

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

General comments

The overall standard achieved by candidates was good and some scripts deserved very high marks. Most candidates achieved a similar standard in **Question 1**, the source-based question, and the essays. The order in which candidates answer the source-based question and the essays is a matter of choice and each carries the same proportion of marks. The majority of candidates organised their time effectively. Some of those candidates who answered the source-based question last earned fewer marks for this than for the essays. This might have been because they were less confident about handling sources or that they did not allow sufficient time for the last answer.

There were two important differences between very successful and less accomplished answers. The first type of answers focused on the key instructions in questions. Several of the questions asked 'Why?' Candidates were rewarded when they analysed issues and provided reasons. They often dealt with the reasons in order of priority and the most effective responses provided a justification for this order. For example, in **Question 6**, the fall of Nicholas II was a significant but indirect reason why Lenin came to power. The success of the Bolsheviks was not certain in February 1917. The failure of Kerensky and the Provisional Government was a more direct and important reason because Lenin outwitted other groups that were seeking power in Russia. Some questions asked 'How far?' These were best tackled when candidates explained what could be said in favour of a claim and then considered alternatives. They concluded by reaching a clear judgement in relation to the question. The second differentiating point was attention to dates. Candidates can refer briefly in introductions or conclusions to the wider background but these references should be linked to the specified period. For example, **Question 2** included the dates 1789 to 1799. Highly creditable answers demonstrated knowledge and understanding of all of this period. They sometimes referred briefly to the years before 1789 but were careful to link this to the time frame in the question. Those candidates who described France before the Revolution and did not link this to the question were awarded lower marks, as were those who ended their essay in the mid-1790s.

Question 1 was best approached when candidates compared and contrasted the sources. One source in isolation can only give limited information and needs to be tested against other sources and against candidates' own knowledge. The reliability of the sources should also be assessed. The selected sources always include some that support the claim to be discussed and some that contradict it. That the majority of sources are in favour or against the claim is not in itself a decisive issue. The quality of a group of sources is more important than their quantity. Having weighed the evidence, the better candidates came to conclusions and explained their judgements, rather than simply making an assertion for or against the hypothesis.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The general topic was The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914. The specific topic was the attitude of Kaiser William II to war and peace. Candidates were given 5 sources and were asked to use them to consider the judgement, or hypothesis, that 'Kaiser William II did not want war.' The more successful candidates grouped the sources as they explained which agreed with the hypothesis and which disagreed. This structure proved to be more effective than a sequential approach, which listed each source in turn, and seemed to encourage a greater degree of analysis. Another feature of the most effective answers was that they linked evaluations to the argument. Those candidates who accepted all of the extracts at face value, without any assessment, achieved lower marks. Some stated that sources were reliable or unreliable but did not use this judgement to advance their argument. Higher marks were awarded when answers explained why a source might be judged to be more or less reliable. For example, Source C might be tested against candidates' own

knowledge to judge the validity of the view that Kaiser William II discouraged Austria from making a peaceful settlement with Serbia. There was some confusion about the reliability of personal statements. Good answers pointed out that Source D was probably written by the Kaiser to persuade America to back Germany. Its claim that he was trying to negotiate peace in the Balkans could be contrasted with Source C. Differences of opinion emerged about Source A. Some candidates saw it as proof that the Kaiser sought war, whilst others took the more convincing line that he saw himself as a peacemaker who had been driven to the limit and accepted war reluctantly. Others claimed that this source was William II's response to the assassination at Sarajevo. This source was written in 1913, before the Sarajevo crisis erupted, demonstrating that it is important to note the dates of the extracts. Some candidates pointed out that Source B agreed to an extent with Source A because the King of Belgium believed that William II had sought peace in the past. The source then provided reasons why his views changed. Evaluations of Source E varied. The more successful answers noted that the writer was not neutral. The former American Ambassador did have first hand experience of pre-war Germany and of the Kaiser in particular, which was an advantage, but America ended the war fighting against Germany. The tone of the extract indicated to better candidates the writer's hostility to William II. Some candidates were given credit for linking the accounts of the Kaiser's relations with the Tsar in Sources D and E. Source D described William II as making genuine efforts to pacify Nicholas II whilst E interpreted the 'Willy-Nicky' correspondence as an attempt by the Kaiser to deceive the Tsar. A common feature of the better answers was that they analysed the text of the sources instead of merely summarising them.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the reasons why French rulers from 1789 to 1799 failed to hold on to power. The most important difference between the most and least successful answers was the extent to which candidates concentrated on the key period of 1789 to 1799. Highly creditable essays sometimes included brief introductions about developments before 1789. These were clearly linked to the question and most of the time was spent discussing the salient period. Such work was often effectively organised and distinguished between different rulers, for example Louis XVI until his execution, Robespierre and the Jacobins, and the Directory. Credit was given when candidates noted the differences between the regimes. Neither the conservative King, nor the radical Robespierre, nor the cautious Directors could hold on to power. Some candidates noted that Louis XVI's supporters ultimately helped to bring about his downfall. Nobles, clergy and some large regions were opposed to any concessions by the King and this increased the determination of the revolutionaries. Less satisfactory answers were sometimes incomplete, for example, ending with the fall of the Jacobins or even with the execution of Louis XVI. In explaining 'Why?' the better answers were analytical, dealing with a series of reasons. A small number of candidates wrote purely narrative accounts and could have improved their answers by including clear links to the question and analysis of the issues.

Question 3

The key issue was the reasons why Britain became the first industrialised country in Europe. Candidates were asked to refer to Britain and at least one other European country. This instruction was included to help candidates to explain why Britain industrialised first. There were some well-informed and well-organised responses. They contrasted Britain's advantages with the comparative disadvantages of France and / or Germany. Some essays could have been improved if they had avoided assumptions. For example, the total population of Britain was smaller than that of France. However, the first half of the nineteenth century saw more British people move to urban areas. France had large reserves of raw materials but was less able to make use of them.

Question 4

The key issue was the failure of the 1848 Revolutions in Germany and Italy. The most successful answers were reasonably balanced between the two regions. Highly unbalanced answers could not expect as much credit. Candidates taking a thematic approach, dealing with factors as they applied to both Germany and Italy, were often the most highly rewarded. For example, the impact of Austria's strength was discussed as it affected the two regions. Some answers would have been improved if they had supported general arguments with more specific examples. For example, the leadership of the revolutionaries was relevant and it was helpful when answers were specific in explaining the shortcomings of the leaders. Better answers considered the roles of Mazzini and Charles Albert in Italy. A few referred to Garibaldi and Pope Pius IX. Discussions of Germany usually focused on the Frankfurt Parliament but some answers included worthwhile assessments of Prussia's role.

Question 5

The key issue was about governments' involvement in imperialism in the later nineteenth century. Were the reasons more defensive than aggressive? The characteristics of the better answers were that they linked imperial enterprises to motives, assessing whether they were more aggressive or defensive, and that points were grouped together. This was more a more effective approach than presenting a list, for example, 'A was an aggressive reason, B was defensive, C was aggressive, D was a defensive reason.' Credit was also given to examples from European governments and from overseas expansion. For example, candidates were given credit when they explained the French interest in northern Africa that led to the Fashoda crisis and provided reasons for rivalry with Britain in Egypt and other areas. Some referred convincingly to imperial expansion by Germany and Italy. A small number of candidates drew relevant examples from Asia. Some candidates listed reasons for imperialism and could have improved their marks if they had been more careful to explain how far they could be seen as aggressive or defensive.

Question 6

The key issue was the reasons why Lenin was able to become ruler of Russia in October 1917. Some candidates spent too much time describing events before the outbreak of war in 1914 and allowed this to limit their discussion of 1917. The better answers dealt with the earlier period quickly in an introduction, and the most successful focused clearly on 1917, especially the period between the two revolutions. Some candidates made the excellent point that Lenin was an unlikely leader of Russia before the February Revolution. Some well-organised answers were structured in two parts. They explained the weaknesses of the Provisional Government that created a vacuum in Russia and then discussed the factors that were to be advantageous to Lenin. Weak answers were sometimes unclear about developments in 1917 and assumed that Lenin took power immediately after the abdication of Nicholas II. There were some sound accounts that questioned the later communist claims that the October Revolution represented a national revolution. These candidates were aware of the limited numbers who backed the Bolsheviks, although Lenin overcame this problem in the successful October Revolution.

Question 7

The key issue was the extent to which Mussolini achieved his aims in domestic policy by 1939. A feature of the most effective responses was that they took care to define and explain the aims of Mussolini's domestic policies. The highest marks were awarded to answers that were aware of the limitations of Mussolini's achievements. Most of the answers were sound but some were uncritically descriptive, narrating Mussolini's policies and not assessing their success. For example, some candidates recounted economic policies such as the Battle for Grain but did not consider whether they fulfilled Mussolini's aims. A minority also included foreign policy which was not relevant. Comparisons with other totalitarian leaders, Hitler and Stalin, were relevant but the most effective answers kept these comparisons reasonably brief.

Question 8

The key issue was extent of the difference between the economies of Russia and western European countries before 1914. This date was important and some candidates wasted valuable time discussing the impact of the First World War and post-war economies. Many answers provided a balanced argument which considered the relative lack of development in Russia with the strength of the economies of western Europe. Some well-informed candidates also showed good awareness of the improvements in the Russian economy in the early twentieth century and were able to discuss the work of Witte and Stolypin with confidence. Some candidates might have improved their answers with a more careful consideration of the state of agriculture; although the Russian peasantry had been emancipated in 1861 they remained very poor and agricultural productivity lagged far behind that of western Europe.



HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

General comments

The overall standard achieved by candidates was good and some scripts deserved very high marks. Most candidates achieved a similar standard in **Question 1**, the source-based question, and the essays. The order in which candidates answer the source-based question and the essays is a matter of choice and each carries the same proportion of marks. The majority of candidates organised their time effectively. Some of those candidates who answered the source-based question last earned fewer marks for this than for the essays. This might have been because they were less confident about handling sources or that they did not allow sufficient time for the last answer.

There were two important differences between very successful and less accomplished answers. The first type of answers focused on the key instructions in questions. Several of the questions asked 'Why?' Candidates were rewarded when they analysed issues and provided reasons. They often dealt with the reasons in order of priority and the most effective responses provided a justification for this order. For example, in **Question 6**, the fall of Nicholas II was a significant but indirect reason why Lenin came to power. The success of the Bolsheviks was not certain in February 1917. The failure of Kerensky and the Provisional Government was a more direct and important reason because Lenin outwitted other groups that were seeking power in Russia. Some questions asked 'How far?' These were best tackled when candidates explained what could be said in favour of a claim and then considered alternatives. They concluded by reaching a clear judgement in relation to the question. The second differentiating point was attention to dates. Candidates can refer briefly in introductions or conclusions to the wider background but these references should be linked to the specified period. For example, **Question 2** included the dates 1789 to 1799. Highly creditable answers demonstrated knowledge and understanding of all of this period. They sometimes referred briefly to the years before 1789 but were careful to link this to the time frame in the question. Those candidates who described France before the Revolution and did not link this to the question were awarded lower marks, as were those who ended their essay in the mid-1790s.

Question 1 was best approached when candidates compared and contrasted the sources. One source in isolation can only give limited information and needs to be tested against other sources and against candidates' own knowledge. The reliability of the sources should also be assessed. The selected sources always include some that support the claim to be discussed and some that contradict it. That the majority of sources are in favour or against the claim is not in itself a decisive issue. The quality of a group of sources is more important than their quantity. Having weighed the evidence, the better candidates came to conclusions and explained their judgements, rather than simply making an assertion for or against the hypothesis.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The general topic was The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914. The specific topic was the attitude of Kaiser William II to war and peace. Candidates were given 5 sources and were asked to use them to consider the judgement, or hypothesis, that 'Kaiser William II did not want war.' The more successful candidates grouped the sources as they explained which agreed with the hypothesis and which disagreed. This structure proved to be more effective than a sequential approach, which listed each source in turn, and seemed to encourage a greater degree of analysis. Another feature of the most effective answers was that they linked evaluations to the argument. Those candidates who accepted all of the extracts at face value, without any assessment, achieved lower marks. Some stated that sources were reliable or unreliable but did not use this judgement to advance their argument. Higher marks were awarded when answers explained why a source might be judged to be more or less reliable. For example, Source C might be tested against candidates' own

knowledge to judge the validity of the view that Kaiser William II discouraged Austria from making a peaceful settlement with Serbia. There was some confusion about the reliability of personal statements. Good answers pointed out that Source D was probably written by the Kaiser to persuade America to back Germany. Its claim that he was trying to negotiate peace in the Balkans could be contrasted with Source C. Differences of opinion emerged about Source A. Some candidates saw it as proof that the Kaiser sought war, whilst others took the more convincing line that he saw himself as a peacemaker who had been driven to the limit and accepted war reluctantly. Others claimed that this source was William II's response to the assassination at Sarajevo. This source was written in 1913, before the Sarajevo crisis erupted, demonstrating that it is important to note the dates of the extracts. Some candidates pointed out that Source B agreed to an extent with Source A because the King of Belgium believed that William II had sought peace in the past. The source then provided reasons why his views changed. Evaluations of Source E varied. The more successful answers noted that the writer was not neutral. The former American Ambassador did have first hand experience of pre-war Germany and of the Kaiser in particular, which was an advantage, but America ended the war fighting against Germany. The tone of the extract indicated to better candidates the writer's hostility to William II. Some candidates were given credit for linking the accounts of the Kaiser's relations with the Tsar in Sources D and E. Source D described William II as making genuine efforts to pacify Nicholas II whilst E interpreted the 'Willy-Nicky' correspondence as an attempt by the Kaiser to deceive the Tsar. A common feature of the better answers was that they analysed the text of the sources instead of merely summarising them.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the reasons why French rulers from 1789 to 1799 failed to hold on to power. The most important difference between the most and least successful answers was the extent to which candidates concentrated on the key period of 1789 to 1799. Highly creditable essays sometimes included brief introductions about developments before 1789. These were clearly linked to the question and most of the time was spent discussing the salient period. Such work was often effectively organised and distinguished between different rulers, for example Louis XVI until his execution, Robespierre and the Jacobins, and the Directory. Credit was given when candidates noted the differences between the regimes. Neither the conservative King, nor the radical Robespierre, nor the cautious Directors could hold on to power. Some candidates noted that Louis XVI's supporters ultimately helped to bring about his downfall. Nobles, clergy and some large regions were opposed to any concessions by the King and this increased the determination of the revolutionaries. Less satisfactory answers were sometimes incomplete, for example, ending with the fall of the Jacobins or even with the execution of Louis XVI. In explaining 'Why?' the better answers were analytical, dealing with a series of reasons. A small number of candidates wrote purely narrative accounts and could have improved their answers by including clear links to the question and analysis of the issues.

Question 3

The key issue was the reasons why Britain became the first industrialised country in Europe. Candidates were asked to refer to Britain and at least one other European country. This instruction was included to help candidates to explain why Britain industrialised first. There were some well-informed and well-organised responses. They contrasted Britain's advantages with the comparative disadvantages of France and / or Germany. Some essays could have been improved if they had avoided assumptions. For example, the total population of Britain was smaller than that of France. However, the first half of the nineteenth century saw more British people move to urban areas. France had large reserves of raw materials but was less able to make use of them.

Question 4

The key issue was the failure of the 1848 Revolutions in Germany and Italy. The most successful answers were reasonably balanced between the two regions. Highly unbalanced answers could not expect as much credit. Candidates taking a thematic approach, dealing with factors as they applied to both Germany and Italy, were often the most highly rewarded. For example, the impact of Austria's strength was discussed as it affected the two regions. Some answers would have been improved if they had supported general arguments with more specific examples. For example, the leadership of the revolutionaries was relevant and it was helpful when answers were specific in explaining the shortcomings of the leaders. Better answers considered the roles of Mazzini and Charles Albert in Italy. A few referred to Garibaldi and Pope Pius IX. Discussions of Germany usually focused on the Frankfurt Parliament but some answers included worthwhile assessments of Prussia's role.

