

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

Key Messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went further than providing summaries (such as ‘Source A says that...Source B says that...’) and used the sources to frame an argument. The most effective responses evaluated and grouped the sources according to the degree to which they supported the hypothesis.

Section B: Candidates are advised to plan their answers briefly. They should note the key instructions in the questions (such as ‘Analyse’ and ‘How far?’) and pay attention to any dates in the question.

General Comments

The general quality of the candidates’ work was similar to that of previous years. Most candidates used their time effectively and answered four questions, as was required. The time for the examination (3 hours) allowed candidates to make brief notes or plans for each of their answers. In **Question 1**, it was helpful to candidates to note how far each source agreed or disagreed with the stated hypothesis that Russian policy before World War I was peaceful. Good responses included brief comments about the reliability of the sources and added contextual knowledge to develop or evaluate the points.

In **Section B**, making a plan encouraged candidates to note the key instructions and key dates. Likewise they helped candidates to organise their answers, for example by putting the most important points first and discussing these in an orderly manner. When reading some weaker answers, it was apparent these had not been planned because some points were repeated while others were omitted. The most important quality in answers to questions in this section was relevance. For example, **Question 2** asked ‘How far did Napoleon Bonaparte achieve his aims in domestic policies?’ It was apparent that the general topic was Napoleon Bonaparte but the key issue on which the question was set was his domestic policies and particularly the achievement of his aims. Therefore answers needed to explain these aims. The key instruction was ‘how far’ Napoleon achieved his aims. Answers that described his policies only went part of the way towards writing a good response. For example, some candidates were given credit for accurate knowledge of the Code Napoleon but others were given more credit when they linked the terms of the Code to Napoleon’s aims.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The key issue was Russia’s policy before World War I. Most of the better answers grouped the sources and compared them, whereas less effective responses often surveyed the sources in sequence and did not attempt to distinguish between them. Another feature of the most effective responses was that they evaluated the sources. Lower marks were awarded when the sources were accepted at face value. For example, Source D was often said to be reliable without further explanation. More thoughtful candidates asked whether it was true that William II made every effort to mediate between Austria and Russia. The Kaiser was concerned about Russia’s military preparations but Germany had its own war plans. Credit was given when candidates looked at the provenance and text of Source E instead of merely asserting that it must, or must not, be reliable because it was a secondary source. Some very good candidates noted that its criticisms of Russia were printed at a time when the large majority of opinions pinned most of the blame for World War I on Germany, then on Austria. It was helpful when candidates wrote an overall opinion in their conclusion rather than concluding by repeating the general stance of individual sources.

Section B

Question 2

The question required candidates to consider how far Napoleon Bonaparte achieved his aims in domestic policies. The majority of responses explained Napoleon's aims. Less successful answers tended to be more general and assessed his success without reference to his aims. Better responses referred to his failures because the question asked how far he achieved his aims. For example, he was successful in gaining and retaining control of France but he was not completely successful in improving the French economy. The question was based on Napoleon's domestic policies but a number of answers considered foreign affairs at some length. A very brief mention of external developments to compare the level of success with his achievements at home was allowable but an extended discussion of Napoleon's foreign policies was not necessary and candidates were not expected to include this aspect.

Question 3

The key issue was the reasons why the Industrial Revolution affected Britain before France and Germany. It was not necessary to achieve an even balance between Britain, France and Germany but responses did need a basic knowledge and understanding of the continental countries. The standard of the discussions of Britain was usually sound and a satisfactory proportion of answers made adequate references to France and Germany. For example, there were some effective contrasts between their economies and the British economy which encouraged individual enterprise by merchants and investors. Some candidates claimed that France had no natural resources. In fact France's major problem was access to materials because of a poor transport system. For example, there was plenty of coal but internal tariffs and poor roads inhibited its easy transport across the regions. Many candidates were aware of the problems in Germany caused by political divisions. The Zollverein was very important in marking a change to a united country. It showed the economic advantages that could come through union but also underlined the importance of Prussia.

Question 4

Candidates were required to make an assessment of the revolutions of 1848-49 in the process which produced a united Germany by 1871. The most effective essays made links between the mid-century revolutions and final unification in 1871 and emphasised either the similarities or the differences between them. For example, some candidates claimed that 1848 was a failure but noted that it underlined the fact that Prussia was the only state that could unify Germany. Germany lacked a national army in 1848 and this also pointed to the importance of Prussia. The failure of the Frankfurt Parliament and the contrast with Bismarck's methods were also discussed by many candidates. The reasons for the failure of the Liberals were compared to the success of Bismarck's more realistic policies. Answers were rewarded when they explained how the 1848 revolutions revealed the limits of German nationalism, a factor that Bismarck recognised later. Some weaker responses did not make any links between 1848 and 1871, either positively or negatively, and wrote restricted narratives of Bismarck's unification of Germany.

Question 5

The key issue was whether political or economic reasons were more important in causing imperial expansion. It was possible to note in a brief conclusion that there were also other reasons for imperialism, such as religion and Social Darwinism, but these were outside the main limits of the question. An important characteristic of the best responses was the inclusion of examples. A number of weaker answers only referred to very large regions such as Africa or Asia. Circumstances in the French colonies in the north of Africa were very different from the British colonies in the south and general references to Africa were unhelpful. On the other hand, more effective responses noted that different motives applied to different regions and supported this point by giving various examples. The question asked candidates to refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in their answer. Better answers responded to this instruction whereas weaker responses were sometimes unclear about which country they were referring to. The general standard of the answers was sound and a number of candidates presented very well informed and balanced arguments which remained focused on the question throughout. A few candidates wrote sound accounts of political and economic interests but could have improved their responses if they had taken a step further and reached a judgement on which were the more important.

Question 6

Candidates were asked to consider why Nicholas II survived a revolution in 1905 but not in February 1917. The best answers generally achieved a reasonable balance between 1905 and 1917. They also focused on explanations, considering why the outcomes of the revolutions were different. Less effective essays often presented a narrative account of the revolutions but did not explain the reasons for their very different impact on Nicholas II. For example, the role of the army in 1905 and 1917 presented a contrast and some of the best responses explained why the army deserted the Tsar. Good answers went on to show other reasons why Nicholas II was isolated in 1917. There were some effective accounts of the failure of Nicholas II's policies from 1906. These showed how and why the Tsar resorted to reactionary policies after the October Manifesto having promised a reforming programme. Some candidates could have been more accurate about developments in 1917. There was a tendency to exaggerate the importance of Lenin and the Bolsheviks in February (for example Lenin returned from exile to Russia after the February Revolution) or to confuse the events of the February and October revolutions.

Question 7

The question required consideration of the similarities and differences between the methods used by Mussolini and Hitler to keep themselves in power to 1939. The standard of the answers was usually sound and many essays were well organised and well informed. They were balanced between Mussolini and Hitler and focused on comparisons and contrasts. Almost all responses recorded the main aspects of their policies but the less successful often limited the comparisons to brief and general statements such as *'Therefore it can be seen that their methods were very similar.'* The more effective responses dealt with aspects of policy in turn, explaining similarities and differences clearly. For example, they considered the political issues. They explained the extent to which Hitler and Mussolini were repressive. Most candidates explained their use of propaganda. Some aspects could have been improved. The dictators' methods of handling the economy could have been explained more fully. While many candidates made relevant points about Mussolini's 'battles', fewer dealt with Hitler and the German economy. Some essays were very impressive in their handling of religion and the Roman Catholic Church in particular.

Question 8

Candidates were asked whether the working classes benefited more from industrialisation or Liberalism in the nineteenth century. The factor that discriminated most frequently between sound and moderate answers was the way in which they dealt with Liberalism. It was helpful when candidates provided a brief explanation of this. The question asked candidates to refer to two countries from Britain, France and Germany in their answers. The references did not have to be detailed but they needed to show that the answers were underpinned with specific knowledge and were not merely assertive. For example, Liberalism gave the working classes the vote by the end of the nineteenth century, although they were not the dominant political group in any country. Some candidates avoided making a decision about which element benefited the working classes more and only wrote descriptive accounts. Their answers could not be given high marks. On the other hand there were some analytical essays which went beyond description and incorporated judgements.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

Key Messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went further than providing summaries (such as 'Source A says that...Source B says that...') and used the sources to frame an argument. The most effective responses evaluated and grouped the sources according to the degree to which they supported the hypothesis.

Section B: Candidates are advised to plan their answers briefly. They should note the key instructions in the questions (such as 'Analyse' and 'How far?') and pay attention to any dates in the question.

General Comments

Candidates' work in this component was generally satisfactory. Some of it was very good showed a sound grasp of relevant material. Almost all candidates attempted the required four questions. The most successful wrote well organised answers that used their knowledge to support and demonstrate their understanding.

Perhaps the most important quality that is needed to achieve the higher levels is relevance. Candidates should check continually, asking themselves 'Why does this point contribute to the argument?', 'Have I covered all of the most significant issues in the question?' Effective organisation is key and the answers should discuss the most important points first, then the less important issues.

The first part of the question paper was **Section A** which contained the source-based question. High marks were awarded when candidates went beyond comprehension of the extracts to show an understanding of the sources and their application to the question. They showed which sources agreed with each other and which disagreed. Using the sources and contextual knowledge, they came to an overall judgement. **Section B** contained a selection of essay questions. The most successful candidates presented their arguments in an organised way, considered a series of factors and explained which were the most convincing. The arguments were supported by relevant knowledge. A good proportion of candidates were able to reach a sound standard in meeting these requirements.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The key issue in this source based question was the extent of Britain's responsibility for World War I. The better responses grouped the sources according to the extent to which they supported or challenged the hypothesis in the question. Weaker responses tended to deal with the sources in sequence and provided summaries which were only occasionally linked to the question. For example, Source A clearly supported the claim that Britain was most responsible and could be backed up with evidence from Source E. Sources C and D took a very different line. The best answers evaluated the sources by cross-referring between them, considering their provenance and using contextual knowledge. For example, Source A showed the intemperate tendencies of Kaiser William II while Source C portrayed the nationalist stance of a newspaper. Perhaps the most surprising opinion was the view of Source D which acquitted Britain of blame even though it was written by a German historian. A question that might be asked by candidates in evaluating a source is what the purpose of the writer was. The general standard of the answers was satisfactory and there were many which deserved high marks.

Section B

Question 2

Candidates were asked to consider whether the most serious problems of the ancien régime were financial or political. Most dealt with the financial aspect very well indeed, explaining the wider issues affecting the financial problems of France and broadening the discussion beyond the taxation system. For example, they explained the efforts to improve the situation made by Calonne and Necker. The most frequent discriminating factor was success in dealing with the political problems of the ancien régime. The most successful candidates showed a good understanding of the political system in France and the reasons why it caused problems. The country was ruled by an absolute king in the eighteenth century but neither Louis XV nor Louis XVI had the qualities that were needed to make an effective governor. The former was lazy and uninterested in reform while the latter was easily influenced by reactionary elements. Many candidates recognised that France lacked the political institutions that might have brought efficiency to the administration. The *parlements* were self-centred, resisted change and opposed the efforts of some of the controllers-general to introduce reforms. The best answers achieved a good balance between both aspects. Many concluded that political problems were the most serious as they were at least partly responsible for the financial situation.

Question 3

The key issue was whether the Industrial Revolution did more to strengthen or weaken the governing classes by the end of the nineteenth century. The question directed candidates to refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in their answers. The reason for this was to deter vague responses. Some weaker essays contained general accounts of industrialisation that referred to all classes or to no class in particular. By contrast, it was encouraging to read answers that were well focused. Most answers were satisfactory and contained some relevant detail and arguments. The most effective responses provided balanced accounts of strength and weakness and came to a considered judgement about which was more important. For example, some of the nobility appreciated the financial gain that could result from involvement in industrialisation, especially in Britain. They invested money or owned land that was rich in useful natural resources. By contrast, most of the nobles in France and Germany were less willing to involve themselves in new ventures and preferred to maintain their traditional interests in land. The most perceptive responses recognised that the governing classes were being challenged by the end of the nineteenth century (to some degree at least) by a rising middle class, while the working class gained the franchise in each of the three specified countries.

Question 4

The question required consideration of the reasons why many European rulers in the period from 1815 to 1849 believed that liberalism and nationalism were dangerous. It was important to keep to the key period and most candidates noted the dates mentioned in the question. In the most effective responses candidates distinguished between liberalism and nationalism. Some answers understood the general political developments in the relevant period but were less certain about the aspects mentioned in the question, especially liberalism. The majority of candidates drew their examples from Germany and Italy, which was entirely acceptable. There were also some very sound discussions of Metternich. Many answers explained that support for liberalism and nationalism varied in different regions within Germany and Italy. A number of established rulers feared that they would lose their power and believed that traditional values were threatened.

