

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

General comments

Examiners were pleased to read some scripts that deserved very high marks. These candidates showed clear knowledge and understanding and were able to present and assess different explanations of an issue or problem and reach a supported conclusion. The most creditworthy scripts included answers that were highly relevant and well organised. **Question 1**, the source based question, is a test of candidates' ability to use and assess historical evidence and the best responses concentrated on explaining and assessing the extracts, rather than merely summarising them. The most effective essay answers pursued arguments or explanations and supported these with appropriate knowledge. There were also scripts that proved unsatisfactory. A frequent characteristic of such scripts was that the essays were not as well considered as answers to the source based question. Marks are not given merely because of the length of answers. Long but irrelevant essays that do not answer the question cannot be given a high reward. Equally very short answers usually contain insufficient development and limited knowledge. As a guide, it is reasonable to expect candidates to take about 40 minutes to write an essay answer. This allows for a few minutes to formulate a brief plan. All candidates are advised to practise writing essays for about this length of time, perhaps first using notes and then writing under examination conditions without them.

In assessing the answers to essay questions, credit was given when candidates noted command words and phrases, such as 'How far?', 'Why?' and 'Which was the most important reason?' The more effective answers used these to organise their answers. In discussing 'How far', candidates are best advised to decide first whether the weight of judgement is in favour of a claim or contradicts it. For example **Question 1** asked how far France was a police state under Napoleon Bonaparte. Well organised answers showed clearly at the beginning whether this was mostly a valid or invalid claim. They dealt with the more convincing case first, explaining its merits, then examining the alternative, showing why it was less persuasive. **Question 6** asked why the Bolsheviks replaced the Provisional Government in Russia in 1917. The best way to organise such answers was to work out a series of reasons and explain them in order of priority. **Question 5** asked whether trade or power was a more important reason for New Imperialism. It was helpful to deal first with whichever factor was thought to be most important and explain why this was so. The alternative could be dealt with later. With all questions in **Section B** the arguments need to be supported by detailed, relevant knowledge, otherwise they appear vague.

Introductions are useful to set out the general direction of answers but they should be brief and the material should relate to the question. For example, **Question 6** focused on events in Russia in 1917. It was acceptable to explain the background to the February Revolution but this background needed to be short and linked to the Provisional Government. For example, the problems caused to Nicholas II by the war continued to trouble Kerensky's government and affected the Bolsheviks. Material about the period before 1914 needed to be connected to the question. Perhaps the best introduction was to focus on the accession of the Provisional Government and to set out its main problems. Conclusions are necessary to round off an essay but should also be short, highlighting the main points but avoiding lengthy repetition.

The more successful candidates used their time wisely, spending roughly equal time on each of their answers. Notes are not assessed but they are helpful to candidates who can use them to organise their responses. In the source based question, candidates can note whether an extract agrees or disagrees with the hypothesis. They can decide how reliable and useful the source is. For essay answers, points can be noted in any order but then, using simple devices such as numbers or letters, swift decisions can be made about which points should be discussed first, and which later, in completed answers.

The syllabus is not a confidential document and all candidates should be given access to it so that they understand what will be assessed and how their answers will be marked. For example, Theme 3 is Nationalism. The syllabus explains which aspects should be studied in preparation for the examination. The syllabus is also a guarantee to candidates that questions will only appear on the question paper if they arise directly from the syllabus.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This was a source based question on 'The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914'. The topic was Germany and Austria in 1914. Candidates were given five sources and were asked to consider how far the sources confirmed the statement that '*Germany wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914*'. The most creditworthy answers noted the advice on the question paper '*to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources both individually and as a group.*' Lower marks were awarded when the extracts were merely summarised with no reference to their interpretation and evaluation. Candidates were given credit when they grouped the sources according to whether they confirmed or disconfirmed the hypothesis, usually at the beginning of their answer. This allowed candidates to organise their responses more effectively. It was helpful when candidates provided brief references to their own knowledge, for example the Triple Alliance that bound Germany and Austria, or Germany's fear that it was isolated against other major powers. A contrast between the most and least successful answers was that the former applied better tests to their evaluation. For example, moderate responses sometimes asserted that extracts were reliable because they were official documents. This does not necessarily follow and historians study the purpose and content of documents to assess their reliability. A few claimed that Source C was the most reliable source because France was not involved in the Serbian crisis. Although this is true in a narrow sense, the deep and long-standing hostility between France and Germany meant that France was not a neutral observer.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the extent to which France was a police state under Napoleon Bonaparte. There were some very good answers that explained what was understood by 'police state' and then used arguments and knowledge to assess Napoleon's regime in this light. However, a number of candidates failed to focus on this issue and less credit could be given to general accounts that narrated Napoleon's policies but did not assess them. For example, some described the terms of Napoleon's Code but did not show how far this supported or contradicted the claim that there was a police state in France. Overall judgements varied. This was allowable because historians constantly differ in their assessments. There was not a 'correct' or 'incorrect' answer to this question. Examiners were looking for clear arguments that were supported by appropriate knowledge. Answers awarded the highest marks considered alternative arguments and explained why one was more justifiable than the other.

Question 3

Candidates were required to assess whether the Industrial Revolution was a disaster for the lower classes. Characteristic of the most successful answers was their ability to focus on the question, concentrating on the relevant social group. They considered alternative explanations, discussed the positive and negative results of the Industrial Revolution for the lower classes and reached a conclusion. Although most answers agreed that the results were mostly adverse, some gained credit by pointing out that there were some reforms in the middle and later stages of the Industrial Revolution. A common tendency was to assume that living and working conditions were idyllic for the lower classes before the Industrial Revolution. A comparison with other classes was not required, although brief comparisons could be relevant if they were used to highlight the condition of the poor. Credit was given when answers included specific references to the countries that were mentioned in the question.

Question 4

There were many satisfactory answers to this question on the problems that faced Bismarck in unifying Germany to 1871. These usually showed adequate knowledge of Bismarck's career and sometimes this was detailed. The most creditworthy answers were organised analytically, defining the issues and then explaining their importance. Answers that were aware of problems for Bismarck within Prussia were highly rewarded. For example, Bismarck was appointed because of the budget crisis and faced opposition from the Liberals. Thoughtful candidates distinguished between Prussian and German nationalism. Within Germany



some states, especially in the south, were hesitant about accepting Prussian leadership. In some responses a study of the final stage of unification after the defeat of France proved worthwhile.

Question 5

The key issue was the comparison of trade and power as reasons for the New Imperialism of the later nineteenth century. The most important difference between less and more successful answers was that the latter concentrated on the causes or reasons for, New Imperialism and provided examples. More moderate essays were often vague. For example, they mentioned trade but did not give examples from Europe or elsewhere. It was relevant to mention other factors but such references needed to be brief, perhaps in an introduction or conclusion, because the key issue was a study of the two stated factors of trade and power. Some candidates deserved credit when they noted the links between these factors. Trade did not have only an economic importance. Whilst France and Italy sought to control some overseas areas that brought no economic benefits, Britain believed that the maintenance of an economic empire was vital to its position as an international power.