Question 5

The key issue was about governments' involvement in imperialism in the later nineteenth century. Were the reasons more defensive than aggressive? The characteristics of the better answers were that they linked imperial enterprises to motives, assessing whether they were more aggressive or defensive, and that points were grouped together. This was more a more effective approach than presenting a list, for example, 'A was an aggressive reason, B was defensive, C was aggressive, D was a defensive reason.' Credit was also given to examples from European governments and from overseas expansion. For example, candidates were given credit when they explained the French interest in northern Africa that led to the Fashoda crisis and provided reasons for rivalry with Britain in Egypt and other areas. Some referred convincingly to imperial expansion by Germany and Italy. A small number of candidates drew relevant examples from Asia. Some candidates listed reasons for imperialism and could have improved their marks if they had been more careful to explain how far they could be seen as aggressive or defensive.

Question 6

The key issue was the reasons why Lenin was able to become ruler of Russia in October 1917. Some candidates spent too much time describing events before the outbreak of war in 1914 and allowed this to limit their discussion of 1917. The better answers dealt with the earlier period quickly in an introduction, and the most successful focused clearly on 1917, especially the period between the two revolutions. Some candidates made the excellent point that Lenin was an unlikely leader of Russia before the February Revolution. Some well-organised answers were structured in two parts. They explained the weaknesses of the Provisional Government that created a vacuum in Russia and then discussed the factors that were to be advantageous to Lenin. Weak answers were sometimes unclear about developments in 1917 and assumed that Lenin took power immediately after the abdication of Nicholas II. There were some sound accounts that questioned the later communist claims that the October Revolution represented a national revolution. These candidates were aware of the limited numbers who backed the Bolsheviks, although Lenin overcame this problem in the successful October Revolution.

Question 7

The key issue was the extent to which Mussolini achieved his aims in domestic policy by 1939. A feature of the most effective responses was that they took care to define and explain the aims of Mussolini's domestic policies. The highest marks were awarded to answers that were aware of the limitations of Mussolini's achievements. Most of the answers were sound but some were uncritically descriptive, narrating Mussolini's policies and not assessing their success. For example, some candidates recounted economic policies such as the Battle for Grain but did not consider whether they fulfilled Mussolini's aims. A minority also included foreign policy which was not relevant. Comparisons with other totalitarian leaders, Hitler and Stalin, were relevant but the most effective answers kept these comparisons reasonably brief.

Question 8

The key issue was extent of the difference between the economies of Russia and western European countries before 1914. This date was important and some candidates wasted valuable time discussing the impact of the First World War and post-war economies. Many answers provided a balanced argument which considered the relative lack of development in Russia with the strength of the economies of western Europe. Some well-informed candidates also showed good awareness of the improvements in the Russian economy in the early twentieth century and were able to discuss the work of Witte and Stolypin with confidence. Some candidates might have improved their answers with a more careful consideration of the state of agriculture; although the Russian peasantry had been emancipated in 1861 they remained very poor and agricultural productivity lagged far behind that of western Europe.



HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

General comments

The questions tested candidates' success in deploying a number of important historical skills, including the use of primary sources and the ability to construct arguments based on understanding and knowledge. Most candidates demonstrated sufficient knowledge but the most striking quality of the better candidates was their degree of understanding. An awareness of what was relevant for answering the questions was most important. For example, the focus of **Question 3** was the social impact of the Industrial Revolution. This required a discussion of the effects of industrialisation on the lives of people. The best answers discussed the effects on the industrial workers and also considered other groups, including those who worked in the countryside, the middle classes and the aristocracy. Knowledge of the causes of the Industrial Revolution was not needed in this question. Demonstrating understanding involved providing more than a narrative account of events. For example, knowledge of Bismarck's wars was important in **Question 4** but high marks depended on candidates' ability to link the wars to Bismarck's leadership, the key issue in the question. The story of the wars alone could not reach a high mark. In answering the essay questions, good candidates appreciated that several factors were involved. They put these into an order of importance. In **Question 1** the sources offer a variety of opinions to be discussed. The answer is not a straightforward 'yes' or 'no'. The responses that were most successful showed an awareness of alternative explanations.

Most candidates used their time effectively and many were able to achieve a similar standard in each of their responses. A minority were unbalanced because they were rushed at the end. These candidates, who were sometimes very knowledgeable, spent too much time on one or two answers and therefore achieved a lower standard on the others. It is important to remember that all of the four questions carry equal marks. A tendency in some answers to **Question 1**, the source-based question, was to spend too much time summarising or paraphrasing the extracts. For example, 'Source A says that... It then says that... It then describes...'. Answers must refer to the sources but these references should make points about the argument. For example, 'Source A is a useful account of the attitude of some Germans to Russia at the end of the nineteenth century because the writer feared that the Reinsurance Treaty gave an unfair advantage to Russia. This can be confirmed from our own knowledge that some Germans believed that their country was isolated and that a choice had to be made between friendship with France and an alliance with Austria.' This approach indicates what the source said in a way that is linked to the question.

Candidates were given credit when they noted the key instructions in questions such as 'Why?', 'Analyse' and 'To what extent?' and used these instructions to shape their answers. They also concentrated on the dates that were mentioned. The quality of most scripts was sound and some candidates showed very high levels of knowledge and understanding.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were given 5 sources and were asked to use them to consider the hypothesis that 'Germany's fears of Russia before World War I were fully justified.' The question paper included the advice that 'candidates are advised to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources, both individually and as a group.' Limited answers sometimes comprised only summaries or paraphrases of the sources. The better responses took care to apply the extracts to the hypothesis and grouped the sources according to whether they supported or challenged it. Sources A and E confirmed the judgement that Germany's fears of Russia were fully justified, whereas Sources C and D were pro-Russian. Source B could be taken both ways. The German writer did not see an immediate threat from Russia but believed that Russia would present a danger to Germany in the future. Credit was given when candidates examined the origins, or provenance, of the sources. Four of the five were written by Germans but they represented a

variety of views. Source C was interesting because a German military diplomat who might be expected to be critical of Russia believed that Russia sought peace with Germany. Some answers were weakened by evaluations that made automatic assumptions. For example, Sources A and B were German memoranda but messages between officials are not necessarily reliable and a study of their content shows that they were contradictory. Source A believed that Russia represented an immediate threat which was denied in Source B. Many candidates made interesting comparisons of Sources D and E. Written within a few days of each other, they made very different claims about the responsibility for the crisis in August 1914. Some candidates used their own knowledge briefly to evaluate the sources and were given credit for this. Source B noted the investment that Russia made in her military forces early in the twentieth century; this was developed in some answers. It was possible to use knowledge of Russian public opinion before the war to evaluate Source C. Russia's commitment to Serbia and Germany's alliance with Austria could be explained to assess Sources D and E. This knowledge should not be used at length but as a brief ingredient of evaluation. Some candidates achieved low marks because they wrote general essays that made little use of the printed sources.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the reasons why the summoning of the Estates-General in 1789 did not solve the problems of the *ancien régime*. The most effective answers put the summoning of the Estates-General firmly in the context of the problems facing France by 1789. Some more moderate answers were able to explain the major problems of the *ancien régime* without dealing specifically with the convening of the Estates-General. Some answers would have been more highly awarded if they had avoided general accounts of French society and had been more specific about the problems facing France. Candidates were given credit when they explained how and why attempts at reform before 1789 failed. There were some worthwhile accounts of the reasons why Louis XVI resorted to the Estates-General. The question asked 'Why' and the best answers were analytical. They contained a number of reasons and higher marks were awarded when answers explained which the more serious problems were. Some moderate answers only contained general descriptions of society in the *ancien régime* but better answers explained why different groups presented different problems. For example, the lower orders were preoccupied by economic and financial issues whilst the middle classes were also concerned about political reforms. Some candidates made useful references to demands in the *cahiers*. It was relevant to explain events that immediately followed the summoning of the Estates-General, although credit could not be given to extended accounts of France in the mid and late 1790s.

Question 3

This question required an assessment of the social impact of the Industrial Revolution on nineteenth century Europe. The answers that were awarded the highest marks had two distinct characteristics. First, they focused on social issues. For example they examined the effects of the Industrial Revolution on the lives of different groups of people, indicating how and why some classes benefited and some suffered. Secondly, they provided examples from at least two of the specified countries (Britain, France and Germany). Less satisfactory answers sometimes concentrated on the causes of industrialisation or described changes without explaining their social impact. For example there were some discussions of changes in communications that would have been improved if their social impact had been examined. How did the development of railways affect society? Many answers dealt with housing but more could have pointed out that the living conditions of the rural poor were not markedly worse than those of the new urban working classes. Industrialisation brought some improvements in health and education by the end of the nineteenth century. Some answers would have benefited if they had been less vague about the effects of the Industrial Revolution on particular countries.

Question 4

The key issue was the reasons why Bismarck was a successful leader of Prussia from 1862 to 1871. Many candidates presented good analyses of the period that concentrated on Bismarck's role. Moderate answers were sometimes limited to narrative accounts of events but the better essays linked these to Bismarck's leadership. The most successful answers explained how he was able to influence the King and other Prussian politicians. He was able to use the advantages of a strong economy and an army that had been reinforced. Weaker answers only dealt with the wars, the more satisfactory responses explained the basis of Bismarck's leadership within Prussia. In addition, credit was also given to discussions of his diplomatic relations with foreign countries. In providing worthwhile explanations, good answers showed why issues such as Schleswig-Holstein and Prussia's role in the successive German confederations were important and

how the outcomes of wars reflected Bismarck's abilities as a leader. Some candidates implied that his success was inevitable but arguments that explained serious internal and external problems, and considered how he dealt with them, had more value.

Question 5

Candidates were asked to consider the reasons why overseas empires were important to major European governments in the late nineteenth century. A discriminating characteristic of the most successful answers was that they made specific references to at least two European countries. Some candidates made valid points about imperial expansion but did not link them to particular countries. The second feature of the best answers was that they included some appropriate overseas examples. Candidates could focus their examples on Africa or Asia but these regions were themselves too general. The most well-informed candidates explained which areas in Africa or Asia were subjected to European influence. Credit was given when candidates noted that the question was essentially about the attitudes of European governments. For example, some explained why public opinion, the work of missionaries and the activities of individuals such as Cecil Rhodes or Karl Peters, influenced governments. There were some effective references to the way in which some politicians, such as Bismarck and Disraeli, were encouraged to become imperialists because of public opinion. Answers which offered only general descriptions of imperial expansion achieved lower marks and would often have been improved by the inclusion of more specific detail.

Question 6

The most successful responses to this question, on the extent of the personal responsibility of Nicholas II for the problems of the Tsarist regime from 1905 to 1914, contained clear assessment. They explored the factors that could be attributed to Nicholas II himself and then explained issues that were probably out of his control. He was personally responsible for his own style of government: aloof from day to day business, liable to be influenced by reactionary advisers and unwilling to concede reforms for fear of appearing weak. He was less responsible for the deep rooted problems of the economy that gave rise to social and political instability. Less satisfactory answers tended to contain accurate but superficial descriptions that did not explain why the Tsar was, or was not, responsible for problems. There were some good assessments of the events of 1905. Although termed a 'revolution', few of those who took part wished to bring down Nicholas II and were willing to accept the concessions that were offered in the October Manifesto, until they became disillusioned by the Tsar's reactionary measures. Some answers contained irrelevant material about the period after 1914. It was possible to explain these briefly in a conclusion but post-1914 developments could not be given credit as part of the main argument in essays.

Question 7

The key issue was the similarities and differences between the economies of Nazi Germany and the USSR in the 1930s. Some excellent answers discussed the basic differences between a communist, centrally directed economy in the USSR and a capitalist-based economy in Nazi Germany. It was not necessary to divide time equally between similarities and differences, but the more successful candidates showed an awareness of both. There were some creditable examples of developments in both countries. Some answers could have been more exact. For example, although the Soviet economy had many problems, the USSR was less affected than Germany by the Wall Street Crash because its economy was more insulated from the West. Most answers were well balanced between Germany and the USSR and the majority of candidates made an effective attempt at comparison.

Question 8

Candidates were required to compare the significance of Liberalism and imperialism in nineteenth-century Europe. High marks were awarded when answers were reasonably balanced. Credit was given to accurate descriptions of the natures of Liberalism and imperialism and the most successful essays focused on their relative significance. A case could be made for either; there was not one 'correct' answer. Candidates were rewarded when they supported their arguments with appropriate examples. Moderate essays were sometimes characterised by vagueness. Some answers were awarded low marks because they dealt with only one of the two stated factors.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/21

Paper 21

General Comments

Many candidates produced good quality answers to the source-based question and very encouraging essays in response to **Questions 2 to 8**. Some candidates could have improved their performance if they had allocated their time more evenly between responses. Some allowed insufficient time for their final answer, with an inevitable decline in standard. This is a key feature of examination technique, which candidates must appreciate. Also it is vital that candidates have a solid factual knowledge of each topic and then use this subject material in an analytical manner to respond to the questions asked. The examination taken as a whole produced a wide range of responses. The very best scripts were truly excellent and this is a credit to both the candidates and their teachers. Such responses were characterised by their analytical approach, clear focus and secure and detailed factual support.

Specific Question Comments

Question 1

How far do Sources A-E support the view that Britain was more concerned with Malaya's interests than with Singapore when it created a Crown Colony in 1946?

The source-based question asked the candidates to examine and interpret five sources and answer the question above. The most effective responses were able to access the highest levels in the mark scheme by demonstrating both an understanding of the material and also sound examination technique. Evaluation can be achieved by both a study of the nature, origin and purpose of the sources and also by using relevant contextual knowledge, or indeed both. Candidates also need to recognise that they should attempt to find evidence for both sides of the argument. Those candidates who were able to go beyond face value interpretation of the sources, evaluated the material in context and cross-referenced between sources were able to access the higher levels of the mark scheme. Some of the best responses provided a summative conclusion and a few presented an alternative hypothesis. Those candidates who took the sources at face value and dealt with each in turn tended to score lower marks as they failed to evaluate the material and rarely reached a clear conclusion.

Question 2

Why was Siam able to avoid colonisation while other areas of Southeast Asia were parts of European Empires in the years to 1914?

This was a popular question and well handled by most candidates who recognised the need to provide a wide range of specific examples to support their answers. Many responses mentioned the skill and diplomacy of successive Thai kings, Chulalongkorn for example, who were able to play European states off against each other. The determination of Britain and France to prevent the other from gaining direct control was also cited as a reason for Siam avoiding colonisation. The Entente Cordiale of 1904 divided Southeast Asia into spheres of influence between Britain and France and preserved Siamese independence. Candidates were also able to explain why other areas of Southeast Asia fell under colonial control. Burma, Malaya and Singapore, with a range of strategic, economic and trading motives, were useful examples and were well known by many candidates. France's desire to gain international prestige and economic advantage in Indo-China, the Dutch quest for economic gains in the East Indies and likewise the USA in the Philippines, were examples which some candidates used to good effect. A relatively small number of candidates could have improved their responses by using more specific detail to support their points.

Question 3

How far did colonial governments allow indigenous participation in administration in the period to 1941?

Candidates had the opportunity to assess the involvement of indigenous populations in colonial administration and this essay required them to highlight regional examples and variations in the operating methods of different colonial powers, in a range of colonies. Many candidates considered the British use of indirect rule through local monarchies in Malaya and Brunei. In the Straits Settlements the British imposed Direct Rule. There was limited involvement under Rajah Brooke in Sarawak and also in the administration of the North Borneo Company in Sabah. The best responses made comparisons, for instance mentioning that the French used the indigenous population in lower level administration. It was useful to point out that in the Malay Peninsula and Brunei the involvement was successful but elsewhere the lack of indigenous population participation encouraged the development of anti-imperial feelings. Weaker responses generally offered a more limited range of examples.

Question 4

How far did the Great Depression of the 1930s affect Southeast Asian economies and societies in the years to 1941?