Question 5

The key issue was the extent to which European countries achieved their imperial aims by 1914. Answers were given credit when they explained these aims. Some excellent answers were aware of limits to achievements. For example, Germany had ambitions to become a world power through its colonies but, as a late starter in the imperial race, could only move into small and economically profitless regions. By the end of the nineteenth century, it was still building a larger navy but was returning to a Europe-centred foreign policy. Italy's few overseas gains did not make it a world power. France had to be content with parts of Africa that were mostly arid and made limited gains in Asia. They did not compensate for the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. A number of responses noted that even Britain began to lose its enthusiasm for imperial expansion after the second Boer War. Candidates were given greater credit when they supported their argument with appropriate overseas examples. Answers in the lower mark bands were often uncertain about aims and these were expressed very generally.

Question 6

The majority of candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the events in Russia that led to the February Revolution. Most answers addressed the key issue of whether the Tsar's incompetence was the main contributing factor. However, some answers were weakened because candidates were confused about developments. For example, some did not distinguish between the February and October revolutions. The role of the Bolshevik radicals in February was often exaggerated. On the other hand, there were sound appraisals of the Tsar's role in the short term, such as his poor leadership of the war effort, and longer term issues, such as his unwillingness to support reforms after the 1905 Revolution that might have saved his position. Overall, the quality of the answers was competent.

Question 7

The key issue was the extent to which Hitler's government of Germany to 1939 was totalitarian. Almost all of the answers were relevant and demonstrated sound knowledge of Hitler's regime. Those candidates who defined their terms and explained explicitly what was meant by totalitarianism often did very well. Weaker answers tended to show adequate knowledge but less ability to use it effectively to form an argument. The most successful essays not only described Germany's one-party state but also explained Hitler's personal position as Führer. This put him beyond the limits of any laws. These candidates also showed a broad grasp of the policies that he controlled, including the political, social, economic and religious elements. Many recognised that totalitarianism justified persecution of anybody who was outside the system. It also helps to explain why Hitler's popularity continued in spite of his harsh methods. Most of the answers were sound.

Question 8

Candidates were asked to consider why Russia remained less industrialised than Britain and Germany during the period to 1914. The quality of the answers was variable. Some addressed a number of reasons for the differences and contained sound knowledge and clear judgement. The best answers explained why economic change was so difficult. The tsars were not interested in industrialisation and gave little support to those who advocated economic reform. Also the tsars were backed by the most important sections of society. Russia had a very small middle class that might have supported industrial innovation. The nobility and the Russian Orthodox Church were reactionary. They believed that industrialisation might introduce changes that would threaten traditional values and practices. Examples that contrasted Russia with Britain and Germany were rewarded. A number of responses provided descriptive accounts of the economy in tsarist Russia. Weaker answers often did not get beyond general assertions and there was often little comparison of Russia and the two other countries mentioned in the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

Key Messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went further than providing summaries (such as 'Source A says that...Source B says that...') and used the sources to frame an argument. The most effective responses evaluated and grouped the sources according to the degree to which they supported the hypothesis.

Section B: Candidates are advised to plan their answers briefly. They should note the key instructions in the questions (such as 'Analyse' and 'How far?') and pay attention to any dates in the question.

General Comments

The majority of answers gained very similar marks for **Section A** as they did for the essays in **Section B**. Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding and were able to support their responses with relevant detail. The time was sufficient for most candidates to write four complete answers.

One of the characteristics of the better answers is that they looked for alternative explanations. For example, in **Question 1**, they considered why it might be thought that Austria acted in self-defence in 1914 and also why the claim might be denied. In **Question 2**, both sides of the argument that Napoleon was and was not an absolute ruler were examined. In both cases it was important to come to a conclusion. Assertions such as 'It is difficult to decide whether...' should be avoided because they can be applied to any question and the task of all candidates is to decide which view is more important. Successful candidates show their abilities when they consider and explain different judgements and show which is preferred. It is not intended that candidates should identify a 'right' answer, but it is important to show that alternatives have been considered and that judgements can be supported.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were given five sources and were asked how far they agreed with the hypothesis that Austria acted in self-defence in 1914. Credit was given when candidates grouped the sources. This was more worthwhile than a sequential and indiscriminating answer. Sources A and B were clearly pro-Austrian but there was also an element of sympathy in Source D. (*'Austria was more responsible in the short term for the outbreak of World War I than any other country.'*) Sources C and E were generally considered together as anti-Austrian writings. Better answers assessed the reliability of the sources by looking at their provenance. For example, Source A was a diplomatic report but it recorded only anti-Austrian sentiments. Sources B and C were both written by heads of state but their intention was to seek support, not to give unbiased views. The best responses supplemented their explanation of the sources with relevant contextual knowledge. Those responses which relied too heavily on knowledge, made very little use of the sources and presented general accounts of the developments that led to World War I were of limited relevance to the question. The vast majority of candidates recognised that this was a source-based exercise and responded accordingly.

Section B

Question 2

Candidates were asked to consider whether Napoleon Bonaparte was the absolute ruler of France. Many made a strong case in favour of the claim. From 1799 Napoleon was the only Consul who mattered. His

power was confirmed when he became Emperor. Many candidates described his policies accurately but the more successful responses linked these policies to the issue of his absolutism. For example, he appointed directly or indirectly the officials who governed France. The Code Napoleon reflected his preferred programme for France. He used censorship and a powerful police system. The propaganda of statues, public buildings and newspapers enhanced his power. On the other hand, there were pockets of resistance containing some Jacobin and royalist supporters that he had to treat carefully and the best responses included a discussion of such limitations to his power.

Question 3

The key issue was an analysis of the most important differences between pre-industrial and industrial societies. To merit a high mark, it was important to refer to specific developments in two of Britain, France and Germany. The best responses took a directly comparative approach. Some moderate essays contained only sequential surveys that contained implied, rather than explicit, comparisons. Most candidates showed some understanding of issues and a large number wrote carefully argued and effectively supported accounts. There were different ways of organising answers, each of which was justifiable as long as they concentrated on similarities and differences. For example, some dealt with social classes and the differences when they lived in pre-industrial and industrial societies. Others concentrated more on living and working conditions. The common factor in all of the good responses was the focus on social issues.

Question 4

The overall standard of the answers was good and some very impressive responses were seen. The question asked whether Cavour's appointment as Prime Minister of Piedmont in 1852 was the most important turning point in the process of Italian unification. Credit was given when candidates went beyond a narrative account to explain the reasons why 1852 was a turning point. Weaker responses typically contained only surveys that lacked an argument about the key issue. Better answers considered the factors in a wider context. For example, Cavour's appointment marked the coming of Italy's most impressive politician. It confirmed that Piedmont would be the state at the centre of unification. He was a monarchist and ensured that a united Italy would become a monarchy and not a republic as Mazzini and Garibaldi planned. It won the support of other European powers, especially France and then Prussia. Very successful answers compared his appointment in 1852 with other events or developments, which could be considered to be turning points, to assess their relative importance. These included Garibaldi's march to the south which ensured that the entire peninsula was included in a united Italy, not a priority for Cavour. The overall standard of the answers was sometimes excellent and often good.

Question 5

The most successful candidates explained explicitly why there was a rapid increase in imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century. More moderate responses tended to give an accurate but general account of the causes of imperialism. Another feature of good answers was that they supported their points with examples from Europe and non-European regions. Some candidates pointed out the conditions in Europe that led to competition. Germany was a new state and William II wanted his country to become a world power. France was an 'old' country but saw imperial expansion as confirmation that it was still a world power after the defeat in 1870. Britain's empire needed to grow to maintain its primacy in political and economic affairs. In each of these countries, public opinion became more important to governments. Good candidates linked imperialism to nationalism, for example giving Bismarck's and Disraeli's changes of mind about imperialism when they were pressed by public opinion. Points such as these needed to be supported by relevant overseas examples for the answer to reach the highest levels. The examples could show how countries' concerns could sometimes take them to expand in unpromising regions where the gains were very marginal rather than real political and economic achievements.

Question 6

Candidates were asked to assess the claim that opposition was not a major threat to Nicholas II during the period up to 1914. The more successful candidates focused on the period specified in the question. No credit could be given to discussions of the February Revolution in 1917 unless they were made in a brief conclusion and linked to the preceding discussion. Some candidates argued convincingly that the Tsar faced serious but not immediate threats during the relevant period. Others preferred to see Russia as a fundamentally stable country. Both judgements could be defended. As evidence of stability, candidates referred to the support that Nicholas II received from the most important sections of society. These included the aristocracy and the Orthodox Church. The police were a powerful agency for stability. Political changes such as the Duma were very limited. Above all, the army was loyal. Most responses referred to the

indications of opposition which were seen in the continued activity of radical groups such as the Bolsheviks although most of their leaders were in prison or in exile. Strikes and other forms of civil disorder were widespread. The military had benefited from increased funds since the war with Japan but it was still weak. The economy was also growing but remained backward when compared with other modern countries. Stolypin's reforms had some success but he had also used harsh methods. A number of candidates pointed out that perhaps the most important issue was the fact that Nicholas II opposed changes that might threaten traditional Russian values and practices. He soon went back on the reforms outlined in the October Manifesto and did not support Stolypin's policies. The best responses considered the alternatives and came to a justified conclusion. More limited answers tended to opt for one side of the argument and consider it exclusively.

Question 7

In general, answers were sound and a number of responses showed excellent knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Stalin achieved his aims in economic policy to 1939. The more successful candidates defined his aims specifically whereas in weaker responses they were assumed. Credit was given when the answers focused on economic issues. On the other hand, some answers ranged too widely and did not link their points to the key issue. Most responses were aware that principle among Stalin's aims was modernisation. His intention was particularly to make Russia strong enough to withstand potential external threats from capitalist countries. There were some well-informed accounts of success but the better essays also showed an awareness of failures. Some enterprises failed and production figures were distorted so that targets were seemingly met. There was an emphasis on quantity rather than on quality. Another aim was to use the economy to achieve social change. An example of this was collectivisation in agriculture which was linked to the suppression of the kulaks. A number of responses recognised that underlining all of the economic policies was the intention to enhance Stalin's personal position.

Question 8

The differences between the ideas of Marxism and Fascism formed the key issue in this question. Most candidates tackled the question in one of two ways. The more successful answers focused on ideas and used examples to support their arguments. More moderate answers tended to be more descriptive and referred less frequently to ideas or theory. The underlying knowledge was drawn mostly from Stalin and Mussolini. This was acceptable but the best essays ranged more widely. For example, some excellent answers used examples from Lenin who was a more thoroughly Marxist thinker than Stalin. There were worthwhile discussions of attitudes to the state. In theory, Marxism believed that the state and its hierarchies would disappear while Fascism saw the state as fulfilling a primary function. Although a pure Marxist state was never achieved, Marxist ideas were more cohesive. Fascism did not depend on one thinker – there was no single Fascist figure to rival Marx. Answers were given credit when they linked practical politics to ideology. For example, the primary feature of Marxism was to liberate and empower the proletariat or working class but Lenin did not succeed in doing this while Stalin imposed a tyrannical rule over the proletariat and other classes. Fascism sought to strengthen the state but Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany ended by destroying their states.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/21

Paper 21

Key Messages

- On the source based question it is vital to use all the sources and separate them into groups to show which support the hypothesis and which challenge it. The sources must be evaluated for strengths and weaknesses and the conclusion should look at which sources are preferred and whether the hypothesis is valid.
- For the essay questions it is very important that responses are analytical and have sufficient factual material to support this analysis.
- Timing is important. A weak final essay may harm a candidate's final grade.

