

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

Key messages

- The most effective answers to the source-based question organised the sources into groups (so that it was clear how far they agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis) evaluated provenance and demonstrated an understanding of context.
- The most highly rewarded essays were well organised and combined valid arguments and appropriate knowledge. They came to considered and justified conclusions.
- The best candidates carefully noted the key instructions and dates in the questions and tailored their knowledge and argument to take these into account.

General comments

A number of scripts deserved very high marks. They were consistent in maintaining high standards across the four responses and answers were relevant and well supported. **Question 1** was dealt with in an analytical and comparative manner. The essays were effectively organised and combined clear understanding and good knowledge.

Candidates need to pay attention to timing in this examination and are advised to spend some time (maybe 10 minutes) reading the sources for **Question 1** and planning their response. The first task is to decide whether the sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis. This helps candidates to organise their answers. The next task should be to assess the reliability of each source. Candidates should think about how far they can believe an extract. They can consider the purpose of the material and decide whether the writer was trying to be objective. Some answers contained very mechanical assessments, for example claiming that Source A should be discounted because it is from a German author. While it is true that it might be expected to be pro-German, it is still helpful to historians in explaining how leading Germans justified their country's policies. The writer's claims should be tested against the other sources and candidates' own knowledge. Candidates can use their contextual understanding to interpret the sources but should do so briefly. Some made very little use of the extracts and wrote general essays about the causes of World War I. This approach could not result in satisfactory answers. Finally, it is important to come to a conclusion that explains how far the hypothesis is valid.

In addressing **Section B** the most effective candidates noted the particular wording of the questions. For instance **Question 2** involved a comparison of Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini to 1871. Comparisons need a reasonable balance between the named people or issues. Some candidates chose one as the most important and wrote only about him, neglecting the others. More successful candidates justified their choice. For example, they explained why Cavour was more important than Garibaldi and Mazzini. Start and end dates in questions should be observed. **Question 6** asked about the opposition to Nicholas II by 1914. Therefore answers should end at this point. Every question has a key instruction that should shape answers. **Question 2** and **Question 7** asked 'Why..?' and the most effective responses analysed reasons and presented them in order of their importance.

It is helpful to candidates to write a brief plan for each response. These aid candidates' recall and ability to write structured answers. The most important points should be discussed first, followed by those that are less significant. Introductions should be brief, avoiding unnecessary background. Conclusions underline the most significant points that candidates wish to make. Candidates are encouraged to practise source-based and essay answers before the examination, first using notes and then without, and in timed conditions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were given 5 sources and were asked to use them to consider the judgement, or hypothesis, that *'France was more responsible than Germany for the tensions between them from 1870 to 1914.'* Higher credit was given when candidates grouped the sources according to the extent to which they confirmed or contradicted the hypothesis. For example, Sources B, C and E contained criticisms of France as opposed to Sources A and D which defended France. It was possible for candidates to suggest alternative explanations as long as they were supported convincingly. For example, a few pointed out that many countries used spies before the war, a fair point. Good candidates made use of their evaluation of the material in their response, while weaker candidates noted bias but did not apply this to their arguments. For example, the majority of candidates pointed out that Sources D and E were contradictory and some also noted similarities. They were both speeches by respective leading politicians and were made on the same date. They were not objective but their purpose was presumably to win support for military action. They referred to similar incidents. In one sense they cancelled each other out. So how can they be applied to the hypothesis? Good candidates used their own knowledge about which side, French or German, was more likely to be nearer the truth. Some answers made a good point about Source C. Although it seems to be more a defence of Germany than France, it was a report by a French diplomat. This would give it additional weight. Most candidates came to a conclusion about the hypothesis and the better answers avoided vague assertions, such as that both sides were responsible, and came to a balanced judgement. Some candidates wrote very creditably and the overall standard of answers was satisfactory. The weakest responses often took the form of a series of sequential summaries that lacked comparisons or contrasts and accepted all of the extracts at face value, even when they disagreed, such as in Sources D and E.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the reasons why Louis XVI was executed in 1793. The question asked 'Why' and candidates deserved more credit when they suggested a series of reasons. The most successful answers were well organised, putting these reasons in order of priority. Less credit could be given to answers that only included a narrative account of the French Revolution. It was possible to begin in 1789. Although the long-term causes of the revolution preceded that date, nobody advocated the King's execution in 1789 and there were few republicans. Weak answers tended to narrate the causes of the Revolution to 1789 and no further. Such answers were too limited to achieve high marks and many assumed that Louis XVI's execution was inevitable by that date. It was relevant to discuss the King's actions and policies from 1789. Higher credit was given when these were linked to the key issue of his execution. The most creditable responses took a wider view. They explained the rise of radicalism, especially the growth of Jacobinism. In the short term, instability in France between the competing forces favouring republicanism or the monarchy, for example in the Vendée, did more to discredit the King than the radicals. The economic situation worsened and the war undermined Louis XVI. Some weaker responses would have been improved with the inclusion of more secure knowledge.

Question 3

The key issue was the importance of the political effects of the Industrial Revolution on Britain and France to the mid-nineteenth century. It was permissible to provide more examples from Britain but for a very high mark it was necessary to demonstrate a basic understanding of the French perspective. The most frequent discriminating factor was the extent to which candidates linked general developments of the Industrial Revolution with political issues. Vague descriptions of industrialisation alone could not merit a high mark. On the other hand, many well-informed candidates referred to changes in the franchise. The 1832 Reform Act in Britain was a turning point and the middle classes, but not the poor, were entitled to vote by the mid-nineteenth century. Many candidates were also aware that pressure from the industrial poor persuaded politicians to pass laws which improved conditions in housing and factories. A beginning was made to an expansion of education provision. The best informed responses made clear comparisons with France where the political effects reflected deep divisions between right and left. The right generally feared the effects of industrialisation while the left encouraged uprisings in the 1830s, then more seriously in 1848. King Louis Philippe was brought down by factors in which the consequences of industrialisation played a major part and the 1848 revolution produced a short-term republic in which the industrialised classes were important. Some candidates were given credit for making the valid point that the political balance was little changed in Britain

and France by about 1850. The urban masses and middle classes were more ambitious but power was still held largely held by the traditional classes, most of whom were landowners.

Question 4

There were many sound and well-informed responses to this question. The key issue was a comparison of the contributions of Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini to Italian unification by 1871. This was a question to which there was not a single 'correct' answer. A case could be made for any of the three. Most important was the quality of the argument that was presented, with appropriate factual knowledge. The most successful answers began with a reference to their preferred leader. It was not necessary to give an evenly balanced treatment to the three but satisfactory answers showed at least a basic knowledge of each of them. Answers that opted for one and did not consider the two others might have reached a satisfactory mark but the lack of a comparative element prevented the award of a high mark. Some candidates chose a thematic approach, for example examining their political ideals or methods or the extent of their success. This could achieve a high mark. Weaker answers might have been improved in a number of ways. Some candidates were unaware that Cavour died in 1861. He was not directly responsible for the later stages of unification that included Venetia and Rome although his indirect influence was evident. Some candidates were aware of Mazzini's aims but would have been given more credit if they had supported their comments with knowledge of the revolutions that he tried to lead, especially in 1848-49.

Question 5

The key issue was the extent to which European countries achieved their aims in 'New Imperialism' by 1900. Candidates were asked to refer to Britain and at least one other European country. There were some well-informed and well-judged discussions that combined sound analysis of reasons and creditable overseas examples. Some answers used examples beyond Africa and included references to Asia. The question asked 'How far..?' and better candidates pointed out some failures as well as successes. Less satisfactory answers were usually vague in their arguments and limited in examples to provide factual support. Some weaker responses referred to economic reasons and would have been improved if they had specified what these were and the regions to which they applied.

Question 6

The key issue was the achievements of the opposition to Nicholas II by 1914. It was important that candidates noted that 1914 was the end date in this question. It was valid to make a brief reference to the period 1914 to 1917 in a conclusion but these later years were not relevant in the main substance of the answer. Most candidates were able to refer satisfactorily to the 1905 Revolution and its immediate aftermath but some would have deserved higher credit if they had explained the reasons for, and extent of, the opposition in 1905. The most frequent discriminating factor between modest and good answers was their success in dealing with the years from 1906 to 1914. Opposition continued and some referred to strikes as evidence of this. A number of candidates balanced their responses by considering the reforms of Stolypin which won some support, although he did not secure the cooperation of Nicholas II. The economy was improving by 1914 but started from a low base. The army continued to support the Tsar and Russia was becoming militarily stronger. Meanwhile the police system continued to be largely effective against radicals such as the Bolsheviks. Lenin and others did not believe that a revolution was imminent in 1914 and the best candidates showed awareness of this in reaching an overall judgement to the question.

Question 7

Most answers to this question on why Stalin established his dictatorship in Russia were relevant and showed awareness of the main factors. The most frequent reason why some candidates scored more highly than others was that they produced appropriate factual knowledge to support their claims and they linked points to the key issue of Stalin's dictatorship. Some gained credit when they noted the importance of his role as General Secretary of the Party under Lenin. This was not a minor clerical position as some claimed and it allowed him to influence those who were promoted to the middle and higher ranks, crucial when Lenin's successor was appointed. Most candidates were aware of Stalin's successful struggle against Trotsky but there was a tendency to be vague about his actions against other real or imagined rivals. The link between Kirov's assassination and the major purges was noted in some answers. Credit was frequently deserved by explanations of Stalin's use of propaganda. An example of the importance of linking discussions to the key issue was the economy. There were many accurate accounts of economic policies but some candidates did not clarify how these helped to make Stalin a dictator.

Question 8

The key issue was the comparative danger to governments of Nationalism and Marxism before 1914. Candidates were not required to spend an equal time on each part of the question but, for a satisfactory mark needed to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of each. There were some sound assessments of Nationalism that were supported by relevant examples, for example in the mid-nineteenth century or the Balkans. A few candidates were aware of governments' nervousness about Marxism. After German unification, Bismarck took steps to limit the appeal of Marxism and socialism by introducing some economic and social reforms. Marxism played a role in the French Commune but the movement had even less appeal in Britain than in Russia. Weaker responses tended to be imbalanced and would have been improved with more effective use of supporting detail and some consideration of both aspects of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

Key messages

- The most effective answers to the source-based question organised the sources into groups (so that it was clear how far they agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis), evaluated provenance and demonstrated an understanding of context.
- The most highly rewarded essays were well organised and combined valid arguments and appropriate knowledge. They came to considered and justified conclusions.
- The best candidates carefully noted the key instructions and dates in the questions and tailored their argument and supporting detail to take these into account.

General comments

A good proportion of scripts deserved high marks and comparatively few were particularly weak. A number of candidates were able to maintain a consistently high standard throughout and fully deserved very high marks. The vast majority of candidates completed the required four answers and demonstrated some relevant knowledge and understanding.

There was evidence that the more successful candidates had planned their answers carefully. They discussed the more important issues first and supported their arguments with relevant and well chosen detail. Less creditable answers were sometimes limited to narrative accounts. For example, some answers to **Question 7** deserved credit for their relevance and accuracy but in the main described Mussolini's policies with a brief reference to totalitarianism at the end. A more effective approach was to discuss issues in turn and assess how far they confirmed or contradicted the view that Mussolini was a totalitarian ruler. **Question 4** was about the link between nationalism and the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and Italy. The comments below on the individual questions refer to 'key issues'. Good answers avoided discussing other issues, for example the work of Bismarck and Cavour. Credit can be given to comparisons, for example of Mussolini and Hitler in **Question 7**, but these should be short and not seen as an excuse to write at length about another topic. The most effective candidates take careful note of the wording of the questions and any given dates and frame their arguments accordingly. Where there were weaker responses these could have been improved with more use of accurate detail and closer attention to the wording of questions.

In **Question 1**, good answers did not confine themselves to sequential accounts but grouped the sources to show which largely agreed with the hypothesis and which did not. There were cross-references to show where the extracts agreed and disagreed. The sources were not taken at face value but assessed. This is how historians work. For example, Source D might be seen as a biased source because it was a speech by the Kaiser to his military chiefs. But this does not mean that it was completely invalid. It is true that Russia declared its full support for Serbia whilst a naval war between Germany and Britain was likely as a consequence of war in Eastern Europe because of the alliances. Both of these claims by William II were justified.