This essay required candidates to assess the impact of the Great Depression over time, on different areas of Southeast Asia. It is important to stress that, in order to achieve the highest marks candidates must evaluate effects in several areas. Economically the depression led to a severe decline in commodity prices and badly affected the Malay Peninsula and Indo-China. The Philippines were more protected with access to the US markets, although import limits were imposed by the US in the 1930s. Declining exports seriously affected colonial revenues and thus the activities of colonial governments and Siam. State revenues of the FMS and the Dutch East Indies fell by approximately 50% from 1929-1932. A number of candidates mentioned attempts to protect certain industries, e.g. the Chadbourne Plan for sugar and the International Rubber Regulation Agreement. Private firms were also badly hit by the Great Depression and only 45 out of 179 private sugar factories survived in Java. To achieve the highest marks a sense of balance between the economic and social aspects was necessary and the best responses went on to discuss the considerable social impact of the depression. The number of government officials was reduced and indigenous employees faced unemployment or wage cuts. In plantations more women were employed, particularly in Malaya. Smallholders suffered badly, particularly in Burma. This question was generally well handled by candidates although some could have improved their responses by including a wider range of examples and a better sense of balance.

Question 5

Assess the impact of the Japanese Occupation on nationalist movements in Southeast Asia.

This is a popular topic and many responses proved to be very well informed. It was important that the candidates assessed the impact of the occupation and did not simply describe it. In many cases this was successfully achieved. Japan's main aim of occupation was economic, but the long term consequences were political. The Japanese Occupation undermined the authority of colonial regimes and they were unable to re-establish their control after the war. Occupation assisted the growth of nationalist movements and caused the British to reassess their role and commitment to the region, leading to the formation of the Malayan Union after the war. The occupation aided the growth of communist groups, particularly in Malaya and Indo-China. In the latter the Vietminh became the dominant group. In the Philippines the war accelerated the US decision to give independence although, as some pointed out, this decision had been taken before the occupation. A minority of well informed candidates lost focus on the question and described the occupation, or its impact, without assessment or analysis.

Question 6

How far did the Cold War affect the process of decolonisation?

In order to answer this question successfully candidates needed to focus on the ways in which the Cold War had an impact on the process of decolonisation. A major impact was seen in Indo-China. Initially the US supported France and their efforts to re-impose colonial rule. Once the French withdrew in 1954, the US took a much more direct role. The Cold War also affected the Malay Peninsula for a decade. The most effective responses recognised that these areas could be usefully contrasted with Burma and Indonesia

where the Cold War did not play a major role. The key focus needed to be on the significance of the Cold War, how it changed the dynamics of the colonial powers, plus the involvement of the USA and USSR. This was quite a popular question but some candidates focused more on decolonisation and so not so much on the impact of the Cold War. At the higher levels the essays were analytical and well focused; candidates made a clear distinction between areas where the Cold War had a significant impact and where it did not.

Question 7

Assess the view that the emphasis on national unity led to political and economic tensions within newly-independent states?

Candidates were asked to assess the success of creating national unity in newly-independent states. In order to achieve high marks it was necessary to balance the response between political and economic tensions and to use a range of examples to illustrate the response. Some candidates mentioned attempts to create both Malaysian and Indonesian national unity on the indigenous Chinese population in both states. This led to ethnic confrontation and, in Malaysia, to the creation of a new type of citizenship which gave preference to the Bumiputras. Vietnam was affected by major political and economic tensions after reunification in 1975. Only a small number of candidates mentioned the attempts by the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia to create a form of national unity based on radical communist principles, resulting in genocide.

Question 8

To what extent were economic factors the cause of rivalry between newly-independent states?

Candidates were required to consider the extent to which tension was caused by economic factors and, for the highest marks, also needed to discuss examples of rivalry caused by other factors. Many responses mentioned that disputes between several Southeast Asian nations and China over the Spratly and Pescadores Islands had an economic basis (oil exploration in the South China Sea). Some candidates also mentioned that tension between Malaysia and the Philippines over the islands in the Sulu Sea arose for similar reasons. Economic factors were also significant in the clash between Indonesia and Malaysia in Borneo in the 1960s. The most effective responses went on to achieve balance by highlighting the importance of other causes, such as ideology, in relations between the newly independent nations of Indo-China with their neighbours, and indeed between themselves.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/22

Paper 22

General Comments

Many candidates produced good quality answers to the source-based question and very encouraging essays in response to **Questions 2 to 8**. Some candidates could have improved their performance if they had allocated their time more evenly between responses. Some allowed insufficient time for their final answer, with an inevitable decline in standard. This is a key feature of examination technique, which candidates must appreciate. Also it is vital that candidates have a solid factual knowledge of each topic and then use this subject material in an analytical manner to respond the questions asked. The examination taken as a whole produced a wide range of responses. The very best scripts were truly excellent and this is a credit to both the candidates and their teachers. Such responses were characterised by their analytical approach, clear focus and secure and detailed factual support.

Specific Question Comments

Question 1

How far do Sources A-E support the view that Britain was more concerned with Malaya's interests than with Singapore when it created a Crown Colony in 1946?

The source-based question asked the candidates to examine and interpret five sources and answer the question above. The most effective responses were able to access the highest levels in the mark scheme by demonstrating both an understanding of the material and also sound examination technique. Evaluation can be achieved by both a study of the nature, origin and purpose of the sources and also by using relevant contextual knowledge, or indeed both. Candidates also need to recognise that they should attempt to find evidence for both sides of the argument. Those candidates who were able to go beyond face value interpretation of the sources, evaluated the material in context and cross-referenced between sources were able to access the higher levels of the mark scheme. Some of the best responses provided a summative conclusion and a few presented an alternative hypothesis. Those candidates who took the sources at face value and dealt with each in turn tended to score lower marks as they failed to evaluate the material and rarely reached a clear conclusion.

Question 2

Why was Siam able to avoid colonisation while other areas of Southeast Asia were parts of European Empires in the years to 1914?

This was a popular question and well handled by most candidates who recognised the need to provide a wide range of specific examples to support their answers. Many responses mentioned the skill and diplomacy of successive Thai kings, Chulalongkorn for example, who were able to play European states off against each other. The determination of Britain and France to prevent the other from gaining direct control was also cited as a reason for Siam avoiding colonisation. The Entente Cordiale of 1904 divided Southeast Asia into spheres of influence between Britain and France and preserved Siamese independence. Candidates were also able to explain why other areas of Southeast Asia fell under colonial control. Burma, Malaya and Singapore, with a range of strategic, economic and trading motives, were useful examples and were well known by many candidates. France's desire to gain international prestige and economic advantage in Indo-China, the Dutch quest for economic gains in the East Indies and likewise the USA in the Philippines, were examples which some candidates used to good effect. A relatively small number of candidates could have improved their responses by using more specific detail to support their points.

Question 3

How far did colonial governments allow indigenous participation in administration in the period to 1941?

Candidates had the opportunity to assess the involvement of indigenous populations in colonial administration and this essay required them to highlight regional examples and variations in the operating methods of different colonial powers, in a range of colonies. Many candidates considered the British use of indirect rule through local monarchies in Malaya and Brunei. In the Straits Settlements the British imposed Direct Rule. There was limited involvement under Rajah Brooke in Sarawak and also in the administration of the North Borneo Company in Sabah. The best responses made comparisons, for instance mentioning that the French used the indigenous population in lower level administration. It was useful to point out that in the Malay Peninsula and Brunei the involvement was successful but elsewhere the lack of indigenous population participation encouraged the development of anti-imperial feelings. Weaker responses generally offered a more limited range of examples.

Question 4

How far did the Great Depression of the 1930s affect Southeast Asian economies and societies in the years to 1941?

This essay required candidates to assess the impact of the Great Depression over time, on different areas of Southeast Asia. It is important to stress that, in order to achieve the highest marks candidates must evaluate effects in several areas. Economically the depression led to a severe decline in commodity prices and badly affected the Malay Peninsula and Indo-China. The Philippines were more protected with access to the US markets, although import limits were imposed by the US in the 1930s. Declining exports seriously affected colonial revenues and thus the activities of colonial governments and Siam. State revenues of the FMS and the Dutch East Indies fell by approximately 50% from 1929-1932. A number of candidates mentioned attempts to protect certain industries, e.g. the Chadbourne Plan for sugar and the International Rubber Regulation Agreement. Private firms were also badly hit by the Great Depression and only 45 out of 179 private sugar factories survived in Java. To achieve the highest marks a sense of balance between the economic and social aspects was necessary and the best responses went on to discuss the considerable social impact of the depression. The number of government officials was reduced and indigenous employees faced unemployment or wage cuts. In plantations more women were employed, particularly in Malaya. Smallholders suffered badly, particularly in Burma. This question was generally well handled by candidates although some could have improved their responses by including a wider range of examples and a better sense of balance.

Question 5

Assess the impact of the Japanese Occupation on nationalist movements in Southeast Asia.

This is a popular topic and many responses proved to be very well informed. It was important that the candidates assessed the impact of the occupation and did not simply describe it. In many cases this was successfully achieved. Japan's main aim of occupation was economic, but the long term consequences were political. The Japanese Occupation undermined the authority of colonial regimes and they were unable to re-establish their control after the war. Occupation assisted the growth of nationalist movements and caused the British to reassess their role and commitment to the region, leading to the formation of the Malayan Union after the war. The occupation aided the growth of communist groups, particularly in Malaya and Indo-China. In the latter the Vietminh became the dominant group. In the Philippines the war accelerated the US decision to give independence although, as some pointed out, this decision had been taken before the occupation. A minority of well informed candidates lost focus on the question and described the occupation, or its impact, without assessment or analysis.

Question 6

How far did the Cold War affect the process of decolonisation?

In order to answer this question successfully candidates needed to focus on the ways in which the Cold War had an impact on the process of decolonisation. A major impact was seen in Indo-China. Initially the US supported France and their efforts to re-impose colonial rule. Once the French withdrew in 1954, the US took a much more direct role. The Cold War also affected the Malay Peninsula for a decade. The most effective responses recognised that these areas could be usefully contrasted with Burma and Indonesia



where the Cold War did not play a major role. The key focus needed to be on the significance of the Cold War, how it changed the dynamics of the colonial powers, plus the involvement of the USA and USSR. This was quite a popular question but some candidates focused more on decolonisation and so not so much on the impact of the Cold War. At the higher levels the essays were analytical and well focused; candidates made a clear distinction between areas where the Cold War had a significant impact and where it did not.

Question 7

Assess the view that the emphasis on national unity led to political and economic tensions within newly-independent states?

Candidates were asked to assess the success of creating national unity in newly-independent states. In order to achieve high marks it was necessary to balance the response between political and economic tensions and to use a range of examples to illustrate the response. Some candidates mentioned attempts to create both Malaysian and Indonesian national unity on the indigenous Chinese population in both states. This led to ethnic confrontation and, in Malaysia, to the creation of a new type of citizenship which gave preference to the Bumiputras. Vietnam was affected by major political and economic tensions after reunification in 1975. Only a small number of candidates mentioned the attempts by the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia to create a form of national unity based on radical communist principles, resulting in genocide.

Question 8

To what extent were economic factors the cause of rivalry between newly-independent states?

Candidates were required to consider the extent to which tension was caused by economic factors and, for the highest marks, also needed to discuss examples of rivalry caused by other factors. Many responses mentioned that disputes between several Southeast Asian nations and China over the Spratly and Pescadores Islands had an economic basis (oil exploration in the South China Sea). Some candidates also mentioned that tension between Malaysia and the Philippines over the islands in the Sulu Sea arose for similar reasons. Economic factors were also significant in the clash between Indonesia and Malaysia in Borneo in the 1960s. The most effective responses went on to achieve balance by highlighting the importance of other causes, such as ideology, in relations between the newly independent nations of Indo-China with their neighbours, and indeed between themselves.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) 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, but not invariably, **Question 1**), leaving themselves too little time to complete their fourth answer. A very small number of candidates ignored or misread the rubric and answered both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Whilst the overall standard was satisfactory, there was some variation in the quality of scripts. It was encouraging to see that many candidates were able to sustain consistently excellent standards throughout their responses. They showed clear evidence of their ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. Most candidates were able to demonstrate a sound grasp of information in at least some of their answers, but a number were unable to sustain this throughout. Some candidates could have improved their responses by using their knowledge in a more focused, analytical manner to address the specific requirements of the questions. A lack of appropriate detail was characteristic of weaker scripts, and these responses often consisted of generalised statements.

In their responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**), most candidates were able to identify information from the sources which both supported and challenged the hypothesis. The most impressive responses were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources in their historical context. Candidates should appreciate that it is essential to study all of the sources, ideally recording their findings in a plan, before commencing their response. Many candidates wrote about each source in turn and as a result their answers tended to lack both structure and a consistent argument. Opportunities for cross-referencing between sources were sometimes missed.

In **Section B**, the most popular choice was **Question 2**, relating to the causes and early development of the Cold War. The most impressive essays were characterised by focus, balance and sustained arguments. Some candidates could improve their responses if they recognised that 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 these responses analysis of whether '*the USSR was responsible for starting the Cold War, but the USA was responsible for developing it*' was often only implicit. Similarly in **Question 6**, many candidates were keen to demonstrate the depth of their factual knowledge by writing about the development of the nuclear arms race and the various attempts to control it. Some responses would have been improved by a clearer focus on the key issue of why the nuclear arms race ended in the 1980s. Candidates are advised to prepare a brief plan prior to embarking on an essay question; this undoubtedly helps them to remain focused on the question, whilst also ensuring that their responses are well structured and consistent.

Comment on specific questions

Section A

Question 1: How far do Sources A-E support the view that the UN has played a useful role in its work against genocide?

It was encouraging to see that most candidates were able to use information contained within the sources to construct a logical and balanced response to the question. Sources A and B were commonly seen as providing the strongest support for the view that the UN has played a useful role in its work against genocide. The fact that the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Source A) was adopted by the UN as early as 1948 was consistently viewed as evidence of the UN's commitment '*to prevent and to punish*' what it clearly considered '*a crime under international law*'. Source B was seen as

confirming that this commitment was still prevalent as recently as 2009. The fact that a *'case is pending before the International Court of Justice'* was taken to show that procedures for dealing with genocide were operating effectively. On the other hand, Sources C, D and E were usually seen as challenging the hypothesis, since they demonstrated how a loophole in the Convention's legal definition of genocide (*'which fails to protect political groups'*: Source C) led to the UN's failure to either prevent or punish mass murders in Cambodia, Indonesia and East Timor.

In order to achieve high marks for this question, candidates were required to go beyond 'face value' interpretations. It was necessary to analyse the sources in their historical context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. For example, whilst Source A demonstrates the UN's commitment to preventing and punishing the international crime of genocide, it is no more than a statement of intent. As an extract from the 1948 Convention it cannot comment on how successful the UN has been in this respect. Many candidates made the perceptive comment that, despite this limitation, Source A was of crucial importance because it attempted to provide a legal definition of genocide that member countries were required to sign. Similarly, many candidates demonstrated how the UN Convention's definition of genocide includes the intent to destroy *'a national, ethnic, racial or religious group'* but makes no mention of political groups (as argued in Sources C, D and E). This omission was clearly exploited in Cambodia, Indonesia and East Timor. Some responses pointed out that political groups were still not covered by the Genocide Convention as late as 2001 (Source D), and argued that the UN's role in tackling genocide was unlikely to be effective until this issue had been addressed. A small number of candidates suggested that this may have been the case because it could lead the UN to interfere in the internal affairs of independent member states against the terms of its Charter. Others thought it would have been difficult to gain support for such a move from some member states.

Source B was generally seen as providing the strongest support for the hypothesis. Describing the UN Genocide Convention as *'a major pillar in the evolving framework of international humanitarian rules'*, it demonstrates how any member country has access to *'competent organs of the UN'* and the International Court of Justice to address any concerns it may have regarding genocide. Many candidates questioned the reliability of Source B, noting that as a UN commentary it would have a vested interest in implying that the UN was being effective. In support of this point, it was argued that the source does not give any examples to demonstrate that the UN had been successful, merely the vague statement that there was one case pending before the International Court of Justice. Nor does it mention any areas in which the UN might be deemed to have failed in its genocide policy, despite the evidence produced in Sources C, D and E. Many responses wondered why the Genocide Convention had not established a specific monitoring body/expert committee in common with other human rights treaties, seeing this as a fundamental flaw in UN procedures.