General Comments

The best scripts were well organised and allowed equal time for each question, recognising that they carry equal weight. Comments on **Section A** are included below. Responses to **Section B** were generally well informed and all candidates were able to demonstrate a level of understanding of the key topics. The most effective answers often took a direct and analytical approach to the questions and avoided writing descriptive accounts of events or issues. Well organised answers contained a clear introduction, a logical theme and a summative conclusion. Examples from around the region and across the time span of the question were used to good effect in a majority of responses and enhanced their quality considerably.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The source based question requires candidates to use all the sources provided and then to divide them into groups to show which support and which challenge the hypothesis in the question. The majority of responses achieved this with some success. For instance it was generally agreed that Source E suggested that the Federation would last and this was used as evidence against the hypothesis. Source B, on the other hand, was seen as a source which suggested there were likely to be problems and this was used as evidence against the hypothesis. There is always a possibility that some sources may contain elements which offer both support and challenge. It is also very important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. This may be by looking at the provenance of the source to assess its nature, origin and purpose. For instance, a number of responses pointed out the differing attitudes of Lee Kuan Yew in Sources A and C, realising that the timing of the sources accounted for the difference in tone. This evaluation can also be achieved by using contextual knowledge to assess the reliability of the claims made in the source. A number of responses considered that although Source E was likely to be optimistic given its timing, there were good reasons for such optimism and used knowledge of the potential economic strength of the Federation to support their argument. To achieve the highest levels, it is necessary to decide which sources can be considered most reliable and whether the argument for or against the hypothesis is stronger. In a minority of responses candidates went on to suggest that a modified hypothesis might be more appropriate, generally adapting the 'little chance' element of the statement. To achieve credit for this it is necessary to explain the reasoning behind the modification and to have gone through the process of evaluating the sources. Where responses were less successful they generally stopped short of evaluating the source material and treated it at face value.

Question 2

This was a popular question and the majority of responses showed good knowledge and understanding. Most candidates had a good grasp of the reasons why some countries were more successful than others in resisting European colonisation. The best answers looked at the issues analytically and explored the differing reasons for countries being colonised or resisting colonisation. Many candidates contrasted Siam with other countries. Examples from Java/Sumatra, the Philippines and Burma were all usefully deployed. Candidates could look at the actions of the countries that resisted colonisation and also at the motives of the colonial powers wanting to establish control. A number of very successful responses established a comparative approach and looked at the behaviour and policies of the countries that were colonised against those that avoided colonisation. They then went on to draw clear and supported conclusions.

Question 3

The question asked candidates to consider the extent of the benefits of colonisation to the local people of Southeast Asia from 1870 to 1941. Some highly impressive answers were seen. It was important that candidates took note of the given dates and did not talk about post-war developments. The majority of responses discussed the vast economic development of the region and the resulting market, increased demand for labour and consequent migration, and considered whether these might be considered to be beneficial. Likewise commercial agriculture, mining and the export-based economy were also examined. Equally, there was a great focus on the development of the institutions of the state, such as the bureaucracy, modern education, justice systems and the media. Social conditions could usefully have been examined although these appeared in fewer answers. The arrival of western ideas and their impact on society was considered to good effect in a number of responses. Some candidates looked at the development of nationalism and the clash between local culture and the habits and beliefs of the colonial powers. The growth of colonial power often led to intrusion into traditional customs and this caused antagonism, for example in Indonesia. This essay required an analysis of the positive and negative effects of colonisation and this needed to be supported by a broad range of regional examples. Few weak responses were seen, although some might have balanced cost and benefits a little more effectively.

Question 4

There was much evidence of thoughtful answers with sound factual support. There was a slight tendency to focus too much on describing the Japanese Occupation, rather than to address the specific question. Candidates were required to assess whether the Japanese Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty sphere was merely a means to exploit the people and the best responses stayed focused on this throughout. Many responses examined the positive and negative impacts of the Japanese Occupation and considered the true aims of the Japanese. To achieve this, a close examination of the role and behaviour of the Japanese and how this changed over the course of World War II was needed. The realisation that Japanese imperialism was no more desirable than British and European imperialism was frequently mentioned. To achieve a balanced response it was also necessary to look at the impact on the colonies in the years after the war. There are plenty of examples of economic success, such as the 'tiger' economies of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. Some responses discussed the reasons for their success and the aid given by the USA to Korea was a useful example.

Question 5

There were some detailed and impressive answers to this question. Candidates were asked to assess the impact of World War II on decolonisation. Most responses agreed that the war tested the resources of the colonial powers, exposed their military and economic weaknesses and also ended any belief in European dominance and superiority over the Asian peoples. It was also good practice to examine individual countries and see what impact the war had on them. Burma, Vietnam, Malaya, the Philippines and Indonesia were all discussed and the best responses were able to reach a differentiated conclusion which accounted for differing events and outcomes. The development of nationalism was examined in detail and it was recognised that it progressed at different speeds and in a differing manner in the various countries of Southeast Asia. The Philippines was used as a good example of a different approach as the Filipinos welcomed the return of the USA after the war, in stark contrast to the Vietnamese and their determination to expel the French.

Question 6

The question asked candidates to consider the extent to which the independence movements were dependent on key personalities for their success. The best responses set leaders, such as Ho Chi Minh and Sukharno, against other influences. A number of responses lacked specific knowledge on the influence of key individuals in the independence movements of Southeast Asia. Although individuals were sometimes mentioned, they were discussed in the most general terms, without precise information about their role and impact. Such responses were often focused almost entirely on other factors, for instance the level of pre-war nationalism and the effects of World War II. This meant that a number of responses were significantly unbalanced and found it difficult to reach an overall judgement on the question.

Question 7

There were relatively few responses to this question. The best ranged widely across a number of countries and drew comparisons. Most looked at the role of the military in resisting the Japanese, the general levels of military force and violence in World War II and the impact this had on post-war Southeast Asian states. The role of the military in conflicts with the colonial powers was also evaluated in a number of answers. Burma provided an interesting example of how the significant role and power of the military, and their distrust of political parties, has shaped the modern state. It was possible to argue that where the new Southeast Asian states were the products of authoritarian rule, the military tended to have greater power, for example under Sukarno in Indonesia. It was generally recognised that the emphasis on stability, rather than democracy, was a key element of military power. Thailand was used as an example of the military gaining power by army-led coups and the monarchy trying to mediate between the military and civilian politicians. It was also possible to discuss Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam, although these examples were less frequently seen.

Question 8

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/22

Paper 22

Key Messages

- On the source based question it is vital to use all the sources and separate them into groups to show which support the hypothesis and which challenge it. The sources must be evaluated for strengths and weaknesses and the conclusion should look at which sources are preferred and whether the hypothesis is valid.
- For the essay questions it is very important that responses are analytical and have sufficient factual material to support this analysis.
- Timing is important. A weak final essay may harm a candidate's final grade.

General Comments

The best scripts were well organised and allowed equal time for each question, recognising that they carry equal weight. Comments on **Section A** are included below. Responses to **Section B** were generally well informed and all candidates were able to demonstrate a level of understanding of the key topics. The most effective answers often took a direct and analytical approach to the questions and avoided writing descriptive accounts of events or issues. Well organised answers contained a clear introduction, a logical theme and a summative conclusion. Examples from around the region and across the time span of the question were used to good effect in a majority of responses and enhanced their quality considerably.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The source based question requires candidates to use all the sources provided and then to divide them into groups to show which support and which challenge the hypothesis in the question. The majority of responses achieved this with some success. For instance it was generally agreed that Source E suggested that the Federation would last and this was used as evidence against the hypothesis. Source B, on the other hand, was seen as a source which suggested there were likely to be problems and this was used as evidence against the hypothesis. There is always a possibility that some sources may contain elements which offer both support and challenge. It is also very important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. This may be by looking at the provenance of the source to assess its nature, origin and purpose. For instance, a number of responses pointed out the differing attitudes of Lee Kuan Yew in Sources A and C, realising that the timing of the sources accounted for the difference in tone. This evaluation can also be achieved by using contextual knowledge to assess the reliability of the claims made in the source. A number of responses considered that although Source E was likely to be optimistic given its timing, there were good reasons for such optimism and used knowledge of the potential economic strength of the Federation to support their argument. To achieve the highest levels, it is necessary to decide which sources can be considered most reliable and whether the argument for or against the hypothesis is stronger. In a minority of responses candidates went on to suggest that a modified hypothesis might be more appropriate, generally adapting the 'little chance' element of the statement. To achieve credit for this it is necessary to explain the reasoning behind the modification and to have gone through the process of evaluating the sources. Where responses were less successful they generally stopped short of evaluating the source material and treated it at face value.

Question 2

This was a popular question and the majority of responses showed good knowledge and understanding. Most candidates had a good grasp of the reasons why some countries were more successful than others in resisting European colonisation. The best answers looked at the issues analytically and explored the differing reasons for countries being colonised or resisting colonisation. Many candidates contrasted Siam with other countries. Examples from Java/Sumatra, the Philippines and Burma were all usefully deployed. Candidates could look at the actions of the countries that resisted colonisation and also at the motives of the colonial powers wanting to establish control. A number of very successful responses established a comparative approach and looked at the behaviour and policies of the countries that were colonised against those that avoided colonisation. They then went on to draw clear and supported conclusions.

Question 3

The question asked candidates to consider the extent of the benefits of colonisation to the local people of Southeast Asia from 1870 to 1941. Some highly impressive answers were seen. It was important that candidates took note of the given dates and did not talk about post-war developments. The majority of responses discussed the vast economic development of the region and the resulting market, increased demand for labour and consequent migration, and considered whether these might be considered to be beneficial. Likewise commercial agriculture, mining and the export-based economy were also examined. Equally, there was a great focus on the development of the institutions of the state, such as the bureaucracy, modern education, justice systems and the media. Social conditions could usefully have been examined although these appeared in fewer answers. The arrival of western ideas and their impact on society was considered to good effect in a number of responses. Some candidates looked at the development of nationalism and the clash between local culture and the habits and beliefs of the colonial powers. The growth of colonial power often led to intrusion into traditional customs and this caused antagonism, for example in Indonesia. This essay required an analysis of the positive and negative effects of colonisation and this needed to be supported by a broad range of regional examples. Few weak responses were seen, although some might have balanced cost and benefits a little more effectively.

Question 4

There was much evidence of thoughtful answers with sound factual support. There was a slight tendency to focus too much on describing the Japanese Occupation, rather than to address the specific question. Candidates were required to assess whether the Japanese Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty sphere was merely a means to exploit the people and the best responses stayed focused on this throughout. Many responses examined the positive and negative impacts of the Japanese Occupation and considered the true aims of the Japanese. To achieve this, a close examination of the role and behaviour of the Japanese and how this changed over the course of World War II was needed. The realisation that Japanese imperialism was no more desirable than British and European imperialism was frequently mentioned. To achieve a balanced response it was also necessary to look at the impact on the colonies in the years after the war. There are plenty of examples of economic success, such as the 'tiger' economies of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. Some responses discussed the reasons for their success and the aid given by the USA to Korea was a useful example.

Question 5

There were some detailed and impressive answers to this question. Candidates were asked to assess the impact of World War II on decolonisation. Most responses agreed that the war tested the resources of the colonial powers, exposed their military and economic weaknesses and also ended any belief in European dominance and superiority over the Asian peoples. It was also good practice to examine individual countries and see what impact the war had on them. Burma, Vietnam, Malaya, the Philippines and Indonesia were all discussed and the best responses were able to reach a differentiated conclusion which accounted for differing events and outcomes. The development of nationalism was examined in detail and it was recognised that it progressed at different speeds and in a differing manner in the various countries of Southeast Asia. The Philippines was used as a good example of a different approach as the Filipinos welcomed the return of the USA after the war, in stark contrast to the Vietnamese and their determination to expel the French.

Question 6

The question asked candidates to consider the extent to which the independence movements were dependent on key personalities for their success. The best responses set leaders, such as Ho Chi Minh and

Sukharno, against other influences. A number of responses lacked specific knowledge on the influence of key individuals in the independence movements of Southeast Asia. Although individuals were sometimes mentioned, they were discussed in the most general terms, without precise information about their role and impact. Such responses were often focused almost entirely on other factors, for instance the level of pre-war nationalism and the effects of World War II. This meant that a number of responses were significantly unbalanced and found it difficult to reach an overall judgement on the question.

Question 7

There were relatively few responses to this question. The best ranged widely across a number of countries and drew comparisons. Most looked at the role of the military in resisting the Japanese, the general levels of military force and violence in World War II and the impact this had on post-war Southeast Asian states. The role of the military in conflicts with the colonial powers was also evaluated in a number of answers. Burma provided an interesting example of how the significant role and power of the military, and their distrust of political parties, has shaped the modern state. It was possible to argue that where the new Southeast Asian states were the products of authoritarian rule, the military tended to have greater power, for example under Sukarno in Indonesia. It was generally recognised that the emphasis on stability, rather than democracy, was a key element of military power. Thailand was used as an example of the military gaining power by army-led coups and the monarchy trying to mediate between the military and civilian politicians. It was also possible to discuss Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam, although these examples were less frequently seen.