Question 6

The standard of many answers to this question on why the Bolsheviks replaced the Provisional Government in Russia in 1917 was sound. The highest marks were usually awarded to responses that considered two alternatives: the weaknesses of the Provisional Government and the strengths of the Bolsheviks. Some candidates made the excellent point that the victory of the Bolsheviks was unexpected, even in the summer of 1917. Answers were given credit when they explained why the Bolsheviks emerged as the victors. More moderate essays sometimes assumed their success. They explained why the Provisional Government failed and then simply announced that the Bolsheviks carried out another revolution.

Question 7

The focus of this question was the extent to which Hitler solved the domestic problems that had faced the Weimar Republic by 1939. Less successful answers often narrated Hitler's policies generally, providing little detail and not linking policies to the Weimar Republic. Although such responses often contained some relevant material, arguments did not focus sufficiently on the question to merit a high mark. A few very weak answers showed no knowledge and understanding of Weimar Germany. In contrast, the best essays were clear about the problems of the Weimar regime which were defined and then linked to the Nazi government's domestic policies. For example, the Weimar governments were weakened by the prevalence of small parties which caused instability. This could be contrasted with Hitler's one-party state and his personal dictatorship. Brief outlines of foreign policy could be made relevant when Hitler's policies were contrasted with those of the so called 'November criminals' who had agreed to the virtual destruction of the German military and its loss of territories.

Question 8

Candidates were required to focus on reasons why Nicholas II, but not Stalin, faced a successful revolution. The most successful answers were reasonably balanced between the two and their arguments were analytical and supported by appropriate knowledge. Moderate answers were often unbalanced although they generally showed adequate knowledge of Nicholas II and Stalin. Explanations were sometimes in the form of narratives rather than arguments. The least creditable answers did not focus on the possibility of revolution but provided general information that was not linked to the question. The overall standard of answers was satisfactory and Examiners were pleased to read some sound responses.



HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

General comments

Examiners were pleased to read some scripts that deserved very high marks. These candidates showed clear knowledge and understanding and were able to present and assess different explanations of an issue or problem and reach a supported conclusion. The most creditworthy scripts included answers that were highly relevant and well organised. **Question 1**, the source based question, is a test of candidates' ability to use and assess historical evidence and the best responses concentrated on explaining and assessing the extracts, rather than merely summarising them. The most effective essay answers pursued arguments or explanations and supported these with appropriate knowledge. There were also scripts that proved unsatisfactory. A frequent characteristic of such scripts was that the essays were not as well considered as answers to the source based question. Marks are not given merely because of the length of answers. Long but irrelevant essays that do not answer the question cannot be given a high reward. Equally very short answers usually contain insufficient development and limited knowledge. As a guide, it is reasonable to expect candidates to take about 40 minutes to write an essay answer. This allows for a few minutes to formulate a brief plan. All candidates are advised to practise writing essays for about this length of time, perhaps first using notes and then writing under examination conditions without them.

In assessing the answers to essay questions, credit was given when candidates noted command words and phrases, such as 'How far?', 'Why?' and 'Which was the most important reason?' The more effective answers used these to organise their answers. In discussing 'How far', candidates are best advised to decide first whether the weight of judgement is in favour of a claim or contradicts it. For example **Question 1** asked how far France was a police state under Napoleon Bonaparte. Well organised answers showed clearly at the beginning whether this was mostly a valid or invalid claim. They dealt with the more convincing case first, explaining its merits, then examining the alternative, showing why it was less persuasive. **Question 6** asked why the Bolsheviks replaced the Provisional Government in Russia in 1917. The best way to organise such answers was to work out a series of reasons and explain them in order of priority. **Question 5** asked whether trade or power was a more important reason for New Imperialism. It was helpful to deal first with whichever factor was thought to be most important and explain why this was so. The alternative could be dealt with later. With all questions in **Section B** the arguments need to be supported by detailed, relevant knowledge, otherwise they appear vague.

Introductions are useful to set out the general direction of answers but they should be brief and the material should relate to the question. For example, **Question 6** focused on events in Russia in 1917. It was acceptable to explain the background to the February Revolution but this background needed to be short and linked to the Provisional Government. For example, the problems caused to Nicholas II by the war continued to trouble Kerensky's government and affected the Bolsheviks. Material about the period before 1914 needed to be connected to the question. Perhaps the best introduction was to focus on the accession of the Provisional Government and to set out its main problems. Conclusions are necessary to round off an essay but should also be short, highlighting the main points but avoiding lengthy repetition.

The more successful candidates used their time wisely, spending roughly equal time on each of their answers. Notes are not assessed but they are helpful to candidates who can use them to organise their responses. In the source based question, candidates can note whether an extract agrees or disagrees with the hypothesis. They can decide how reliable and useful the source is. For essay answers, points can be noted in any order but then, using simple devices such as numbers or letters, swift decisions can be made about which points should be discussed first, and which later, in completed answers.

The syllabus is not a confidential document and all candidates should be given access to it so that they understand what will be assessed and how their answers will be marked. For example, Theme 3 is Nationalism. The syllabus explains which aspects should be studied in preparation for the examination. The syllabus is also a guarantee to candidates that questions will only appear on the question paper if they arise directly from the syllabus.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This was a source based question on 'The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914'. The topic was Germany and Austria in 1914. Candidates were given five sources and were asked to consider how far the sources confirmed the statement that 'Germany wanted Austria to go to war with Serbia in 1914'. The most creditworthy answers noted the advice on the question paper 'to pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources both individually and as a group.' Lower marks were awarded when the extracts were merely summarised with no reference to their interpretation and evaluation. Candidates were given credit when they grouped the sources according to whether they confirmed or disconfirmed the hypothesis, usually at the beginning of their answer. This allowed candidates to organise their responses more effectively. It was helpful when candidates provided brief references to their own knowledge, for example the Triple Alliance that bound Germany and Austria, or Germany's fear that it was isolated against other major powers. A contrast between the most and least successful answers was that the former applied better tests to their evaluation. For example, moderate responses sometimes asserted that extracts were reliable because they were official documents. This does not necessarily follow and historians study the purpose and content of documents to assess their reliability. A few claimed that Source C was the most reliable source because France was not involved in the Serbian crisis. Although this is true in a narrow sense, the deep and long-standing hostility between France and Germany meant that France was not a neutral observer.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the extent to which France was a police state under Napoleon Bonaparte. There were some very good answers that explained what was understood by 'police state' and then used arguments and knowledge to assess Napoleon's regime in this light. However, a number of candidates failed to focus on this issue and less credit could be given to general accounts that narrated Napoleon's policies but did not assess them. For example, some described the terms of Napoleon's Code but did not show how far this supported or contradicted the claim that there was a police state in France. Overall judgements varied. This was allowable because historians constantly differ in their assessments. There was not a 'correct' or 'incorrect' answer to this question. Examiners were looking for clear arguments that were supported by appropriate knowledge. Answers awarded the highest marks considered alternative arguments and explained why one was more justifiable than the other.