Whilst Sources C, D and E provide evidence that the UN's work on tackling genocide has been less useful than Source B suggests, the most effective responses reflected the need to go beyond 'face value' interpretation. For example, many candidates pointed out that the author of Source C had spent a considerable amount of time researching issues relating to genocide in East Timor. On the basis of this research, he concludes that the ethnic Chinese in the towns of East Timor were *'singled out for destruction apparently because of their ethnicity'*. The key word here is *'apparently'*, which implies that the author is unable to claim categorically that the Chinese were killed because of their ethnicity rather than for political reasons. Moreover, he refers to *'some experts'*, who are clearly of the opinion that the mass exterminations which he quotes do not fall within the UN's definition of genocide. Similarly, as stated in Source D, *'international observers have been hesitant to call the Khmer Rouge's actions genocide'*. The best responses demonstrated how Source D shows that, once international organisations had begun to acknowledge that their actions might be classed as genocide, they turned to the UN to provide credible mediation. Arguably, the reason why international organisations, including the UN, had begun to see the events in Cambodia as constituting genocide is explained in Source E. Clearly, the availability of new evidence had begun to show *'beyond a reasonable doubt'* that the actions of the Khmer Rouge did fit the UN definition of genocide. Statements such as *'the evidence has now been gathered'* show that the UN was unable to act under international law until it was in possession of clear evidence that genocide had taken place.

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 took the form of arguing that the UN has, since 1948, had a clear commitment to prevent and punish what it refers to as the international crime of genocide. That it still has credibility in this area is confirmed by the fact that it has been asked to mediate in the trial of the Khmer Rouge perpetrators. However, it is very difficult to prove how effective the Genocide Convention has been as a deterrent. The UN is constrained both by loopholes in its own definition of genocide and by the legal requirement to have clear evidence to support any action it may decide to take.

Section B

Question 2: 'The USSR was responsible for starting the Cold War, but the USA was responsible for developing it'. How far do you agree with this view of events from 1945 to 1949?

It was clear that most candidates had impressive knowledge of the causes of the Cold War and the surrounding historical debate. The best responses were produced by candidates who were able to sustain a balanced argument which was focused on the question, in particular differentiating between 'start' and 'development'. Such responses usually argued that the hypothesis fits the traditional view, which suggests that the Cold War started as a result of Stalin's divisive tactics at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences and his subsequent expansionist moves to 'liberate' Eastern Europe. Alerted by Kennan's telegram and Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech, the USA responded with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Blockade and NATO, all of which helped to develop the Cold War. In order to ensure balance, such responses argued that the hypothesis could be challenged by reference to the revisionist view that the USA was not only responsible for developing the Cold War, but also for starting it. This argument was supported by reference to Truman's strongly anti-communist views and his use of atomic diplomacy at the end of World War Two. Truman's actions could be seen as an attempt to enhance the USA's own economic power in Europe, rather than merely defensive in the face of Soviet aggression. Some responses lacked differentiation between 'start' and 'development', their analysis confined to a more basic outline of the causes of the Cold War and which superpower should be seen as most responsible.

Question 3: To what extent did the Cold War affect regional conflicts in the period from 1950 to 1989?

The key word in the question is 'affect' and the best responses were able to focus on the impact which Cold War issues had on regional conflicts, with supporting evidence from many areas of the world. Many candidates considered a variety of issues. For instance there was discussion of how what began as a civil war in Korea became a major conflict through the intervention of a US-dominated UN and the communist Chinese. Some discussed how a struggle for independence in Indo-China became a long-lasting, major regional war through the USA's determination not to allow a communist/nationalist government to establish itself in Vietnam or Laos. Examples from the Middle East were also used and it was shown that US support for Israel and Soviet support for Arab states such as Egypt, Syria and Yemen helped escalate a regional conflict into major wars in 1967 and 1973. A smaller number mentioned US and Soviet support for regimes in Congo/Zaire, Angola, Mozambique and the Horn of Africa which caused destabilisation in several regions. By contrast, a number of responses would have been improved by better focus on the question. Some answers contained considerable detail of various regional conflicts, most notably the Korean and Vietnam Wars. Whilst these accounts were often factually accurate, reference to the ways in which the Cold War might have affected such conflicts tended to be implicit. In some cases, there was no mention of the Cold War at all. A few weak responses lacked understanding of what constituted a 'regional conflict', and a minority wrote at length about events which took place in Europe before 1950.

Question 4: 'The USA lost the Vietnam War because of its own mistakes'. How far do you agree?

Most candidates were able to explain in detail why the USA lost the war in Vietnam, and the most impressive responses contained focused analysis to demonstrate how some of these reasons could be attributed to American mistakes. The most commonly held view was that, constrained by its containment policy, the USA was attempting to support an unsustainable political entity in South Vietnam. US military intervention, it was argued, came too late and failed to recognise the opinions and wishes of the Vietnamese people. Moreover, failure to reform the government and the use of ineffective tactics, both political and military, ultimately led to defeat. In order to ensure balance, the most effective responses analysed the importance of other factors, such as the tactics used by the Vietcong, the nationalistic feelings of the Vietnamese people, the actions of the PRC and the USSR, the UN's opposition to American escalation and changing public opinion in the USA. Some responses, although containing much relevant factual information, lacked focus on the question. Such candidates often confined their answers to basic accounts of the Vietnam War, sometimes going into considerable detail about the history of Vietnam under France and Japan. A small number of candidates made unsupported assertions about what constituted American 'mistakes'.

Question 5: To what extent was Mao Zedong personally responsible for the Sino-Soviet split?

The most effective responses were characterised by fully focused, consistent and sustained arguments. They contained detailed analysis considering whether Mao could be held personally responsible for the split between the PRC and the USSR, ensuring balance by evaluating the relative significance of other factors. Mao was often seen as being unwilling to play the role of junior partner to the USSR in the world communist movement, particularly after the death of Stalin and Khrushchev's 'secret speech' to the 20th Party Congress

in 1956. This was reflected in his heavy criticism of Khrushchev and his determination to develop Chinese communism in a different direction from that of the Soviet Union, as evidenced by the Hundred Flowers Campaign and the Great Leap Forward. On the other hand some candidates argued that Khrushchev was no less responsible for the deteriorating relationship since he was critical of Chinese communism and withdrew much Soviet assistance to China. Indeed, personal animosity between Mao and Khrushchev was consistently viewed as a significant factor for which Mao was not solely to blame. Many argued that ideological disputes between the PRC and the USSR were an inevitable reflection of historical, social and economic differences between the two countries. On-going border disputes and American diplomacy did nothing to ease tensions. Many candidates possessed an impressive amount of knowledge regarding the causes of the Sino-Soviet split but confined their answers to listing them without explicit reference to the question. The weakest responses were based on insufficient or inaccurate factual content, and were characterised by unsupported and confused assertions

Question 6: Why did the nuclear arms race end in the 1980s?

Many candidates selected this question because they possessed considerable knowledge of the nuclear arms race and the various attempts to control it throughout the period from 1949 to 1991. Relatively few were able to concentrate their responses on the 1980s. Some candidates wrote in detail about how the nuclear arms race had developed and about the various treaties that had been passed since 1963, without reference to the situation which existed in the 1980s, other than to assume that the cumulative effect of these treaties must have been the eventual end of the arms race. The best responses came from those candidates who, whilst clearly in possession of such background knowledge, were able to focus on the period following the onset of the 'second Cold War' in 1979. Most argued that the escalating cost associated with nuclear arms was causing additional strain on an already ailing Soviet economy, especially after the imposition of Reagan's hard-line strategy which included SDI. Gorbachev's accession to the Soviet leadership was commonly seen as crucial, since his policies not only required a fundamental reappraisal of Soviet armaments spending but also encouraged the West to view him as someone they could negotiate with. The most perceptive responses argued that the USA's economy was also suffering at this time as a result of the global recession and that American presidents also had a vested interest in reducing the cost of armaments.

Question 7: How far has the capitalist world economy been in crisis since 1945?

The most impressive responses were able to demonstrate how the international economy displayed a continuous growth trend throughout the period from 1945 to 1991, whilst also showing the impact of the oil price shocks in the 1970s, the developing world's debt crisis in the 1970s and 1980s and the recession of 1979-1983. Such responses were able to draw on impressive knowledge of issues such as the Bretton-Woods system, the recovery of Germany and Japan, the role of the IMF and the World Bank, the significance of free trade policies and the development of newly-emerging economies such as those of the Asian Tigers. Some other responses, whilst containing appropriate factual material, tended to concentrate on the gradual erosion of American dominance of the world economy. Although this was relevant it was not the primary focus of the question. Weaker responses tended to rely on unsupported assertions and some were based on an inadequate, or inaccurate, definition of the phrase '*capitalist world economy*'.

Question 8: 'The developing world was itself mostly responsible for the problems that it faced in the 1970s and 1980s'. How far do you agree?

There was a huge range in the quality of responses and they tended to fit into one of three categories. The best were able to sustain a consistently focused and balanced argument throughout, supported by appropriate examples and relevant factual content. Responses in the second category were characterised by unsupported assertions and broad generalisations which implied that all developing countries experienced exactly the same problems and for exactly the same reasons. For example, it was assumed that all newly-independent states suffered from high levels of political corruption and inappropriate use of public funds, and that all developing countries suffered from the effects of famine and bad weather conditions. The third category contained responses from candidates who misunderstood the question, usually because of an inaccurate interpretation of '*the developing world*'. Some, for example, concentrated on the problems faced by European countries in the aftermath of World War Two, ignoring the timeframe established by the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) 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, but not invariably, **Question 1**), leaving themselves too little time to complete their fourth answer. A very small number of candidates ignored or misread the rubric and answered both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Whilst the overall standard was satisfactory, there was some variation in the quality of scripts. It was encouraging to see that many candidates were able to sustain consistently excellent standards throughout their responses. They showed clear evidence of their ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. Most candidates were able to demonstrate a sound grasp of information in at least some of their answers, but a number were unable to sustain this throughout. Some candidates could have improved their responses by using their knowledge in a more focused, analytical manner to address the specific requirements of the questions. A lack of appropriate detail was characteristic of weaker scripts, and these responses often consisted of generalised statements.

In their responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**), most candidates were able to identify information from the sources which both supported and challenged the hypothesis. The most impressive responses were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources in their historical context. Candidates should appreciate that it is essential to study all of the sources, ideally recording their findings in a plan, before commencing their response. Many candidates wrote about each source in turn and as a result their answers tended to lack both structure and a consistent argument. Opportunities for cross-referencing between sources were sometimes missed.

In **Section B**, the most popular choice was **Question 2**, relating to the causes and early development of the Cold War. The most impressive essays were characterised by focus, balance and sustained arguments. Some candidates could improve their responses if they recognised that 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 these responses analysis of whether '*the USSR was responsible for starting the Cold War, but the USA was responsible for developing it*' was often only implicit. Similarly in **Question 6**, many candidates were keen to demonstrate the depth of their factual knowledge by writing about the development of the nuclear arms race and the various attempts to control it. Some responses would have been improved by a clearer focus on the key issue of why the nuclear arms race ended in the 1980s. Candidates are advised to prepare a brief plan prior to embarking on an essay question; this undoubtedly helps them to remain focused on the question, whilst also ensuring that their responses are well structured and consistent.

Comment on specific questions

Section A

Question 1: How far do Sources A-E support the view that the UN has played a useful role in its work against genocide?

It was encouraging to see that most candidates were able to use information contained within the sources to construct a logical and balanced response to the question. Sources A and B were commonly seen as providing the strongest support for the view that the UN has played a useful role in its work against genocide. The fact that the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Source A) was adopted by the UN as early as 1948 was consistently viewed as evidence of the UN's commitment '*to prevent and to punish*' what it clearly considered '*a crime under international law*'. Source B was seen as confirming that this commitment was still prevalent as recently as 2009. The fact that a '*case is pending*

before the International Court of Justice was taken to show that procedures for dealing with genocide were operating effectively. On the other hand, Sources C, D and E were usually seen as challenging the hypothesis, since they demonstrated how a loophole in the Convention's legal definition of genocide (*'which fails to protect political groups'*: Source C) led to the UN's failure to either prevent or punish mass murders in Cambodia, Indonesia and East Timor.

In order to achieve high marks for this question, candidates were required to go beyond 'face value' interpretations. It was necessary to analyse the sources in their historical context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. For example, whilst Source A demonstrates the UN's commitment to preventing and punishing the international crime of genocide, it is no more than a statement of intent. As an extract from the 1948 Convention it cannot comment on how successful the UN has been in this respect. Many candidates made the perceptive comment that, despite this limitation, Source A was of crucial importance because it attempted to provide a legal definition of genocide that member countries were required to sign. Similarly, many candidates demonstrated how the UN Convention's definition of genocide includes the intent to destroy *'a national, ethnic, racial or religious group'* but makes no mention of political groups (as argued in Sources C, D and E). This omission was clearly exploited in Cambodia, Indonesia and East Timor. Some responses pointed out that political groups were still not covered by the Genocide Convention as late as 2001 (Source D), and argued that the UN's role in tackling genocide was unlikely to be effective until this issue had been addressed. A small number of candidates suggested that this may have been the case because it could lead the UN to interfere in the internal affairs of independent member states against the terms of its Charter. Others thought it would have been difficult to gain support for such a move from some member states.

Source B was generally seen as providing the strongest support for the hypothesis. Describing the UN Genocide Convention as *'a major pillar in the evolving framework of international humanitarian rules'*, it demonstrates how any member country has access to *'competent organs of the UN'* and the International Court of Justice to address any concerns it may have regarding genocide. Many candidates questioned the reliability of Source B, noting that as a UN commentary it would have a vested interest in implying that the UN was being effective. In support of this point, it was argued that the source does not give any examples to demonstrate that the UN had been successful, merely the vague statement that there was one case pending before the International Court of Justice. Nor does it mention any areas in which the UN might be deemed to have failed in its genocide policy, despite the evidence produced in Sources C, D and E. Many responses wondered why the Genocide Convention had not established a specific monitoring body/expert committee in common with other human rights treaties, seeing this as a fundamental flaw in UN procedures.

Whilst Sources C, D and E provide evidence that the UN's work on tackling genocide has been less useful than Source B suggests, the most effective responses reflected the need to go beyond 'face value' interpretation. For example, many candidates pointed out that the author of Source C had spent a considerable amount of time researching issues relating to genocide in East Timor. On the basis of this research, he concludes that the ethnic Chinese in the towns of East Timor were *'singled out for destruction apparently because of their ethnicity'*. The key word here is *'apparently'*, which implies that the author is unable to claim categorically that the Chinese were killed because of their ethnicity rather than for political reasons. Moreover, he refers to *'some experts'*, who are clearly of the opinion that the mass exterminations which he quotes do not fall within the UN's definition of genocide. Similarly, as stated in Source D, *'international observers have been hesitant to call the Khmer Rouge's actions genocide'*. The best responses demonstrated how Source D shows that, once international organisations had begun to acknowledge that their actions might be classed as genocide, they turned to the UN to provide credible mediation. Arguably, the reason why international organisations, including the UN, had begun to see the events in Cambodia as constituting genocide is explained in Source E. Clearly, the availability of new evidence had begun to show *'beyond a reasonable doubt'* that the actions of the Khmer Rouge did fit the UN definition of genocide. Statements such as *'the evidence has now been gathered'* show that the UN was unable to act under international law until it was in possession of clear evidence that genocide had taken place.

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 took the form of arguing that the UN has, since 1948, had a clear commitment to prevent and punish what it refers to as the international crime of genocide. That it still has credibility in this area is confirmed by the fact that it has been asked to mediate in the trial of the Khmer Rouge perpetrators. However, it is very difficult to prove how effective the Genocide Convention has been as a deterrent. The UN is constrained both by loopholes in its own definition of genocide and by the legal requirement to have clear evidence to support any action it may decide to take.

Section B

Question 2: 'The USSR was responsible for starting the Cold War, but the USA was responsible for developing it'. How far do you agree with this view of events from 1945 to 1949?