Question 8

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

Key messages

- In answering **Section A**, candidates should ensure that they link each source to the hypothesis, go beyond face-value interpretation and structure their essays so that there is a clear argument throughout.
- In **Section B**, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General comments

Many candidates maintained a consistently high standard throughout, displaying their ability to make informed judgements based on appropriate knowledge and understanding. Most demonstrated sound knowledge in at least some of their answers. Weaker scripts often lacked relevant detail and relied too heavily on general statements or unsupported assertions.

In their responses to **Section A: Question 1**, most candidates identified information from the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis and constructed a focused argument. The most impressive went beyond face value and interpreted the sources in context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and effective use of background knowledge. Many showed awareness of the need to evaluate the sources, but relied on vague assertions which were unconvincing. Statements such as '*Source A is biased*' require supporting evidence to demonstrate how and why the source is biased and how this affects its use for interpreting the validity of the hypothesis. The most impressive answers were carefully planned. They showed a good understanding of both sides of the argument and stayed focused throughout. Those who wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis and missed opportunities for cross-referencing.

The best responses to the essay questions contained well-focused arguments which were based on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. Many essays contained accurate detail but could have been improved if this had been related more directly to the question. For example, many of the responses to **Question 4** described American involvement in the Korean War. Reference to '*American foreign policy*' was often implicit and many overlooked the need to define what the '*policy*' was. The best responses were well balanced. Some dealt effectively with the factor given in the question but could have been improved by considering a wider range of factors, for example in **Question 5**. To be highly rewarded, essays need to contain relevant argument and sufficient support. In a number of scripts, candidates showed that they were aware of the analytical demands of the question but did not always have adequate knowledge to support their points.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates used the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis and create a balanced argument. Sources B and D were seen as offering the strongest support for the view that Dag Hammarskjold enhanced the prestige and effectiveness of the UN. Source B's claim that it was Hammarskjold's work '*that was to result in the UN developing into an effective and constructive international organisation*' and Source D's statement that Hammarskjold '*made the UN the indispensable actor in global conflict resolution*' were widely noted. The majority also argued that Source A provides the greatest challenge to the hypothesis since it is critical of Hammarskjold's performance as UN Secretary-General, accusing him of violating '*the elementary*

principles of justice' and demanding his resignation. Sources C and E were often seen as challenging Hammarskjöld's effectiveness, since his actions '*brought him into conflict not just with the Soviet Union but with France and the USA*' (Source E), '*a crippling impediment for a Secretary-General*' (Source C).

The best responses went beyond 'face value' interpretation and reached a more analytical assessment of the impact of Hammarskjöld's work as UN Secretary-General. Some referred to the emotive language which Khrushchev used ('*simply deplorable role*' and '*bloody crimes*'). Others used their contextual knowledge to show how the Soviet Union saw the UN as dominated by the USA (the UN's role in the Korean War encouraged this view). Khrushchev interpreted the UN's actions in the Congo as further evidence that the UN and Hammarskjöld had '*always been prejudiced against the socialist countries*'. A number of effective responses cross-referenced between sources and disputed Khrushchev's claim. Sources B, C, D and E all show that Hammarskjöld was determined to maintain the UN's '*independence from... national interests*', and that this determination led to him becoming '*the object of attack*' not just from the USSR but also from the West. Most responses attempted a level of evaluation but some were less convincing. For example, many dismissed Source A as unreliable because it came from a speech by Khrushchev and therefore must be biased. To make this point effectively it was necessary to show how the source demonstrates its bias.

Relatively few analysed Source B in depth, the majority noted the high praise for Hammarskjöld and felt that to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize the Secretary-General must have enhanced the prestige and effectiveness of the UN. More perceptive responses realised that such a speech would inevitably focus on Hammarskjöld's positive achievements, especially given that the award was made so soon after his untimely death. Indeed, some noted the significance of the claim that it was only as a result of his death that '*criticism of Hammarskjöld and UN policy was silenced*'. Similarly, some recognised that the title of the article from which Source D is taken implies a positive view of Hammarskjöld.

The most impressive responses demonstrated that Source C contains a balanced assessment of Hammarskjöld's work, that he solved some international problems (e.g. Suez and Lebanon), but faced insoluble problems as a result of Cold War rivalry and his determination to remain neutral. Cross-referencing with Source E showed how Hammarskjöld's unpopularity was the result of the changes he made within the UN to address the problems caused by the Cold War and the effects of decolonisation. Some candidates found Source C more difficult to interpret. For example, it was commonly argued that Urquhart saw Hammarskjöld as '*a sort of superman before whom governments trembled*'. Similarly, the source was seen as evidence that '*Hammarskjöld was admired and enthusiastically supported*'. Therefore some concluded that Urquhart's article strongly supports the hypothesis. On the other hand some interpreted the source as being critical of Hammarskjöld, since his '*high-minded*' nature and '*single-minded internationalism*' brought him into conflict with both the USSR and the West.

Candidates who achieved the highest level evaluated the evidence on both sides of the argument, and explained how and why the quality of the evidence differed. Here, the use of contextual knowledge was crucial. Many showed how Hammarskjöld enhanced the role of the Secretary-General and replaced the inoperative collective security system with a new form of '*preventive diplomacy*' – peacekeeping. As Sources D and E demonstrate Hammarskjöld's changes became the UN's accepted form of action. Inevitably this brought Hammarskjöld into conflict with the superpowers. To the Soviet Union, Hammarskjöld adopted policies which favoured the capitalist West. To the USA, his actions potentially undermined American control over the UN. Many argued that Hammarskjöld's reforms led to '*a fundamental constitutional crisis in the UN*' (Source C), but that they were vital in order for the UN to survive and maintain its role as '*the indispensable actor in global conflict resolution*' (Source D).

Section B

Question 2

The majority of answers contained accurate detail on the events which marked the early development of the Cold War. The most impressive addressed the question directly and in a balanced way. In support of the hypothesis, it was argued that Stalin's primary objective was to ensure the security of the Soviet Union, which he saw as being threatened by the actions of the USA. Truman's use of the atomic bomb in Japan, the ending of Lend-Lease, Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and determination to unite the western zones of Berlin were commonly seen as evidence of the USA's desire to extend its political and economic influence in Europe. Stalin's statements regarding world-wide communist revolution, his refusal to keep to his Yalta promises and his aggressive actions in Eastern Europe could be seen as evidence of Soviet expansionism which inevitably led to an American reaction. Most responses provided an account of the causes of the Cold War, usually describing the deterioration in relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common

approach involved recounting the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War, outlining the views of different schools of thought. This sometimes resulted in generalised answers with only limited focus on the question. The weakest responses (of which there were few) would have been improved by more secure chronology, better support and greater depth. For example, Stalin's reasons for beginning the Berlin Blockade were misinterpreted and some claimed that this was a direct response to the Marshall Plan. A few drifted outside the time frame.

Question 3

Most candidates demonstrated secure knowledge of superpower involvement in the regional conflicts which marked the globalisation of the Cold War between 1950 and 1980. The most impressive responses analysed superpower motives and developed a balanced argument. On the one hand, the globalisation of the Cold War was seen as the result of the superpowers' expansionist policies – the USSR's determination to spread communism (e.g. Cuba) matched by the USA's desire to extend its political and economic power (e.g. Southeast Asia). On the other hand, it was argued that the superpowers were reluctantly forced to become involved for political, strategic, economic and prestige reasons (e.g. in the Middle East, with its oil supplies and strategic location; in Africa, with its valuable resources and newly-independent states). A number of responses were well informed but not sufficiently focused. Such answers often gave accounts of regional conflicts (the Korean War, Cuban missile crisis and Vietnam War, but also the Middle East, Latin America and Africa) and the extent to which the superpowers were involved. Insufficient attention was given to the reasons behind superpower involvement and the extent to which it could be described as exploitation. The weakest responses often lacked accurate content and contained assertions. A small minority of candidates wrote exclusively about one regional conflict; this prevented them from reaching more general conclusions and covering the entire time frame. A small number misinterpreted 'regional conflicts' and wrote about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

The majority of candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of this topic and the best addressed the question directly. Most argued that the USA was successful in achieving the basic objective of its containment policy; North Korean forces were successfully repelled and South Korea remained an independent country with a border at the 38th parallel. Moreover, US policy and action had been endorsed and supported by the United Nations. The most impressive responses balanced this by pointing out that US policy towards Korea had been inconsistent; Korea was not mentioned in Acheson's 'defence perimeter' speech and there was a failed attempt to 'roll-back' communism beyond the 38th parallel. An effective analysis of the success of US policy required some consideration the USA's objectives and how these were reflected in the policy adopted. Although the basic objective of weakening communism in Southeast Asia remained consistent, the policies did not. If containment was successfully applied, 'roll-back' was not. Many concluded that the USA's overall objective was not achieved, as seen in the continued spread of communism in Southeast Asia. While containing much of the same information, some responses would have benefited from a more explicit analysis of American policy. Concluding remarks which link to the question are unlikely to be as highly rewarded as explicit comments which address the question throughout.

Question 5

Most responses offered detailed knowledge of Deng's reforms and his reasons for introducing them, and the best were focused and well-balanced. On the one hand, Deng's determination to develop 'market socialism' to address China's economic and social problems was seen as leading to demands for more radical reforms and a split within the Chinese Communist Party. Conversely, Deng's insistence on maintaining one-party control and refusal to countenance political reform (such as established by Gorbachev in the USSR) could equally be seen as the cause of the resentment which led to Tiananmen Square. In general, candidates seemed less confident in analysing the impact of the reforms and the extent to which they were responsible for the crisis of communism within the PRC. As a result some took a descriptive approach, outlining Deng's reforms with little attempt to address the question. In many cases, there was an assumption that Deng's reforms were responsible for the crisis and other possible causal factors were not considered. There were relatively few weak responses. A small number of candidates drifted into irrelevance with excessive detail on the impact of reforms carried out by Mao or Gorbachev in the Sovietiet.

Question 6

Many candidates produced fully focused and balanced arguments, based on impressive knowledge and understanding of the context, aims, terms and impact of the NNPT. Some provided detailed accounts of the NNPT's terms, but did so in a descriptive way with little attempt to analyse its impact, significance and achievements. Conversely, some attempted to focus on the Treaty's achievements, but provided little evidence to support their arguments. Such responses tended to lack balance, the most common argument being that the NNPT achieved nothing substantial because it did not prevent the continuation of the arms race. It was clear that some candidates lacked sufficient knowledge to write accurately about the NNPT. Confusion between the terms of NNPT and other attempts to control nuclear weapons (such as the Test Ban Treaty of 1963) was not uncommon. The weakest responses were characterised by irrelevance. Some wrote general accounts about attempts to control the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons following the Cuban missile crisis. As a result, discussion of the NNPT was given no more prominence than coverage of other treaties, such as the Test Ban Treaty, the SALT Treaties and START. A significant number of candidates wrote about the nuclear arms race in general, describing the development of weapons rather than attempts at control.

Question 7

Most responses demonstrated sound understanding of the factors which led to the dramatic resurgence of the Japanese economy in the post-World War II era. The best compared the impact of external factors (e.g. support from the USA, the importance of the Korean War) with that of internal issues (e.g. stable governments, the role of MITI), generally concluding that Japan's economic miracle was dependent on the interaction of both. Some less effective responses contained the same factual information but lacked focus. These often outlined the causal factors without direct reference to the relative significance of internal and external issues, except, perhaps, in the conclusion. As a result, some responses seemed rather disjointed with causal factors discussed in no particular order.

Question 8

Most candidates concentrated on OPEC's successes during the 1970s. It was clear that they understood the significance of OPEC's ability to exploit the fact that demand for oil began to outstrip supply at that time, and they analysed the impact of the two 'oil shocks' on the international economy. Few responses covered the entire timeframe. This required an understanding of how and why OPEC's ability to dictate the international price of oil was severely limited during the 1960s and became restricted again during the 1980s. As a result, a number of responses did not address all aspects of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

Key messages

- When answering **Section A**, candidates should link each source to the hypothesis, go beyond face value interpretation and structure their essays so that there is a clear argument throughout.
- In **Section B**, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General comments

Many candidates maintained a consistently high standard and made informed judgements, based on sound knowledge and understanding. Most demonstrated knowledge in their answers but a number found it more difficult to use this to address the questions. Weaker scripts often lacked appropriate detail, so responses became vague and unfocused.

In response to **Section A** most identified information to support and challenge the hypothesis and constructed well-focused arguments. The most impressive responses went beyond face value and interpreted the sources in context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of background knowledge. Some recognised the need to evaluate the sources but were less convincing. Statements such as '*Source A is biased*' require supporting evidence to demonstrate how and why it is biased, and how this affects its use for interpreting the validity of the hypothesis. The most effective answers showed evidence of careful reading and planning. Both sides of the argument were addressed and responses were balanced and relevant. Candidates who wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis and missed opportunities for cross-referencing. A small number wrote general accounts of the Soviet proposals rather than analysing the possible motives behind them.