Question 3

Candidates were required to assess whether the Industrial Revolution was a disaster for the lower classes. Characteristic of the most successful answers was their ability to focus on the question, concentrating on the relevant social group. They considered alternative explanations, discussed the positive and negative results of the Industrial Revolution for the lower classes and reached a conclusion. Although most answers agreed that the results were mostly adverse, some gained credit by pointing out that there were some reforms in the middle and later stages of the Industrial Revolution. A common tendency was to assume that living and working conditions were idyllic for the lower classes before the Industrial Revolution. A comparison with other classes was not required, although brief comparisons could be relevant if they were used to highlight the condition of the poor. Credit was given when answers included specific references to the countries that were mentioned in the question.

Question 4

There were many satisfactory answers to this question on the problems that faced Bismarck in unifying Germany to 1871. These usually showed adequate knowledge of Bismarck's career and sometimes this was detailed. The most creditworthy answers were organised analytically, defining the issues and then explaining their importance. Answers that were aware of problems for Bismarck within Prussia were highly rewarded. For example, Bismarck was appointed because of the budget crisis and faced opposition from the Liberals. Thoughtful candidates distinguished between Prussian and German nationalism. Within Germany some states, especially in the south, were hesitant about accepting Prussian leadership. In some responses a study of the final stage of unification after the defeat of France proved worthwhile.

Question 5

The key issue was the comparison of trade and power as reasons for the New Imperialism of the later nineteenth century. The most important difference between less and more successful answers was that the latter concentrated on the causes or reasons for, New Imperialism and provided examples. More moderate essays were often vague. For example, they mentioned trade but did not give examples from Europe or elsewhere. It was relevant to mention other factors but such references needed to be brief, perhaps in an introduction or conclusion, because the key issue was a study of the two stated factors of trade and power. Some candidates deserved credit when they noted the links between these factors. Trade did not have only an economic importance. Whilst France and Italy sought to control some overseas areas that brought no economic benefits, Britain believed that the maintenance of an economic empire was vital to its position as an international power.

Question 6

The standard of many answers to this question on why the Bolsheviks replaced the Provisional Government in Russia in 1917 was sound. The highest marks were usually awarded to responses that considered two alternatives: the weaknesses of the Provisional Government and the strengths of the Bolsheviks. Some candidates made the excellent point that the victory of the Bolsheviks was unexpected, even in the summer of 1917. Answers were given credit when they explained why the Bolsheviks emerged as the victors. More moderate essays sometimes assumed their success. They explained why the Provisional Government failed and then simply announced that the Bolsheviks carried out another revolution.

Question 7

The focus of this question was the extent to which Hitler solved the domestic problems that had faced the Weimar Republic by 1939. Less successful answers often narrated Hitler's policies generally, providing little detail and not linking policies to the Weimar Republic. Although such responses often contained some relevant material, arguments did not focus sufficiently on the question to merit a high mark. A few very weak answers showed no knowledge and understanding of Weimar Germany. In contrast, the best essays were clear about the problems of the Weimar regime which were defined and then linked to the Nazi government's domestic policies. For example, the Weimar governments were weakened by the prevalence of small parties which caused instability. This could be contrasted with Hitler's one-party state and his personal dictatorship. Brief outlines of foreign policy could be made relevant when Hitler's policies were contrasted with those of the so called 'November criminals' who had agreed to the virtual destruction of the German military and its loss of territories.

Question 8

Candidates were required to focus on reasons why Nicholas II, but not Stalin, faced a successful revolution. The most successful answers were reasonably balanced between the two and their arguments were analytical and supported by appropriate knowledge. Moderate answers were often unbalanced although they generally showed adequate knowledge of Nicholas II and Stalin. Explanations were sometimes in the form of narratives rather than arguments. The least creditable answers did not focus on the possibility of revolution but provided general information that was not linked to the question. The overall standard of answers was satisfactory and Examiners were pleased to read some sound responses.



HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

General comments

The overall quality of candidates' work was satisfactory and all of the Examiners read scripts that deserved high marks. A characteristic of these scripts was that they maintained a good standard across all answers. A number of scripts, reaching the middle bands of marks, were uneven. They contained two or possibly three sound answers, whilst the remaining responses were more limited. This might point to either of two explanations. The candidates' study of topics or themes in the syllabus might have been too narrow so they knew too little to complete the required number of questions satisfactorily. Alternatively, they might have misjudged the time that was available so that they could not complete four answers adequately. If candidates believe that the first was probably the case, they are advised to read the syllabus carefully to become familiar with its requirements. If the second applies, candidates should be careful to ration their time in the examination. Allowing about 40 minutes for an essay answer, candidates should deal first with the most important points that they wish to make. If time is short, the remaining points can be summarised quickly because they will be less important. A guiding word should be 'focus' and candidates should consider what is essential to the response and what can be omitted.

There was generally a competent response to **Question 1**, the source based question. It was helpful when candidates presented their case at the beginning of the answer, arguing either for or against the hypothesis that no country engaged in a war of aggression in 1914. Credit was given to the candidates who suggested an alternative hypothesis in a conclusion. Candidates' own knowledge was used to support arguments but some weak answers were too heavily reliant on this contextual knowledge, giving too little attention to the printed sources. It was creditable when candidates gave reasons for their views about an extract's reliability and usefulness. Preparatory notes help candidates to organise their thoughts before writing answers but they should be very short. For example, in the source based question, they can record which of the extracts support and which contradict the hypothesis. In essay answers, candidates can draw on their short notes to decide the most important points. They can work out whether there are links between the various points. For example, **Question 5** asked for an assessment of the results of New Imperialism for Europe. Candidates' notes could be used to decide which factors should be discussed first because they were the most important results. When answering the essay questions, candidates should bear two issues in mind: 'What point do I want to make that is relevant to the question', and 'What facts do I want to note to support the point?'

