all countries must disarm, however, Germany were the only ones who were forced to. The Germans felt this was hypocritical as no one else had been made to disarm to such an extent, and that therefore the Treaty was unfair and too harsh.

On the other hand, the Treaty of Versailles can be seen as fair because of the way Germany treated Russia in the ~~7th~~ Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918. Russia lost 34% of its land and most of its valuable steel and coal industry. The harshness of this treaty made the Treaty of Versailles seem very lenient in comparison, and the allies argued that Germany had no right to complain, as they too had imposed such a harsh treaty on another country.

Another reason the treaty could be seen as not too harsh is because of how few of these reparations Germany actually paid. Germany received more loans from the USA than they had to pay in reparation and the large figure was reduced in the Young Plan of 1929. This meant that Germany was perfectly able to pay off the reparations in the end, and the Dawes Plan of 1924 was made just to help with ~~Gmen~~ Germany's economy, meaning the

### Example candidate response – high, continued

Finally a reason that the Treaty of Versailles can be seen as not too harsh is because ~~many~~ one of the territories lost didn't actually belong to Germany. Alsace-Lorraine, an industrial region was given to France in the TOV, it had rich iron and steel and Germany resented its being taken away. However Alsace-Lorraine had originally belonged to France, and France were just being returned what was rightfully theirs. Therefore Germany had no right to complain about the loss of Alsace-Lorraine and this section of the Treaty was not too harsh.

In conclusion, I disagree with the statement that the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh, because I believe that the result of the Young Plan meant that Germany were not in too much financial difficulty. The harshness of the Treaty of Brest Litovsk also meant that Germany had no right to complain ~~of the~~ about the punishment they received, as they had inflicted greater on others.

### Example Candidate Responses – Paper 1

#### Examiner comment – high

(c) Here, the candidate presents a well-organised, balanced answer explaining arguments both for and against the question's hypothesis.

The size of reparations is a valid issue in relation to this question. The level at which reparations were eventually set was considered by many, especially the German people, to be extremely harsh. It is true that the German leaders planned to recoup the cost of war when they were victorious and so the high cost of reparations was added to an already enormous debt. Consideration of the concept of these being 'too harsh' is more implicit than explicit in this answer and would have benefited from clearer explanation. The candidate could have developed the explanation by identifying that the Treaty took profitable industrial areas, such as the Saar, making it almost impossible for the country to make the repayments.

The second paragraph highlights blame as another aspect of 'too harsh'. Here the candidate mentions one other country that held some responsibility, although the detail might have been greater. If dealing with the 'blame' issue it is important to identify a country or countries and say why they could have been partially blamed. The answer goes on to mention German pride and the sense that Germany was 'being scapegoated'. For all these elements the answer was awarded one mark for a weak explanation. The final point made in this paragraph relates to the level of disarmament forced on Germany and the candidate explains why this might be considered harsh.

In the third and fifth paragraphs the candidate presents clear, concise explanations that show how the Treaty of Versailles was not too harsh.

**Mark awarded = 8 out of 10**