The most impressive responses to the **Section B** questions contained clear and sustained arguments which were focused on the questions and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. A number of essays would have been improved if the material they contained had been used to address the question. For example, many responses to **Question 4** outlined American involvement in the Korean War but did not directly address whether the policy towards Korea could be described as '*confused and inconsistent*'. Some answers contained appropriate features but became disjointed or were unbalanced. For example, many of the responses to **Question 5** were based on the assumption that ideological differences were entirely responsible for the Sino-Soviet split, with little attempt to analyse other causal factors.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates identified information in the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis and developed a logical, balanced response. Source B was seen as providing the strongest support for the view that the Soviet demands for reform of the UN Secretariat were designed to improve the structure and effectiveness of the United Nations. It was noted that Khrushchev's demands were based on the desire to ensure equal representation for the three basic groups within the UN and to '*create conditions for a more correct implementation of the decisions taken.*' Source A provided supporting evidence for Khrushchev's statement. On the other hand the vast majority argued that Source D provided the greatest challenge to the hypothesis, since it claims that the Soviet proposals would undermine the authority of the Secretary-General and the effectiveness of the General Assembly. Similarly, the King of Jordan's statement in Source C was widely felt

to be sceptical of Khrushchev's motives, suggesting that his main aim was to 'damage the reputation of the Security Council and the General Assembly' and 'to destroy the UN itself.'

To achieve the highest levels it was necessary to go beyond face value interpretation and reach an assessment of Soviet motives in demanding reform. The most impressive responses achieved this in a number of ways. Careful analysis of Source B shows that Cold War rivalry is reflected in the reference to 'the military block of the Western Powers'. In suggesting that the reforms are necessary there is implied criticism of the current Secretary-General. Many suggested that Khrushchev was trying to gain support from the newly decolonised Asian and African states by arguing that his aim was to enhance their representation within the UN. Contextual knowledge was used to show that the Soviet Union saw the UN as dominated by the USA. Some explained how the UN Security Council was hindered by Cold War rivalry and the USSR's use of the veto, and that this had led Hammarskjöld to increase the powers of the Secretary-General. In this context, the USSR's proposals for reform could be seen as an attempt to undermine the Secretary-General so that the Soviet Union would regain the ability to prevent action being taken by the UN. Cross-referencing enabled some to show that there were structural problems within the UN. In Source C, Nehru states that the structure of the UN was unbalanced and 'weighted in favour of Europe and the Americas.' This view is supported in Source A, which claims that 'the Western powers were running things at the time'. Even Source D, which is critical of the USSR's proposals, accepts there is some need for a 'prompt review and revision of the composition of UN bodies.' It was noted that Source D argued that acceptance of the Soviet proposals would effectively paralyse the UN, a view shared by the King of Jordan in Source C. Even Nehru, who was critical of the structural imbalance within the UN, was sceptical of Soviet motives, urging the need to 'proceed slowly'. Many showed how this view supported Kennedy's claim in Source D that having three Secretaries-General 'would be to accept the Cold War in the headquarters of peace.'

Most recognised the need to evaluate the sources. For example, many argued that Source B is biased. To make this point it was necessary to show how and why the source is biased. More effective responses noted that Source A provides an outline of the arguments which Khrushchev used to justify his proposals in 1960 without expressing an opinion about his motivation. Indeed, the most perceptive responses argued that the writer of Source A acknowledges Khrushchev's ulterior motives, the statement regarding 'a broader strategic position' recognising the advantages which the Soviet Union would gain if the proposed reforms were implemented. Some responses ignored Source E completely, while others claimed it was irrelevant. Better answers appreciated that Source E provided a context for Soviet proposals. With Cold War rivalry making it virtually impossible for the Security Council to function, and the General Assembly rendered 'unwieldy by the increase in membership', there was some justification in calls for reform. Such responses generally agreed with Kennedy in Source D; to have three Secretaries-General, 'each with veto power', would cause 'paralysis' and 'confusion'. Most reached the conclusion that, plausible though Khrushchev makes the proposals seem, the Soviet Union's ulterior motive was to undermine US dominance of the UN.

Section B

Question 2

Most responses displayed detailed knowledge of the early development of the Cold War. The most impressive addressed the question directly and in a balanced way. In support of the hypothesis, it was argued that Truman's strongly anti-communist views made a breakdown in relations with the USSR inevitable. His use of the atomic bomb in Japan, the ending of Lend-Lease, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and his determination to unite the western zones of Berlin were seen as evidence of the USA's desire to extend its political and economic influence in Europe. Not surprisingly Stalin saw these actions as 'dollar imperialism' and a direct threat to the Soviet Union. Conversely, the USA had been prepared to agree many of Stalin's demands at Yalta. It was only after Stalin's statements regarding world-wide communist revolution, his refusal to keep to his Yalta promises and his aggressive actions in Eastern Europe that the USA saw the need to confront Soviet expansionism. Many offered a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War with some analysis of whether the USA or the USSR should be held more responsible for the deterioration in relations between them. Another common approach involved developing an account of the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War. Such responses tended to be rather general with only limited focus on the question, usually confined to conclusions.

Question 3

Most candidates demonstrated good knowledge of superpower involvement in regional conflicts; fewer used it effectively to address the question. Most responses gave an account of various regional conflicts and the extent of superpower involvement. The most impressive responses analysed superpower motives and developed balanced arguments. The globalisation of the Cold War was seen as the result of the superpowers' expansionist policies – the USSR's determination to spread communism (e.g. Cuba) matched by the USA's desire to extend its political and economic power (e.g. Southeast Asia), leading to their exploitation of regional conflicts. For balance, it was argued that the superpowers were reluctantly forced to become involved for political, strategic and economic reasons (e.g. in the Middle East and in Africa). While containing similar factual information, some responses addressed a rather different question, such as whether the USA or USSR was more responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War. In general, more attention could have been given to the reasons behind superpower involvement and whether it could be described as 'reluctant'.

Question 4

The majority of candidates possessed detailed knowledge about the Korean War and the best used this to develop an argument which directly addressed the question. Most argued that US policy was 'confused and inconsistent', and supported this view. It was noted that Korea was not in Acheson's 'defence perimeter' speech, yet the USA was quick to send troops to defend South Korea even before the UN had decided what action to take. It was widely recognised that what began as a containment operation to defend South Korea, developed into 'roll-back' as MacArthur's troops moved northwards beyond the 38th parallel. The most impressive responses ensured balance by demonstrating that US involvement in Korea was part of a consistent attempt to prevent the spread of communism in areas such as Southeast Asia, which were sensitive to American interests. The change from containment to 'roll-back' emerged from the military situation in Korea and provided the US with an opportunity to achieve its primary aim – weakening communism in the region. Weaker responses, although generally well-informed were less focused on the question. Some candidates produced accounts of the Korean War in which the analysis of US policy was only implicit and a few addressed a rather different question, such as the extent to which the Soviet Union should be held responsible for the war. Such discussions were of limited relevance.

Question 5

Most responses provided convincing evidence of the part played by ideological differences in the Sino-Soviet split. It was commonly noted that the Chinese form of communism, emerging from a rural-based economy, was substantially different from that of the Soviet Union. Khrushchev's public criticism of Stalin was commonly seen as the main cause of friction. His claim that communism could be achieved by methods other than violent revolution, his belief in 'peaceful coexistence' and seemingly 'soft' line in relations with the USA were all seen as ideological factors which clashed with Chinese opinions. In adopting this approach, many gave the impression that the Sino-Soviet split was entirely due to ideological factors. The most impressive responses appreciated that it was necessary to establish balance by showing how other, non-ideological issues also played a significant role in causing the Sino-Soviet split. Mao's desire to be seen as the leader of the communist world following Stalin's death, border disputes and competition for improved relations with the USA were noted as causal factors. Weaker responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by descriptions of the breakdown in relations between China and the Soviet Union, with little reference to the significance of ideological differences.

Question 6

Many candidates produced focused and balanced arguments based on sound knowledge of the context, aims, terms and impact of the SALT Treaties. Some provided detailed accounts of the treaties, but did so in a descriptive way with little analysis of impact and significance. Conversely, some candidates attempted to focus on the significance of the treaties, but provided limited evidence to support their arguments. A number of responses would have been improved by more secure knowledge and there was confusion between the terms of the SALT Treaties and other attempts to control nuclear weapons (such as the Test Ban Treaty of 1963). Some wrote general accounts of attempts to control the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons following the Cuban missile crisis. As a result, discussion of the SALT Treaties was given no more prominence than coverage of other treaties, such as the Test Ban Treaty and START. The relevance of these other treaties in giving context to the SALT negotiations was rarely acknowledged. A significant number of candidates described the development of weapons rather than focusing on the question.

Question 7

Most responses were well-informed on the key role of the USA in developing the international economy in the post-WWII era. They generally outlined the USA's involvement through the Marshall Plan, Bretton-Woods, GATT, the IMF and the World Bank. The most impressive responses demonstrated the impact of US involvement, for example by reference to the resurgence of the Japanese and European economies. While most showed that the USA's dominance had begun to diminish during the 1970s, some found it difficult to analyse the causes and significance of this, often relying on vague comments about devaluation of the dollar, the role of OPEC and the development of rival economies such as Japan, the EEC and the Asian Tigers. Weaker responses often provided accurate accounts of the role of the US within the international economy without reference to change. The implication was that the USA's role and impact remained constant throughout the period. Some answers were entirely focused on the immediate post-WWII era rather than the whole time period. A few misinterpreted the question and explained how American policy changed from isolationism at the end of WWII. A very small number assumed that this was a question about Cold War rivalry and wrote about US involvement in regional conflicts such as the Korean War.

Question 8

All responses demonstrated some degree of appropriate knowledge and understanding. The best differentiated between internal and external factors, considered their relative significance and reached a focused conclusion. The most common argument was that the emergence of the Asian Tiger economies was dependent on a combination of favourable internal and external circumstances. Weaker responses might have been improved by maintaining a clearer focus on the question. Such answers sometimes became disjointed, with causal factors discussed in no particular order.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

Key messages

- When answering **Section A**, candidates should link each source to the hypothesis, go beyond face-value interpretation and structure their essays so that there is a clear argument throughout.
- In **Section B**, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General comments

Many responses maintained a high standard throughout and contained informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation knowledge and understanding. Most candidates used accurate knowledge in some of their answers, but some found it more difficult to link this to the questions. Weaker scripts tended to lack detailed knowledge and were either vague or assertive.

In their responses to **Question 1**, most candidates found information to support and challenge the hypothesis and constructed a well-focused argument. The most impressive went beyond face-value and interpreted the sources in context through provenance evaluation and cross-referencing. Many candidates showed an awareness of the need to evaluate but were less convincing. A number of responses stated that Source E was unreliable because it was written by an American, missing the point that it is critical of Lie and the USA's determination to ensure his re-election. Statements such as '*Source A is biased*' require supporting evidence and consideration of how this affects its use for interpreting the validity of the hypothesis. The most impressive answers were well-planned. They understood both sides of the argument and were balanced and focused throughout. Those who wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis and missed opportunities for cross-referencing.

In **Section B** the best responses contained clear arguments which were well-focused and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. It is important to note that the quality of some essays was adversely affected by an overly-assertive style; opinions were presented as fact and potentially valid interpretations were dismissed without adequate analysis. Amongst the weaker responses, some contained relevant material which wasn't effectively linked to the question or which only addressed part of the issue.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates identified information to support and challenge the hypothesis and developed a logical argument. Sources A and E were seen as offering the strongest support for the view that Lie's re-election was not in the UN's best interests. It was widely noted that Source A criticised Lie for lacking '*statesmanlike qualities*' and accused him of failing to display '*objectivity and impartiality*.' Similarly, Source E argued that Lie was '*no objective outsider*', leading a UN which was '*in no way neutral or balanced*'. As a result of his own political leanings, Lie facilitated US dominance of the UN. Most candidates identified further evidence to support the hypothesis. The Soviet Union's refusal to accept the legality of Lie's re-election, and determination to '*have nothing to do with him*', as outlined in Sources B and C, would make it difficult for the UN to operate with Lie as its Secretary-General. The majority of responses referred to Source D's claim that Lie was '*too political and incautious*', making him '*the wrong man, in the wrong job, at the wrong time*.'