It was clear that most candidates had impressive knowledge of the causes of the Cold War and the surrounding historical debate. The best responses were produced by candidates who were able to sustain a balanced argument which was focused on the question, in particular differentiating between 'start' and 'development'. Such responses usually argued that the hypothesis fits the traditional view, which suggests that the Cold War started as a result of Stalin's divisive tactics at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences and his subsequent expansionist moves to 'liberate' Eastern Europe. Alerted by Kennan's telegram and Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech, the USA responded with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Blockade and NATO, all of which helped to develop the Cold War. In order to ensure balance, such responses argued that the hypothesis could be challenged by reference to the revisionist view that the USA was not only responsible for developing the Cold War, but also for starting it. This argument was supported by reference to Truman's strongly anti-communist views and his use of atomic diplomacy at the end of World War Two. Truman's actions could be seen as an attempt to enhance the USA's own economic power in Europe, rather than merely defensive in the face of Soviet aggression. Some responses lacked differentiation between 'start' and 'development', their analysis confined to a more basic outline of the causes of the Cold War and which superpower should be seen as most responsible.

Question 3: To what extent did the Cold War affect regional conflicts in the period from 1950 to 1989?

The key word in the question is 'affect' and the best responses were able to focus on the impact which Cold War issues had on regional conflicts, with supporting evidence from many areas of the world. Many candidates considered a variety of issues. For instance there was discussion of how what began as a civil war in Korea became a major conflict through the intervention of a US-dominated UN and the communist Chinese. Some discussed how a struggle for independence in Indo-China became a long-lasting, major regional war through the USA's determination not to allow a communist/nationalist government to establish itself in Vietnam or Laos. Examples from the Middle East were also used and it was shown that US support for Israel and Soviet support for Arab states such as Egypt, Syria and Yemen helped escalate a regional conflict into major wars in 1967 and 1973. A smaller number mentioned US and Soviet support for regimes in Congo/Zaire, Angola, Mozambique and the Horn of Africa which caused destabilisation in several regions. By contrast, a number of responses would have been improved by better focus on the question. Some answers contained considerable detail of various regional conflicts, most notably the Korean and Vietnam Wars. Whilst these accounts were often factually accurate, reference to the ways in which the Cold War might have affected such conflicts tended to be implicit. In some cases, there was no mention of the Cold War at all. A few weak responses lacked understanding of what constituted a 'regional conflict', and a minority wrote at length about events which took place in Europe before 1950.

Question 4: 'The USA lost the Vietnam War because of its own mistakes'. How far do you agree?

Most candidates were able to explain in detail why the USA lost the war in Vietnam, and the most impressive responses contained focused analysis to demonstrate how some of these reasons could be attributed to American mistakes. The most commonly held view was that, constrained by its containment policy, the USA was attempting to support an unsustainable political entity in South Vietnam. US military intervention, it was argued, came too late and failed to recognise the opinions and wishes of the Vietnamese people. Moreover, failure to reform the government and the use of ineffective tactics, both political and military, ultimately led to defeat. In order to ensure balance, the most effective responses analysed the importance of other factors, such as the tactics used by the Vietcong, the nationalistic feelings of the Vietnamese people, the actions of the PRC and the USSR, the UN's opposition to American escalation and changing public opinion in the USA. Some responses, although containing much relevant factual information, lacked focus on the question. Such candidates often confined their answers to basic accounts of the Vietnam War, sometimes going into considerable detail about the history of Vietnam under France and Japan. A small number of candidates made unsupported assertions about what constituted American 'mistakes'.

Question 5: To what extent was Mao Zedong personally responsible for the Sino-Soviet split?

The most effective responses were characterised by fully focused, consistent and sustained arguments. They contained detailed analysis considering whether Mao could be held personally responsible for the split between the PRC and the USSR, ensuring balance by evaluating the relative significance of other factors. Mao was often seen as being unwilling to play the role of junior partner to the USSR in the world communist movement, particularly after the death of Stalin and Khrushchev's 'secret speech' to the 20th Party Congress

in 1956. This was reflected in his heavy criticism of Khrushchev and his determination to develop Chinese communism in a different direction from that of the Soviet Union, as evidenced by the Hundred Flowers Campaign and the Great Leap Forward. On the other hand some candidates argued that Khrushchev was no less responsible for the deteriorating relationship since he was critical of Chinese communism and withdrew much Soviet assistance to China. Indeed, personal animosity between Mao and Khrushchev was consistently viewed as a significant factor for which Mao was not solely to blame. Many argued that ideological disputes between the PRC and the USSR were an inevitable reflection of historical, social and economic differences between the two countries. On-going border disputes and American diplomacy did nothing to ease tensions. Many candidates possessed an impressive amount of knowledge regarding the causes of the Sino-Soviet split but confined their answers to listing them without explicit reference to the question. The weakest responses were based on insufficient or inaccurate factual content, and were characterised by unsupported and confused assertions

Question 6: Why did the nuclear arms race end in the 1980s?

Many candidates selected this question because they possessed considerable knowledge of the nuclear arms race and the various attempts to control it throughout the period from 1949 to 1991. Relatively few were able to concentrate their responses on the 1980s. Some candidates wrote in detail about how the nuclear arms race had developed and about the various treaties that had been passed since 1963, without reference to the situation which existed in the 1980s, other than to assume that the cumulative effect of these treaties must have been the eventual end of the arms race. The best responses came from those candidates who, whilst clearly in possession of such background knowledge, were able to focus on the period following the onset of the 'second Cold War' in 1979. Most argued that the escalating cost associated with nuclear arms was causing additional strain on an already ailing Soviet economy, especially after the imposition of Reagan's hard-line strategy which included SDI. Gorbachev's accession to the Soviet leadership was commonly seen as crucial, since his policies not only required a fundamental reappraisal of Soviet armaments spending but also encouraged the West to view him as someone they could negotiate with. The most perceptive responses argued that the USA's economy was also suffering at this time as a result of the global recession and that American presidents also had a vested interest in reducing the cost of armaments.

Question 7: How far has the capitalist world economy been in crisis since 1945?

The most impressive responses were able to demonstrate how the international economy displayed a continuous growth trend throughout the period from 1945 to 1991, whilst also showing the impact of the oil price shocks in the 1970s, the developing world's debt crisis in the 1970s and 1980s and the recession of 1979-1983. Such responses were able to draw on impressive knowledge of issues such as the Bretton-Woods system, the recovery of Germany and Japan, the role of the IMF and the World Bank, the significance of free trade policies and the development of newly-emerging economies such as those of the Asian Tigers. Some other responses, whilst containing appropriate factual material, tended to concentrate on the gradual erosion of American dominance of the world economy. Although this was relevant it was not the primary focus of the question. Weaker responses tended to rely on unsupported assertions and some were based on an inadequate, or inaccurate, definition of the phrase '*capitalist world economy*'.

Question 8: 'The developing world was itself mostly responsible for the problems that it faced in the 1970s and 1980s'. How far do you agree?

There was a huge range in the quality of responses and they tended to fit into one of three categories. The best were able to sustain a consistently focused and balanced argument throughout, supported by appropriate examples and relevant factual content. Responses in the second category were characterised by unsupported assertions and broad generalisations which implied that all developing countries experienced exactly the same problems and for exactly the same reasons. For example, it was assumed that all newly-independent states suffered from high levels of political corruption and inappropriate use of public funds, and that all developing countries suffered from the effects of famine and bad weather conditions. The third category contained responses from candidates who misunderstood the question, usually because of an inaccurate interpretation of '*the developing world*'. Some, for example, concentrated on the problems faced by European countries in the aftermath of World War Two, ignoring the timeframe established by the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, virtually all candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates planned their time well. It is interesting to note that many of those who were left short of time for their final response were those who had not attempted the source-based question first.

Many candidates were able to maintain consistently excellent standards throughout all four of their responses, displaying evidence of their ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge, but some found it difficult to use this 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 factual knowledge which meant that essays consisted of generalised statements.

In their answers to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) the majority of candidates were able to identify information from the sources which supported and challenged the hypothesis. The most impressive responses went beyond 'face value' and interpreted the sources in their historical context. Candidates must appreciate that it is essential to study all of the sources, ideally recording their findings on a plan, before commencing their response. Many candidates wrote about each source in turn and their answers tended to lack both structure and consistent arguments, whilst vital issues of cross-referencing between sources were often missed. A number of candidates who adopted this approach missed the significance of Source A.

In **Section B**, the most popular choice was **Question 2**, relating to the causes and early development of the Cold War. The most impressive essays were characterised by focus, balance and sustained arguments. Candidates should 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 Truman Doctrine might be seen as a 'turning point' was often only implicit. Similarly in **Question 6**, most 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 its impact on international stability. Candidates are advised to prepare a brief plan prior to embarking on an essay question; this undoubtedly helps them to remain focused on the requirements of the question, while ensuring that their responses are well structured and that their arguments are clear throughout.

Comment on specific questions

Section A

Question 1: How far do Sources A-E support the view that US President Eisenhower was responsible for the UN's failure to take more effective action over the Hungarian Crisis?

Virtually all candidates were able to use information from the sources to construct a logical and balanced response to the question. Sources D and E were commonly seen as providing the strongest support for the view that Eisenhower was responsible for the UN's failure to take more effective action over the Hungarian crisis. His administration viewed the situation in the Middle East as being of greater strategic importance to the USA. This led to his decision to prevent the '*Hungarian issue being referred to the special session of the General Assembly before the second Soviet intervention*' (Source D), and his insistence at the UN that Hungary and the Soviet Union needed to resolve the problem '*together and alone*' (Source E). In addition his refusal to deploy what Source E describes as the USA's superior military power against the Soviet Union made it impossible for the UN to take any effective action in Hungary. Many candidates noted that Eisenhower's active encouragement of the Hungarian revolt and subsequent failure to do anything to support

it was not only hypocritical, but would also have made the UN's role more difficult. On the other hand, Source B was universally seen as challenging the hypothesis. Given Hungary's geographical location, the lack of support from '*the major nations of Europe*' and the absence of a UN mandate for action, Eisenhower states that there was simply nothing the USA could do. Most candidates were able to demonstrate how Source C provides support for Eisenhower's assertion.

To achieve high marks candidates were required to go beyond 'face value' interpretation of the sources. It was necessary to analyse the sources in context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. For example, the vital significance of Source A was often missed; indeed, a small number of candidates dismissed it for lack of reference to either the USA in general or Eisenhower in particular. The most effective responses came from candidates who were able to use their contextual knowledge to demonstrate that Source A was probably the most important source in addressing the hypothesis. Such responses showed how, under the terms of its own Charter, the UN would not have been able to take action in Hungary against the wishes of the Hungarian government, even though this was heavily controlled by the Soviet Union. Regardless of Eisenhower's opinion the UN could not take action, a point which he himself makes in Source B.

Many candidates claimed that Source B was biased since it was inevitable that Eisenhower would seek to justify his lack of action over the Hungarian crisis. Candidates must appreciate that to make such a statement without providing examples of *how* the source is biased constitutes an unsupported assertion. More effective responses were able to demonstrate that Eisenhower's somewhat emotional statements, regarding his sympathy for the Hungarian rebels and his strong desire to assist them, are rather contradicted by his administration's determination to prevent the Hungarian issue being referred to the General Assembly. Similarly many candidates stated that, as the work of an American historian, Source C is likely to contain pro-American bias and it is not surprising that it supports Eisenhower's claim that there was nothing he could do. More analytical responses argued that although Source C does make this point, it is also highly critical of Eisenhower, going so far as to refer to his talk about liberation in Europe as '*hypocritical*'. It was argued that such a balanced view gave Source C enhanced credibility.

The escalation of the Middle Eastern conflict was widely seen as being a critical factor in preventing more effective UN action over the crisis in Hungary. Many candidates argued that Source D's allegations that Britain, France and the USA exploited the Hungarian crisis for their own political advantage in the Middle East carried considerable weight. Statements such as '*the real aim of the negotiating partners was no longer the condemnation of Soviet intervention, let alone putting obstacles in its way*' clearly indicate that Eisenhower's administration was prepared to sacrifice the Hungarian rebels for its own strategic reasons. Corroborating evidence was found in Source E, with Eisenhower's instruction to the USA's Ambassador to the UN to declare that the Hungarian issue was an internal matter between Hungary and the USSR. The most analytical responses pointed out that, whilst the factual content of Source D would be largely verifiable by reference to historical sources, the interpretation placed upon it by the writer is flavoured with the resentment of a Hungarian who feels that the major Western powers let his country down in its hour of need.

A number of candidates assumed that Source E, having been written by a historian of mixed Hungarian and American background, was likely to portray a balanced view. The most perceptive responses quickly dismissed this idea, showing how the source makes a scathing attack on Eisenhower's failure to take decisive action. Such responses pointed out that, whilst Eisenhower's reluctance to discuss the crisis at the UN can be verified by cross-referencing with Source D, the remainder of the source is both opinionated and contradictory to Sources B and C. Many candidates argued logically that the writer's suggestions are implausible and would inevitably have led, as Eisenhower himself states in Source B, to a '*general war*'. The most perceptive candidates argued that as the USA had not deployed nuclear weapons in Korea (and did not to do so in Cuba in the 1960s) it was extremely unlikely that their use would have been contemplated over a matter relating to a country that was within the Soviet sphere of influence in Europe.

Candidates who achieved the highest level in this question did so by evaluating the sources on both sides of the argument, and then explaining how and why the quality of the evidence differed. Such responses often concluded that the main reason why the UN did not take more effective action over the Hungarian crisis was because it had no right to intervene. Therefore the UN could do little more than pass resolutions condemning Soviet actions in Hungary. Without a UN mandate and with no support from '*the major nations of Europe*' (Source B), the USA would have had to act alone. Given that Hungary was in the Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe, any American action would have gone well beyond the notion of containment and was likely to lead to war. Most concluded that Eisenhower was not to blame for the UN's ineffective response.

Section B

Question 2: To what extent was the Truman Doctrine a turning-point in the development of the Cold War in the years from 1945 to 1949?

A large number of candidates were able to draw on impressive knowledge relating to the causes and early development of the Cold War in Europe. There were some excellent responses comprising detailed, analytical and balanced arguments, fully focused on the requirements of the question. Such responses tended to argue that the Truman Doctrine was a turning point because it represented the first formal declaration of American intent to resist what it saw as Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe and established the policy of containment which was to shape future American actions. Together with the Marshall Plan and American determination to protect its own economic interests, the Truman Doctrine set the USA on a path of formal opposition to the USSR and could be seen as marking the start of the Cold War. To achieve balance the best responses suggested that the Cold War had already started before the introduction of the Truman Doctrine, citing evidence such as the disagreements which existed at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, Truman's atomic diplomacy, Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech and Kennan's 'long telegram'. In this way the Truman Doctrine could be seen as a logical extension of the existing situation, rather than a turning point. Some candidates argued that the Berlin Blockade had a better claim to be viewed as a turning point, since it marked the first time that the USA and the USSR came into direct conflict with each other. Such responses considered all aspects of the question and were characterised by careful analysis and focused factual support. Many other responses, whilst containing appropriate and often very detailed material, offered a general narrative on the causes of the Cold War and/or the historical debate which surrounds them, with only limited focus on the question. These responses tended to see the Truman Doctrine as just one causal factor and overlooked the issue of whether it was a 'turning point'.

Question 3: 'The Cold War did not become truly global until after the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.' How far do you agree?

The majority of candidates remained focused on the question, the most common argument involving a direct challenge to the hypothesis by demonstrating how the Cold War had already become global before 1962. The Korean War was consistently seen as the best evidence for this since it involved the USA, the USSR, the PRC and many other nations through the direct involvement of the UN. Many candidates claimed that there were other examples of Cold War globalisation before the Cuban Missile Crisis, such as superpower involvement in the Middle East and the Congo, together with American involvement in Vietnam and Guatemala. Whilst such responses were fully focused on the question, many tended to remain unbalanced because they did not review evidence which might be seen as supporting the hypothesis. The most effective arguments did provide such balance by showing how the Cuban Missile Crisis was significantly different from the earlier issues, since it was the first time that the USA and the USSR had come into direct conflict outside Europe. It was only after 1962 that issues in the Americas, Africa and the Middle East escalated into major Cold War confrontations. Many other responses, whilst containing a great deal of appropriate factual material, provided a narrative of examples of Cold War issues without an explicit focus on the question. A small number of candidates wrote exclusively about the Cuban Missile Crisis itself, with no reference to its impact on the globalisation of the Cold War.

Question 4: 'The US played a much more significant role than the USSR in the Arab-Israeli Conflict in the years from 1948 to 1991.' How far do you agree?