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This was a source based question on the general topic of The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914. The topic was the outbreak of World War I. Candidates were asked to use five sources to assess the claim that '*No country engaged in a war of aggression.*' The most successful answers avoided a sequential approach to the discussion of the sources. Some grouped the extracts, considering those that agreed with the hypothesis and those that contradicted it. For example, Source E summarised the situation by claiming that every country, except Britain, fought to defend itself and that Britain went to war to defend Belgium. On the other hand, Source D blamed Russian aggression as shown by its mobilisation. Others looked at individual countries. For example, they interpreted Source A as a criticism of France whilst Source C attributed blame to an aggressive Serbia. A common feature of these highly creditable answers was that they evaluated the material instead of taking it at face value. Sources B, C and E were seen to be defensive of their respective governments. Credit was given when candidates noted that Source A included perhaps unexpected criticism of France by the Belgian Ambassador. Usually France would be seen as defending Belgium's interests and neutrality against Germany before World War I. These high quality answers also cross-referenced the

sources. In particular the view of a modern historian in Source E was tested against the other extracts and against candidates' own knowledge. Moderate and weak answers often devoted too much time to summarising content and gave too little attention to interpretation. The overall quality of the answers was satisfactory and Examiners read a good proportion of very successful responses.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was an assessment of the claim that the most serious problem in the French ancien régime was poor quality leadership. The standard of most of the answers was satisfactory. There was a high level of relevance, even in answers that contained thin arguments and slight knowledge. Most candidates could deal effectively with the poor leadership of Louis XVI, but the better answers also discussed other aspects of leadership in eighteenth-century France. For example, the nobility occupied an important place in government and society but they were unwilling to concede any changes that might endanger their privileged position. The Church was not just a leading religious institution but was powerful in society and able to influence the government. The combination of the conservative Church and the nobility meant that two of the most powerful classes in France stood against reform of the ancien régime. Candidates were also able to assess the significance of problems other than poor leadership. Some argued that the situation at the accession of Louis XVI was so serious that even an able king would have been tested to remedy it. The most successful answers made links between other factors identified and the issue of leadership.

Question 3

This question required discussion of the judgement that capitalists were the most important reason for the development of the Industrial Revolution. Achieving satisfactory marks depended on candidates' understanding of the term 'capitalists' as those who provided investment during the Industrial Revolution. The question did not require candidates to agree with the claim. They could choose to give priority to alternative reasons for industrial development such as good communications, the availability of raw materials or a flexible work force. However, answers were given credit when they explained why capitalists were important. Individual inventors contributed to significant developments such as steam power but usually lacked the resources to turn their inventions into practical innovations, for example in factories or on railways. In the early days of the Industrial Revolution, the capitalists were often individuals who risked their money. Later groups of investors were formed. Some families such as the Rothschilds became important. Banks also provided capital investment. In a period when free trade was admired more than government intervention, governments might pursue policies that encouraged industrialisation but direct financial intervention was not welcomed by tax payers. Some answers would have been awarded a higher mark if they had included examples of industrial development from at least two of the specified countries (Britain, France or Germany) to avoid vague discussions.

Question 4

Candidates were asked to consider the reasons why Prussia unified Germany. They could spend most time explaining and assessing the role played by Bismarck because he was certainly the most important person in the unification of Germany. The highest marks were awarded to answers that also considered other factors. These might have included the economic strength of Prussia, represented best by its domination of the Zollverein. Prussia also had the best army of the German states and this allowed it to win the wars that were vital to its success. It was relevant to discuss the external factors that helped Prussia to unify Germany. For example, Austria was apparently the leading influence in Germany in the mid-nineteenth century. It took a major part in the defeat of the revolutions of 1848-49. Although it could not suppress German nationalism it kept it under control until Bismarck came to power. Austria was out-manoeuvred by Bismarck but was treated leniently after defeat by Prussia so that it did not remain an enemy. In their different ways the other major powers of France, Britain and Russia helped Prussia. The question asked 'Why?' and better candidates analysed the reasons for Prussia's success and suggested an order of priority. This was more creditable than answers that contained only narrative. The overall standard was satisfactory and Examiners were pleased to read some excellent essays that combined convincing arguments with sound knowledge.



Question 5

Some candidates would have achieved higher marks in this question if they had focused on the results of New Imperialism, instead of discussing its causes. However, the majority of answers were directly relevant and the most successful shared two characteristics. Firstly they were well organised; candidates sorted their ideas into categories, such as the political, strategic, economic and social consequences of New Imperialism. Secondly they provided examples from different countries in Europe. The highest marks were given to the answers that assessed the results; they sorted out the consequences into positive and negative and they indicated which were the most significant. A feature of answers in the middle bands was that they made valid points, but in a less organised way, and lacked examples so that they were too general for a high reward.

Question 6

The key issue was the comparative danger to Nicholas II's government of the revolutions of 1905 and February 1917. Examiners read a number of highly creditable answers. The highest marks were awarded to those that concentrated on a comparison of the dangers. For example, they noted the danger to Nicholas II's government from the army in 1917 and contrasted this with the support he enjoyed from the military in 1905. World War I was a very significant danger at the end of the reign, whereas in 1905 the government was recovering from the effects of the unsuccessful war with Japan. Candidates compared the extent of the opposition in 1905 and 1917 and assessed the condition of the economy and social problems in the two periods. Valid comparisons were made between the personal position of the Tsar in 1905 and in 1917. The least successful answers were often very unbalanced. The question presented candidates with two developments (1905 and 1917) and answers that were reasonably balanced between them deserved higher marks than essays that showed knowledge and understanding of only one. It was relevant to discuss the period from 1906 to 1917 but the best candidates linked developments to the key issue. For example, they explained how far Stolypin's policies contributed to the Tsar's problems at the time of the revolution.

Question 7

Candidates were required to make an assessment of the extent to which Hitler's government represented a totalitarian regime up to 1939. They were rewarded when they explained the meaning of the term 'totalitarian'. This involved the total, or complete, control of a country, going beyond a political dictatorship to include the economy, society, religion and culture. Whilst most agreed that the term was an appropriate description, some candidates were aware of opposition, although it was very limited in scope. This point was given high credit. It was pleasing to read many well-organised and knowledgeable answers that focused on the key issue. The weakest answers tended to give accounts of Hitler's rule which contained general and unspecific knowledge and dealt with the issue of totalitarianism very briefly, either in an introduction or a conclusion.

Question 8

This question required a comparison of the extent to which Lenin and Stalin established communism in Russia and asked 'Who did more...?' Candidates were entitled to spend more time on their preferred choice but higher marks were awarded when there was a reasonable balance between the two leaders. Essays that were limited to only one leader could not achieve the highest mark bands. There were some interesting alternative arguments, for example that neither established a truly communist rule because their regimes were very different from those advocated by Marx. Neither set up the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' but managed governments that were personally dictatorial, even totalitarian. A good number of candidates showed adequate understanding and knowledge but a discriminating factor was the extent to which the description of the policies of Lenin and Stalin was linked to communism. Some answers deserved very high marks for their sustained comparative approach.



HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

General comments

Whilst the overall standard of the scripts was satisfactory, the examination paper produced a wide range of responses in terms of quality. Examiners were encouraged to note that many candidates were able to sustain excellent standards throughout all four of their answers. They displayed clear evidence of the ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. The vast majority of candidates were able to show evidence of sound factual knowledge, but often found it difficult to deploy this in a focused and analytical manner in order to address the specific requirements of the questions. Conversely, some candidates demonstrated the ability to write in a relevant and analytical manner, but tended to produce assertions which were not supported by appropriate factual content. Disappointingly, some candidates seemed ill-prepared for the examination, their responses displaying a lack of suitable knowledge and relying on vague generalisations.