Conversely, Source B and Lodge's statement in Source C were seen as providing the strongest evidence to challenge the hypothesis. The fact that Lie was re-elected by a clear majority implied that most UN member states were satisfied with his performance during his first five years in office. It was noted that Lodge praised

Lie for the highly effective way in which he had confronted the task *'to set up the UN and to make it a going concern'*, thereby enhancing *'the dignity of his office.'*

To achieve the highest levels candidates interpreted the sources in context, evaluated provenance and cross-referenced to reach an analytical assessment of the impact of Lie's re-election for a second term. Some attempts at evaluation were not taken far enough. For example, a number dismissed Source A as unreliable because it came from a Soviet newspaper and must be biased. The best responses explained why this was the case. Some used contextual knowledge to show that the Security Council's decision to take action in Korea greatly angered the USSR. The Soviet leadership held Lie responsible, not least because he had *'been quick to outspokenly recommend UN action against North Korea'* (Source B). This led the USSR to accuse Lie of failing to observe *'objectivity and impartiality'* and of allowing the UN to fall under the dominance of the USA. It was noted that the source is an extract from a Soviet newspaper, shortly after the UN's decision to become involved in Korea and just before the end of Lie's first term. The title of the article reflects Cold War rivalry and Soviet opinion that Lie was simply a *'yes-man of the American imperialists'*. The source implicitly accuses Lie of failing to uphold the UN Charter, failing to strengthen international cooperation and becoming *'an exponent of the will and desires'* of a particular *'power or group of powers.'* No evidence is given to support these accusations, and many argued that the source is Soviet propaganda, provided by a state-controlled newspaper. The most effective responses showed that, while Source E supports the view that Lie was anti-communist and supportive of the USA, other sources dispute this. For example, Source D's claim that *'Lie was perceived as sympathetic to the Soviet position'* is supported by Source B's statement that Lie *'had once proposed admitting Red China to the UN'*.

The most impressive responses devoted similar analysis to the other sources. For example, it was noted that the reference to *'Red China'* is a reflection of the pro-American bias in Source B, which claims that the USSR wished to *'punish'* Lie for the *'courage'* which he had shown over Korea. Moreover, Source B rather gloats over the tactics which the USA used to ensure Lie's re-election. Some argued that the 46-5 vote in favour was more a reflection of UN member states' political and economic dependence on the USA than of the Secretary-General's popularity. The majority argued that Source E confirms the Soviet view that Lie was anti-communist and pro-American. The claim that Lie's memoirs suggest *'he was no objective outsider'*, and that his strategy on Korea was the result of *'pure knee-reflex anti-communism'*, were seen as especially significant. Many suggested that Source E's credibility is heightened by the fact that it was written by an American, who might be expected to support the USA's position. More analytical responses noted that the source was written in 2003 (after the end of the Cold War) and is highly opinionated. The claim that Lie was anti-communist is disputed in other sources (e.g. Sources B and D). It was pointed out that references to Lie's memoirs are interpretations rather than direct quotes.

Contextual knowledge was important in achieving the highest levels. The most impressive responses realised that Lie's period as Secretary-General coincided with the onset of the Cold War, which effectively ended hopes of international cooperation and paralysed the UN Security Council. There is sufficient evidence in the sources to suggest that Lie tried to reach a compromise between the capitalist and socialist elements within the UN. This brought him into conflict with both sides and was very frustrating. Many quoted Source D's statement that *'caught between two camps, Trygve Lie in bitterness resigned his post in 1953.'* The most common conclusion was that anyone would have found it difficult to be UN Secretary-General at that time, but that Lie's tendency to be *'too political and incautious'* (Source D) made it particularly difficult for him. In acting to ensure Lie's re-election, the USA created a situation in which it was impossible for the Secretary-General, without recognition by the Soviet Union, to work effectively.

Section B

Question 2

The vast majority of candidates possessed detailed knowledge of the events which marked the development of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1949. There were many very impressive responses, characterised by arguments which were balanced, focused and well supported. Weaker responses, of which there were relatively few, would have been improved by having a more specific focus. They often took the form of an account of the historical debate, outlining the various viewpoints without developing an argument regarding the significance of misinterpretation between the superpowers. Some responses explicitly argued either that the development of the Cold War was, or was not, the result of misinterpretation between the USA and the USSR but dismissed the opposing view without consideration. Some responses were characterised by a heavily assertive style, in which opinions were stated as if they were facts and without adequate factual or analytical support. A number showed some confusion over chronology and demonstrated little understanding of how various events were inter-related. A few candidates drifted outside the given time frame and wrote about the Korean War and/or the Cuban missile crisis.

Question 3

In general, this question was answered less well than **Question 4**. This was not due to lack of knowledge; most responses contained appropriate detail, covering issues such as the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War and superpower involvement in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. Some found it difficult to use this knowledge in order to address the question, tending to describe superpower involvement in regional conflicts rather than analysing the motives behind it. As a result, many responses were restricted to a narrative account of a series of regional conflicts and the ways in which tensions were intensified by Cold War rivalry. Such accounts, while accurate and detailed, tended to be based on the assumption that the superpowers had expansionist ambitions, an assumption which was not genuinely tested by reference to evidence. Similarly, many responses were unbalanced because they concentrated on the involvement of one of the superpowers (usually the USA) rather than both.

Question 4

The majority of responses showed good understanding of the events surrounding Khrushchev's decision to place nuclear weapons in Cuba. Most were appropriately focused. The best responses offered a balanced assessment, demonstrating understanding of Cuba's vulnerability to American aggression and relating this to the wider Cold War context. Lack of such balance was the most common weakness in responses to this question. Many argued that Khrushchev was motivated by his desire to gain parity in the nuclear arms race and to develop communist expansion in the Americas by testing a new and inexperienced US president. The notion that he might have been trying to protect Cuba was often rejected out of hand. Consideration of the reasons for Castro's Cuba being under threat from the USA and of how important it was, in terms of international prestige, for the Soviet Union to be seen as protecting a weak and vulnerable country from 'American imperialism' was not always seen. To be effective, arguments should be based on a balanced analysis of all possible interpretations. Some identified possible motives and would have been improved by analysing relative significance. Some focused on the outcomes of the crisis rather than motives.

Question 5

Most responses were well-informed on the factors which led to the collapse of the USSR by 1991. The most impressive demonstrated an understanding of how causal factors are inter-connected. The most common approach identified which factors could be classed as 'external' and 'internal'. The most frequently found conclusion was that internal factors were most significant. Gorbachev's reforms were seen as the single most important reason for the collapse of the USSR and many argued that the Soviet Union could have survived had he not attempted them. Such an approach, while relevant, led to two significant weaknesses: some drifted into narrative as individual causes were considered without sufficient analysis of their relative significance; each factor was looked at in isolation with little attempt to demonstrate how they were intimately connected. For example, relatively few explained why Gorbachev instituted his reforms by referring to factors such as the USSR's on-going political/economic stagnation or the Cold War context. As a result, some responses contained too many unsupported assertions. The weakest lacked focus on the question and became disjointed, causal factors discussed in no particular order.

Question 6

The best answers were based on detailed knowledge and understanding of the various attempts to control the development and spread of nuclear weapons, such as the Test Ban Treaty, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and SALT Treaties. The aims and terms of these treaties were sensibly used as criteria by which to evaluate their impact and effectiveness, facilitating the development of a balanced argument. Such responses demonstrated clear understanding of the difference between 'development' and 'spread'. Many candidates, who shared the same depth of factual knowledge, adopted a more descriptive approach. While terms of the treaties were outlined accurately there was little attempt to analyse their effectiveness. In many such responses focus on the question was confined to the conclusion. Weaker responses were often over-reliant on unsupported assertions. For example, it was not uncommon for candidates to describe a particular treaty as effective or ineffective without providing any evidence to show how or why this was the case. Some responses confused the terms or order of the treaties which made it difficult to analyse them in detail. A significant number of candidates wrote at length about mutually assured destruction (MAD), assuming, incorrectly, that this was an attempt to control nuclear weapons.

Question 7 and Question 8

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/41

Paper 41

Key Messages

- To achieve the highest standards candidates should aim to produce a balanced argument in all four of their chosen questions. This argument should be supported by appropriately developed examples and the evidence analysed to reach a logical conclusion.
- Historians' work should only be used to consolidate an answer with scholarly opinions rather than to supplement the text with frequent basic references.

General Comments

There is clear evidence that candidates are making good progress in examination techniques. There have been notable improvements in maintaining a clear focus, providing analysis rather than description and evaluating the relative significance of factors. There is still some room for improvement and a number of answers would have benefited from having a more secure geographical base and more effectively developed conclusions. The latter should offer supported judgements rather than simply providing a summary of the content of the essay. A number of scripts demonstrated an ability to argue confidently using examples which candidates had selected from their own knowledge. This was commendable and is to be encouraged.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The majority of responses were well informed about the contribution of the Creoles. While most candidates knew who the Creoles were, many mistakenly referred to them as nationalists. Answers which showed a good understanding of the traditional approach and analysed the contribution of individual Creoles (Crowther and John Thorpe were frequently mentioned) were often satisfactory. The best responses went further to consider the revisionist viewpoint that the Creoles hindered progress by Africans. Such answers were better balanced and were often very well supported.

Question 2

Although this was not the most popular question, there were some impressive responses. These were often very detailed, showing a secure grasp of the geography and developing a comparative approach throughout. Some responses dealt first with the Swahili Arabs and then the Ngoni and this could be effective so long as there was a degree of comparison. While details on the Swahili Arabs were very well known, a number of responses might have achieved better balance if they had been similarly knowledgeable about the Ngoni. Weaker answers could generally have been improved by addressing the question of similarities and differences more directly.

Question 3

This question required a comparison between Tewodros and Yohannes and proved to be very popular. Some highly impressive responses were seen. Many achieved a thematic comparison by considering the aims, methods, short/long term successes, failures and legacy of each ruler. A considerable proportion of candidates also made effective comparisons between domestic and foreign policies. There were very few weak responses. These could have been improved by taking a more directly comparative approach. Some answers discussed one ruler followed by the other and therefore found it more difficult to reach an overall assessment.

Question 4

Candidates were asked to consider the reactions of rulers, elites and people to the Christian Missionaries. The majority of responses contrasted the reactions of Mutesa and Mwanga and provided detailed accounts of the ways in which the people reacted to Christian missionaries. Fewer candidates were equally confident about 'elites' – this section was either confused with 'educated elites' or ignored. Only the stronger answers discussed the katikiros as 'elites' and therefore achieved the best balance. Occasionally the focus was incorrectly seen as Bunyoro.

Question 5

In order to answer this question successfully candidates needed to take careful note of the 'changing roles' aspect of the question. The most effective responses focused clearly on the changing roles of Europeans in Africa before and after 1884. These answers showed awareness that the emphasis needed to be on how the provisions of the Berlin Agreement worked out in practice. Candidates who concentrated on the causes of the Berlin Conference, the 'triggers' of the scramble and the Eurocentric background to Berlin wrote less relevant and well-focused responses, although some of them contained accurate detail.

Question 6

There were some excellent responses to this question which were based on sound geographical detail and specific analysis of how far the railways were more significant than other agents of economic growth. Several candidates wrote generally about railways rather than selecting East or Central Africa as required by the question. Some candidates chose to write about the more negative aspects of railways and evaluated the benefits of trade and urbanisation against exploitation of Africans. This could be highly effective if used to address the 'how far' element of the question in arguing that railway building was not 'key' to economic growth.

Question 7

This question on Dahomean efficiency was popular and most candidates produced detailed and thorough answers. The best responses analysed the reasons, rather than providing a narrative account. The most commonly found argument was that the highly organised and centralised system of government was the main reason for efficiency and many explained why this was the case. Weaker responses were sometimes very detailed but tended to be descriptive.

Question 8

The question required candidates to assess the importance of religion in 'opposition to European rule'. The best responses recognised that this indicated post-pacification rebellions and included discussion of the Ndebele-Shona and Maji-Maji rebellions. Opposition from Islam and Independent African Churches was also used to good effect in a number of answers. Evaluation of other factors such as political and local considerations was also required in order to provide a balanced response. Examples from the south and north of Africa were outside the parameters of the syllabus.

Question 9

The best responses demonstrated secure knowledge of concessionary or chartered companies. Most responses were aware of the British South Africa Company, but there was limited analysis of the role of trading companies set against political or strategic considerations in establishing colonies. Weaker responses generally offered limited coverage of the topic and were less confident in their use of detail.