Most candidates seemed to have good knowledge relating to the USA's involvement in the Middle East, but the nature of the Soviet Union's involvement was less well known or understood. As a result some responses were rather unbalanced; American actions were described in detail, followed by the unsupported assertion that such evidence must prove that the USA's role in the Arab-Israeli conflict was more significant than that of the USSR. More impressive responses frequently reached the same conclusion, but only after reviewing the nature of (and motivation behind) the involvement of both the USA and the USSR. Both were seen as having strategic, economic and political reasons for taking an active interest in Middle Eastern affairs, and both supplied finances, arms and military assistance to the protagonists. Both supported the creation of Israel and helped the new state to achieve victory in the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. Subsequently, Soviet support for Arab states was to have profound effects on the Six Day War of 1967 and the Yom Kippur War of 1973. Conversely, the USA was seen as playing a more significant role as peacemaker between the Arabs and the Israelis, US diplomatic initiatives helping to end the Yom Kippur War and facilitating the Camp David Accords of 1978-9 and subsequent agreements in the 1980s. Some candidates wrote accurate and detailed accounts of the Arab-Israeli conflict between 1948 and 1991, but with only implicit reference to the significance of superpower involvement. The weakest responses were based on limited factual content and unsupported assertions.

Question 5: How far did the collapse of communist rule in Eastern Europe in 1989 cause the collapse of the USSR in 1991?

The majority of candidates possessed considerable knowledge of the causes of the USSR's collapse in 1991, although a number of responses contained only limited reference to the fall of communism in Eastern Europe and no analysis of its relative significance. Conversely, some candidates wrote in great detail about events in Eastern Europe and concluded that these must have been the reason for the subsequent collapse of the USSR. Characteristically, such responses tended to make no reference to other causes of the demise of the USSR or to the reasons behind the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. The key to producing an effective response to this question was the ability to see how the various causal factors were inter-linked. The most impressive essays showed how the collapse of communist rule in Eastern Europe did help to re-ignite nationalist sentiment in the Baltic States and Transcaucasia. This accelerated political fragmentation within the USSR, but was itself caused by the same problems which beset the Soviet Union. Economic stagnation, enhanced by a costly war in Afghanistan and Reagan's nuclear strategies, made it impossible for Gorbachev to resist nationalism, whether in Eastern Europe or elsewhere within the USSR. The Brezhnev Doctrine was no longer sustainable and the failure of perestroika and glasnost led to the collapse of the USSR from within.

Question 6: How far did nuclear weapons provide international stability during the Cold War?

This question produced some exceptional responses which were based on focused and balanced arguments. Generally it was suggested that nuclear weapons did provide international stability during the Cold War as evidenced by the USA's reluctance to deploy its nuclear might during the Korean War, the fact that both the USA and the USSR backed down in the Cuban Missile Crisis, the development of Mutually Assured Destruction and the large number of treaties which were passed to control both the development and proliferation of nuclear arms. On the other hand, such responses also provided evidence to support the counter argument: the fact that the various treaties were largely ineffective, at least before the 1980s; the fact that countries other than the USA and the USSR acquired nuclear capability; the fact that instability was created by the deployment of SS20s, Pershing II and Cruise missiles; the destabilising effect of SDI; the development of flexible response and the growing intensity of proxy wars. A number of responses were less focused on the particular requirements of the question. Some candidates wrote in great detail about the build up of nuclear weapons by both the USA and the USSR, concluding that this must have caused instability in superpower relations. Others wrote in equally impressive detail about the various treaties which were signed from the 1960s onwards, concluding that this clearly shows that the nuclear arms race did have a stabilising effect on international relations. Such responses tended to be unbalanced and lacked analysis.

Question 7: To what extent was the growth of the global economy from 1945 to 1991 the result of the increasing adoption of free trade policies?

This question was attempted by too few candidates to make general comment appropriate.

Question 8: How far was the success of the Asian Tiger economies the result of government policies?

This question was answered by a minority of candidates. The most effective responses displayed good knowledge of the reasons for the growth of the Asian Tiger economies, and the most impressive were able to analyse the relative significance of government policies, such as investment in education and the development of export-driven models of economic expansion. Some essays would have been improved if candidates had balanced their answers and considered a number of factors.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/41

Paper 41

General Comments

The responses to this paper were generally very encouraging and there was clear evidence of sound knowledge and understanding throughout. Most candidates understood the need to focus on the question set rather than on a previously learnt response from within the topic. Those candidates who chose their questions wisely were able to score high marks on four questions which is key to achieving a high grade overall. A few candidates mistakenly referred to the period as the 'eighteenth' century. A minority of candidates confused west with east, or gave examples from the wrong part of Africa, and would have improved their answers if their geographical knowledge had been more secure. For a paper covering the whole of tropical Africa, a good sense of geography is essential.

Candidates are to be commended for the effort with which they prepared for this exam. There were very few weak scripts. The majority of candidates demonstrated accurate knowledge and had clearly paid attention to the structure of their answers. Most candidates were able to complete four questions within the time limit but some wasted time by producing over-lengthy plans. Candidates are reminded that while the planning of answers is advised, rough work needs to be used constructively to produce better quality answers and not simply be repeated more neatly.

Questions 2 and 8 were the most popular and in these questions many candidates gave evidence of careful preparation, sound knowledge and mature understanding. **Question 1** was chosen by many candidates but some responses could have been improved for the reasons explained below.

It was encouraging to note that many candidates used the work of historians to good effect by quoting selectively and weaving these quotations into their argument. Some essays could have been improved by the inclusion of a greater level of evaluation, especially considering the priority of factors or the weight of evidence. A number of candidates are still content to give a list of well-explained factors without discussing their relative importance. If candidates take time to develop their techniques of evaluation they can lift a moderately good answer into one of the top two bands. Writing conclusions remains an area where some could further develop their skills. The most effective conclusions consider the weight of evidence used in the essay and move on to a logical judgement, rather than merely summarising the information.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

What difficulties, both within and external to East Africa, delayed the ending of the slave trade in that region? How were these difficulties overcome?

Those candidates who took good note of the question and maintained a clear focus on East Africa, particularly on Zanzibar, showing awareness that the slave trade there was quite different from that in West Africa, were able to construct the most effective responses. However, some candidates wrote about the Atlantic slave trade (which was more familiar to them) hoping that if they changed 'West' to 'East' this would be acceptable. Some candidates wrote about East Africa, but gave examples from West Africa as 'external' factors. This showed either weak geographical knowledge, or a misinterpretation of the question. Such candidates often limited themselves to the lower bands of the mark scheme and this serves as reminder that it is crucial to choose questions with care.

Question 2

Explain the successful establishment of Samori Touré's Mandinka empire in the Western Sudan. Did its strength lie more in the political or in the economic field?

This was a very popular question, usually done well. Those candidates who offered more than just a list of developed factors scored highly. The first section invited an analysis of all factors leading to the successful establishment of Samori's empire – thus allowing military, religious and social factors to be developed as well as political and economic. The second half needed a focused evaluation of the latter two only. More skilful candidates were able to weave military considerations into their political argument and religious and social issues into their economic argument and then make a judgement based on weight of evidence, rather than simply offering a summative paragraph. A few candidates included Samori's final failure to resist the French. Some candidates lost valuable time in discussing this aspect which was not required. There was some evidence of candidates having been confused by text books referring to Samori's empire in the east. This means the move of Samori's empire from the west coast regions of West Africa to the interior of the eastern areas of West Africa. This was another reminder that a clear grasp of the geography is important in this paper.

Question 3

Examine the reactions of the leaders and people of Uganda to the arrival and activities of Christian missionaries. Assess the impact of the missions upon African welfare and development.

The most effective answers to this question focused on the responses of the Kabakas (Mutesa and Mwanga), the Katikiros, especially Apolo Kagwa, the court pages and the people. By selecting information in this way candidates were able to produce a clearly structured essay. Some responses would have benefited from more secure knowledge and offered only a patchy chronology for the first half of the question, with some reactions mentioned for the second aspect. The majority of candidates were aware of general developments such as schools or new crops, while the best responses also included, for example, the reading house movement.

Question 4

In the period up to 1914, who gained and who lost in the 'scramble for Africa'?

It was encouraging to note that a large number of candidates were able to offer a wider perspective, going beyond a list of territorial gains or a Eurocentric response. The most effective essays offered suggestions of gains and losses on both sides and reached a balanced judgement. Some answers concentrated on the causes of the scramble, without linking each European country's aims to its gains or losses. Such a focus would have added depth to the analysis. Candidates are reminded that the parameters of this paper are 'Tropical Africa' and therefore North African gains or losses of territory are not relevant. The only exception was Britain gaining Egypt, which acted as a trigger for the scramble.

Question 5

Why did Lugard's system of Indirect Rule work more successfully in Northern Nigeria than in other regions of that country?

The majority of candidates were able to analyse the reasons for Lugard's success in the Sokoto Caliphate. The best informed could also write about the political systems of the Yoruba in SW Nigeria, or the Igbo to the east, in similar detail. The significance of warrant chiefs was generally understood, but that of the educated elite could have been developed further. Some candidates interpreted 'in other regions' to mean other parts of Africa where indirect rule was practised. This was clearly not the focus of the question which specifies 'other regions of that country'.

Question 6

Show how Lobengula attempted to safeguard the interests of the Matabele people through his policy of concessions to the British South Africa Company and other foreign agencies. How successful was this policy?

This question was usually done well with the majority of responses reflecting a sound grasp of the relevant material. Occasionally candidates confused the Grobler, Moffat and Rudd treaties, or did not take their

answer up to 1894 when the rule of the BSAC in Matabeleland was recognised. On the whole there was good knowledge of the way Lobengula was tricked and the longer-term outcomes for his people. In the most effective responses candidates used their knowledge to construct a clear argument.

Question 7

Analyse the causes of the Maji-Maji Rising (1905-07). What changes in German colonial policy followed?

Candidates who went beyond providing a list of causes for the rising were able to score well, although it was surprising how many referred to the Maji-Maji as a people. In the most effective responses candidates showed how factors were interlinked, were immediate or trigger factors, were longer-term grievances or simply coincidental. Changes in German policy were well understood and identified by the majority, but some responses would have benefited if these changes had been evaluated, either as part of the wider significance of this rising or by being explicitly linked to the causes.

Question 8

'Where Tewodros II failed, Johannes IV succeeded.' Does the history of Ethiopia support this summary?

It was encouraging to see so many well informed and confident responses to this popular question. The most effective answers used a comparative, rather than a sequential, approach. The best candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding and reached the conclusion that, although the quotation is generally true, there are some grounds for praising Tewodros and criticising Johannes, thus achieving a more balanced judgement.

Question 9

Show how, and explain why, Christianity expanded rapidly in West Africa during this period.

The focus of this question was West Africa and details on the contribution of missionaries, the Creoles working in Sierra Leone and particularly Bishop Crowther in the Niger Delta characterised, the strongest answers. Independent African Churches came later and were sometimes used to add depth and perspective to the analysis. Some responses took a rather vague approach, giving general accounts of missionaries, with minimal reference to the Creoles and would have been improved if they had provided more specific details about the spread of Christian churches.

Question 10

Did the activities of African, Arab and European traders result in more harm than good for the people of East Africa? Illustrate your answer with examples from each of the three groups.

The strongest answers to this question were able to evaluate the contribution of each group through the use of detailed knowledge, and then go on to show links between the traders and make an overall judgment about 'harm' or 'good'. Some candidates needed to improve their responses by considering the three groups separately, rather than amalgamating them together into a general discussion.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/42

Paper 42

General Comments

The responses to this paper were generally very encouraging and there was clear evidence of sound knowledge and understanding throughout. Most candidates understood the need to focus on the question set rather than on a previously learnt response from within the topic. Those candidates who chose their questions wisely were able to score high marks on four questions which is key to achieving a high grade overall. A few candidates mistakenly referred to the period as the 'eighteenth' century. A minority of candidates confused west with east, or gave examples from the wrong part of Africa, and would have improved their answers if their geographical knowledge had been more secure. For a paper covering the whole of tropical Africa, a good sense of geography is essential.

Candidates are to be commended for the effort with which they prepared for this exam. There were very few weak scripts. The majority of candidates demonstrated accurate knowledge and had clearly paid attention to the structure of their answers. Most candidates were able to complete four questions within the time limit but some wasted time by producing over-lengthy plans. Candidates are reminded that while the planning of answers is advised, rough work needs to be used constructively to produce better quality answers and not simply be repeated more neatly.

Questions 2 and 8 were the most popular and in these questions many candidates gave evidence of careful preparation, sound knowledge and mature understanding. **Question 1** was chosen by many candidates but some responses could have been improved for the reasons explained below.

It was encouraging to note that many candidates used the work of historians to good effect by quoting selectively and weaving these quotations into their argument. Some essays could have been improved by the inclusion of a greater level of evaluation, especially considering the priority of factors or the weight of evidence. A number of candidates are still content to give a list of well-explained factors without discussing their relative importance. If candidates take time to develop their techniques of evaluation they can lift a moderately good answer into one of the top two bands. Writing conclusions remains an area where some could further develop their skills. The most effective conclusions consider the weight of evidence used in the essay and move on to a logical judgement, rather than merely summarising the information.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

What difficulties, both within and external to East Africa, delayed the ending of the slave trade in that region? How were these difficulties overcome?

Those candidates who took good note of the question and maintained a clear focus on East Africa, particularly on Zanzibar, showing awareness that the slave trade there was quite different from that in West Africa, were able to construct the most effective responses. However, some candidates wrote about the Atlantic slave trade (which was more familiar to them) hoping that if they changed 'West' to 'East' this would be acceptable. Some candidates wrote about East Africa, but gave examples from West Africa as 'external' factors. This showed either weak geographical knowledge, or a misinterpretation of the question. Such candidates often limited themselves to the lower bands of the mark scheme and this serves as reminder that it is crucial to choose questions with care.

Question 2

Explain the successful establishment of Samori Touré's Mandinka empire in the Western Sudan. Did its strength lie more in the political or in the economic field?

This was a very popular question, usually done well. Those candidates who offered more than just a list of developed factors scored highly. The first section invited an analysis of all factors leading to the successful establishment of Samori's empire – thus allowing military, religious and social factors to be developed as well as political and economic. The second half needed a focused evaluation of the latter two only. More skilful candidates were able to weave military considerations into their political argument and religious and social issues into their economic argument and then make a judgement based on weight of evidence, rather than simply offering a summative paragraph. A few candidates included Samori's final failure to resist the French. Some candidates lost valuable time in discussing this aspect which was not required. There was some evidence of candidates having been confused by text books referring to Samori's empire in the east. This means the move of Samori's empire from the west coast regions of West Africa to the interior of the eastern areas of West Africa. This was another reminder that a clear grasp of the geography is important in this paper.

Question 3

Examine the reactions of the leaders and people of Uganda to the arrival and activities of Christian missionaries. Assess the impact of the missions upon African welfare and development.

The most effective answers to this question focused on the responses of the Kabakas (Mutesa and Mwanga), the Katikiros, especially Apolo Kagwa, the court pages and the people. By selecting information in this way candidates were able to produce a clearly structured essay. Some responses would have benefited from more secure knowledge and offered only a patchy chronology for the first half of the question, with some reactions mentioned for the second aspect. The majority of candidates were aware of general developments such as Schools or new crops, while the best responses also included, for example, the reading house movement.

Question 4

In the period up to 1914, who gained and who lost in the 'scramble for Africa'?

It was encouraging to note that a large number of candidates were able to offer a wider perspective, going beyond a list of territorial gains or a Eurocentric response. The most effective essays offered suggestions of gains and losses on both sides and reached a balanced judgement. Some answers concentrated on the causes of the scramble, without linking each European country's aims to its gains or losses. Such a focus would have added depth to the analysis. Candidates are reminded that the parameters of this paper are 'Tropical Africa' and therefore North African gains or losses of territory are not relevant. The only exception was Britain gaining Egypt, which acted as a trigger for the scramble.

Question 5

Why did Lugard's system of Indirect Rule work more successfully in Northern Nigeria than in other regions of that country?