Sometimes, secondary sources are used in source-based questions. They should be tackled with the same care as the others and are neither necessarily more nor less reliable. Source A was such a source and candidates should not assume that it is reliable because it was written by a British historian. History is a matter of opinion based on evidence. It is correct that historians write with the benefit of hindsight and when more evidence is usually available, but this does not make them infallible. A proper assessment of a secondary source would depend on judgements about the interpretation of facts referred to by the author.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were given 5 sources and were asked to use them to consider the judgement, or hypothesis, that *'Austria was to blame for tensions in the Balkans before World War I.'* The sources offered candidates a variety of opinions. It was more effective to group the sources than to deal with them sequentially. While less satisfactory candidates only summarised or paraphrased the extracts (*'Source A says that...Source B states that...Source C says that...'*), the more creditable candidates used the extracts to comment on the hypothesis. For example, Source A broadly agreed with Source B but disagreed with Source D about Austria's primary responsibility. The order in which each group was examined was not important. Credit was given for cross-references. For example, Source B claimed that Austria threatened Serbia while Source D saw Serbia as the threat to Austria. Some candidates did not comment on the reliability of the extracts and others contained only vague suggestions. Neither of these approaches deserved as much credit as the answers that tried to link reliability to their arguments. For example, some candidates suggested possible reasons why a source was written. The later historian in Source A was probably trying to be objective and this source presented a view and also considered alternatives. This was not true of Sources B and E. However, both of these sources were useful as evidence of points of view that shaped diplomacy and public opinion before the war. Source E was probably reliable as a record of a conversation but the Tsar's views would not seem to be realistic. It was helpful when candidates came to a conclusion. Whereas less satisfactory answers omitted an overall judgement or stated only that it was difficult to decide, higher marks were deserved when candidates signified either agreement or disagreement with the hypothesis and especially when they explained why. Credit is given when candidates suggest a modified or alternative hypothesis. There was some brief but effective use of candidates' own knowledge, for example about the Balkans war or the Sarajevo crisis. Such use of own knowledge should be kept within limits.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was Napoleon's comparative success in domestic and foreign affairs. The overall standard of the answers was satisfactory and some candidates deserved very high marks for their essays. It was not necessary to write perfectly balanced answers because candidates could spend more time explaining the aspect that they believed to represent Napoleon's greater achievements. However, answers that were very unbalanced, for example ignoring one of the alternatives, could not merit the highest marks. Assessing achievements involved more than describing policies. For example, many candidates described his authoritarian policies but failed to consider how far and why these represented an achievement. Some saw them in the context of the preceding policies that had divided and weakened France under the Jacobins and the Directory. They were an achievement because they restored order to France. On the other hand, they contradicted the liberty for which the revolutionaries had fought. There were economic reforms but Napoleonic France suffered from the constant wars. These were valid points to make and additional credit was given when candidates considered which of the arguments was more convincing. Some answers made the creditable point that both domestic and foreign policies represented an achievement because of Napoleon's humble origins. The highest marks were awarded to answers that put Napoleon's policies in order of priority of importance and explained the reasons why they were put in this order. This represented a well organised answer. On the other hand, some candidates wasted time by excessive accounts of pre-revolutionary France. The period before Napoleon could be made relevant as a contrast but the point would need to be made briefly.

Question 3

The key issue was the importance of the Agricultural Revolution for the development of the Industrial Revolution. The question asked how far it was the most important factor. Candidates could agree or disagree but good answers considered a range of possibilities. Some candidates described the main changes in the Agricultural Revolution but did not score highly because they did not explain the links to later industrialisation. For example, new methods increased food production. In turn this contributed to an increase in population that could not find employment in the countryside and moved to towns where the poor became an available work force in factories. This move to towns, or urbanisation, was also impelled by enclosures that caused unemployment in rural areas. Some made considerable profits from the Agricultural Revolution that could be invested in ventures that contributed to industrialisation. Slower rates of agrarian

change in France and most of Germany held back the Industrial Revolution in those countries. Some candidates discussed agrarian change effectively but preferred to emphasise the importance of other factors as causes of the Industrial Revolution. This was a valid approach to take.

Question 4

The key issue was the role of nationalism in the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and Italy. Candidates were awarded the highest marks when they explained the term 'nationalism' in the context of the nineteenth century and when their answers were reasonably balanced between Germany and Italy. In assessing nationalism, they weighed its importance against other factors that influenced the causes and outcomes of the revolutions. Some answers deserved credit when they pointed out the limited appeal of nationalism. In places regionalism was more important than support for a larger united country. Good candidates realised that there were different forms of nationalism. For example, they noted that Italian nationalists included monarchists and republicans, centralists and federalists. There were some creditable accounts of the different degrees of support for nationalism. Some social groups were more concerned about economic grievances. There were also common traits, especially dislike of Austrian influence and the despotic government of some native rulers. Moderate candidates often displayed some understanding and knowledge of 1848-49 but a number spent too much time on introductions or on surveys of the development of unification after 1849. Most candidates who attempted the question did creditably when writing about Italy but often the weaker responses were less confident about Germany. Some discussions were limited to the Frankfurt Parliament and such answers would have been improved by taking a more balanced approach to the question.

Question 5

The key issue was the reasons for the 'Scramble for Africa' in the late nineteenth century. There were many sound answers that combined valid reasons and appropriate examples from Europe and Africa. Answers that deserved lower marks were usually vague and lacking specific detail. They recorded general reasons for imperial interest in Africa but did not link them to particular European countries and did not produce African examples. In order to improve weaker candidates need to ensure that they have secure knowledge of the overseas regions where imperial expansion took place (in Africa for this specific question and in Asia for other questions on the topic) and are confident about which European countries were involved.

Question 6

The key issue in this question was the reasons why World War I had important effects on Russia to October 1917. A frequent discriminating factor was candidates' ability to discuss both revolutions in 1917. Most candidates could discuss effectively the general effects of the war on Russia but some did not take the argument past February 1917. Some weak answers were uncertain about the chronology of 1917, either confusing the revolutions in claiming that Nicholas II abdicated to the Bolsheviks or that the February revolution was due to Lenin. There were a number of very creditable answers. These focused on the effects of the war. They avoided excessive introductions about the background to 1914. The period before the war broke out was relevant to set the scene but was best dealt with briefly. Good answers distinguished between the February and October revolutions and were clear about the link between the war and the fortunes of the Provisional Government.

Question 7

The key issue was the extent to which Mussolini exercised a totalitarian rule over Italy to 1939. The key word was 'totalitarian' and candidates were given credit when they provided a brief but accurate definition. Some answers included comparisons of Mussolini, Hitler and Stalin. This was relevant but the comparisons needed to be short to be given credit as Mussolini was the focus of the question. The more successful candidates avoided narrative biographies of Mussolini's career but wrote more thematic accounts, for example discussing government, then the economy, then relations with Church and so on in terms of totalitarianism. The question asked 'How far..?' and candidates deserved credit when they examined the limitations, as well as the extent, of Mussolini's power. For example, he did not succeed in completely destroying the opposition. He did not have full control over the economy. The economic and social 'battles' that he fought revealed the limited powers that he enjoyed. The monarchy was not a major problem until after 1939 but Mussolini took care to handle the King respectfully and realised that his power was, to some extent at least, dependent on the support of the church.

Question 8

The key issue was the comparative effects of Bismarck and Marx to 1914. High marks did not necessarily demand an equal mastery of each man but rather a sound understanding and knowledge of one and an adequate treatment of the other. Most candidates were more confident writing about Bismarck. The most successful went beyond providing a narrative of his unification of Europe, which in itself did not explain his effect on Europe. Higher credit was given when candidates explained how he changed the balance of power in Europe. For the first time (at least in many centuries), Germany became a major European power. It can be argued that his impact on Europe was greater after 1871. Franco-German relations became a central aspect of European diplomacy to 1914. Although a reluctant imperialist, Bismarck began a process of German imperial expansionism that had consequences for the rest of Europe. Some candidates considered how far his attempts to build international alliances to safeguard Germany had the opposite effect by endangering peace. This was a very creditable point. Marx's ideas did not result in a Marxist state by 1914 but the number of Marxists was increasing in France, Germany and Russia. Marxism provided a challenge to right and left-wing opinion. Weaker answers made vague assertions and contained only general descriptions of his policies. The better responses considered the groups to whom he appealed and explained why others were opposed to his views. The most effective candidates achieved a reasonably balanced argument and were able to explain and justify their conclusions.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

Key messages

- The most effective answers to the source-based question organised the sources into groups (so that it was clear how far they agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis), evaluated provenance and demonstrated an understanding of context.
- The most highly rewarded essays were well organised and combined valid arguments and appropriate knowledge. They came to considered and justified conclusions.
- The best candidates carefully noted the key instructions and dates in the questions and tailored their argument and supporting detail to take these into account.

General comments

The overall standard of the scripts was satisfactory and some candidates deserved the award of very high marks. Their answers were consistently relevant and their work was well organised, combining valid arguments and appropriate knowledge. They came to considered and justified conclusions. In the middle range of marks were scripts that were often variable. Some individual answers merited high marks but candidates' work was uneven and the standard inconsistent. A characteristic of weaker scripts was that the candidates did not have sufficient knowledge to tackle the questions they had chosen. However it should be made clear that most scripts showed at least some evidence of relevant knowledge and understanding.

Comments are made below on individual questions but it might be helpful to make comments on issues that apply to several questions. It is important to note the dates in questions. Introductions about a preceding period and conclusions about aftermaths can be given credit if the points are linked to the dates in the questions and if they are brief. For example, **Question 6** could be tackled without any reference to Russia after 1914 and any discussion of the war years had to be short if it was to be given credit. In **Question 8**, it was possible to argue that Hitler became popular because of his contrast to politicians in the Weimar Republic but this did not require an extensive description of Weimar Germany in order to be effective.

Question 1, the source-based question, was answered most effectively when candidates avoided a sequence of summaries of the extracts. They were best organised into groups so that it was clear how far they agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis in the question. In assessing their reliability and usefulness, candidates should ask themselves questions such as '*Why was the source written?*' and '*Was the writer genuinely trying to inform people or persuade an audience?*' Candidates can use their own knowledge to assess the sources and should ask themselves '*Can I believe the source from what I know of the topic?*' On the other hand, contextual knowledge should be used to support an argument about the sources rather than included for its own sake. Answers will only achieve limited credit if they are general essays on the topic. They should be very largely source-based and evaluative in order to score high marks.

There were very few incomplete scripts. The large majority of candidates wrote four answers as required. Some could have used their time more effectively because their last answers were apparently rushed. However it is important to note that such scripts were in a minority.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were given 5 sources and were asked to use them to consider the judgement, or hypothesis, that *'Germany was not to blame for the war'*. There were a number of well organised answers that grouped the sources. They noted that Sources A and E mostly blamed Germany while Sources B, C and D gave different reasons for not blaming Germany. The most successful went beyond making general comparisons and made specific references to points of agreement or disagreement. For example, Source A was critical of William II's attitude, claiming that he took a hard line, while Source D saw him as a weak character who was dragged into war by others. Some sources disagreed about where the blame should lie if it was not with Germany. Source C blamed the countries in the Triple Entente. Source D blamed Austria, especially Berchtold, the Prime Minister. Candidates were given credit when they did not merely note provenances with bald statements about bias but were more critical. For example, it is true that Cambon's report was suspect because he was a French ambassador but the better responses looked at the text of his report to assess its value more convincingly. Source B was a German justification for going to war but additional credit was given when candidates looked at the grounds for German self-justification. Was it true that Germany tried strenuously to mediate between the rival forces? Was Russia's premature mobilisation decisive? It might be thought surprising that Britain's wartime Prime Minister should see Austria as more responsible than Germany for the war in Source D when the Versailles settlement condemned Germany as most responsible. A modern German historian blamed Germany and candidates could use their own knowledge briefly to test whether this country did indeed have ambitions for world power before the war. Candidates were expected to come to an overall judgement and most provided a conclusion that agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis, or suggested an alternative judgement.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was whether Robespierre and the Jacobins did more to save or endanger the French Revolution. The weakest responses provided general narratives of the French Revolution, sometimes only accounting for its causes. On the other hand, there were some thoughtful and informed discussions that focused on Robespierre and the Jacobins. The most successful considered both alternatives suggested by the question. They did not need to be evenly balanced because more time could be spent on the judgement that seemed more valid. Such responses discussed how Robespierre and his associates might be considered to have saved the Revolution, how they might have threatened it, and came to an overall conclusion. Many candidates considered the Jacobin Terror and its associated cruelty to have threatened the Revolution. Jacobin economic policies failed while their social and religious policies proved very divisive, hence their fall after a comparatively brief period. On the other hand, sound answers noted how they might have saved the Revolution. The execution of Louis XVI and the treatment of the nobility and other domestic counter-revolutionaries put an end to monarchism (until after the defeat of Napoleon although this was outside the scope of the topic). Although Robespierre and his party were at first opposed to the war, they were to be effective revolutionary leaders against the threats of foreign counter-revolutionaries. Robespierre was executed and his followers became an ineffective minority but the Republic was saved until Napoleon declared himself emperor.

Question 3

The key issue was the reasons why Britain industrialised before France and Germany. Answers deserved most credit when they showed some understanding and knowledge of France and Germany. The weaker responses tended to deal with the origins of the Industrial Revolution, but without linking these to any particular country. Such responses often contained some relevant ideas but were insufficiently focused on the key issue to merit a high mark. Sound candidates discussed factors such as the capital that was available in Britain for investment in new industries. In France, investments in offices or land were the preferred choice until late in the nineteenth century. Richer landowners in Britain were more willing to invest in agricultural improvements which in turn yielded profits that could be linked to industrial enterprises. There was more reluctance to change in rural regions of France and Germany. Some candidates contrasted the comparative political stability of Britain with circumstances in France and Germany. Credit was given when candidates made a link between the unified Zollverein and industrial change in Germany in the mid-nineteenth century. There was sometimes a tendency to exaggerate Britain's freedom from foreign war.

Britain was engaged in long and expensive wars against Napoleon. However, it is true that these wars did not do as much damage to Britain as to France and Germany. Some invalid claims were made about resources. France had as much in natural resources as Britain although the situation was more patchy in Germany. Britain's advantage was that it used these resources better for industrial improvement. Britain's naval superiority was explained creditably by some candidates who showed that it allowed the country to develop profitable trade.