Question 10

There were some very good answers to this question which showed a clear grasp of the emergence and achievements of nationalist movements. The best responses established a focus on the early stages of political nationalism in the British and French colonies. Some of the weaker responses would have benefited from such a focus and often included detail from outside West Africa. A number of candidates wrote about independent churches, rather than nationalist movements, or omitted one of the two clear sections (emergence and achievements) and were therefore unbalanced.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/42

Paper 42

Key Messages

- To achieve the highest standards candidates should aim to produce a balanced argument in all four of their chosen questions. This argument should be supported by appropriately developed examples and the evidence analysed to reach a logical conclusion.
- Historians' work should only be used to consolidate an answer with scholarly opinions rather than to supplement the text with frequent basic references.

General Comments

There is clear evidence that candidates are making good progress in examination techniques. There have been notable improvements in maintaining a clear focus, providing analysis rather than description and evaluating the relative significance of factors. There is still some room for improvement and a number of answers would have benefited from having a more secure geographical base and more effectively developed conclusions. The latter should offer supported judgements rather than simply providing a summary of the content of the essay. A number of scripts demonstrated an ability to argue confidently using examples which candidates had selected from their own knowledge. This was commendable and is to be encouraged.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The majority of responses were well informed about the contribution of the Creoles. While most candidates knew who the Creoles were, many mistakenly referred to them as nationalists. Answers which showed a good understanding of the traditional approach and analysed the contribution of individual Creoles (Crowther and John Thorpe were frequently mentioned) were often satisfactory. The best responses went further to consider the revisionist viewpoint that the Creoles hindered progress by Africans. Such answers were better balanced and were often very well supported.

Question 2

Although this was not the most popular question, there were some impressive responses. These were often very detailed, showing a secure grasp of the geography and developing a comparative approach throughout. Some responses dealt first with the Swahili Arabs and then the Ngoni and this could be effective so long as there was a degree of comparison. While details on the Swahili Arabs were very well known, a number of responses might have achieved better balance if they had been similarly knowledgeable about the Ngoni. Weaker answers could generally have been improved by addressing the question of similarities and differences more directly.

Question 3

This question required a comparison between Tewodros and Yohannes and proved to be very popular. Some highly impressive responses were seen. Many achieved a thematic comparison by considering the aims, methods, short/long term successes, failures and legacy of each ruler. A considerable proportion of candidates also made effective comparisons between domestic and foreign policies. There were very few weak responses. These could have been improved by taking a more directly comparative approach. Some answers discussed one ruler followed by the other and therefore found it more difficult to reach an overall assessment.

Question 4

Candidates were asked to consider the reactions of rulers, elites and people to the Christian Missionaries. The majority of responses contrasted the reactions of Mutesa and Mwanga and provided detailed accounts of the ways in which the people reacted to Christian missionaries. Fewer candidates were equally confident about 'elites' – this section was either confused with 'educated elites' or ignored. Only the stronger answers discussed the katikiros as 'elites' and therefore achieved the best balance. Occasionally the focus was incorrectly seen as Bunyoro.

Question 5

In order to answer this question successfully candidates needed to take careful note of the 'changing roles' aspect of the question. The most effective responses focused clearly on the changing roles of Europeans in Africa before and after 1884. These answers showed awareness that the emphasis needed to be on how the provisions of the Berlin Agreement worked out in practice. Candidates who concentrated on the causes of the Berlin Conference, the 'triggers' of the scramble and the Eurocentric background to Berlin wrote less relevant and well-focused responses, although some of them contained accurate detail.

Question 6

There were some excellent responses to this question which were based on sound geographical detail and specific analysis of how far the railways were more significant than other agents of economic growth. Several candidates wrote generally about railways rather than selecting East or Central Africa as required by the question. Some candidates chose to write about the more negative aspects of railways and evaluated the benefits of trade and urbanisation against exploitation of Africans. This could be highly effective if used to address the 'how far' element of the question in arguing that railway building was not 'key' to economic growth.

Question 7

This question on Dahomean efficiency was popular and most candidates produced detailed and thorough answers. The best responses analysed the reasons, rather than providing a narrative account. The most commonly found argument was that the highly organised and centralised system of government was the main reason for efficiency and many explained why this was the case. Weaker responses were sometimes very detailed but tended to be descriptive.

Question 8

The question required candidates to assess the importance of religion in 'opposition to European rule'. The best responses recognised that this indicated post-pacification rebellions and included discussion of the Ndebele-Shona and Maji-Maji rebellions. Opposition from Islam and Independent African Churches was also used to good effect in a number of answers. Evaluation of other factors such as political and local considerations was also required in order to provide a balanced response. Examples from the south and north of Africa were outside the parameters of the syllabus.

Question 9

The best responses demonstrated secure knowledge of concessionary or chartered companies. Most responses were aware of the British South Africa Company, but there was limited analysis of the role of trading companies set against political or strategic considerations in establishing colonies. Weaker responses generally offered limited coverage of the topic and were less confident in their use of detail.

Question 10

There were some very good answers to this question which showed a clear grasp of the emergence and achievements of nationalist movements. The best responses established a focus on the early stages of political nationalism in the British and French colonies. Some of the weaker responses would have benefited from such a focus and often included detail from outside West Africa. A number of candidates wrote about independent churches, rather than nationalist movements, or omitted one of the two clear sections (emergence and achievements) and were therefore unbalanced.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

Key Messages

- In **Section A** it is important to analyse and evaluate the five sources. Conclusions should summarise the assessment of how accurately the sources support the hypothesis.
- It is important to read the questions in **Section B** carefully and note the dates and key instructions. These should be used to provide the framework for the answer. Conclusions should address the questions directly.

General Comments

Almost all candidates answered four questions, as required. In general, responses demonstrated a sound grasp of the topics covered. Many candidates achieved a similar standard in both sections of the paper but some found **Section A** more challenging. The most effective responses to **Question 1** showed an awareness of the need to evaluate the source materials, consider their provenance and make an explicit judgement in relation to the question. Weaker answers tended to take the sources at face value and often provided a summary of each source in turn. This approach meant it was more difficult to retain a clear focus on the question.

In response to **Section B** most candidates demonstrated relevant and detailed knowledge. Some responses might have been improved if they had linked this more carefully to the question, rather than describing the topic. The best responses were characterised by balanced and detailed arguments and reached supported judgements.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Source-Based Question

Question 1

The hypothesis required candidates to consider how the standards of Southern planters were different from those of Northern preachers, even though they both used the same religion to justify their stance. A number of candidates noted that this contrast was highlighted by comparing Sources A and C. Most candidates focused on the sources, although a considerable proportion summarised or paraphrased them rather than using them to answer the question. It is vital that the points raised in the sources are linked with the hypothesis. More than just summarise the sources, candidates need to do two things. Firstly, they need to analyse them, which requires them to consider several parts of the source – who wrote it, what they said, when did they say it and to whom, what might their purpose have been – in order to make a brief comment about each. Secondly, they need to establish a clear and explicit connection between their summary analysis of each source and the hypothesis they are being asked to consider. Some candidates chose to address this by offering a paragraph of analysis for each source, then adding *‘thus we can see that this source supports – or does not support – the hypothesis’* at the end of their paragraph. A number of candidates went further and evaluated the sources by using cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge to decide whether the hypothesis could be supported or not. Such responses were often more effective as they developed a clear argument and maintained a focus on the question throughout.

This question requires candidates to place the sources at the heart of their answers. There is still a minority who do not do so; rather these candidates use sources to support arguments in a standard essay about the subject. They put the sources in a supporting role, occasionally referring to them to help support arguments based on their own knowledge. Instead, the sources must have the leading role, candidates’ knowledge

being used to support arguments which arise from the sources. The conclusion must certainly focus on the relationship between the sources and the hypothesis.

Question 2

The significance of Turner's thesis could be viewed in two ways. Firstly, as a number of candidates noted, looking back from 1893, it could indicate an important interpretation of American history. The best responses recognised that this interpretation needs to be evaluated against key events and developments of that history. Secondly, it could be used to look forward from 1893; the thesis could be seen seminal to the development of American historiography. A considerable proportion of candidates explained the significance when the question asked them to 'assess'. The difference, though slight, is important. It was also apparent that a number of responses would have preferred the question to have been '*Write all you know about the Turner thesis.*'

One feature of all answers which needs further consideration concerns the relationship between Turner's frontier thesis and O'Sullivan's concept of 'manifest destiny'. Most candidates assumed them to be one and the same. It is important to realise that they are not. The term 'manifest destiny' was first used by a journalist in 1845, when the USA was only half-formed, to justify the case for American expansionism. The Frontier Thesis was first used by an historian in 1893, fifty years later, reflecting on the expansionism which had been fuelled in part by Americans' belief in 'manifest destiny'. The best answers were aware of this important distinction.

Question 3

This was a popular question and the best responses contained detailed knowledge and noted the specific focus of the question. Most candidates wrote about Reconstruction in general rather than Radical Reconstruction in particular. Thus many answered the question '*how radical was Reconstruction?*' which is not the same as the question on the paper. The best candidates noted the capital 'R' in 'Radical', although this was generally overlooked. A number of candidates seemed unsure of what 'radical' might mean. They tended to equate it with harsh treatment of Southern whites – and, by implication, generous treatment of the ex-slaves. While this distinction has some validity, 'radical' in this context means fundamental rather than tough. The best responses were sharply focused on the question while weaker ones tended towards general descriptions.

Question 4

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

Question 5

This question on advances made by African Americans as a result of the world wars proved to be a popular one. A number of candidates realised that it was possible to compare the impact of the two wars and some pointed out that the impact of the First World War was likely to be less given the much longer involvement in the Second World War. There was plenty of ground to cover: two wars, the impact during both wartimes on both the war front and the home front, and then the peacetime impact of the wars on US domestic affairs. Some response included relevant detail on the 'Double V' campaign and Truman's Executive Order 8802. In weaker responses knowledge of the impact of the wars on the position of African Americans was often patchy and a number extended their consideration of the impact well into the 1950s and 1960s.

Question 6

There were many knowledgeable and well-argued responses to this popular question on the New Deal. The reforms were well known, as were their limitations and the criticisms which were levelled at both the New Deal and Roosevelt. The best responses appreciated that criticisms are not the same as opposition and even supporters could sometimes be critical. They focused on the reasons for opposition, writing a paragraph on each and illustrating it with examples of opponents and the arguments they used. Among the commonly discussed reasons for opposition was the feeling that reforms went too far (the American Liberty League) or not far enough (Huey Long). There was good coverage of government opposition. A number of weaker responses wrote too generally about opposition to the New Deal, asserting that 'many' people opposed it because, for example, it strengthened federal government at the expense of the states' rights. Specific examples of legislation which could be said to have done this would have made this point more

convincing. Some concentrated on describing the opposition groups rather than explaining and analysing why such groups opposed the reforms of the New Deal.

Question 7

This question was generally well answered and most candidates provided at least two or three reasons for the United States' return to isolation. The most frequently seen included the impact of the First World War, the tradition of isolationism and the opposition to the League of Nations. The focus of the question was more about isolationism and less about its limited nature. The best answers picked up on the inclusion of 'partial' in the question and attempted to address both points: why the USA was isolationist and why that isolationism could not involve total withdrawal from international affairs.

Question 8

The best essays reached a differentiated conclusion about how far the role and status of women changed between 1945 and 1968. There are several distinctions that can be applied; between married and unmarried women; between women with children – especially children of school age – and women without; between women from different social and educational backgrounds. Both the role and status of single women, free from family responsibilities, were different from those of married women. The distinctions were reduced as childcare facilities and maternity pay became more common but it was recognised that such changes only happened on a significant scale after 1968. Weaker responses often made general points about the changing position of women in the twenty-five years after the end of the Second World War but did not support their points with precise information and did not differentiate between different groups, or roles and status.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

Key Messages

- In **Section A** it is important to analyse and evaluate the five sources. Conclusions should summarise the assessment of how accurately the sources support the hypothesis.
- It is important to read the questions in **Section B** carefully and note the dates and key instructions. These should be used to provide the framework for the answer. Conclusions should address the questions directly.

General Comments

Almost all candidates answered four questions, as required. In general, responses demonstrated a sound grasp of the topics covered. Many candidates achieved a similar standard in both sections of the paper but some found **Section A** more challenging. The most effective responses to **Question 1** showed an awareness of the need to evaluate the source materials, consider their provenance and make an explicit judgement in relation to the question. Weaker answers tended to take the sources at face value and often provided a summary of each source in turn. This approach meant it was more difficult to retain a clear focus on the question.