The majority of candidates were able to analyse the reasons for Lugard's success in the Sokoto Caliphate. The best informed could also write about the political systems of the Yoruba in SW Nigeria, or the Igbo to the east, in similar detail. The significance of warrant chiefs was generally understood, but that of the educated elite could have been developed further. Some candidates interpreted 'in other regions' to mean other parts of Africa where indirect rule was practised. This was clearly not the focus of the question which specifies 'other regions of that country'.

Question 6

Show how Lobengula attempted to safeguard the interests of the Matabele people through his policy of concessions to the British South Africa Company and other foreign agencies. How successful was this policy?

This question was usually done well with the majority of responses reflecting a sound grasp of the relevant material. Occasionally candidates confused the Grobler, Moffat and Rudd treaties, or did not take their answer up to 1894 when the rule of the BSAC in Matabeleland was recognised. On the whole there was good knowledge of the way Lobengula was tricked and the longer-term outcomes for his people. In the most effective responses candidates used their knowledge to construct a clear argument.

Question 7

Analyse the causes of the Maji-Maji Rising (1905-07). What changes in German colonial policy followed?

Candidates who went beyond providing a list of causes for the rising were able to score well, although it was surprising how many referred to the Maji-Maji as a people. In the most effective responses candidates showed how factors were interlinked, were immediate or trigger factors, were longer-term grievances or simply coincidental. Changes in German policy were well understood and identified by the majority, but some responses would have benefited if these changes had been evaluated, either as part of the wider significance of this rising or by being explicitly linked to the causes.

Question 8

'Where Tewodros II failed, Johannes IV succeeded.' Does the history of Ethiopia support this summary?

It was encouraging to see so many well informed and confident responses to this popular question. The most effective answers used a comparative, rather than a sequential, approach. The best candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding and reached the conclusion that, although the quotation is generally true, there are some grounds for praising Tewodros and criticising Johannes, thus achieving a more balanced judgement.

Question 9

Show how, and explain why, Christianity expanded rapidly in West Africa during this period.

The focus of this question was West Africa and details on the contribution of missionaries, the Creoles working in Sierra Leone and particularly Bishop Crowther in the Niger Delta characterised, the strongest answers. Independent African Churches came later and were sometimes used to add depth and perspective to the analysis. Some responses took a rather vague approach, giving general accounts of missionaries, with minimal reference to the Creoles and would have been improved if they had provided more specific details about the spread of Christian churches.

Question 10

Did the activities of African, Arab and European traders result in more harm than good for the people of East Africa? Illustrate your answer with examples from each of the three groups.

The strongest answers to this question were able to evaluate the contribution of each group through the use of detailed knowledge, and then go on to show links between the traders and make an overall judgment about 'harm' or 'good'. Some candidates needed to improve their responses by considering the three groups separately, rather than amalgamating them together into a general discussion.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

General comments

There were some excellent responses where candidates showed both clear understanding of the implications of the questions and were able to present analytical arguments which addressed issues directly with relevant, good quality supporting evidence. Some candidates could have improved their responses to source-based **Question 1**. Too often such candidates simply relied on summarising the different sources without reference to their context. There were some essay responses which were fragmentary and very brief. This made it difficult to develop a coherent theme. It was also apparent that some candidates addressed the topic rather than the question and this led to weak relevance and reliance on a purely narrative approach. There were no significant rubric infringements, although some candidates did not answer the required 4 questions. This may have been as a result of time management issues and candidates are reminded that they should divide their time equally between all of the questions.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1: ‘Douglas’s policy of applying the principle of popular sovereignty to the Kansas-Nebraska issue was entirely reasonable.’ Using Sources A-E discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

Most candidates demonstrated an ability to use information taken from the sources to challenge or support the hypothesis. Some took the sources at face value and could only achieve limited marks as a result. A considerable number of candidates agreed with the hypothesis and a more evaluative approach might have improved their responses. The immediate effect of the Kansas-Nebraska Act was serious and lasting splits in both the Whig and Democratic parties and the first attempt in Kansas to apply Douglas’s principle of popular sovereignty resulted in the Border War of 1854-9. It is this sort of contextual background which should be embedded in the candidate’s answer. In Source A some candidates drew attention to who the authors of the Appeal were and commented that some of them, such as Seward, were to be founders of the Republican Party and to play a leading role in the secession crisis of 1860-1. This approach was creditworthy, showing an ability to look beyond content. Source C needed similar contextual appraisal and some candidates recognised this. Buchanan’s whole career had been based on conciliation, compromise and the avoidance of conflict. While these qualities have been praised by some revisionist historians, in his Inaugural Address the President ignored the near civil war which had existed in Kansas since 1854 and which was a direct result of applying popular sovereignty to the issue of slavery extension. There was some evidence that candidates had been persuaded by the reasonable tone of Douglas’s comments in Source C. A few pointed out that he assumed the decision to be slave or free would take place as a result of a normal political process where the losing side would accept defeat. As Source E pointed out, the error he made was that the slavery issue was not just a practical one as he and Buchanan envisaged, but a moral one, arousing very strong feelings. In order to achieve high marks in this question it was necessary to evaluate the material, rather than simply explain the content of the sources. Too often candidates took a sequential approach and missed opportunities for cross-referencing and consideration of context.

Question 2: ‘An aggressive and unjust war.’ To what extent is this is fair assessment of the Mexican War of 1846?

This proved to be a popular question which invited some spirited answers. The most effective responses were consistently analytical and took particular note of the terms ‘aggressive’ and ‘unjust’. A few candidates considered that these terms were open to interpretation. Grant, who served in the war, stated that it was the most unjust war ever fought and a few used this as their starting point. That the war was aggressive was universally argued. James Polk, during his one term Presidency, acquired more territory for the United States than any other President before him. By purchase, acquisition and warfare the territory of the United States increased by 60%. Some answers explained that at one point Polk was threatening war against both Mexico and Great Britain and used this to support their argument that the war was indeed aggressive. The

Oregon dispute was settled leaving Polk free to force a war on Mexico with the aim of enlarging Texas and acquiring California. Many candidates assumed the war was unjust but found it more difficult to define their arguments. Several responses referred to O'Sullivan's doctrine of Manifest Destiny; it was Divine Providence for the US to expand westwards to acquire the whole North American landmass. If this thesis was accepted as reasonable then the war was just. However to do this depends on the assumption that the rights of Mexicans, Indians and Canadians should be disregarded, which is of course highly debatable. Most candidates went on to discuss the consequences of the war which opened up sectional tensions between slave and free states, and where compromises to resolve these proved unsuccessful and led to Civil War. While such comment was often thoughtful and valid, candidates are reminded not to stray too far from the terms of the question. Some responses, which offered only a narrative account of the war, would have been improved by explicit consideration of whether it was aggressive or unjust.

Question 3: Compare Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis as war leaders.

This question was often well answered and most candidates made an attempt at comparison and showed themselves to be reasonably well informed. History favours the winners and Lincoln, who saved the Union and was assassinated at the time of his greatest triumph, attracted most attention in responses. While it was not necessary to provide a perfectly balanced answer, candidates did need to discuss both leaders in order to construct a reasonable argument. The most effective responses were comparative throughout and showed clear appreciation of a range of different features which affected the performance of each as a war leader. The majority of candidates made effective comparisons between the experience and attitude to the military of both men. In 1860 Davis's military experience in Mexico might have suggested that he would be the better qualified war leader of the two. However Lincoln realised that he had no military knowledge and left both strategy and tactics to his chosen generals. He was prepared to dismiss them if they proved ineffective. Davis was inclined to interfere in the conduct of military affairs but always stayed loyal to his generals, even when things were going badly. Lincoln expanded his powers as Commander in Chief to the very limit while Davis did not stand up to the State Governors, which hampered the Confederate war effort considerably. The most perceptive candidates made the political skills of the two relevant to their argument. There were two areas where Lincoln showed much greater political skill. At the start of the war Lincoln insisted that it was not about slavery, but about the integrity of the Union. Here Davis held the moral high ground, for all Confederate States were demanding what the 13 Colonies had demanded from Britain, the right to rebel and to choose a government of their own. Lincoln took the moral ground from under the Confederacy by the Emancipation Proclamation. This gave the Union a clear cut cause to fight for and made it difficult for foreign powers to recognise the Confederacy. Some candidates chose to write the first part of their essay about Lincoln and the second about Davis and, as a result, found it more difficult to compare the two effectively.

Question 4: 'A conscious and successful effort by the more enlightened business groups to guide and control economic and social policies in their own long-term interest.' Is this a valid criticism of the Progressive movement in America in the period 1901-1917?

Too few candidates answered this question to make general comment appropriate.

Question 5: Evaluate Martin Luther King's contribution to the cause of civil rights in the United States in the period 1955-1968.

What was required here was an evaluation of both Dr King and the civil rights movement. While many candidates showed themselves to be very well informed on the topic, a number could have improved their answers by taking note of the key instruction in the question. To evaluate implies consideration of criticism as well as praise and the most effective responses made a clear attempt to balance their argument. Many candidates mentioned King's personality, charisma, determination and inspirational leadership of the civil rights movement. His handling of the media showed great skill; his non violent protests in the South were often illegal and passive resistance meant that the police had to accept breaches of local law or use force to enforce it. Candidates recognised that these protests were both influential in bringing attention to the plight of African-Americans in the south and also for winning white, middle class support. A few responses made the point that the sight of 'Bull' Connor and his fierce dogs attacking women and children on national television did more for civil rights than anything else. Some candidates also considered that King's Christian and non violent philosophy, while very powerful in the south, held little appeal for young Blacks in the urban ghettos of the north. His concentration on civil rights in the narrow political sense (the right to vote and freedom from segregation and discrimination in public institutions) was criticised by figures such as Malcolm X for ignoring poverty, unemployment, bad housing and crime, all of which were prevalent among African-

Americans in cities. Some candidates weakened their responses at this point by dwelling more than necessary on Malcolm X, although a few made the valid comment that extremists frightened people and encouraged them to support King. It was also quite possible to argue that King's contribution has been exaggerated. Whereas he put civil rights on the agenda, President Lyndon Johnson must take much of the credit for driving civil rights into law and then imposing it on State Governors. The role of the Supreme Court was largely overlooked and it could be argued that the implications of the Brown Case (1954) transformed the whole civil rights issue by making those who discriminated against African-Americans into lawbreakers for the first time. Some candidates did not benefit from their knowledge as much as they might have by presenting a narrative account rather than an evaluative and balanced response.

Question 6: 'There was no single New Deal but at least two different and distinct programmes.' How far do you agree with this assessment of FDR's policies?

The best responses made a clear attempt to address the question and made a distinction between phases of the New Deal. The first, in 1933, was developed to restore some degree of stability to the economy and largely covered issues of relief and recovery with legislation such as the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Banking Act. The second, from 1935 to 1937, contained much more radical reforms, for example, retirement pensions for the elderly and an improved legal status for trade unions. Many candidates showed a sound grasp of New Deal legislation but not all used this to good effect. Some responses listed several pieces of legislation, sometimes in great detail and did not consider the New Deal as a whole. Better candidates used their knowledge of New Deal programmes to support their arguments and were able to differentiate between the different phases and intentions of legislation. A few weaker responses gave a background account of the Wall Street Crash and Great Depression and then described the New Deal from 1933 to 1938 as if it were a continuous and coherent set of events.

Question 7: 'Walk softly and carry a big stick.' Is this an accurate statement of Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policies as President, 1901-1909?

Those candidates who took the time to explain what they understood by the comment in the question generally produced the most focused and effective essays. The most common interpretation of Roosevelt's statement was that he would always try to be reasonable and to seek a peaceful solution to a problem, but if this did not work he would not hesitate to use armed force. Many responses demonstrated good knowledge of Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policy. Many commented that it was noticeable that America was not involved in any wars during his presidency. A few responses dealt with the Roosevelt Corollary which expanded the Monroe Doctrine to claim for the United States the right to intervene anywhere in the Americas where there was serious 'wrong doing or instability'. Some answers mentioned Roosevelt's role in the building of the Panama Canal and his being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1904 for his role in mediating between Russia and Japan. Virtually all responses dealt with the Great White Fleet, and a few highlighted that it was a classic example of TR's stated philosophy; it could be interpreted as a gesture of goodwill and peace, but with an implied threat in the background. Some candidates did not do this and their responses tended to become general discussions of foreign policy, rather than maintaining a clear focus on the question.

Question 8: Evaluate the impact of television on American social and political life in the period 1945-1968.

The best responses to this question made an attempt to analyse the impact of television in both elements of the question, although a number of candidates limited their marks by only considering one aspect. The impact on political life was considered by the majority of candidates and the Kennedy-Nixon Debates were discussed. The best responses considered the extent of their influence on Kennedy's narrow victory in the 1960 Presidential election. Some candidates discussed the impact of television on the Vietnam War and were aware that, unlike Korea, the war was fought out on nationwide television screens from 1963 onwards. It was impossible to censure the coverage and the effect on the American public was profound, leading to Johnson standing down as President in 1968. The social effects of television were more pervasive although not as well covered by many candidates. TV gave a huge boost to the advertising industry and its effect on popular entertainment was quite dramatic. Many candidates seemed to think that watching TV encouraged family life, but there is no real evidence of this. It certainly played an important part in the wave of student radicalism in the 1960s. A number of candidates who answered this question confined themselves to general observations about the role of television and therefore could only achieve limited marks.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

General comments

There were some excellent responses where candidates showed both clear understanding of the implications of the questions and were able to present analytical arguments which addressed issues directly with relevant, good quality supporting evidence. Some candidates could have improved their responses to source-based **Question 1**. Too often such candidates simply relied on summarising the different sources without reference to their context. There were some essay responses which were fragmentary and very brief. This made it difficult to develop a coherent theme. It was also apparent that some candidates addressed the topic rather than the question and this led to weak relevance and reliance on a purely narrative approach. There were no significant rubric infringements, although some candidates did not answer the required 4 questions. This may have been as a result of time management issues and candidates are reminded that they should divide their time equally between all of the questions.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1: ‘Douglas’s policy of applying the principle of popular sovereignty to the Kansas-Nebraska issue was entirely reasonable.’ Using Sources A-E discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

Most candidates demonstrated an ability to use information taken from the sources to challenge or support the hypothesis. Some took the sources at face value and could only achieve limited marks as a result. A considerable number of candidates agreed with the hypothesis and a more evaluative approach might have improved their responses. The immediate effect of the Kansas-Nebraska Act was serious and lasting splits in both the Whig and Democratic parties and the first attempt in Kansas to apply Douglas’s principle of popular sovereignty resulted in the Border War of 1854-9. It is this sort of contextual background which should be embedded in the candidate’s answer. In Source A some candidates drew attention to who the authors of the Appeal were and commented that some of them, such as Seward, were to be founders of the Republican Party and to play a leading role in the secession crisis of 1860-1. This approach was creditworthy, showing an ability to look beyond content. Source C needed similar contextual appraisal and some candidates recognised this. Buchanan’s whole career had been based on conciliation, compromise and the avoidance of conflict. While these qualities have been praised by some revisionist historians, in his Inaugural Address the President ignored the near civil war which had existed in Kansas since 1854 and which was a direct result of applying popular sovereignty to the issue of slavery extension. There was some evidence that candidates had been persuaded by the reasonable tone of Douglas’s comments in Source C. A few pointed out that he assumed the decision to be slave or free would take place as a result of a normal political process where the losing side would accept defeat. As Source E pointed out, the error he made was that the slavery issue was not just a practical one as he and Buchanan envisaged, but a moral one, arousing very strong feelings. In order to achieve high marks in this question it was necessary to evaluate the material, rather than simply explain the content of the sources. Too often candidates took a sequential approach and missed opportunities for cross-referencing and consideration of context.

Question 2: ‘An aggressive and unjust war.’ To what extent is this is fair assessment of the Mexican War of 1846?