Question 4

The key issue was the reasons why the Revolutions of 1848-49 failed to unify Germany and Italy. Some candidates organised their answers thematically, others referred to each region in turn. Neither approach was necessarily better than the other, although the former made it easier to be comparative. Credit was given when candidates analysed the reasons why the appeal of the revolutionaries was limited. Revolutionaries had different aims and favoured different methods to achieve change. Austria was a common enemy of the revolutions but some good candidates pointed out that both Germany and Italy contained powerful conservative forces that opposed the dangerous changes proposed by revolutionaries. A common feature was the lack of sufficient physical force. In Italy, this was evident in the risings headed by Mazzini and Garibaldi. In Germany the Frankfurt Parliament faced many problems, one of which was that it was no match for Prussian power. Some answers explained some of these differences. For example, Piedmont gave support for limited unification even though it was unsuccessful, while no German state gave its backing to movements for unification. It was not only Austrian power that confronted German revolutionaries. Answers in the highest bands were equally confident about Germany and Italy. In the middle and lower bands were answers that dealt satisfactorily with only one country, usually Italy. Some answers would have been improved if they had spent less time explaining the causes of the revolutions. It was relevant to explain the later success of Bismarck and Cavour briefly in a conclusion but some weak candidates spent too much time on this or were uncertain about the chronology. Neither statesman played a significant part in the events of 1848-49.

Question 5

The key issue was the problems that 'New Imperialism' caused for European countries by the end of the nineteenth century. The most important characteristic of good answers was that they explained why imperial developments caused problems and linked these to individual European countries and specific regions outside Europe. Weak answers tended to limit themselves to the causes of the 'New Imperialism' or to refer to problems without mentioning European or non-European countries. For example, while it is true that imperialism aroused tensions, these were best explained when examples were given, such as the Fashoda incident between Britain and France. A valid point made by a number of candidates was that some European countries developed empires in regions that had few worthwhile natural resources. Better candidates contrasted Britain's gains in South Africa with the North African gains of France and Italy. A few candidates deserved credit for discussing European problems in developing empires in Asia. It was more difficult to exert political control in the Far East. This is an aspect of imperialism to which candidates might give more attention. The general quality of the answers was satisfactory and some candidates wrote excellent answers.

Question 6

The key issue was the strengths and weaknesses of Nicholas II's regime at the outbreak of war in 1914. Candidates were awarded high marks when they showed a good knowledge and understanding of the period from 1906 to 1914 and when they considered both alternatives in the question: strengths and weaknesses. The best responses came to a considered judgement. Weak answers sometimes contained irrelevant material about tsarism and the war after 1914. In the middle ranges were answers that could explain the 1905 Revolution and its immediate consequences in the October Manifesto, Nicholas II's contradictory assertion of autocracy in the Fundamental Law, but little on the remaining period to 1914. The overall quality of the answers was satisfactory and some candidates explained the continuing weaknesses of the regime, for example a Tsar who remained opposed to significant reforms and an economic system that was more backward than in industrialised countries in Western Europe. The most creditable answers were aware of some strengths which not only included a military that was loyal to Nicholas II but an opposition that was divided and mostly controlled by the police. Some candidates were aware that the reforms of Witte and Stolypin produced some improvement in the economy. The efficiency of the army began to improve after defeat against Japan. The Tsar relied on the powerful influence of the Church and the policy of Russification was popular with the majority, although opposed by racial minorities. Nobody predicted an imminent revolution in 1914. The position of the Tsar seemed stable - until the war changed everything. Some of the most effective responses reflected on these issues in their conclusions.

Question 7

The key issue was whether propaganda was the most important reason for Hitler's popularity in Germany to 1939. Most answers were relevant and well-informed about Hitler's use of propaganda. Examples of propaganda methods were generally accurate. Useful references were made to the work of Goebbels. Credit was given when candidates explained the importance of Hitler's personal role as Führer. The Führer Principle put him above the constraints of law. The question asked whether propaganda was the most important reason for Hitler's popularity. Candidates could agree but for high marks to be awarded some consideration of other reasons to provide a comparison was required. For example, credit was given when economic and social policies were discussed. It may well be that the economy would have revived without Hitler but most people felt that they benefited from Nazi policies. Social policies were designed to appeal to the majority of the population although at a cost to minorities. Many candidates recognised that there was probably genuine support for Hitler's foreign policies in the 1930s which provided a strong contrast with the humiliation of Versailles. The most successful answers discussed such wider points and assessed their relative importance.

Question 8

The key issue was the extent to which Russia became a Marxist country under Lenin and Stalin to 1939. The most important quality of the best answers was their ability to explain what is meant by a Marxist state and link this to specific policies of Lenin and Stalin. There were some sound responses that considered both political and economic issues. High marks were also awarded when answers were reasonably balanced between Lenin and Stalin. Some moderate responses described the regimes of Lenin and Stalin but without commenting on the extent to which they sought and achieved a Marxist state. However, there were effective discussions that contrasted the dictatorships of Lenin, and especially Stalin, with Marxist ideals. Valid comparisons were made between Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP) and Marxism. Stalin's enforced collectivisation and other economic policies were far from the views of Marx and a number of candidates recognised this.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

Key messages

- To achieve the higher levels on the source-based question it is necessary to evaluate the sources beyond face value, cross-reference between them and consider relevant contextual knowledge.
- It is most important to answer the question as it is written on the question paper – using a prepared response or simply writing about the topic means that candidates achieve only limited marks.
- It is necessary to support points and arguments with accurate and relevant detail.

General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question (**Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Very few candidates misread or ignored the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

A number of candidates sustained consistently high standards throughout all of their responses. They displayed clear evidence of their ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of knowledge and understanding. Many candidates demonstrated sound knowledge in at least some of their answers but were unable to maintain this throughout. A number found it difficult to use their knowledge in a focused and analytical manner to address the specific requirements of the questions. Common characteristics of weaker scripts included a lack of relevant knowledge and a tendency to rely on generalised statements and unsupported assertions.

Most candidates enjoyed some success in tackling **Question 1** as they were able to identify information from the sources which both supported and challenged the hypothesis. This enabled them to construct an argument which was focused on the demands of the question. The most impressive responses went beyond 'face value' descriptive accounts and interpreted the sources in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of contextual knowledge. Many candidates showed an awareness of the need to apply such analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources. The best candidates achieved this convincingly, while the weaker responses relied on vague and unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability. Some candidates wrote about each source in turn; as a result, their answers tended to lack both structure and a consistent argument focused on the question. Vital opportunities for cross-referencing between sources were often missed. It is essential to read carefully through all of the sources, noting relevant information and analysis on a structured plan, before beginning a response.

The most impressive responses to essay questions were characterised by focus, balanced and sustained arguments and were fully supported by appropriate material. It is essential to address the particular question set rather than the topic it covers. For example, many answers to **Question 2** lapsed into descriptive accounts of the causes of the Cold War in Europe in the period between 1945 and 1949. Only in the best responses was there explicit analysis of whether '*Truman's fear of communism was the main cause*'. Similarly, there was a temptation in **Question 6** to write about the development of nuclear arms, rather than attempts to control that development. It is equally important that an essay, while proposing a clear argument in direct response to the question, maintains a balanced analysis of the available evidence. For example, in their responses to **Question 4**, a number of candidates decided that one of the three protagonists was more culpable and wrote exclusively about his part in the build up to the Cuban missile crisis with no reference to the other two. Weaker responses to the essay questions were often fragmentary, superficial and frequently characterised by generalisations and assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

How far do Sources A-E support the view that UNRWA has done more harm than good?

Most candidates used information contained within the sources to construct a logical and balanced response to the question. Sources C and D were commonly seen as providing the strongest support for the view that UNRWA has done more harm than good. Both sources compare UNRWA unfavourably with other United Nations' relief agencies, such as UNHCR (Source C) and UNICEF (Source D). They claim that its unique organisation and policies relating to hiring staff have created '*an infrastructure for Palestinian dependency*' (Source D), making it impossible for UNRWA to '*entertain any permanent solution for the Palestinian refugees*' (Source C), thereby perpetuating the problem. Both sources claim that UNRWA is '*antagonistic to the achievement of peace in the Middle East*' (Source C) and is guilty of '*complicity with terrorism*' (Source D).

By contrast, Sources B and E, which claim that UNRWA provides vital services to people in desperate need, were generally seen as challenging the hypothesis. Source E argues that UNRWA makes sure '*vulnerable refugees receive the basic services and common decencies*', concluding that such action represents '*the UN at its best*'. Source B shows that UNRWA's work in providing '*food, water... and other social services*' on an ever-increasing scale, has gained support from the international community. The best candidates recognised the need to go beyond 'face value' interpretation and to analyse the sources in their historical context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. The most impressive responses were based on a sound understanding of the wider context. Many showed how the creation of Israel in 1948 displaced large numbers of Palestinians from their homeland - numbers which have been greatly increased by subsequent Israeli actions and the fact that the refugees are now into their '*third generation*' (Source D). As Source B shows, the UN has passed numerous resolutions in an attempt to encourage '*a peaceful and just settlement of the refugee problem*', but these have been largely ineffective and the problem remains. Candidates who fully understood this contrasted Source B's view that the problem persists largely because Israel and the USA '*lack the political will to put these expressions of international law into effect*' with Source C's claim that the problem is on-going because '*UNRWA has declined to entertain any permanent solution for the Palestinian refugees.*'

Most candidates correctly identified Source A as an extract from the UN Resolution which established UNRWA. While many responses dismissed this source as having no relevance because it makes no reference to UNRWA doing '*more harm than good*', some were able to make effective use of it through cross-referencing. For example, the aim of preventing '*conditions of starvation and distress*' amongst Palestinian refugees has been achieved according to Sources B, E and elements of C. The intention to '*further conditions of peace and stability*' conforms to Source E's opinion that UNRWA '*has been the most powerful force for moderation*'. Relatively few candidates made effective use of the statement in Source A that '*constructive measures should be undertaken at an early date with a view to the termination of the assistance for relief which UNRWA will provide.*' While some appreciated the implication that UNRWA was intended to be a short-term project, this was almost invariably seen as providing support for the views expressed in Sources C and D that UNRWA itself was responsible for the fact that no permanent solution had been found. Only a few candidates were able to show that there might be other reasons for the continuing problem, as suggested in Source B.

The most impressive responses evaluated sources by cross-referencing between them. Many noted that both Sources C and D claim that terrorism breeds in Palestinian refugee camps and that UNRWA has adopted a '*don't ask, don't tell*' policy towards this. Source B, on the other hand, argues that '*there is no substantial evidence to support claims that UNRWA facilities have been used to store weapons or promote terrorism*', while Source E argues that UNRWA has been '*a force for moderation*'. Having highlighted this discrepancy, few candidates took their evaluation to a deeper level by considering whether the UNRWA Commissioner's admission that '*there are Hamas members on the UNRWA payroll and I don't see that as a crime*' (Source D) suggests that Sources C and D are perhaps closer to the truth.

Many candidates realised the need to consider source provenance and reliability, although this was sometimes attempted in an unconvincing manner. For example, statements such as '*Source C is biased*' are unsupported assertions unless candidates attempt to explain how and why. Similarly, having argued that Source A had no relevance to the hypothesis, a number of candidates stated that it is unlikely to contain bias because it is a formal UN Resolution; while this might be a valid point, it is of no significance if the source content has already been dismissed as irrelevant. Some attempts at provenance evaluation highlighted confusion over the context of the sources; for example, a number of candidates argued that Source B

supports the work of UNRWA because it was written by Jewish people, only to subsequently argue that Source C is heavily against UNRWA for the same reason. The most impressive responses argued that Sources C and D both come from Jewish origins and are strongly supportive of Israel and Israeli actions in the Middle East. As a result, they both express concern about UNRWA and its relationship with Palestinian terrorism. Conversely, Source E comes from a Palestinian newspaper catering for a largely Palestinian audience, and therefore is likely to support the work of UNRWA. A few candidates recognised that Source B is also from a Jewish organisation, but in this case one opposed to the extension of Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands, and is therefore likely to be supportive of UNRWA's work. Fewer gave examples of Source B's emotive content (that international funding was being used to restore 'medical and educational services' lost due to 'Israeli aggression') in order to substantiate their argument.

Question 2

'US President Truman's fear of communism was the main cause of the Cold War in Europe between 1945 and 1949.' How far do you agree?

The most impressive responses were fully focused on the question throughout, and provided balanced arguments which included consideration of alternative interpretations of the causes of the Cold War. A number of candidates used the question as an opportunity to repeat prepared answers on the topic, usually focusing on the historical debate and covering the traditional and revisionist (etc.) viewpoints in varying levels of detail. Some such responses ended with a conclusion which was partly focused on the question, but often took the form of determining whether it was Truman or Stalin who was mostly to blame for the outbreak of the Cold War. Weaker candidates might have improved their responses by addressing Truman's 'fear of communism'. Only a few demonstrated an understanding of how the USSR's perceived expansionism in Europe posed a significant threat to Truman's desire to maintain and extend American economic interests.

A number of candidates confined their answers to a descriptive account of the various events which characterised the escalation of the Cold War, sometimes demonstrating a limited grasp of chronology. In many such responses the Potsdam Conference, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the Berlin Blockade were treated as almost simultaneous events. Similarly, there was a widespread belief that Truman was influenced by the 'domino theory', even before 1950. The weakest responses were characterised by a series of unsupported assertions.

Question 3

Why did the Cold War spread outside Europe in the period from 1950 to 1975?