The compulsory source based question (**Section A: Question 1**) requires quite different skills from those needed for the essay questions in **Section B**. Whilst almost all candidates were able to find arguments to both support and challenge the hypothesis, relatively few were able to go beyond face value and interpret the sources fully in their historical context. In general, responses to the essay questions were of higher quality than those for **Question 1**, although all of the questions produced responses across the full mark range. The majority of candidates were able to display evidence of sound knowledge, but this was often used in a descriptive manner, without directly addressing the requirements of the specific question. The most successful candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding to produce well-structured, relevant, focused, balanced and analytical essays, often making effective use of appropriate quotations from specific historians or text books.

Disappointingly, a small number of candidates ignored or misread the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question required candidates to use the sources as evidence to test the validity of the hypothesis that '*U Thant was a failure as UN Secretary-General.*' Most candidates were able to use the information contained within the sources to construct a logical response to the question, although generally candidates found it easier to find points in support of the hypothesis than points which might challenge it. The majority stated that Source B was heavily critical of U Thant's performance as Secretary-General, demonstrating his ineffectiveness in dealing with major issues and citing the damning statement that '*History remembers U Thant as weak and essentially invisible.*' Similarly, Source D was seen as supporting the hypothesis; U Thant's decision to withdraw UNEF being viewed as a major error of judgement which contributed to the onset of war between Israel and the Arab states. U Thant's own admission regarding the failure of the UN in Yemen, as described in Source C, was seen as further confirmation of the hypothesis. On the other hand, most candidates felt that Source E paid tribute to U Thant for his success in certain areas, although many interpreted the fact that his proposals to deal with the problems in Vietnam were ignored by the USA as a further sign of his weakness. Source A provoked mixed responses, most concluding that U Thant's seemingly contradictory views must have contributed to his overall failure.

However, in order to achieve higher marks for this question, candidates were required to go beyond such face value interpretation of the sources. It was necessary to analyse the sources in their historical context,

evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. For example, the article quoted in Source A was published at the time when U Thant was inaugurated as Secretary-General and therefore cannot comment on his performance in that role. It is conjecture about his performance from an American viewpoint, hence the repeated references to 'Red China' and to the belief that he was likely to be 'very sturdy' in protecting the UN from Russian attempts to undermine it. Source A is therefore of limited use in evaluating U Thant's actual performance in the role of Secretary-General. Interestingly, many candidates misinterpreted U Thant's claim that the Secretary-General '*must be impartial, but not necessarily neutral.*' Many felt this meant that U Thant would favour the USA in Cold War issues, whilst many others believed that it meant he would favour the USSR.

Most candidates rightly pointed out that, being written in 1996, Source B had the advantage of hindsight and, given its origin, was unlikely to contain any bias. However many candidates assumed that because U Thant oversaw a decade containing so many major problems, he must somehow be responsible for them. More perceptive candidates used their contextual knowledge to show that the 1960s was a period when Cold War rivalries were at their height. It was almost inevitable that the UN Secretary-General would find it difficult to maintain credibility and would earn the anger and contempt of the USA and the USSR alike. Similarly, some candidates made the point that U Thant did not simply ignore these major issues, but made a conscious effort to intervene. They confirmed this by cross-referencing with Sources C and E. Source C implies that U Thant played a crucial role in calming the Cuban Missile Crisis, while Source E claims that U Thant's attempts to mediate in the Vietnam War failed not because of his own inefficiencies but because of US opposition.

Many candidates pointed out that Source E comes from a UN publication and that it would be unlikely to be overly-critical of its former Secretary-General. Whilst this is valid, to accuse the source of unreliability or bias would be an unsupported assertion unless evidence is given to show how it might create a false impression. The best responses showed how the source actually only refers to one specific example (West Irian) where U Thant was successful. Much of the remaining content is vague and generalised, for example stating that he made proposals on '*disarmament and economic and social cooperation, and many of his suggestions were adopted.*'

On a similar note, the most effective responses pointed out that while both Sources C and D supported the hypothesis, they each only mention one specific example in which U Thant might be deemed to have failed. Some candidates commented that the failure of the UN mission in Yemen could be explained by the fact that it was under-resourced, a feature common to many UN activities during the period and not a reflection of U Thant himself. Surprisingly few candidates explained that, under the terms of the UN Charter and the specific mandate, U Thant had little choice but to comply with Nasser's request for the withdrawal of UNEF.

Only a minority of candidates achieved the top level of performance for **Question 1**. They did this by stating, usually in the final paragraph, that the quality of evidence either for or against the hypothesis was stronger on one side of the argument. This was achieved by evaluating the evidence beyond face value, on both sides of the argument and then explaining how and why the quality of evidence differed. Alternatively, after offering an effective evaluation of the sources, candidates were able to use the argument presented to suggest a change in the hypothesis. This often took the form of stating that it would be more appropriate to talk about the failure of the UN in general, with an implied criticism of its member states, rather than U Thant in particular.

Section B

Question 2

This question, the most popular in **Section B**, required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cold War in Europe, and to assess the view that neither the USA nor the USSR wanted the Cold War to develop. The vast majority of candidates displayed sound knowledge of events in Europe following the end of the Second World War. Most recognised that the hypothesis reflected the post-revisionist interpretation of the outbreak and early development of the Cold War between 1945 and 1949. Many argued that neither the USA nor the USSR wanted a Cold War, but that it developed because of misunderstandings and misinterpretations. For example the USA misinterpreted the reasons why the USSR established communist regimes in Eastern Europe, whilst the USSR misinterpreted the USA's motives in developing the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Thus the Cold War developed because of the fear and insecurity created by each side's false assumptions regarding the motives and actions of the other. Disappointingly a large number of candidates failed to see the necessity to achieve balance by analysing other interpretations of events. More effective responses reflected the need to develop a balanced argument, also exploring the traditional view that it was the aggressive expansionism of the USSR which

provoked the Cold War. Many responses also considered the revisionist position that President Truman's vehemently anti-communist policies, together with the USA's desire to extend her economic interests in Europe, made confrontation inevitable. Those who wrote in general terms about the historical debate surrounding the causes and early development of the Cold War, without constructing a balanced argument focused on the specific needs of the question, did not score highly. The most effective responses contained relevant analysis, supported by precise, accurate and detailed examples.

Question 3

Although not quite as popular as **Question 4**, this was attempted by a large number of candidates. It required knowledge and understanding of the causes of the globalisation of the Cold War and evaluation of the relative significance of the US policy of containment. Whilst there were some very impressive responses, the vast majority tended to be significantly unbalanced. Many candidates were able to demonstrate a reasonable degree of understanding of what containment was trying to achieve. Most were able to give wide-ranging examples of its successes and failures. However, very few were able to relate this to the globalisation of the Cold War. Many responses revealed a lack of genuine understanding of the term 'globalisation', whilst others suffered from the absence of an appropriate definition of 'containment' and confusion with other US strategies, such as 'roll back'. Many candidates argued erroneously that it was containment which caused China to become involved in the Korean War when the USA moved into North Korea. The overwhelming majority of responses focused entirely on the role of the USA in globalising the Cold War. Very few candidates appreciated the need to maintain balance by investigating other possible causes, such as the role of the USSR and China in extending their influence, or the way in which superpower rivalry was to some extent manipulated by people such as Castro. Accordingly, a large number of candidates underachieved in this question despite being able to display considerable knowledge of US involvement in many areas of the world (South-East Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East) and throughout the entire period from 1950 to 1980.