This proved to be a popular question which invited some spirited answers. The most effective responses were consistently analytical and took particular note of the terms ‘aggressive’ and ‘unjust’. A few candidates considered that these terms were open to interpretation. Grant, who served in the war, stated that it was the most unjust war ever fought and a few used this as their starting point. That the war was aggressive was universally argued. James Polk, during his one term Presidency, acquired more territory for the United States than any other President before him. By purchase, acquisition and warfare the territory of the United States increased by 60%. Some answers explained that at one point Polk was threatening war against both

Mexico and Great Britain and used this to support their argument that the war was indeed aggressive. The Oregon dispute was settled leaving Polk free to force a war on Mexico with the aim of enlarging Texas and acquiring California. Many candidates assumed the war was unjust but found it more difficult to define their arguments. Several responses referred to O'Sullivan's doctrine of Manifest Destiny; it was Divine Providence for the US to expand westwards to acquire the whole North American landmass. If this thesis was accepted as reasonable then the war was just. However to do this depends on the assumption that the rights of Mexicans, Indians and Canadians should be disregarded, which is of course highly debatable. Most candidates went on to discuss the consequences of the war which opened up sectional tensions between slave and free states, and where compromises to resolve these proved unsuccessful and led to Civil War. While such comment was often thoughtful and valid, candidates are reminded not to stray too far from the terms of the question. Some responses, which offered only a narrative account of the war, would have been improved by explicit consideration of whether it was aggressive or unjust.

Question 3: Compare Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis as war leaders.

This question was often well answered and most candidates made an attempt at comparison and showed themselves to be reasonably well informed. History favours the winners and Lincoln, who saved the Union and was assassinated at the time of his greatest triumph, attracted most attention in responses. While it was not necessary to provide a perfectly balanced answer, candidates did need to discuss both leaders in order to construct a reasonable argument. The most effective responses were comparative throughout and showed clear appreciation of a range of different features which affected the performance of each as a war leader. The majority of candidates made effective comparisons between the experience and attitude to the military of both men. In 1860 Davis's military experience in Mexico might have suggested that he would be the better qualified war leader of the two. However Lincoln realised that he had no military knowledge and left both strategy and tactics to his chosen generals. He was prepared to dismiss them if they proved ineffective. Davis was inclined to interfere in the conduct of military affairs but always stayed loyal to his generals, even when things were going badly. Lincoln expanded his powers as Commander in Chief to the very limit while Davis did not stand up to the State Governors, which hampered the Confederate war effort considerably. The most perceptive candidates made the political skills of the two relevant to their argument. There were two areas where Lincoln showed much greater political skill. At the start of the war Lincoln insisted that it was not about slavery, but about the integrity of the Union. Here Davis held the moral high ground, for all Confederate States were demanding what the 13 Colonies had demanded from Britain, the right to rebel and to choose a government of their own. Lincoln took the moral ground from under the Confederacy by the Emancipation Proclamation. This gave the Union a clear cut cause to fight for and made it difficult for foreign powers to recognise the Confederacy. Some candidates chose to write the first part of their essay about Lincoln and the second about Davis and, as a result, found it more difficult to compare the two effectively.

Question 4: 'A conscious and successful effort by the more enlightened business groups to guide and control economic and social policies in their own long-term interest.' Is this a valid criticism of the Progressive movement in America in the period 1901-1917?

Too few candidates answered this question to make general comment appropriate.

Question 5: Evaluate Martin Luther King's contribution to the cause of civil rights in the United States in the period 1955-1968.

What was required here was an evaluation of both Dr King and the civil rights movement. While many candidates showed themselves to be very well informed on the topic, a number could have improved their answers by taking note of the key instruction in the question. To evaluate implies consideration of criticism as well as praise and the most effective responses made a clear attempt to balance their argument. Many candidates mentioned King's personality, charisma, determination and inspirational leadership of the civil rights movement. His handling of the media showed great skill; his non violent protests in the South were often illegal and passive resistance meant that the police had to accept breaches of local law or use force to enforce it. Candidates recognised that these protests were both influential in bringing attention to the plight of African-Americans in the south and also for winning white, middle class support. A few responses made the point that the sight of 'Bull' Connor and his fierce dogs attacking women and children on national television did more for civil rights than anything else. Some candidates also considered that King's Christian and non violent philosophy, while very powerful in the south, held little appeal for young Blacks in the urban ghettos of the north. His concentration on civil rights in the narrow political sense (the right to vote and freedom from segregation and discrimination in public institutions) was criticised by figures such as Malcolm

X for ignoring poverty, unemployment, bad housing and crime, all of which were prevalent among African-Americans in cities. Some candidates weakened their responses at this point by dwelling more than necessary on Malcolm X, although a few made the valid comment that extremists frightened people and encouraged them to support King. It was also quite possible to argue that King's contribution has been exaggerated. Whereas he put civil rights on the agenda, President Lyndon Johnson must take much of the credit for driving civil rights into law and then imposing it on State Governors. The role of the Supreme Court was largely overlooked and it could be argued that the implications of the Brown Case (1954) transformed the whole civil rights issue by making those who discriminated against African-Americans into lawbreakers for the first time. Some candidates did not benefit from their knowledge as much as they might have by presenting a narrative account rather than an evaluative and balanced response.

Question 6: 'There was no single New Deal but at least two different and distinct programmes.' How far do you agree with this assessment of FDR's policies?

The best responses made a clear attempt to address the question and made a distinction between phases of the New Deal. The first, in 1933, was developed to restore some degree of stability to the economy and largely covered issues of relief and recovery with legislation such as the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Banking Act. The second, from 1935 to 1937, contained much more radical reforms, for example, retirement pensions for the elderly and an improved legal status for trade unions. Many candidates showed a sound grasp of New Deal legislation but not all used this to good effect. Some responses listed several pieces of legislation, sometimes in great detail and did not consider the New Deal as a whole. Better candidates used their knowledge of New Deal programmes to support their arguments and were able to differentiate between the different phases and intentions of legislation. A few weaker responses gave a background account of the Wall Street Crash and Great Depression and then described the New Deal from 1933 to 1938 as if it were a continuous and coherent set of events.

Question 7: 'Walk softly and carry a big stick.' Is this an accurate statement of Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policies as President, 1901-1909?

Those candidates who took the time to explain what they understood by the comment in the question generally produced the most focused and effective essays. The most common interpretation of Roosevelt's statement was that he would always try to be reasonable and to seek a peaceful solution to a problem, but if this did not work he would not hesitate to use armed force. Many responses demonstrated good knowledge of Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policy. Many commented that it was noticeable that America was not involved in any wars during his presidency. A few responses dealt with the Roosevelt Corollary which expanded the Monroe Doctrine to claim for the United States the right to intervene anywhere in the Americas where there was serious 'wrong doing or instability'. Some answers mentioned Roosevelt's role in the building of the Panama Canal and his being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1904 for his role in mediating between Russia and Japan. Virtually all responses dealt with the Great White Fleet, and a few highlighted that it was a classic example of TR's stated philosophy; it could be interpreted as a gesture of goodwill and peace, but with an implied threat in the background. Some candidates did not do this and their responses tended to become general discussions of foreign policy, rather than maintaining a clear focus on the question.

Question 8: Evaluate the impact of television on American social and political life in the period 1945-1968.

The best responses to this question made an attempt to analyse the impact of television in both elements of the question, although a number of candidates limited their marks by only considering one aspect. The impact on political life was considered by the majority of candidates and the Kennedy-Nixon Debates were discussed. The best responses considered the extent of their influence on Kennedy's narrow victory in the 1960 Presidential election. Some candidates discussed the impact of television on the Vietnam War and were aware that, unlike Korea, the war was fought out on nationwide television screens from 1963 onwards. It was impossible to censure the coverage and the effect on the American public was profound, leading to Johnson standing down as President in 1968. The social effects of television were more pervasive although not as well covered by many candidates. TV gave a huge boost to the advertising industry and its effect on popular entertainment was quite dramatic. Many candidates seemed to think that watching TV encouraged family life, but there is no real evidence of this. It certainly played an important part in the wave of student radicalism in the 1960s. A number of candidates who answered this question confined themselves to general observations about the role of television and therefore could only achieve limited marks.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

General Comments

There were no rubric infringements and all candidates answered 4 questions as required. The general standard was excellent and the majority of candidates demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding, along with an ability to focus their answers on the requirements of the questions. The best essays were analytical and used relevant supporting detail in a skilled manner. A number of candidates achieved consistently high standards across all of their responses.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1: 'The sectional conflict which led to the Civil War was about the clash of competing economic interests.' Using Sources A-E discuss how far the evidence supports this explanation of the causes of the Civil War.

This was competently answered by most candidates, indeed some produced excellent responses. The best were fully focused on interpreting the sources in their context, often in a highly perceptive way. A few candidates were content to summarise and analyse the sources without reference to their historical context and achieved only limited marks as a result. The concept of 'slavery' presented problems to some who overlooked its inherent ambiguity. In Source A, by Jefferson Davis, slavery is treated as a purely economic concept, while Congressman Wade (Source C) treats it as a social phenomenon with a strongly moral dimension. The majority of candidates who rejected the hypothesis favoured slavery as the cause of the Civil War, but in doing so invariably concentrated on the social, political and moral questions arising from it rather than the economic ones. Most candidates overlooked that Seward was a rival to Lincoln and had challenged him for the Republican nomination for the Presidency. In Source C a few candidates pointed out that Wade's comment that *'we of the North with a few disgraceful exceptions are all abolitionists at heart'* was simply untrue. The reality was more accurately expressed in Source E; most Northerners were indifferent to the slavery question. Several candidates produced alternative hypotheses and where these were based firmly on evidence from the sources, and after a discussion of context and cross-referencing between sources, they were able to achieve high marks. A few candidates argued that inserting the word 'mainly' into the hypothesis would present a more acceptable statement.

Question 2: How far was the displacement of the Native American nations and the destruction of their way of life a consequence of deliberate government policy in the period 1840-1896?

This question was often answered very well and most candidates were able to support their points with detailed and relevant material. Some candidates ignored the commencement date of 1840, sometimes giving very detailed discussion of Jackson's aggressive, illegal and expulsive policies toward Native Americans in the 1830s. This could well have been used as a starting point in a brief introductory paragraph. Better candidates focused on the doctrine of Manifest Destiny which ignored the rights of Native Americans and Mexicans standing in the way of expansion. The importance of railroads was correctly highlighted in cutting through Nations' territory and encouraging migration. Virtually all candidates discussed the deliberate extermination of the buffalo herds on which Native Americans depended for their way of life. Divisions between the Nations were often correctly cited and it was frequently noted that any disputes between Nations and settlers were resolved in favour of the latter. The distinction between State and Federal governments was made by a number of candidates who pointed out the former was much less sympathetic to Native Americans. Very few candidates mentioned the numerous Plains Wars in which the Nations tried unsuccessfully to defend their heritage. Some candidates agreed with the assertion in the question but the majority argued that neglect and the failure to protect the Native Americans were far more important.

Question 3: How far was the battle of Gettysburg the key turning point of the Civil War?

Candidates were evenly divided into agreeing or opposing the contention of the question. Most candidates correctly pointed out that until Gettysburg the military struggle had been in favour of the Confederacy. It was Davis's intention to make a peace offer to the Union had the battle been won by Lee. Following the very heavy casualties the Confederate army suffered it was impossible for Lee to continue an offensive strategy and he was compelled to rely on defensive tactics, hoping to wear down the Union's will to fight on. A common argument put forward was that the Union's victory was inevitable from the outset because of its greater superiority in manpower, industrial production, railways and naval forces. This line of argument overlooked the fact that the Confederacy was able to continue the war for another 21 months. Candidates correctly pointed to the increase in Union morale following the victory, but by mid 1864 this had been replaced by war weariness and the distinct possibility of Lincoln losing the Presidential election. Nearly all candidates were aware that following Gettysburg British and French recognition of the Confederacy was no longer a serious possibility. A number of candidates mentioned the Union victory at Vicksburg, the day after Gettysburg, as the most significant turning point as it effectively cut the Confederacy in half, disrupting its internal lines of communication.

Question 4: Which of the three 'Progressive' Presidents was the most successful in tackling American social and economic problems in the period 1901-1917?

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

Question 5: Why did it take so long to secure effective implementation of African-American civil rights in the period 1895-1968?

Candidates showed good awareness of a range of relevant issues and many explained how legalised segregation and features such as the 'Jim Crow' laws made it difficult to secure civil rights. A large number of candidates also pointed out that African-Americans themselves were slow in getting organised and were divided in tactics. Virtually all candidates highlighted the key importance of the Brown decision in the Supreme Court in 1954. Some perceptive responses identified that a key element in assisting civil rights was the negative publicity given to discrimination in education in the Deep South during the height of the Cold War. This weakened America's claim to be a nation wedded to democratic ideals and it was probably this factor which caused President Eisenhower to intervene in the Little Rock crisis. The rights of the former slaves had been spelled out explicitly in the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution, but to make these rights meaningful required effective policies from all three branches of the government and also implementation at all levels of the political system. A number of candidates either spent too long detailing the repressive measures taken by the former Confederate States to deny rights, or on the negative role of the Supreme Court, to the exclusion of other factors. The reality was that for different reasons there was no political will from any of the key groups in the political process to assist African-Americans. Presidents were either indifferent to the issue, hostile (Woodrow Wilson) or subordinated Civil Rights to other issues (FDR). A number of candidates failed to consider that the persistence of generalised racism in the North meant that little interest was shown by voters to the plight of the black minority. While candidates correctly highlighted the Ku Klux Klan's revival in the 1920s as a factor this was not a key element in the situation from the 1930s onwards.

Question 6: Which groups benefited the most and which the least from FDR's New Deal policies in the period 1933-1941?

This question was reasonably well answered. Nearly all candidates gave a structured balance sheet on broadly correct lines and maintained an analytical approach. The beneficiaries of the New Deal were stated correctly to be the unemployed (though by 1937 unemployment was still very high), labour unions which were given legal status for the first time and farmers who were supported by a variety of measures to boost farm incomes. Better answers gave prominence to regional policy with the Tennessee Valley Authority transforming an impoverished area of the country. A few candidates acknowledged that the banking system itself was a beneficiary as without the early measures of the New Deal it would have collapsed. Many candidates gave the Democratic Party as a beneficiary and although this was not a 'group' there was a valuable insight in this approach. The losers were African-Americans and Native Americans and in the case of the former, ingrained racism meant they were usually the last to be hired and the first to be fired, hence suffered particularly in times of high unemployment. Some New Deal legislation excluded African-Americans; the Fair Labour Standards Act omitted domestic servants, the majority of whom were female and of African-American origin. The AAA also meant reduced opportunities for share-croppers. Upper income earners regarded themselves as losers although, as many candidates pointed out, this may have been self-

deception. Some candidates offered a narrative of New Deal policies. Such responses tended to be less effective as they often became sidetracked in providing details of legislation rather than maintaining a clear focus on the question.

Question 7: Why, in spite of its stated policy of neutrality, did the United States enter World War I?

This question was well answered. The best responses discussed a range of reasons and evaluated their relative significance. Candidates showed detailed knowledge of the main features of the evolution of US policy and showed a good awareness that by 1914 the United States was a Great Power. It was also the world's largest industrial economy and by 1918 it had been transformed, as a result of war, to the world's largest creditor nation. Many candidates considered that in this context the US, though neutral, had to have an active policy towards European events. This took two forms; huge loans amounting to two billion dollars to the Allies, and active steps by President Wilson to mediate a negotiated peace. A German victory, as nearly all candidates pointed out, would have meant that the vast American loans to the Allies would be, in practice, forfeited. Many candidates commented that from the outset there were influential voices calling for US involvement on the side of the Allies, particularly former President Roosevelt. Wilson had been shocked by Germany's deliberate violation of Belgian neutrality and among the elites opinion was much more sympathetic to the Allies. As early as April 1916 Wilson had given an ultimatum to the German government threatening the severance of diplomatic relations. Most candidates pointed out the effect of the two Russian revolutions of 1917 which ended Russian autocracy and resulted in a collapse of the Russian military. Once German troops were shifted to the Western Front victory over the Allies was highly likely. As far as many candidates were concerned the decisive factor was that from 1915 onwards Americans had been enraged by the sinking of British passenger ships with loss of American lives. In January 1917 Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare. The final impetus to American entry was the publication of the Zimmerman telegram urging Mexico to declare war on the United States and promising financial and other support from Germany. Some candidates presented a narrative account and could have improved their responses with more consistent evaluation.

Question 8: How far is it correct to say there was a serious urban crisis in America in the 1960s?

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