While the most effective responses were focused on the key element in the question and addressed the issue of *why* the Cold War spread outside Europe, the majority tended to concentrate on *how* it occurred. This usually took the form of descriptive accounts (with varying levels of detail and accuracy) of one or two conflict areas, most frequently Korea, Vietnam and Cuba. Notwithstanding the wording of the question, many candidates wrote about events in Europe, sometimes concentrating on issues which took place prior to 1950.

Many candidates showed considerable knowledge of aspects of American foreign policy, such as containment, roll-back, NSC-68 and the 'domino theory'. However, only the best responses demonstrated its impact in helping to cause the globalisation of the Cold War. Similarly, analysis of Soviet culpability was frequently confined to vague and unsupported assertions regarding the USSR's desire for world domination. The significance of issues such as decolonisation and regional conflicts was largely ignored.

Question 4

Who was most responsible for causing the Cuban Crisis of 1962 – Castro, Kennedy or Khrushchev?

There were some very high quality responses to this question and these were characterised by clear understanding of the causes of the Cuban crisis together with detailed evaluation of the motives of each of those involved. The most effective candidates analysed the culpability of each of the three protagonists before reaching a reasoned conclusion which was fully focused on the requirements of the question.

A number of responses were heavily unbalanced. Many candidates determined from the outset that one of the protagonists (usually, but not exclusively, Khrushchev) was primarily responsible, and then confined their answer to an explanation of this viewpoint without any analysis of the culpability of the other key players. Some compared the responsibility of two of the three leaders named in the question, ignoring the third.

Castro, in particular, was often missed out in such responses. Some candidates wrote narrative accounts of the crisis itself, with little or no reference to causation. It was clear in the weakest responses that candidates' knowledge and understanding of this topic was limited and there was a marked tendency to base responses on unsupported assertions.

Question 5

Why did Deng Xiaoping survive the 'crisis of communism' whilst Mikhail Gorbachev did not?

Candidates who attempted this question generally produced solid, well informed responses. Many were able to write confidently about the reforms of Deng and Gorbachev respectively. The most impressive answers highlighted the difference between economic and political reform, while identifying the different circumstances which accompanied the disintegration of the Soviet Empire compared with the core stability and centralised political control which was maintained in China.

Some candidates were clearly secure in their knowledge of the crisis of communism in either China or the Soviet Union, but much weaker on the other. Their responses tended to be significantly unbalanced and could not engage in the comparative analysis required by the question. The weakest responses were characterised by vague and generalised comment and inadequate or inaccurate factual support.

Question 6

'Attempts to control the development of nuclear weapons between 1949 and 1980 were largely ineffective.' How far do you agree?

The most effective essays offered a reasonable overview of attempts to control development (such as the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963, the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 and the SALT Treaties of the 1970s), outlining some reasons for their failure and producing basic arguments to demonstrate that they did have at least some positive effects. Such candidates were able to support their points with relevant detail and maintained a balanced approach to the question.

Many candidates wrote descriptive accounts, in varying degrees of detail and accuracy, on the build-up of nuclear armaments with limited reference to attempts to control this. Surprisingly few referred to any particular treaty other than the SALT Treaties, while many included the Reagan initiatives which were clearly beyond the remit of the question. The majority of responses consisted of vague and generalised assertions, with little analysis of what each of the treaties was trying to achieve or what impact it actually had.

Question 7

Why did the international economy experience serious problems in the 1970s and early 1980s?

Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the impact of the oil crises. A smaller number made detailed reference to other factors which created serious problems for the international economy in the 1970s and 1980s. Some responses outlined the debt crisis in the developing world and the rapid development of newly industrialised countries such as the Asian Tigers, although very few were able to analyse the ways in which they impacted on the world economy in general. Relatively few candidates seemed aware of the negative impact of problems affecting the American economy, such as the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreements or the abandonment of the US dollar exchange mechanism. It was clear that a number of candidates lacked the depth of factual knowledge required to address this question effectively.

Question 8

'The Brandt Report had made little difference to the North-South Divide by 1991.' How far do you agree?

While some candidates clearly had a sound understanding of the term 'North-South Divide', only a small minority were able to demonstrate sufficient levels of knowledge about the Brandt Report itself to allow for a detailed analysis of its aims and achievements. Characteristically weak responses were confined to loosely related assertions with very limited corroborative evidence.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

Key messages

- The most impressive responses to the source-based question (**Question 1**) interpreted the sources in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of contextual knowledge.
- The most effective responses to the essay questions were characterised by focus, balance and consistently sustained arguments.
- The highest achieving candidates addressed the particular question set, rather than the topic it covered, and supported their points with accurate and relevant detail.

General comments

The majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates used their time effectively although a small number spent too long on one response (usually **Question 1**) leaving them too little time to complete their fourth answer. A few ignored or misread the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Many candidates maintained consistently excellent standards throughout their scripts, displaying evidence of their ability to make informed judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. Most candidates demonstrated sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but some were unable to sustain this across all four of their responses. A number found it difficult to use their knowledge in a focused and analytical manner in order to address the specific requirements of the questions. A characteristic of weaker scripts was the lack of appropriate factual knowledge, so that responses tended to consist largely of vague or generalised statements and assertions.

In their responses to the source-based question most candidates identified information from the sources which both supported and challenged the hypothesis. This enabled them to construct an argument clearly focused on the requirements of the question. The most impressive responses went beyond 'face value' and interpreted the sources in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of contextual knowledge. Many candidates were aware of the need to apply such analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources but were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying almost exclusively on vague and unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability. Some candidates wrote about each source in turn; these answers tended to lack both structure and a consistent argument focused on the question. Vital opportunities for cross-referencing between sources were often missed. It is essential to read carefully through all of the sources, recording relevant information and analysis on a structured plan, before commencing a written response.

The most impressive answers to the essay questions were characterised by focus, balanced and sustained arguments and well supported points. It is essential to address the particular question set rather than the topic it covers. For example, less successful answers to **Question 2** often provided descriptive accounts of the causes of the Cold War in Europe and analysis of whether the Truman Doctrine was a 'symptom' or a 'cause' was either implicit or lacking. Similarly in **Question 6**, many candidates were keen to demonstrate the depth of their factual knowledge by writing in great detail about the development of the nuclear arms race and the various attempts to control it, without focusing on the key issue of America's deterrence strategies between 1954 and 1967. It is advisable to prepare a brief plan before beginning a response to an essay question. This helps candidates to remain focused on the question, while ensuring that responses are well structured and arguments are consistent throughout.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

'The effectiveness of the UN has been hindered more by the self-interest of member states than by its own structural weaknesses.' How far do Sources A-E support this view?

The majority of candidates used information from the sources to construct a logical and balanced response. Source C was usually seen as providing the strongest support for the hypothesis. That the USA refused to meet its full financial obligations to the UN, largely because *'it did not like certain expenditures'* was seen as clear evidence that national self-interest was being given priority over *'humanity's future.'* The claim that *'the Soviet Union has also failed to pay its UN dues for the same reason'* added further support to this argument. By contrast, Sources B and E were viewed as offering the strongest challenge to the hypothesis, largely because of their scathing attacks on the voting system, which Source E describes as *'absurd'*. The fact that each member state, regardless of its population, has one vote means that the General Assembly *'can pass resolutions with the votes of nations representing less than 10% of the world's population'* (Source B). Both sources are equally critical of the Security Council, Source B highlighting the dangers implicit in the right of veto with the statement that *'A Security Council that can be rendered impotent by the vote of one nation cannot begin to guarantee security.'* Source D was seen as offering the most balanced approach. Most candidates showed that the source is critical of the United Nations' structure with the statement that the UN *'needs a great deal of administrative reform.....it needs a better civil service.'* However, its claim that *'these things can be done, provided governments are prepared really to support their organisation'* was perceived as evidence to support the view that UN weaknesses stem from a lack of commitment by member states.

The most successful responses went beyond 'face value' interpretation and analysed the sources in their historical context, evaluated their provenance and cross-referred between them. A number of candidates dismissed Source A as being irrelevant because it does not directly refer to UN effectiveness. More perceptive responses, appreciating that the speech was made in the early days of the UN, demonstrated that from the beginning there were serious concerns that delegates would put their national interests above those of the UN. Many candidates suggested that these fears were subsequently realised, using Source D's implicit statement that governments were not prepared *'really to support their organisation'* as evidence. The most impressive responses contrasted this with the comment made at the beginning of Source B, to the effect that *'conventional wisdom'* assumes that *'there is nothing wrong with the UN; all that is required to make it work is the political will of its members'*, a view which Source B strenuously denies.

While many candidates recognised the similarities between Sources B and E in their views on the weaknesses in the structure of both the General Assembly and Security Council, fewer referred to the inadequate funding which the UN receives. The best responses cross-referenced the statement in Source B that *'the UN has no taxing power, no way to get money from any government without that government's consent'*, with Source C's allegations regarding the failure of both the USA and the Soviet Union to pay their dues. Some candidates noted that Source B states government contributions to the UN are voluntary, while Source C gives the impression that they are rather more than this by claiming that the USA has *'failed to pay its UN dues'* and is *'unwilling to honour our obligations.'* Using contextual knowledge, these candidates went on to show that Source B is more accurate on this issue (as one might expect from a legal journal), and by implication the writers of Source C must have had some ulterior motive for making their claims. Indeed, the title of their book, together with its emotive content (e.g. *'carnage of WWII'*, *'humanity's future'*), indicate their belief that a strong UN is essential for the benefit of mankind and their disappointment that the UN Charter has failed to live up to expectations. Source D was commonly seen as the most balanced source, offering explicit criticism of UN administration, management and leadership while implicitly accusing member states' governments of inadequate support. Many candidates felt that the source's credibility was enhanced by the fact that its author had held a senior post in the UN for virtually all of the Cold War era.

Candidates who achieved the highest level did so by evaluating the evidence on both sides of the argument, and explaining how and why the quality of the evidence differed. Some were able to show that the UN's effectiveness was hindered both by the self-interest of members and its own structural weaknesses, and that these issues are inter-linked. The right of veto in the Security Council, a structural weakness, was seen as making it possible for governments *'which often have interests at stake within an area of dispute'* to jockey for position (Source E). The best responses used contextual knowledge to demonstrate how such structural weaknesses came about because the Great Powers were keen to protect their own interests when drafting and agreeing to the UN Charter. As Source D points out, the UN is not (and was never intended to be) a *'world government'* of the type which the authors of Source C seem to be advocating, and which would be required if it were have the power to *'get money from any government without that government's consent'* (Source B).

Question 2

'The Truman Doctrine was a symptom not a cause of the Cold War.' How far do you agree?

It was clear that most candidates possessed good knowledge of the causes of the Cold War and the historical debate surrounding them. The best responses were produced by candidates who used their knowledge to sustain a balanced argument which was focused on the specific requirements of the question, in particular differentiating between *'symptom'* and *'cause'*. Such responses tended to argue that while the Truman Doctrine significantly changed relationships between the superpowers and represented the first formal recognition of open animosity between them, it was a symptom of deeper problems which were already evident at the 1945 conferences. For instance the power vacuum which existed at the end of World War II, the USA's desire to maintain and extend markets in Europe, Stalin's paranoia regarding security, the USA's possession of atomic weapons and long-term ideological differences all had a part to play.

By contrast, weaker candidates seemed less able to link their knowledge to the requirements of the question. Many wrote, often in great detail, about the causes of the Cold War, usually focusing on the traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist viewpoints, with only a token reference to the question in their conclusion. Such responses, essentially descriptive rather than analytical, could not achieve the higher marks reserved for essays which are focused on the question throughout. A significant number of candidates repeated prepared essays on the causes of the Cold War, with no attempt to analyse the relative significance of the Truman Doctrine. Many such responses contained a great deal of information about the Berlin Blockade which was peripheral to this question. The weakest responses revealed a limited grasp of the chronology of events between 1945 and 1949 - particularly important in explaining the process of action and reaction from which the Cold War evolved, and in deciding the role of the Truman Doctrine.

Question 3

'The globalisation of the Cold War between 1950 and 1975 was caused by the USA's misguided and irrational fear of Soviet intentions.' How far do you agree?

There were a number of very impressive responses, characterised by detailed analysis of Soviet intentions and American perceptions. A common argument was that while the American perception of Soviet intentions was misguided, it was not irrational given the Cold War background and the inevitable mistrust which it created. It was perhaps understandable, after the communist take-over of China in 1949, that the USA would base its foreign policy on the assumption that the communist 'bloc', intent on world domination, was a clear threat to American economic and strategic security. In turn, this would lead to an enhancement of the containment policy through NSC-68 and the 'domino theory', causing the USA to become actively involved in a series of regional conflicts around the world. Balance was achieved by demonstrating Soviet complicity in helping to spread the Cold War through involvement in areas such as Cuba, the Middle East and the recently de-colonised and vulnerable countries of Africa. It was pleasing to note the wide range of appropriate examples (e.g. Guatemala and Congo) which candidates used to support their arguments.

A significant number of candidates wrote analytical essays which pursued a slightly different focus from the question, either discussing the causes of the globalisation of the Cold War in general or debating whether the USA or the USSR was most responsible. In such responses, the issue of whether American policy was *'misguided'* and/or *'irrational'* was either considered only implicitly or ignored completely. Weaker responses comprised narrative accounts of two or three conflicts (most commonly Korea, Vietnam and Cuba) with no relevant analysis, while some were characterised by irrelevant coverage of events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

How far were Arab-Israeli relations affected by the Cold War between 1950 and 1979?