Question 4

This was both more popular and generally better answered than the alternative **Question 3**. It required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cuban Missile Crisis and to assess the relative significance of the USA's reaction to Castro's Cuban revolution. Most candidates were able to display an impressive level of knowledge about the Cuban Missile Crisis, although too many produced straightforward narrative accounts with no explicit reference to the question. A disappointingly large number of responses reflected a degree of confusion about the requirements of the question and concentrated on the USA's reaction to the fact that the USSR had placed missiles in Cuba. Inevitably, perhaps, these tended to argue that the USA did not overreact at all, but simply took understandable measures to ensure its own security. The most effective responses were able to show that the USA became alarmed by the overthrow of Batista, together with Castro's nationalistic policies which were perceived as being to the detriment of American interests. Ill-fated attempts to remove Castro by force, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, along with the imposition of economic sanctions, forced Cuba to seek assistance from the USSR. It could be argued that American overreaction created the problem by turning Castro from a nationalistic freedom fighter into a staunch supporter of communism. However, in order to maintain balance, it was necessary to show that this alone would not have led to the missile crisis. The best responses provided an explanation of Soviet motives in installing missiles on the island and Castro's own motives in seeking Soviet assistance and pledging himself and his country to communism.

Question 5

This question required candidates to use knowledge and understanding of the crises facing the world's largest communist states in the 1980s to evaluate the relative importance of political leadership in shaping the very different outcomes for the USSR and China. There were a large number of excellent responses. Most candidates displayed impressive knowledge of the policies of Deng Xiaoping and Gorbachev and the impact which these policies had in their respective countries. They were able to argue that Deng's liberal economic reforms transformed the ailing Chinese economy, but also led to demands for major political reform, culminating in the Tiananmen Square demonstrations. Clever and resolute leadership enabled Deng to maintain control of both the communist party and the army, which he was prepared to use in order to crush political opposition. In contrast, Gorbachev's attempts to overcome the social, political and economic stagnation of the Soviet Union through policies such as glasnost and perestroika failed to reverse the decline. He was also unable to maintain control of the Communist Party. The best responses were able to demonstrate that the quality of political leadership was not the only factor which led to such different outcomes, stressing that Gorbachev also had to contend with problems such as nationalism, a major



commitment in Afghanistan and the huge financial outlays necessitated by the nuclear arms race. Weaker responses tended to be largely narrative accounts of events in the USSR and China with little reference to the question, often drifting into lengthy accounts of problems under Mao and Khrushchev. However, Examiners were pleased to note the large number of candidates who were able to engage in effective comparative evaluation.

Question 6

Candidates were required to display knowledge and understanding of the role of nuclear weapons in the Cold War and to evaluate their effects on superpower relations, reaching a conclusion as to whether they made the Cold War more or less dangerous. Most candidates displayed a great deal of knowledge about the development of nuclear weapons and about the various treaties designed to limit their use. However, relatively few were able to apply this knowledge in a focused manner to address the specific requirements of the question. Most responses tended to be descriptive in character, rather than analytical. Many candidates, for example, wrote at length about the various treaties, but very few analysed their impact or effectiveness. The weakest responses tended to comprise a series of generalised assertions, unsupported by factual content. The most effective responses were able to demonstrate that nuclear weapons did, at times, increase tension, such as the Soviet development of SS20s and the US deployment of Pershing and Cruise in the early 1980s. At other times they led to periods of détente, for instance following the Cuban Missile Crisis and with the development of Mutually Assured Destruction.

Question 7

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Japanese economy was able to develop so effectively in the post-war period, and to evaluate the relative importance of internal political measures. It was attempted by a small minority of candidates and responses tended to fall into one of three categories. The weakest responses were characterised by a lack of appropriate factual knowledge and consisted of generalised and unsupported assertions. Conversely, the majority of responses contained a great deal of appropriate factual material which was deployed in a descriptive manner with very little focused reference to the terms of the question. The best responses compared and contrasted the relative importance of the various factors which led to the 'economic miracle'. Whilst referring to the various policies adopted by successive Japanese governments which aided economic growth, they also referred to other internal factors such as the availability of an effective labour force, limited military expenditure and the considerable importance of external factors, such as the role of the USA and the impact of the Korean War.

Question 8

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the problems facing Africa in the period from 1970 to 1991, and to test the validity of the hypothesis in the question. It was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates, often as a final response and, in many cases, as a last resort. Most responses were very poor, characterised by a lack of knowledge regarding the problems which faced Africa in the 1970s and 1980s. Many answers comprised gross generalisations, based on the assumption that the whole of Africa must have faced the same problems, for the same reasons. Indeed, Examiners were disappointed to note that many candidates consistently referred to Africa as a 'country' and to its 'government'. Only a few candidates were able to provide a focused and balanced response, demonstrating, with appropriate examples, their understanding that different African countries experienced problems for very different reasons, some of them relating to governmental mismanagement, some of them not.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

General comments

Whilst the overall standard of the scripts was satisfactory, the examination paper produced a wide range of responses in terms of quality. Examiners were encouraged to note that many candidates were able to sustain excellent standards throughout all four of their answers. They displayed clear evidence of the ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. The vast majority of candidates were able to show evidence of sound factual knowledge, but often found it difficult to deploy this in a focused and analytical manner in order to address the specific requirements of the questions. Conversely, some candidates demonstrated the ability to write in a relevant and analytical manner, but tended to produce assertions which were not supported by appropriate factual content. Disappointingly, some candidates seemed ill-prepared for the examination, their responses displaying a lack of suitable knowledge and relying on vague generalisations.

The compulsory source based question (**Section A: Question 1**) requires quite different skills from those needed for the essay questions in **Section B**. Whilst almost all candidates were able to find arguments to both support and challenge the hypothesis, relatively few were able to go beyond face value and interpret the sources fully in their historical context. In general, responses to the essay questions were of higher quality than those for **Question 1**, although all of the questions produced responses across the full mark range. The majority of candidates were able to display evidence of sound knowledge, but this was often used in a descriptive manner, without directly addressing the requirements of the specific question. The most successful candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding to produce well-structured, relevant, focused, balanced and analytical essays, often making effective use of appropriate quotations from specific historians or text books.