In response to **Section B** most candidates demonstrated relevant and detailed knowledge. Some responses might have been improved if they had linked this more carefully to the question, rather than describing the topic. The best responses were characterised by balanced and detailed arguments and reached supported judgements.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Source-Based Question

Question 1

The hypothesis required candidates to consider how the standards of Southern planters were different from those of Northern preachers, even though they both used the same religion to justify their stance. A number of candidates noted that this contrast was highlighted by comparing Sources A and C. Most candidates focused on the sources, although a considerable proportion summarised or paraphrased them rather than using them to answer the question. It is vital that the points raised in the sources are linked with the hypothesis. More than just summarise the sources, candidates need to do two things. Firstly, they need to analyse them, which requires them to consider several parts of the source – who wrote it, what they said, when did they say it and to whom, what might their purpose have been – in order to make a brief comment about each. Secondly, they need to establish a clear and explicit connection between their summary analysis of each source and the hypothesis they are being asked to consider. Some candidates chose to address this by offering a paragraph of analysis for each source, then adding *‘thus we can see that this source supports – or does not support – the hypothesis’* at the end of their paragraph. A number of candidates went further and evaluated the sources by using cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge to decide whether the hypothesis could be supported or not. Such responses were often more effective as they developed a clear argument and maintained a focus on the question throughout.

This question requires candidates to place the sources at the heart of their answers. There is still a minority who do not do so; rather these candidates use sources to support arguments in a standard essay about the subject. They put the sources in a supporting role, occasionally referring to them to help support arguments based on their own knowledge. Instead, the sources must have the leading role, candidates’ knowledge

being used to support arguments which arise from the sources. The conclusion must certainly focus on the relationship between the sources and the hypothesis.

Question 2

The significance of Turner's thesis could be viewed in two ways. Firstly, as a number of candidates noted, looking back from 1893, it could indicate an important interpretation of American history. The best responses recognised that this interpretation needs to be evaluated against key events and developments of that history. Secondly, it could be used to look forward from 1893; the thesis could be seen seminal to the development of American historiography. A considerable proportion of candidates explained the significance when the question asked them to 'assess'. The difference, though slight, is important. It was also apparent that a number of responses would have preferred the question to have been '*Write all you know about the Turner thesis.*'

One feature of all answers which needs further consideration concerns the relationship between Turner's frontier thesis and O'Sullivan's concept of 'manifest destiny'. Most candidates assumed them to be one and the same. It is important to realise that they are not. The term 'manifest destiny' was first used by a journalist in 1845, when the USA was only half-formed, to justify the case for American expansionism. The Frontier Thesis was first used by an historian in 1893, fifty years later, reflecting on the expansionism which had been fuelled in part by Americans' belief in 'manifest destiny'. The best answers were aware of this important distinction.

Question 3

This was a popular question and the best responses contained detailed knowledge and noted the specific focus of the question. Most candidates wrote about Reconstruction in general rather than Radical Reconstruction in particular. Thus many answered the question '*how radical was Reconstruction?*' which is not the same as the question on the paper. The best candidates noted the capital 'R' in 'Radical', although this was generally overlooked. A number of candidates seemed unsure of what 'radical' might mean. They tended to equate it with harsh treatment of Southern whites – and, by implication, generous treatment of the ex-slaves. While this distinction has some validity, 'radical' in this context means fundamental rather than tough. The best responses were sharply focused on the question while weaker ones tended towards general descriptions.

Question 4

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

Question 5

This question on advances made by African Americans as a result of the world wars proved to be a popular one. A number of candidates realised that it was possible to compare the impact of the two wars and some pointed out that the impact of the First World War was likely to be less given the much longer involvement in the Second World War. There was plenty of ground to cover: two wars, the impact during both wartimes on both the war front and the home front, and then the peacetime impact of the wars on US domestic affairs. Some response included relevant detail on the 'Double V' campaign and Truman's Executive Order 8802. In weaker responses knowledge of the impact of the wars on the position of African Americans was often patchy and a number extended their consideration of the impact well into the 1950s and 1960s.

Question 6

There were many knowledgeable and well-argued responses to this popular question on the New Deal. The reforms were well known, as were their limitations and the criticisms which were levelled at both the New Deal and Roosevelt. The best responses appreciated that criticisms are not the same as opposition and even supporters could sometimes be critical. They focused on the reasons for opposition, writing a paragraph on each and illustrating it with examples of opponents and the arguments they used. Among the commonly discussed reasons for opposition was the feeling that reforms went too far (the American Liberty League) or not far enough (Huey Long). There was good coverage of government opposition. A number of weaker responses wrote too generally about opposition to the New Deal, asserting that 'many' people opposed it because, for example, it strengthened federal government at the expense of the states' rights. Specific examples of legislation which could be said to have done this would have made this point more

convincing. Some concentrated on describing the opposition groups rather than explaining and analysing why such groups opposed the reforms of the New Deal.

Question 7

This question was generally well answered and most candidates provided at least two or three reasons for the United States' return to isolation. The most frequently seen included the impact of the First World War, the tradition of isolationism and the opposition to the League of Nations. The focus of the question was more about isolationism and less about its limited nature. The best answers picked up on the inclusion of 'partial' in the question and attempted to address both points: why the USA was isolationist and why that isolationism could not involve total withdrawal from international affairs.

Question 8

The best essays reached a differentiated conclusion about how far the role and status of women changed between 1945 and 1968. There are several distinctions that can be applied; between married and unmarried women; between women with children – especially children of school age – and women without; between women from different social and educational backgrounds. Both the role and status of single women, free from family responsibilities, were different from those of married women. The distinctions were reduced as childcare facilities and maternity pay became more common but it was recognised that such changes only happened on a significant scale after 1968. Weaker responses often made general points about the changing position of women in the twenty-five years after the end of the Second World War but did not support their points with precise information and did not differentiate between different groups, or roles and status.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

Key Messages

- In **Section A** it is important to analyse and evaluate the five sources. Conclusions should summarise the assessment of how accurately the sources support the hypothesis.
- It is important to read the questions in **Section B** carefully and note the dates and key instructions. These should be used to provide the framework for the answer. Conclusions should answer the questions directly.

General Comments

All candidates met the basic requirements of the examination, answering the compulsory source-based question and three essay questions. It was more noticeable this year that a number of candidates answered the source-based question last. There is always a danger that, despite a candidate's best intentions, the final answer of whatever kind is hurried. The analysis and evaluation required for a source-based question are harder to compress than those of an essay question. In general, however, candidates wrote answers which showed a sound understanding of the questions and a willingness to debate the issues they raised. Some candidates concentrated so much on their arguments that they neglected the detailed evidence needed to support them. The very best answers showed a mastery of both arguments and evidence. It is also worth noting that many scripts were a pleasure to read.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The vast majority of candidates were both (a) aware of the demands of source-based questions and (b) able to analyse and, more importantly evaluate, the specific sources used in this question. There were few weak responses and most went beyond face value consideration of the sources to achieve some level of evaluation. In a number of scripts candidates might have made their analysis more explicitly relevant to the hypothesis. The key point of the question was the extent to which the North-South divide was unbridgeable. Too many simply argued that the sources showed there was a gap, which rather missed the point.

Candidates seemed more willing than usual to analyse the hypothesis itself. Some focused on 'revealed' and considered whether the political punch-up in the Senate simply highlighted a pre-existing division or actually caused a division where there had not been one before. Others argued that the Congressional brawl was more personal than political, which, in terms of four of the five sources, was a valid argument. The only problem with this argument is that Source D became irrelevant. In this respect, it is worth remembering that the sources are chosen carefully so that all of them can be used to contribute to the argument.

Perhaps the main difficulty candidates faced was in evaluating Source D. On the surface of it this election speech by Senator Douglas clearly challenged the hypothesis. (Too many thought this speech was part of a presidential election campaign when, in fact, Douglas was running to remain a US Senator.) The fact that the source made no mention of the Sumner-Brooks incident confused some candidates. The question, however, was not just about the brawl in Congress. It was about the North-South divide and whether it could be bridged. Douglas believes it can. That he said so in public, in the middle of an election campaign, makes it possible that he did not fully believe what he was saying. As many wrote, Douglas was out to win votes and politicians will say what their audience wants to hear if it helps their cause.

Given that most candidates achieved a good standard, the key issue becomes how to reach the highest level. There are two equally valid routes. One is to decide which of the two sets of sources – for or against – is the more convincing. In taking this path, candidates need to measure the relative merits of the two sets of sources. The other is to decide that the evaluated sources and the hypothesis are out of line with each other. Bringing them into line can only be done by rewording the hypothesis in some way. Here a number of candidates concluded that the hypothesis made more sense in relation to the sources if ‘unbridgeable’ was removed.

Section B

Question 2

Most candidates knew something about how the Mormons moved from the Mid-West but were less secure about what they did once in Utah. Thus they generally wrote about the 1840s when the new homeland was not fully established until the 1890s. Also most responses focused on how the Mormons succeeded, in effect giving an account of their success rather than accounting for that success. Furthermore, there was a tendency to focus on the obstacles which the Mormons faced rather than why they were able to overcome them.

Question 3

This question was about Lincoln’s contribution to the North’s victory rather than the causes of that victory. Some candidates concentrated on the latter rather than the issue of leadership. The question asks whether the North won despite its leader. Given the reverence that Lincoln now receives, it might seem hard to argue that he did little or nothing to help the victory of the North. It is therefore encouraging that most candidates showed a more critical approach and identified and evaluated weaknesses of Lincoln’s leadership, the most obvious being his lack of military expertise and his poor choice of military leaders, especially in the first year or two of the war. Overall, this was a popular and well-answered question and the majority of responses were detailed and balanced.

Question 4

There were relatively few responses to this question. An interesting argument, which considered that Progressivism aimed to quieten capitalism by introducing elements of socialism, was put forward in a number of responses. This was a good example of candidates using the wording of the question to develop an individual approach to the issues it raised. The majority of answers were less perceptive and tended to be superficial in both arguments and examples. Many, however, were wide of the mark, often writing about the USA in the 1920s, which was presumably the question they would have preferred to answer.

Question 5

This question could be used to illustrate what might be called the First Rule of answering History questions: make sure you cover the whole period of the question. Check on the start and finish date. In this case the specified starting date for many candidates became 1950 – or even 1960 – rather than 1900. This excluded the greater part of the period which they were asked to consider, which in turn limited the marks they could receive. Within self-imposed limits, most candidates wrote a balanced answer, comparing the importance of divisions in the civil rights movement with the hostility of the white majority and the indifference of the federal government leadership. There is a point of detail worth highlighting. Many candidates assumed or implied that Malcolm X was the leader of the Black Panthers. In fact, he was a member of the Nation of Islam from 1952 to 1964, when he left the church and became a Muslim. The Black Panther movement was formed in October 1966, eighteen months after the assassination of Malcolm X.

Question 6

Thus it was a popular choice and usually answered well. The vast majority of responses achieved a degree of balance and avoided heaping the blame on Hoover’s shoulders. Candidates argued that there were longer term, or ‘deeper’, causes, such as the strong belief in laissez-faire. The best answers drew a distinction between the two halves of the Hoover presidency: laissez-faire at the start, more interventionist towards the end. Some wanted to compare Hoover’s policies with those of Franklin Roosevelt, which was to step outside the boundaries set by the question.

Question 7

Candidates' responses varied considerably, especially in covering the various presidencies. A few answers mentioned all the presidents, at least in passing. The favourite approach was to choose one president and describe his foreign policy, Theodore Roosevelt being the most popular. The question, however, asks candidates to decide which President was the **most** successful, which means that at least three Presidents' policies need to be analysed. The trio preferred by most candidates was the two Roosevelts and Woodrow Wilson. When it came to Franklin Roosevelt, only a few took their analysis beyond 1939. The USA became 'the arsenal of democracy' leading allied forces in the defeat of Nazi Germany and Imperialist Japan. The Yalta conference at the very end of his life is also important in any assessment of FDR. The very best answers achieved an excellent standard by imposing a conceptual framework, such as isolationism or imperialism, to give greater coherence to their analysis.

Question 8

The question required candidates to discuss the degree to which America became a more tolerant nation. The idea of 'tolerance' needed to be defined and most regarded it as the majority's acceptance of minorities whose ways of life and values differed from its own. The question could be condensed into asking how far did white middle-aged males, who dominated the key institutions of US life, accept ethnic minorities of several kinds, sexual minorities, adolescents and women. The latter could be included, even though they were not in a minority in the strictest sense, because of the discrimination they faced. Weaker responses tended to discuss the changing position of women and African Americans in very general terms.