There were some very impressive responses to this question showing clear understanding of how Cold War issues affected relations between Israel and the Arab states within the given time frame. A number of responses offered chronological accounts of the various conflicts with limited reference to the ways in which Cold War rivalries helped to impact on those events or, indeed, why the superpowers had become involved in the region at all. It was evident that, while most candidates possessed sound knowledge of the Arab-Israeli conflict, there was a general lack of understanding of how it was affected by the Cold War. A number of weaker responses contained narrative accounts, often in considerable detail, about events between 1947 and 1949. To achieve higher marks some candidates needed to take more note of the dates given in the question.

Question 5

'Deng Xiaoping's move towards market socialism was both the cause of the crisis of Chinese communism and the reason why it survived.' How far do you agree?

Most candidates who attempted this question displayed an impressive knowledge of Deng Xiaoping's reforms and their impact. In general, the first part of the question was covered more effectively than the second. The majority were able to demonstrate that although Deng's economic reforms had some initial success, they led to inflation. Social reform led to a split within the CCP and to demands for greater democracy and freedom than Deng was prepared to allow. The most impressive responses went on to show how Deng's conviction that one-party control was necessary in order to supervise the transition to a 'socialist market economy' helped him to survive. This was often compared with Gorbachev's belief that it was impossible to have economic reform without political reform. As a counter-argument, many candidates suggested that Deng's survival owed at least as much to his political manoeuvrings within the CCP and to his ability to maintain control over the army.

Weaker responses tended to offer descriptive accounts of Deng's reforms, with little reference to the actual question. Many candidates devoted far too much time to a comparison with the situation facing the USSR, thereby effectively answering a different question. Similarly, a number of candidates explained why Deng decided to carry out his reforms, often writing at considerable and unnecessary length about Mao and the problems he left behind.

Question 6

How and why did the USA's nuclear deterrence strategies develop between 1954 and 1967?

The majority of candidates displayed some knowledge of massive retaliation, mutually assured destruction and flexible response, though not all were able to demonstrate a secure sense of chronology in the development of these different strategies. The best responses linked the changes to specific events or developments within nuclear technology, thereby addressing both the 'how' and the 'why' elements of the question. Less impressive responses tended to describe the different strategies accurately but with no explicit attempt to focus on how and why they developed. The weakest responses were often the product of confusion over the requirements of the question. A number of candidates wrote at length about the nuclear arms race, and/or the significance of periods of detente, with no reference to the USA's deterrence strategies. Similarly, other candidates provided a narrative account of the various treaties which were intended to control the number or proliferation of nuclear weapons, often going outside the time frame of the question by describing the SALT Treaties.

Question 7

How important was the USA to the development of the international economy in the period from 1945 to 1980?

A number of candidates wrote confidently and analytically about the changing influence of the USA on the international economy throughout the period in question. However, most responses tended to focus on the immediate post-war period and often exclusively on America's contribution to the reconstruction of the European economy through the Marshall Plan. Only a few candidates were able to comment on the role of the USA in helping to shape key international institutions, such as GATT, the World Bank and the IMF, while fewer still made reference to the failings of the US economy in the late 1960s, or the changing role of the USA in the crisis years of 1970s.

Question 8

'In the period from 1970 to 1991, international aid did more to hinder than assist Third World countries in the development of their economies'. How far do you agree?

Some candidates who attempted this question produced focused and balanced arguments, well supported by an impressive array of appropriate material and specific examples. By contrast, weaker responses tended to be heavily generalised, with many vague and unsupported assertions regarding issues such as debt, famine and corruption etc. In many cases there was a lack of clarity regarding what 'international aid' actually means and some candidates lacked a clear understanding of the term 'Third World'.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

Key messages

- The most impressive responses to the source-based question (**Question 1**) interpreted the sources in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of contextual knowledge.
- The most effective responses to the essay questions were characterised by focus, balance and consistently sustained arguments.
- The highest achieving candidates addressed the particular question set, rather than the topic it covered, and supported their points with accurate and relevant detail.

General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates used their time effectively, although a small number spent too long on one response (usually **Question 1**), leaving themselves too little time to complete their fourth answer. A very small number of candidates ignored or misread the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Many candidates maintained consistently excellent standards throughout all four of their responses, clearly displaying evidence of their ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. Most demonstrated sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, although some were unable to sustain this across all four of their responses. A small number of candidates would have improved their answers if they had used their knowledge in a more focused and analytical manner in order to address the specific requirements of the questions. A characteristic of weaker scripts was a lack of appropriate knowledge, so that responses tended to consist largely of generalised statements and assertions.

In their responses to **Question 1**, most candidates identified information from the sources which both supported and challenged the hypothesis, enabling them to construct an argument clearly focused on the requirements of the question. The most impressive responses went beyond 'face value' and interpreted the sources in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the application of appropriate background knowledge. The majority were clearly aware of the need to apply such analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying almost exclusively on vague and unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability. Some candidates wrote about each source in turn; as a result, their answers tended to lack both structure and a consistent argument focused on the question. Vital opportunities for cross-referencing between sources were often missed. Candidates are advised that it is essential to read carefully through all of the sources, recording relevant information and analysis on a structured plan, before commencing their written response.

The most impressive responses to the essay questions were characterised by focus and balanced and consistently sustained arguments. Candidates need to appreciate that it is essential to address the particular question set rather than the topic it covers. For example, many answers to **Question 2** became descriptive accounts of the causes of the Cold War in Europe in the period between 1945 and 1949. Analysis of whether '*the USA was more responsible than the USSR*' was often only implicit. Similarly in **Question 3**, many chose to focus on *how* the Cold War was globalised rather than the extent to which globalisation was caused by the '*expansionist ambitions of the USSR*'. It is advisable to prepare a brief plan before beginning an essay question; this helps candidates to remain focused on the requirements of the question, while also ensuring that their response is well structured and their argument is clear and consistent throughout.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

How far do Sources A-E support the view that, between 1945 and 1991, UNHCR was successful in dealing with the international refugee problem?

The majority of candidates used information contained within the sources to construct a logical and balanced response to the question. Source B was universally seen as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis. That UNHCR has uniquely been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize on two occasions was seen as clear evidence of success, further supported by the source's reference to examples of the effective work which UNHCR has carried out across the world. By contrast, Source C was interpreted as providing the most effective arguments challenging the hypothesis, stressing that UNHCR frequently '*finds itself out of its depth*' when faced with complex issues for which it is under-resourced. The terms of its mandate mean that UNHCR effectiveness is undermined because it is not allowed to interfere '*even where there is clear evidence of human rights violations that result in forcible displacement.*' Sources D and E were generally viewed as offering more balanced opinions, concentrating on the factors which inhibit UNHCR in its work on behalf of refugees. Both sources highlight the vast increase in the scale of the refugee problem (in numbers and geographical location) since the creation of UNHCR, and both demonstrate how UNHCR effectiveness is limited by the need to '*keep these rapidly increasing humanitarian relief operations clearly separated from political, economic and military operations*' (Source E).

In order to achieve higher marks for this question, it was necessary to analyse the sources in their historical context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. Many candidates dismissed Source A as having no relevance to the question because it does not make any explicit comment on whether UNHCR has been successful in dealing with the international refugee problem. More effective responses showed that an understanding of Source A is vital to fully appreciate factors which might limit the actions which UNHCR is able to take. Such responses cross-referenced Source A's statement that '*no assistance may be granted... without the approval of the authorities of the country concerned*' with Source D's comment that UNHCR has to defend the rights of refugees and carry out its humanitarian duties '*without alienating the national authorities*' involved. Inevitably this requirement would restrict UNHCR effectiveness, as confirmed by the situations in Rwanda (Source D) and Pakistan (Source E). While some candidates suggested that these restrictions meant that there was a need to change the UNHCR mandate to allow it to take more effective action where there is '*evidence of human rights violations*' (Source C), the more perceptive set this matter in context. They demonstrated how the mandate is a reflection of a basic tenet of the UN Charter, which precludes any involvement in the internal affairs of a member state without the permission of its government.

Most candidates recognised the need to evaluate source provenance and reliability, although this was sometimes attempted in an unconvincing manner. Statements such as '*Source B is biased*' are merely assertions if they lack an attempt to explain how and why. Having argued that Source A has no relevance to the hypothesis, a number of candidates stated that it is unlikely to contain bias because it is an internal memo never intended for public consumption; while this might be a valid point, it is of no significance if the source contents are irrelevant to the question. There were many examples of far more effective evaluation of source provenance. For example, many candidates argued convincingly that, as it was part of a UN press release issued immediately following receipt of UNHCR's second Nobel Peace Prize, Source B would inevitably concentrate on the agency's successes and make no mention of less impressive issues such as those raised in Sources C, D and E. Many responses pointed out that Source D, from a research project funded by the UNHCR seems more concerned with listing external factors which inhibit the agency's achievement than in evaluating its success or failure – the massive increase in the scale of the refugee problem since the 1960s, the requirement to work in cooperation with host nations and to '*make sure it was not dragged into internal feuds*', for example. Source C was frequently viewed as opinionated, reflecting the political views of its authors, evidenced by the nature of the publication in which the article appears (from a pressure group) and unsubstantiated claims such as '*the major powers have been highly selective about whether... to get involved in political crises and humanitarian emergencies.*'

Candidates who achieved the highest level in this question did so by evaluating the evidence on both sides of the argument, and then explaining how and why the quality of the evidence differed. In most cases, this led to the conclusion that UNHCR is a well-intentioned agency, working hard to alleviate an ever-expanding problem under circumstances which are often extremely difficult. While it has enjoyed much success (as outlined in Source B), there have also been significant failures. How successfully UNHCR confronts a particular problem has less to do with the commitment of the agency and its staff than with the support it receives from the host nation in particular and the international community in general.

Question 2

Consider the view that the USA was more responsible than the USSR for the outbreak and development of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1949.

Most candidates possessed very detailed knowledge on the causes and early development of the Cold War and there were many impressive responses. The best provided a balanced overview while remaining fully focused on the question throughout, sustaining a clear and consistent argument. Pleasingly, many candidates differentiated effectively between the 'outbreak' and 'development' aspects of the question.

Recognising that the hypothesis is a reflection of the revisionist viewpoint, most candidates took the opportunity to describe the various views in the historical debate which surrounds the causes of the Cold War (traditional, revisionist etc.). In adopting such an approach, many lost sight of the question, producing narrative accounts of the historical debate with little explicit reference to whether the USA was more responsible than the USSR for the outbreak and development of the Cold War. Characteristically, such responses tended to summarise each viewpoint and then make a statement in the conclusion regarding which one was to be preferred. While this might be implicitly relevant to the question, weaker essays would have been improved if convincing reasons had been given to explain why one interpretation was preferred.

Question 3

'The globalisation of the Cold War in the period between 1950 and 1975 was caused by the expansionist ambitions of the USSR.' How far do you agree?

Most candidates displayed sound knowledge of *how* the Cold War became globalised between 1950 and 1975, even if many seemed less secure on *why* this occurred. There were a number of very high quality responses which analysed Soviet culpability in the light of other causal factors such as de-colonisation, regional disputes and American over-reaction to what it perceived as the expansionist actions of the communist 'bloc' following the communist take-over of China in 1949. Such responses contained balanced, focused arguments supported by appropriate factual material.

Weaker responses were characterised by the absence of a consistent and sustained argument. Such answers often provided a narrative of individual events in isolation. Most frequently discussed were the Korean War, the Cuban Missile crisis and the Vietnam War, but, pleasingly, a wide range of other examples, including the Middle East, Latin America and Africa, were also mentioned. Each review tended to be concluded with a statement, such as '*so the USSR was mainly responsible for causing the Cuban Missile crisis*', which was only implicitly relevant.

Question 4

Why did the USA become directly involved in the Korean War when the USSR did not?

The majority of candidates displayed a sound knowledge of the Korean War itself and the various reasons for the USA's direct involvement. In general, however, candidates seemed less confident in explaining why the USSR did not become directly involved, and a relatively large number ignored this part of the question entirely, thereby rendering their responses unbalanced.

The most impressive responses demonstrated that the USSR, unlike China, had no strategic interests in the Korean area and that Stalin's priority lay in Europe. He certainly had no wish to become embroiled in a direct war with the USA at a time when the Soviet Union was still recovering from the devastating effects of the Second World War. He only gave Kim permission to attack once he was convinced that America would take no action, and was quick to distance himself when the USA intervened. By contrast, the USA felt compelled to take action due to domestic anti-communist political pressure, its strategic (especially economic) interests in South East Asia (which it deemed to be threatened as a result of the 'domino theory') and a foreign policy based on containment, NSC-68 and supremacy within the United Nations.

The weakest responses were largely confined to narrative accounts of the Korean War. While they gave details of *how* American troops shaped the events and eventual outcome of the War, there was little attempt to explain *why* they were involved. Reference to the Soviet Union was commonly restricted to unfocused statements such as '*the USSR merely supplied North Korea with weapons and military advisers.*'

Question 5

To what extent did the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 make the collapse of the USSR unavoidable?