Disappointingly, a small number of candidates ignored or misread the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question required candidates to use the sources as evidence to test the validity of the hypothesis that '*U Thant was a failure as UN Secretary-General.*' Most candidates were able to use the information contained within the sources to construct a logical response to the question, although generally candidates found it easier to find points in support of the hypothesis than points which might challenge it. The majority stated that Source B was heavily critical of U Thant's performance as Secretary-General, demonstrating his ineffectiveness in dealing with major issues and citing the damning statement that '*History remembers U Thant as weak and essentially invisible.*' Similarly, Source D was seen as supporting the hypothesis; U Thant's decision to withdraw UNEF being viewed as a major error of judgement which contributed to the onset of war between Israel and the Arab states. U Thant's own admission regarding the failure of the UN in Yemen, as described in Source C, was seen as further confirmation of the hypothesis. On the other hand, most candidates felt that Source E paid tribute to U Thant for his success in certain areas, although many interpreted the fact that his proposals to deal with the problems in Vietnam were ignored by the USA as a further sign of his weakness. Source A provoked mixed responses, most concluding that U Thant's seemingly contradictory views must have contributed to his overall failure.

However, in order to achieve higher marks for this question, candidates were required to go beyond such face value interpretation of the sources. It was necessary to analyse the sources in their historical context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. For example, the article quoted in Source A was

published at the time when U Thant was inaugurated as Secretary-General and therefore cannot comment on his performance in that role. It is conjecture about his performance from an American viewpoint, hence the repeated references to 'Red China' and to the belief that he was likely to be *'very sturdy'* in protecting the UN from Russian attempts to undermine it. Source A is therefore of limited use in evaluating U Thant's actual performance in the role of Secretary-General. Interestingly, many candidates misinterpreted U Thant's claim that the Secretary-General *'must be impartial, but not necessarily neutral.'* Many felt this meant that U Thant would favour the USA in Cold War issues, whilst many others believed that it meant he would favour the USSR.

Most candidates rightly pointed out that, being written in 1996, Source B had the advantage of hindsight and, given its origin, was unlikely to contain any bias. However many candidates assumed that because U Thant oversaw a decade containing so many major problems, he must somehow be responsible for them. More perceptive candidates used their contextual knowledge to show that the 1960s was a period when Cold War rivalries were at their height. It was almost inevitable that the UN Secretary-General would find it difficult to maintain credibility and would earn the anger and contempt of the USA and the USSR alike. Similarly, some candidates made the point that U Thant did not simply ignore these major issues, but made a conscious effort to intervene. They confirmed this by cross-referencing with Sources C and E. Source C implies that U Thant played a crucial role in calming the Cuban Missile Crisis, while Source E claims that U Thant's attempts to mediate in the Vietnam War failed not because of his own inefficiencies but because of US opposition.

Many candidates pointed out that Source E comes from a UN publication and that it would be unlikely to be overly-critical of its former Secretary-General. Whilst this is valid, to accuse the source of unreliability or bias would be an unsupported assertion unless evidence is given to show how it might create a false impression. The best responses showed how the source actually only refers to one specific example (West Irian) where U Thant was successful. Much of the remaining content is vague and generalised, for example stating that he made proposals on *'disarmament and economic and social cooperation, and many of his suggestions were adopted.'*

On a similar note, the most effective responses pointed out that while both Sources C and D supported the hypothesis, they each only mention one specific example in which U Thant might be deemed to have failed. Some candidates commented that the failure of the UN mission in Yemen could be explained by the fact that it was under-resourced, a feature common to many UN activities during the period and not a reflection of U Thant himself. Surprisingly few candidates explained that, under the terms of the UN Charter and the specific mandate, U Thant had little choice but to comply with Nasser's request for the withdrawal of UNEF.

Only a minority of candidates achieved the top level of performance for **Question 1**. They did this by stating, usually in the final paragraph, that the quality of evidence either for or against the hypothesis was stronger on one side of the argument. This was achieved by evaluating the evidence beyond face value, on both sides of the argument and then explaining how and why the quality of evidence differed. Alternatively, after offering an effective evaluation of the sources, candidates were able to use the argument presented to suggest a change in the hypothesis. This often took the form of stating that it would be more appropriate to talk about the failure of the UN in general, with an implied criticism of its member states, rather than U Thant in particular.

Section B

Question 2

This question, the most popular in **Section B**, required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cold War in Europe, and to assess the view that neither the USA nor the USSR wanted the Cold War to develop. The vast majority of candidates displayed sound knowledge of events in Europe following the end of the Second World War. Most recognised that the hypothesis reflected the post-revisionist interpretation of the outbreak and early development of the Cold War between 1945 and 1949. Many argued that neither the USA nor the USSR wanted a Cold War, but that it developed because of misunderstandings and misinterpretations. For example the USA misinterpreted the reasons why the USSR established communist regimes in Eastern Europe, whilst the USSR misinterpreted the USA's motives in developing the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Thus the Cold War developed because of the fear and insecurity created by each side's false assumptions regarding the motives and actions of the other. Disappointingly a large number of candidates failed to see the necessity to achieve balance by analysing other interpretations of events. More effective responses reflected the need to develop a balanced argument, also exploring the traditional view that it was the aggressive expansionism of the USSR which provoked the Cold War. Many responses also considered the revisionist position that President Truman's

vehemently anti-communist policies, together with the USA's desire to extend her economic interests in Europe, made confrontation inevitable. Those who wrote in general terms about the historical debate surrounding the causes and early development of the Cold War, without constructing a balanced argument focused on the specific needs of the question, did not score highly. The most effective responses contained relevant analysis, supported by precise, accurate and detailed examples.

Question 3

Although not quite as popular as **Question 4**, this was attempted by a large number of candidates. It required knowledge and understanding of the causes of the globalisation of the Cold War and evaluation of the relative significance of the US policy of containment. Whilst there were some very impressive responses, the vast majority tended to be significantly unbalanced. Many candidates were able to demonstrate a reasonable degree of understanding of what containment was trying to achieve. Most were able to give wide-ranging examples of its successes and failures. However, very few were able to relate this to the globalisation of the Cold War. Many responses revealed a lack of genuine understanding of the term 'globalisation', whilst others suffered from the absence of an appropriate definition of 'containment' and confusion with other US strategies, such as 'roll back'. Many candidates argued erroneously that it was containment which caused China to become involved in the Korean War when the USA moved into North Korea. The overwhelming majority of responses focused entirely on the role of the USA in globalising the Cold War. Very few candidates appreciated the need to maintain balance by investigating other possible causes, such as the role of the USSR and China in extending their influence, or the way in which superpower rivalry was to some extent manipulated by people such as Castro. Accordingly, a large number of candidates underachieved in this question despite being able to display considerable knowledge of US involvement in many areas of the world (South-East Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East) and throughout the entire period from 1950 to 1980.