It was clear that most candidates possessed detailed knowledge of the reasons why the USSR collapsed by 1991, although some had difficulty in relating this to the specific requirements of the question. The most effective responses came from those candidates who demonstrated how the various causal factors were inter-connected, and that to review the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in isolation is misleading. They showed how events in Eastern Europe were a symptom of the wider problems affecting the Soviet Union. For example, Gorbachev's attempts to overcome the massive social and economic problems facing the Soviet Union led to reforms which encouraged nationalism both in Eastern Europe and within the USSR, while his abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine meant that uprisings went unchallenged.

The majority of responses lacked such analytical depth and provided narrative accounts of the reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union, often in considerable detail. The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe (often described at great length) was commonly seen as one of those reasons, but its actual impact on the Soviet Union was seldom evaluated, and the issue tended to be largely ignored as other causal factors (such as Gorbachev's reforms, the role of the USA, the economic drain of the nuclear arms race and war in Afghanistan) were discussed.

Question 6

Which did more to control the growth of nuclear weapons – the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 or the SALT Treaties of the 1970s?

Most candidates displayed a sound understanding of the terms of both the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the SALT Treaties. The most impressive responses demonstrated that the treaties were attempting to address different aspects of the problems associated with nuclear weapons (horizontal and vertical proliferation), and used this as the basis of a comparative analysis of their respective impacts. Many candidates, while reaching analytical conclusions on the impact of each of the treaties, made little attempt to discuss the key issue of which did more to control the growth of nuclear weapons.

Less focused responses, many of them based on very detailed content, concentrated on the terms of the treaties rather than their outcomes. Such responses rarely addressed the question directly. Some candidates clearly knew a great deal about either the Non-Proliferation Treaty or the SALT Treaties but very little about the other, with the result that their responses became heavily unbalanced. The weakest responses were those which based their argument on a series of unsupported assertions.

Question 7

'Japan's economic miracle was primarily a result of favourable domestic policies and practices'. How far do you agree?

Many candidates displayed good knowledge of the factors which led to Japan's economic growth. The most impressive responses contained focused and consistent arguments based on a balanced review of favourable internal and external factors. The most common argument was that stable government (with policies of encouraging business, industry, trade and education), together with a skilled and committed workforce enabled Japan to exploit the special treatment it received from the USA and the advantages which it gained from the Korean War. Less well focused responses, while containing much of the same content, listed the reasons behind Japan's economic miracle without directly addressing the hypothesis in the question.

Question 8

Account for the rise and decline of OPEC in the 1970s and 1980s.

While most candidates provided a valid definition of OPEC, relatively few possessed sufficient knowledge to address the question adequately. While some were able to demonstrate how OPEC countries exploited crises in the Middle East to their economic advantage, causing the 'oil shocks' which had profound effects on the international economy, very few were provided convincing arguments to explain OPEC's subsequent decline. This led to the presence of unsupported assertions, such as '*the West was forced to find other sources of oil.*'

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

Key messages

- The most successful candidates focus on the questions set and provide detailed examples to support their arguments.
- To do well in the source-based question it is necessary for candidates to show evidence that they have evaluated the source material.
- Taking a little time to read sources carefully and plan responses benefits the overall quality of the candidates' responses.

General comments

To achieve higher marks, candidates need to show evidence of two discrete skills: for the compulsory **Question 1**, to evaluate sources and, for the essay questions, to write essays which provide relevant and balanced arguments based on detailed examples. For **Question 1**, some candidates did what was needed and attempted to assess the relative value of the sources, rather than explaining their content. For the essays, some candidates provided specific and thoughtful arguments, rather than general explanations of the topic. Candidates can achieve high marks if they consistently show some evidence of source-evaluation skills for **Question 1**, and evidence-based analytical skills for their three essays.

Most candidates answered the four questions required of them and the majority allocated their time effectively between their four answers. Other candidates found it difficult either to choose four questions or to organise their time properly. In the latter case, it is always better to write arguments left unexplained in note form, rather than not mention them at all; some credit can usually be given for note-form answers.

With **Question 1**, candidates are faced with five sources which they have to evaluate and then link together into a relevant argument. The sources, being unfamiliar, require careful consideration. Essay responses benefit when candidates have made a brief plan as this helps them to focus on the question and maintain a consistent argument. It is important, however, that candidates do not spend so long planning as to reduce the time for the actual response too much.

In the essay questions, two main improvements could be made: (a) to focus more sharply on the question as set and (b), to provide more detailed and relevant examples. Some of the questions were on social and economic topics: **Question 2**, on taming the 'Wild West'; **Question 4**, on the impact of immigration in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries; **Question 6**, on the 1920s; **Question 8**, on the emergence of feminism in the 1960s. By comparison with **Question 5**, on race relations, which did produce many detailed answers, answers to these four questions were often generalised, and would have been improved by the inclusion of precise evidence, which is the foundation of sound historical analysis.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

'The Wilmot Proviso provided the basis for a solution of the sectional issue.' Using sources A-E, discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

It is worth highlighting part of **Question 1** which is sometimes overlooked. Before Source A is the statement *'when answering Question 1, candidates are advised to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the Sources, both individually and as a group.'* Many candidates would benefit from considering this advice. These candidates tend to describe and explain each source, rather than interpret and evaluate. Though these candidates usually focus on the sources and relate their explanations to the

question, they limit the marks they can receive by not evaluating the five sources on the paper. 'Evaluate' means to give a value to a source, in this case to their value or worth as a source which helps answer the question. Assessing the value of the source requires placing each source in context, making careful and explicit reference to its provenance, to contextual knowledge or to the other sources.

In terms of how sources are used, a small group of candidates use sources only to support an answer to the question which is, in effect, an essay. Such answers cannot achieve the highest marks. The sources must be the focus of the answer to **Question 1**.

The five sources will have been chosen to provide evidence both for and against the hypothesis. This summer's question asked candidates to assess how far the Wilmot Proviso provided the basis for a solution of the sectional issue between North and South. Some candidates struggled to use any of the sources to support the hypothesis. These responses dismissed Source A, the Wilmot Proviso itself, because it was unacceptable to the South. Source C - the second main supporting source, was discounted because it talked of 'a war for slavery' and 'eternal conflict'.

Candidate responses would have benefitted making more use of contextual knowledge about the sectional dispute or even about the provenance of some of the sources. The authors of Sources B and C, Senators Calhoun and Seward respectively, were both leading figures in the sectional dispute - Calhoun for the South, Seward for the North. A candidate who writes '*(Source B) is from John C Calhoun who we know is the Senator of South Carolina which was the first state to secede from the Union. Calhoun is very pro-slavery and mad at the Union for tariffs and the control they have over the South*' is assessed as having evaluated Source B. The evaluation would have been more convincing had the candidate gone on to say that these facts about Calhoun mean that the evidence of Source B, though useful, is not wholly reliable as part of an analysis of the Wilmot Proviso.

Context is the key to effective evaluation. Candidates who assert that Source E is reliable because it is written by a professional historian, who will base his/her analysis on a careful examination of primary sources, need to use some primary evidence to support their assertion. Evaluation by assertion needs to be replaced with evaluation by evidence. Also, sources need to be evaluated as a group as well as individually; in other words, candidates need to decide whether the set of sources, on balance, support or undermine the hypothesis. This judgement must be based on the evaluated sources and not just on the 'surface' content of the sources.

Question 2

Assess the main factors involved in the taming of the 'Wild West' between 1840 and 1896.

This was a popular question. Most answers tended to *describe* the main factors rather than assess them, which restricted the marks which could be awarded. Assessment requires some kind of reasoned judgement about the relative importance of the factors being explained. That judgement needs to be focused on key words in the question, in this case, 'the taming of the Wild West'. Thus those who wrote about the myth of the Wild West were not directing their responses to the question actually set. 'Taming' involves control of something not previously controlled. Some candidates would have improved responses by considering the following: Who was tamed? The lands and the peoples of the West. Who did the taming? The settlers and the authorities who moved into the West. Answers focused on the various factors which enabled them to assert their control scored well.

The more detailed the explanation in essays, the better. A number of candidates wrote far too generally about westward expansion in the nineteenth century. The question focused on 56 years mostly in the second half of the century. Many mentioned the establishment of a trans-continental railway link but more candidates could have gone on to mention when it was established or how long it took to develop.

Question 3

Explain why in September 1864 Lincoln appeared to be facing defeat in the Presidential elections of that year.

More detailed examples were essential for **Question 3**, which covered a shorter time period. Knowledge of the years 1861 to 1864 was needed to answer the question. The small number of candidates who attempted this question knew something about the civil war, although more knowledge about the reasons why Lincoln's chances of re-election seemed slim just a few months beforehand would have helped. Some confused the

election of 1864 with the election of 1860. A small group explained the military, political and party political factors which put Lincoln's electoral victory in doubt until relatively late in the day. Some candidates appeared to want to answer a question on the reasons why the North took so long to win the Civil War.

Question 4

Analyse the impact of immigration on American social and economic life in the period from 1865 to 1914.

This, a wide-ranging question, provoked responses which could have been more specific and detailed. Candidates tended to concentrate on immigration itself, and would have benefited from assessing the impact of immigration on US society and economy. **Question 4** asked about the relationship between a casual factor – immigration – and the object which the cause affected – US society and economy. Thus, ideally, answers to **Question 4** should have given as much attention to the USA as to immigration. In many responses, the changing nature of the USA over this half-century needed to be looked at. Most answers were generalised, and in need of detailed facts or figures essential to providing a convincing historical analysis. Some answers did attempt to distinguish between social life and economic life, although answers to both parts rarely went beyond the general. The main detail that many offered was NINA, i.e. No Irish Need Apply, but the term needed to be located in time or place within the 49 years spanned by the question, to provide a more convincing answer.

Question 5

Evaluate the effectiveness of the different tactics used by various branches of the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s.

This was the most popular essay question. It was also the best-answered. Candidates could identify different branches of the civil rights movement and the different tactics that they used. (Black Power movements were accepted as being part of the civil rights movement, even if they are not generally seen as civil rights groups.) Many candidates needed to focus more on the issue of effectiveness, which was the key point. The questions asked for a comparison not of the methods of the groups, but the effectiveness of those methods.

Some answers were mainly comparisons of Martin Luther King and Malcolm X. (Incidentally, there are two factual errors about the latter that are commonly held: that he was a leader of the Black Panthers and that he was assassinated after Martin Luther King.) The better answers focused on groups, not on individuals - the NAACP, CORE and SCLC. The best answers showed how and how far each achieved their goals.

Finally, the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s included more than African-Americans. Latino farm workers in California, led by Cesar Chavez, fought long and hard for collective bargaining rights, while Native Americans also demonstrated, for example by occupying the island of Alcatraz, and to some effect. Occasionally candidates did consider such groups, which is encouraging.

Question 6

How far were the 1920s a period of prosperity and optimism in the United States?

Some candidates simply explained *how* the 1920s were a period of prosperity and optimism when the question asked them to assess *how far* the decade was thus. Many, however, did go on to explain ways in which the 1920s were a time of hardship and pessimism, as well as prosperity and optimism. Some answered the question almost entirely in terms of the Great Crash and Great Depression; the former was relevant – just – the latter not at all. As always, the more detailed the evidence and the more thoughtful the analysis, the more convincing the answer. Some candidates wrote very generally about the 1920s. Surprisingly few mentioned prohibition and its impact, or that the mood of the USA changed from optimism to pessimism during the course of the decade.

Question 7

Why, having entered the First World War, did the United States not join the League of Nations?

The small number of candidates who attempted this needed to provide the detailed information essential to a convincing answer. Most wrote very generally about American isolationism in the early-twentieth century. Some knew about President Wilson, the problems he faced at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, and the

special features of the League of Nations. Knowing about the domestic politics of 1919-20, following the 1918 mid-term elections, which was crucial to answering the question, would have further enhanced answers. Responses would have also benefitted from mentioning the basic constitutional point that any international treaty signed by the President needed to be ratified by a supermajority in the Senate.

Question 8

Why did a feminist movement emerge in America in the 1960s?

This was a very popular question, and to be successful candidates needed to provide convincing, relevant explanation. Most candidates answered the question by taking a long-term perspective, explaining the impact of both the First and Second World Wars on the role of women in US society. A close focus was needed on the 1960s. When this was achieved, candidates mentioned the growth of counter-culture values and Betty Freidan's *The Feminine Mystique*. More was needed. Answers tended to be descriptive rather than analytical. This type of 'why' question does allow for some kind of judgement in the conclusion about which of the various factors considered is the most important. Answers were also broadly narrative in approach, starting in 1918 or 1941 or 1945 and reaching the 1960s only towards the end. The best answers focused on the 1960s from the start and analysed short-term as well as long-term causes.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

Key messages

- The most successful candidates focus on the questions set and provide detailed examples to support their arguments.
- To do well in the source-based question it is necessary for candidates to show evidence that they have evaluated the source material.
- Taking a little time to read sources carefully and plan responses benefits the overall quality of the candidates' responses.

General comments

To achieve higher marks, candidates need to show evidence of two discrete skills: for the compulsory **Question 1**, to evaluate sources and, for the essay questions, to write essays which provide relevant and balanced arguments based on detailed examples. For **Question 1**, some candidates did what was needed and attempted to assess the relative value of the sources, rather than explaining their content. For the essays, some candidates provided specific and thoughtful arguments, rather than general explanations of the topic. Candidates can achieve high marks if they consistently show some evidence of source-evaluation skills for **Question 1**, and evidence-based analytical skills for their three essays.

Most candidates answered the four questions required of them and the majority allocated their time effectively between their four answers. Other candidates found it difficult either to choose four questions or to organise their time properly. In the latter case, it is always better to write arguments left unexplained in note form, rather than not mention them at all; some credit can usually be given for note-form answers.

With **Question 1**, candidates are faced with five sources which they have to evaluate and then link together into a relevant argument. The sources, being unfamiliar, require careful consideration. Essay responses benefit when candidates have made a brief plan as this helps them to focus on the question and maintain a consistent argument. It is important, however, that candidates do not spend so long planning as to reduce the time for the actual response too much.

In the essay questions, two main improvements could be made: (a) to focus more sharply on the question as set and (b), to provide more detailed and relevant examples. **Question 3** on the Civil War, **Question 6**, on the New Deal, and **Question 7**, on the US entry into the Second World War, are examples of questions to which some candidates wrote essays about the topic rather than answers to the specific questions set. In attempting to write as much as possible in the time available, some candidates do not give themselves time to think 'what exactly is this question asking me to focus on?' The more candidates answer the question actually set, the better their responses will be.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

'The arguments put forward in favour of the United States acquiring Cuba were reasonable.' Using Sources A-E, discuss how far the evidence supports the assertion.

It is worth highlighting part of **Question 1** which is sometimes overlooked. Before Source A is the statement *'when answering Question 1, candidates are advised to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the Sources, both individually and as a group.'* Many candidates would benefit from considering this advice. These candidates tend to describe and explain each source, rather than interpret and evaluate. Though these candidates usually focus on the sources and relate their explanations to the question, they limit the marks they can receive by not evaluating the five sources in the paper. 'Evaluate'

means to give a value to a source, in this case to their value or worth as a source which helps answer the question. Assessing the value of the source requires placing each source in context, making careful and explicit reference to its provenance, to contextual knowledge or to the other sources. For example, the following extract shows a candidate evaluating the material through cross-reference, supporting their points through close reference to the sources and considering the reliability and tone of the sources:

'Without doubt, E is not supporting the assertion and nor is A, which says that 'if we are to have Cuba, let us buy it for we do not need it at the cost of war'. This contrasts with B and C directly and when A claims that 'there is no overwhelming necessity for acquiring Cuba ...' the simple language of the New York Times casts extreme doubt on both the Ostend Manifesto and Slidell, whose emotional language, e.g. 'individual justified to tear down (sic) the burning house ...' makes it even more unreliable.

The most effective candidates followed such evaluation by a conclusion which weighed one set of evaluated sources against the other. Therefore, they were able to reach a supported judgement in relation to the hypothesis.

In contrast to this answer, a small group of candidates use sources only to support an answer to the question which is, in effect, an essay. Such answers cannot achieve the highest marks. The sources must be the focus of the answer to **Question 1**.

Question 2

Why was it that the 1850 Compromise had started to unravel by 1856?

Those who chose this question usually had a sound knowledge of the 1850 Compromise and the political storm it created in the next few years. Among the factors covered were the North's reaction to the Fugitive Slave Act, the impact of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and Bleeding Kansas. Many candidates, however, used the information to explain *how* the Compromise had unravelled rather than *why*, to provide a narrative rather than an analysis. To provide the latter, candidates had to identify and explain the key reasons for the disintegration of the Compromise. The best answers then prioritised these reasons in their conclusion.

Question 3

'Divided by the Civil War but united by the experience of Reconstruction.' Consider this verdict on white Southerners.

This was a popular question which was interpreted differently by many who answered it. Although the question asked about *white* Southerners, some candidates chose to write about Southerners in general and thus considered the state of the South and its relations with the North in and after the Civil War, which limited the marks which could be achieved. The original interpretation, focusing on white Southerners, required candidates to consider political, social and cultural differences within the white South. In the war, these involved differences over war strategies and between plantation owners and small farmers. The most basic division during the Civil War was between the Outer South and the Inner South, the former joining the North. Reconstruction might have united white Southerners against the North but there were still those who were prepared to co-operate with the North, the group labelled scalawags. Thus the question allowed some nice contrasts to be made. Some candidates managed to make these contrasts.

With both the Civil War and the Reconstruction eras mentioned in the question, giving equal coverage to both meant there was a lot to write about. More candidates needed to analyse fully the state of either the white South or the South during both periods. Most concentrated on either the Civil War or Reconstruction, with the post-war era proving more popular. The better answers gave equal coverage to white Southerners in both eras. Others gave equal coverage to the South in both eras, or the white South in both. The least successful responses focused on the South in one period only.

Question 4

Account for the rise of giant corporations in the period 1870-1914.

Better responses were analytical in nature. The majority of candidates wrote essentially descriptive answers about some of the giant corporations, usually focusing on the individuals who established them - people such as J D Rockefeller and J P Morgan. Such answers usually *gave an account of* the rise of Standard Oil and US Steel, rather than *accounting for* their rise. This question required candidates to explain and analyse the

reasons for the rise of giant corporations in late-nineteenth and early- twentieth century America. This required consideration of the context of the US economy, society and government, which proved so favourable to the establishment of giant corporations. Business leaders such as Rockefeller, Morgan, Carnegie and Duke were greatly helped by the economic policies of the governments of the time, policies such as high tariffs and a liberal immigration policy. The creation of a single US market - large, growing and increasingly integrated by the development of a nationwide infrastructure, also helped. Another factor was the growth of Wall Street, which was able to raise the capital needed by the businessmen to create their giant corporations. Finally, the development of Business Trusts and Holding Companies were institutional devices which allowed small companies to be merged into a larger whole.

Question 5

‘Without the Supreme Court’s favourable decisions, the advances made by the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s would not have been possible.’ How far do you agree with that judgement?

Many candidates knew about the methods of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s and thus described the freedom marches and bus boycotts, often at considerable length. These methods were only one part of the question, and some responses would have been improved by a greater focus on other, more important elements. The question requires an examination of the relationship between various judgements of the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Warren from 1953 onwards which helped the civil rights movement and the advances made by that movement. Those advances were either social – increased integration of Schools, universities and public transport, for example – or political – the passage of legislation such as the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act of the mid-1960s. Many candidates knew one relevant Supreme Court judgement, *Brown vs. the Board of Education, Topeka*, which they then related to integration of schools, arguing that the judgement brought about integration. The problem was that it did not. Many responses would have been improved by knowing that there were two *Brown* judgements, the second ordering integration with ‘all deliberate speed’, which Southern states saw as justification for dragging their feet. They passed state laws which delayed integration. It took a further Supreme Court judgement, *Cooper vs. Aaron* in 1958, to assert the supremacy of federal law over state laws. Even that was not the end of the story. Full integration of Schools in the South required yet another Supreme Court judgement, *Alexander vs. Holmes County* (1969), which ordered that segregated Schools must be desegregated immediately. Thus the relationship between Supreme Court decisions and civil rights’ advances was more complex than some candidates’ responses suggested.

The integration of public transport also involved a complex relationship between politics and law. Segregated transport *between* states was declared unconstitutional as early as 1946, in the case of *Morgan vs. Virginia*. Segregated transport *within* states was declared unconstitutional by *Browder vs. Gayle* in 1960, several years *after* the Montgomery bus boycott – thus political action preceded judicial action – but the later judgement led to Freedom Rides across the South. When it comes to political advances such as the Voting Rights Act, it is possible to argue that Supreme Court judgements were much less important than the political actions of the early 1960s.

Candidates’ answers provided a range of responses which the question allowed for. Some described the methods and advances of the Civil Rights movement, but would have improved responses by mentioning some Supreme Court judgements – or the importance of the Supreme Court. Better answers tried to use the *Brown* judgement to develop some relevant arguments, and the most impressive responses used a number of Supreme Court judgements to develop a more thorough and thoughtful analysis.

Question 6

How accurate is it to describe the New Deal as a ‘political revolution’?

The majority of candidates made a clear and well-informed attempt to answer the question. Some briefly discussed whether the New Deal was a political revolution before moving quickly to consider whether it was more of an economic revolution. Stronger answers focused entirely on the politics of the New Deal, arguing for and against it being a revolution in the practice and values. Points covered included changes in political ideology, in political communication and in the role of the US federal government. The opposition to the New Deal, whether political – from left or right – or judicial – from the Supreme Court, was well known. The most perceptive responses pointed out that such opposition limited the political radicalism of the New Deal. Even the aims and values of FDR were relevant to the debate. On the whole, most responses were well balanced and effectively supported.

Question 7

Why and how did the United States become involved in the Second World War?

'Become involved' here means more than just entering the war in December 1941. Most candidates realised this. They described the move from neutrality in the 1930s to involvement in 1941. Answers were usually stronger in explaining 'how' the USA became involved, rather than 'why'. The latter required some analysis of great power relations at the time and, ideally, the interrelationship between European and Asiatic politics. More candidates could have mentioned that the USA was as involved – perhaps more involved – in the politics of the Pacific Ocean and Eastern Asia as she was in the affairs of Europe.

A small number of candidates confused the Second World War with the First World War. Some stated that the USA became involved in the Second World War because Germany sank the *Lusitania*. Some even mentioned the Zimmerman telegram.

Question 8

'The 1950s were deeply conformist but by 1968 unwillingness to conform had become both fashionable and acceptable.' How valid is this assertion?

Question 8 involves social and cultural history. Well-prepared candidates had plenty to argue about - although when faced with such questions, other candidates tended to generalise and to omit solid supporting evidence. For example, some used stereotypes of the 1950s and the 1960s to develop their arguments: the 1950s was a dull, materialist decade, the 1960s a time of youthful rebellion and the growth of a counter-culture. Evidence to support these descriptions was more widely supplied for the better-known 1960s than the 1950s, but answers were often still general.

More candidates could have used the quotation to develop a more focused analysis. Were the 1950s really *deeply* conformist? The emergence of Bill Haley and Elvis Presley, the growth of rock and roll, in the middle of the decade, would suggest not. Was unwillingness to conform in the 1960s really *fashionable and acceptable*? Might it have been fashionable but not acceptable? The alleged non-conformity of the 1960s was confined to a small section of US society - young people. How do the protests against the Vietnam War in the second half of the 1960s affect analysis of the decade?

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

Key messages

- The most successful candidates focus on the questions set and provide detailed examples to support their arguments.
- To do well in the source-based question it is necessary for candidates to show evidence that they have evaluated the source material.
- Taking a little time to read sources carefully and plan responses benefits the overall quality of the candidates' responses.

General comments

To achieve higher marks, candidates need to show evidence of two discrete skills: for the compulsory **Question 1**, to evaluate sources and, for the essay questions, to write essays which provide relevant and balanced arguments based on detailed examples. For **Question 1**, some candidates did what was needed and attempted to assess the relative value of the sources, rather than explaining their content. For the essays, some candidates provided specific and thoughtful arguments, rather than general explanations of the topic. Candidates can achieve high marks if they consistently show some evidence of source-evaluation skills for **Question 1**, and evidence-based analytical skills for their three essays.

Most candidates answered the four questions required of them and the majority allocated their time effectively between their four answers. Other candidates found it difficult either to choose four questions or to organise their time properly. In the latter case, it is always better to write arguments left unexplained in note form, rather than not mention them at all; some credit can usually be given for note-form answers.

With **Question 1**, candidates are faced with five sources which they have to evaluate and then link together into a relevant argument. The sources, being unfamiliar, require careful consideration. Essay responses benefit when candidates have made a brief plan as this helps them to focus on the question and maintain a consistent argument. It is important, however, that candidates do not spend so long planning as to reduce the time for the actual response too much.

In the essay questions, two main improvements could be made: (a) to focus more sharply on the question as set and (b), to provide more detailed and relevant examples. **Question 3** on the Civil War, **Question 6**, on the New Deal, and **Question 7**, on the US entry into the Second World War, are examples of questions to which some candidates wrote essays about the topic rather than answers to the specific questions set. In attempting to write as much as possible in the time available, some candidates do not give themselves time to think 'what exactly is this question asking me to focus on?' The more candidates answer the question actually set, the better their responses will be.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

'The arguments put forward in favour of the United States acquiring Cuba were reasonable.' Using Sources A-E, discuss how far the evidence supports the assertion.

It is worth highlighting part of **Question 1** which is sometimes overlooked. Before Source A is the statement *'when answering Question 1, candidates are advised to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the Sources, both individually and as a group.'* Many candidates would benefit from considering this advice. These candidates tend to describe and explain each source, rather than interpret and evaluate. Though these candidates usually focus on the sources and relate their explanations to the question, they limit the marks they can receive by not evaluating the five sources in the paper. 'Evaluate'

means to give a value to a source, in this case to their value or worth as a source which helps answer the question. Assessing the value of the source requires placing each source in context, making careful and explicit reference to its provenance, to contextual knowledge or to the other sources. For example, the following extract shows a candidate evaluating the material through cross-reference, supporting their points through close reference to the sources and considering the reliability and tone of the sources:

'Without doubt, E is not supporting the assertion and nor is A, which says that 'if we are to have Cuba, let us buy it for we do not need it at the cost of war'. This contrasts with B and C directly and when A claims that 'there is no overwhelming necessity for acquiring Cuba ...' the simple language of the New York Times casts extreme doubt on both the Ostend Manifesto and Slidell, whose emotional language, e.g. 'individual justified to tear down (sic) the burning house ...' makes it even more unreliable.

The most effective candidates followed such evaluation by a conclusion which weighed one set of evaluated sources against the other. Therefore, they were able to reach a supported judgement in relation to the hypothesis.

In contrast to this answer, a small group of candidates use sources only to support an answer to the question which is, in effect, an essay. Such answers cannot achieve the highest marks. The sources must be the focus of the answer to **Question 1**.

Question 2

Why was it that the 1850 Compromise had started to unravel by 1856?

Those who chose this question usually had a sound knowledge of the 1850 Compromise and the political storm it created in the next few years. Among the factors covered were the North's reaction to the Fugitive Slave Act, the impact of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and Bleeding Kansas. Many candidates, however, used the information to explain *how* the Compromise had unravelled rather than *why*, to provide a narrative rather than an analysis. To provide the latter, candidates had to identify and explain the key reasons for the disintegration of the Compromise. The best answers then prioritised these reasons in their conclusion.

Question 3

'Divided by the Civil War but united by the experience of Reconstruction.' Consider this verdict on white Southerners.

This was a popular question which was interpreted differently by many who answered it. Although the question asked about *white* Southerners, some candidates chose to write about Southerners in general and thus considered the state of the South and its relations with the North in and after the Civil War, which limited the marks which could be achieved. The original interpretation, focusing on white Southerners, required candidates to consider political, social and cultural differences within the white South. In the war, these involved differences over war strategies and between plantation owners and small farmers. The most basic division during the Civil War was between the Outer South and the Inner South, the former joining the North. Reconstruction might have united white Southerners against the North but there were still those who were prepared to co-operate with the North, the group labelled scalawags. Thus the question allowed some nice contrasts to be made. Some candidates managed to make these contrasts.

With both the Civil War and the Reconstruction eras mentioned in the question, giving equal coverage to both meant there was a lot to write about. More candidates needed to analyse fully the state of either the white South or the South during both periods. Most concentrated on either the Civil War or Reconstruction, with the post-war era proving more popular. The better answers gave equal coverage to white Southerners in both eras. Others gave equal coverage to the South in both eras, or the white South in both. The least successful responses focused on the South in one period only.

Question 4

Account for the rise of giant corporations in the period 1870-1914.

Better responses were analytical in nature. The majority of candidates wrote essentially descriptive answers about some of the giant corporations, usually focusing on the individuals who established them - people such as J D Rockefeller and J P Morgan. Such answers usually *gave an account of* the rise of Standard Oil and US Steel, rather than *accounting for* their rise. This question required candidates to explain and analyse the

reasons for the rise of giant corporations in late-nineteenth and early- twentieth century America. This required consideration of the context of the US economy, society and government, which proved so favourable to the establishment of giant corporations. Business leaders such as Rockefeller, Morgan, Carnegie and Duke were greatly helped by the economic policies of the governments of the time, policies such as high tariffs and a liberal immigration policy. The creation of a single US market - large, growing and increasingly integrated by the development of a nationwide infrastructure, also helped. Another factor was the growth of Wall Street, which was able to raise the capital needed by the businessmen to create their giant corporations. Finally, the development of Business Trusts and Holding Companies were institutional devices which allowed small companies to be merged into a larger whole.

Question 5

‘Without the Supreme Court’s favourable decisions, the advances made by the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s would not have been possible.’ How far do you agree with that judgement?

Many candidates knew about the methods of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s and thus described the freedom marches and bus boycotts, often at considerable length. These methods were only one part of the question, and some responses would have been improved by a greater focus on other, more important elements. The question requires an examination of the relationship between various judgements of the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Warren from 1953 onwards which helped the civil rights movement and the advances made by that movement. Those advances were either social – increased integration of Schools, universities and public transport, for example – or political – the passage of legislation such as the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act of the mid-1960s. Many candidates knew one relevant Supreme Court judgement, *Brown vs. the Board of Education, Topeka*, which they then related to integration of schools, arguing that the judgement brought about integration. The problem was that it did not. Many responses would have been improved by knowing that there were two *Brown* judgements, the second ordering integration with ‘all deliberate speed’, which Southern states saw as justification for dragging their feet. They passed state laws which delayed integration. It took a further Supreme Court judgement, *Cooper vs. Aaron* in 1958, to assert the supremacy of federal law over state laws. Even that was not the end of the story. Full integration of Schools in the South required yet another Supreme Court judgement, *Alexander vs. Holmes County* (1969), which ordered that segregated Schools must be desegregated immediately. Thus the relationship between Supreme Court decisions and civil rights’ advances was more complex than some candidates’ responses suggested.

The integration of public transport also involved a complex relationship between politics and law. Segregated transport *between* states was declared unconstitutional as early as 1946, in the case of *Morgan vs. Virginia*. Segregated transport *within* states was declared unconstitutional by *Browder vs. Gayle* in 1960, several years *after* the Montgomery bus boycott – thus political action preceded judicial action – but the later judgement led to Freedom Rides across the South. When it comes to political advances such as the Voting Rights Act, it is possible to argue that Supreme Court judgements were much less important than the political actions of the early 1960s.

Candidates’ answers provided a range of responses which the question allowed for. Some described the methods and advances of the Civil Rights movement, but would have improved responses by mentioning some Supreme Court judgements – or the importance of the Supreme Court. Better answers tried to use the *Brown* judgement to develop some relevant arguments, and the most impressive responses used a number of Supreme Court judgements to develop a more thorough and thoughtful analysis.

Question 6

How accurate is it to describe the New Deal as a ‘political revolution’?

The majority of candidates made a clear and well-informed attempt to answer the question. Some briefly discussed whether the New Deal was a political revolution before moving quickly to consider whether it was more of an economic revolution. Stronger answers focused entirely on the politics of the New Deal, arguing for and against it being a revolution in the practice and values. Points covered included changes in political ideology, in political communication and in the role of the US federal government. The opposition to the New Deal, whether political – from left or right – or judicial – from the Supreme Court, was well known. The most perceptive responses pointed out that such opposition limited the political radicalism of the New Deal. Even the aims and values of FDR were relevant to the debate. On the whole, most responses were well balanced and effectively supported.

Question 7

Why and how did the United States become involved in the Second World War?

'Become involved' here means more than just entering the war in December 1941. Most candidates realised this. They described the move from neutrality in the 1930s to involvement in 1941. Answers were usually stronger in explaining 'how' the USA became involved, rather than 'why'. The latter required some analysis of great power relations at the time and, ideally, the interrelationship between European and Asiatic politics. More candidates could have mentioned that the USA was as involved – perhaps more involved – in the politics of the Pacific Ocean and Eastern Asia as she was in the affairs of Europe.

A small number of candidates confused the Second World War with the First World War. Some stated that the USA became involved in the Second World War because Germany sank the *Lusitania*. Some even mentioned the Zimmerman telegram.

Question 8

'The 1950s were deeply conformist but by 1968 unwillingness to conform had become both fashionable and acceptable.' How valid is this assertion?

Question 8 involves social and cultural history. Well-prepared candidates had plenty to argue about - although when faced with such questions, other candidates tended to generalise and to omit solid supporting evidence. For example, some used stereotypes of the 1950s and the 1960s to develop their arguments: the 1950s was a dull, materialist decade, the 1960s a time of youthful rebellion and the growth of a counter-culture. Evidence to support these descriptions was more widely supplied for the better-known 1960s than the 1950s, but answers were often still general.

More candidates could have used the quotation to develop a more focused analysis. Were the 1950s really *deeply* conformist? The emergence of Bill Haley and Elvis Presley, the growth of rock and roll, in the middle of the decade, would suggest not. Was unwillingness to conform in the 1960s really *fashionable and acceptable*? Might it have been fashionable but not acceptable? The alleged non-conformity of the 1960s was confined to a small section of US society - young people. How do the protests against the Vietnam War in the second half of the 1960s affect analysis of the decade?

HISTORY

Paper 9697/06

Paper 6

Key messages

In the Source-based **Question 1**, candidates should make use of all the sources, including the details of who had written the material, and when. Quotations from the sources need not be long but they should be carefully chosen to illustrate important points. In a minority of cases answers to this question were very long, leaving insufficient time for candidates to complete their other responses fully.

The essay questions often contained key words, phrases or dates and the most effective responses reflected careful consideration of these terms. **Question 2** was about emancipation in French colonies. Some wrote generally about events in Haiti before 1804 but made little reference to specific details relating to emancipation. **Question 3** stressed the date 1838, inviting candidates to consider the significance of that year. **Question 7** began with 'To what extent', and in order to score highly candidates needed to make a clear assessment in relation to the terms of the question.

General comments

The majority of candidates completed four full answers to questions. There were very commendable responses given to most of the questions on the paper.

The Source-based **Question 1** was generally well done. Candidates sorted the sources into those which were clearly in agreement with the statement in the question and those which were against. The simple 'for or against' approach was not always fully appropriate. Sources A and E for example were more complex and some candidates could have made better use of their content.

Of the **Section B** essay questions, **Questions 4** and **5** were answered well by many candidates. Some knowledgeable answers were written to **Questions 3, 6** and **7**. Responses to **Question 2** often did not achieve even coverage over the date range of 1794 to 1848. In a small number of scripts answers were too general in their coverage. In these cases candidates failed to adapt their knowledge to the particular wording of the question and therefore did not demonstrate their understanding of the topics. Many answers to **Questions 4, 5** and **7** were entirely exempt from this criticism.

Comments on specific questions

Section A Source Based Question

Question 1

'Plantation owners were responsible for the problems of the sugar industry in Jamaica after emancipation.' How far do Sources A-E support this statement?

Many answers were full and direct. The sources were divided into groups, either in the introductions or in the body of the responses. This gave clarity to the argument presented. In most cases, the points made were well illustrated by quotations from the sources. Background knowledge was used to help to interpret and evaluate the sources. Only a few candidates made full use of the details of the origins of the sources or their dates (Sources A and B were from the 1840s, the others were of a later date). The language used or tone of the material was also commented on to good effect; Sources A, C and E seemed severe, 'total lack of example' (A), 'The planter refuses to co-operate' (C), 'The planter was bankrupt before emancipation' (E).

Some candidates accepted that each of the sources had a single purpose, for or against the statement in the question. This was not always the case. Source A does condemn the management of estates but also

accepts that labourers might not be 'willing to work'. Source E begins with blaming the planter but goes on to note that in special circumstances planters could be successful. This was supported by Source D (of a later date than Sources A and B) which also suggests another cause of problems for the sugar industry, that of 'competition with the whole world'.

As a concluding paragraph it was preferable to make some assessment in relation to the statement and those candidates who adopted this approach gained more marks. For example, broad agreement with the statement could be modified by indicating that the role of planters was one of a number of causes of problems for the sugar industry. In many cases however answers finished with a paragraph which really only repeated what had already been written.

Some candidates who answered **Question 1** first spent too much time on it. This resulted in shorter or even hurried answers to later questions. A few candidates answered the question last and did not allow themselves sufficient time for a complete coverage of the sources.

Section B

Question 2

Explain how emancipation was achieved in Haiti and other parts of the French colonised Caribbean between 1794 and 1848.

Answers to this question concentrated on events in Haiti from 1794 to 1804. The most effective made reference directly to emancipation, but many candidates concentrated more on the turmoil of events. The section on events and activities leading to 1848 was generally less detailed but most candidates did provide an outline based on the campaign for and realisation of emancipation.

Question 3

Why was the Apprenticeship Scheme in the British Caribbean ended in 1838?

Candidates wrote confidently on the problems arising during the period from 1834 to 1838. Stress was put on the faults of the Scheme, the impracticability of apprentices being part free and at the same time being tied to plantation work, the problems faced by the Special Magistrates and the attitudes of the plantation owners. Only a few candidates traced the background to the premature ending of the scheme in 1838 in any detail.

Question 4

Discuss the causes of the movement of freed people away from the sugar estates.

This question was answered very well. Candidates showed awareness of many possible reasons for movement and of the debate among historians about them. Comments were supported by detailed references and points were clearly explained. In addition to dealing with the motives of the freed people, answers showed awareness of the variations in opportunities in different territories as well as the choices which became available.

Question 5

Examine the contributions of the peasantry to the Caribbean economy and society.

Candidates produced a good balance between the two elements, economy and society. The diversification of agricultural products with its impact on local markets and overseas trade was well considered, though the significance of banana growing was rarely given detailed consideration. Education, village formation, co-operative efforts and social mobility were all discussed to good effect in sections dealing with society.

Question 6

Explain the problems of securing a suitable supply of labour for sugar plantations after emancipation.

There were some strong answers which defined the problems of labour after emancipation and went on to consider the various attempts to find sources of workers which would satisfy the needs of the sugar plantations. The failures of early schemes, both concerning the suitability of the immigrants for plantation work and the shortage in numbers, were well covered. The solution of immigration from India, with issues of cost, health,

overwork and continuous supply, tended to be summarised but with sufficient understanding displayed concerning the significance of this longer term solution.

Question 7

To what extent did governments in the Caribbean take responsibility for social policies for the public good in post-slavery societies?

The core issues discussed by most candidates were education and health. Answers tended to be on the brief side, which meant that many lacked a sufficiently wide range of material. The extent of government action was directly addressed in the best responses but the majority considered this aspect by implication only. Many were aware however that governments were often reluctant to take responsibility for social policy and when they did take action it was piecemeal in nature.

Question 8

How did the people of Cuba seek to gain freedom from Spanish rule?

There were too few responses to this question to make general comment appropriate.