Question 4

This was both more popular and generally better answered than the alternative **Question 3**. It required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cuban Missile Crisis and to assess the relative significance of the USA's reaction to Castro's Cuban revolution. Most candidates were able to display an impressive level of knowledge about the Cuban Missile Crisis, although too many produced straightforward narrative accounts with no explicit reference to the question. A disappointingly large number of responses reflected a degree of confusion about the requirements of the question and concentrated on the USA's reaction to the fact that the USSR had placed missiles in Cuba. Inevitably, perhaps, these tended to argue that the USA did not overreact at all, but simply took understandable measures to ensure its own security. The most effective responses were able to show that the USA became alarmed by the overthrow of Batista, together with Castro's nationalistic policies which were perceived as being to the detriment of American interests. Ill-fated attempts to remove Castro by force, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, along with the imposition of economic sanctions, forced Cuba to seek assistance from the USSR. It could be argued that American overreaction created the problem by turning Castro from a nationalistic freedom fighter into a staunch supporter of communism. However, in order to maintain balance, it was necessary to show that this alone would not have led to the missile crisis. The best responses provided an explanation of Soviet motives in installing missiles on the island and Castro's own motives in seeking Soviet assistance and pledging himself and his country to communism.

Question 5

This question required candidates to use knowledge and understanding of the crises facing the world's largest communist states in the 1980s to evaluate the relative importance of political leadership in shaping the very different outcomes for the USSR and China. There were a large number of excellent responses. Most candidates displayed impressive knowledge of the policies of Deng Xiaoping and Gorbachev and the impact which these policies had in their respective countries. They were able to argue that Deng's liberal economic reforms transformed the ailing Chinese economy, but also led to demands for major political reform, culminating in the Tiananmen Square demonstrations. Clever and resolute leadership enabled Deng to maintain control of both the communist party and the army, which he was prepared to use in order to crush political opposition. In contrast, Gorbachev's attempts to overcome the social, political and economic stagnation of the Soviet Union through policies such as glasnost and perestroika failed to reverse the decline. He was also unable to maintain control of the Communist Party. The best responses were able to demonstrate that the quality of political leadership was not the only factor which led to such different outcomes, stressing that Gorbachev also had to contend with problems such as nationalism, a major commitment in Afghanistan and the huge financial outlays necessitated by the nuclear arms race. Weaker

responses tended to be largely narrative accounts of events in the USSR and China with little reference to the question, often drifting into lengthy accounts of problems under Mao and Khrushchev. However, Examiners were pleased to note the large number of candidates who were able to engage in effective comparative evaluation.

Question 6

Candidates were required to display knowledge and understanding of the role of nuclear weapons in the Cold War and to evaluate their effects on superpower relations, reaching a conclusion as to whether they made the Cold War more or less dangerous. Most candidates displayed a great deal of knowledge about the development of nuclear weapons and about the various treaties designed to limit their use. However, relatively few were able to apply this knowledge in a focused manner to address the specific requirements of the question. Most responses tended to be descriptive in character, rather than analytical. Many candidates, for example, wrote at length about the various treaties, but very few analysed their impact or effectiveness. The weakest responses tended to comprise a series of generalised assertions, unsupported by factual content. The most effective responses were able to demonstrate that nuclear weapons did, at times, increase tension, such as the Soviet development of SS20s and the US deployment of Pershing and Cruise in the early 1980s. At other times they led to periods of détente, for instance following the Cuban Missile Crisis and with the development of Mutually Assured Destruction.

Question 7

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Japanese economy was able to develop so effectively in the post-war period, and to evaluate the relative importance of internal political measures. It was attempted by a small minority of candidates and responses tended to fall into one of three categories. The weakest responses were characterised by a lack of appropriate factual knowledge and consisted of generalised and unsupported assertions. Conversely, the majority of responses contained a great deal of appropriate factual material which was deployed in a descriptive manner with very little focused reference to the terms of the question. The best responses compared and contrasted the relative importance of the various factors which led to the 'economic miracle'. Whilst referring to the various policies adopted by successive Japanese governments which aided economic growth, they also referred to other internal factors such as the availability of an effective labour force, limited military expenditure and the considerable importance of external factors, such as the role of the USA and the impact of the Korean War.

Question 8

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the problems facing Africa in the period from 1970 to 1991, and to test the validity of the hypothesis in the question. It was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates, often as a final response and, in many cases, as a last resort. Most responses were very poor, characterised by a lack of knowledge regarding the problems which faced Africa in the 1970s and 1980s. Many answers comprised gross generalisations, based on the assumption that the whole of Africa must have faced the same problems, for the same reasons. Indeed, Examiners were disappointed to note that many candidates consistently referred to Africa as a 'country' and to its 'government'. Only a few candidates were able to provide a focused and balanced response, demonstrating, with appropriate examples, their understanding that different African countries experienced problems for very different reasons, some of them relating to governmental mismanagement, some of them not.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

General comments

Whilst the overall standard of the scripts was satisfactory, the examination paper produced a wide range of responses in terms of quality. Examiners were encouraged to note that many candidates were able to sustain excellent standards throughout all four of their responses, clearly displaying evidence of their ability to make informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of appropriate knowledge and understanding. The vast majority of candidates were able to show evidence of sound factual knowledge, but often found it difficult to deploy this in a focused and analytical manner in order to address the specific requirements of the questions. Conversely, some candidates were able to demonstrate the ability to write in a relevant and analytical manner, but tended to produce assertions which were not adequately supported by factual content. Time management was a problem for a small number of candidates who clearly rushed their final response or failed to complete it.

The compulsory source based question (**Section A: Question 1**) requires quite different skills from those needed for the essay questions in **Section B**. Whilst the vast majority of candidates were able to find arguments to both support and challenge the hypothesis, relatively few were able to go beyond face value and interpret the sources fully in their historical context. In general, responses to the essay questions were of higher quality than those for **Question 1**. The majority of candidates were able to display evidence of sound factual knowledge, but this was often used in a narrative or descriptive manner, without directly addressing the requirements of the specific question. The most successful candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding to produce well-structured, relevant, focused, balanced and analytical essays, often making effective use of appropriate quotations from specific historians or text books.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question required candidates to use the sources as evidence to test the validity of the hypothesis that *'UN peacekeeping has demonstrated that it can deal effectively with international conflicts.'* The vast majority of candidates were able to use the information contained within the sources to construct a logical response to the question. Most were able to identify information both in support of and challenging the hypothesis, thereby enabling them to write balanced arguments.

Most candidates felt that Source A supported the hypothesis because of its claim that *'peacekeeping became a key for the maintenance of international peace and security.'* Similarly, Source B was seen as showing the success of the UN in keeping peace in the Middle East. The fact that the UN was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in 1988 was widely viewed as confirmation of the success of UN peacekeeping. Many noted that the Secretary-General pointed out in his acceptance speech (Source C) that this method could only work with the support of member states and the countries involved in the dispute. It was necessary for the UN to keep more forceful methods available to it as envisaged in Chapter Seven of the UN Charter. Source D was seen as providing a balanced view, showing how UN peacekeeping had been successful in Congo but failed to meet any of its objectives in Lebanon. Whilst confirming that UN peacekeeping had achieved some success, and confirming the award of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1988, Source E was widely seen as challenging the hypothesis, noting that UN peacekeeping is *'not the solution to every conflict.'*

However, in order to achieve higher marks, candidates were required to go beyond such face value interpretation of the sources. It was necessary to analyse the sources in their historical context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them. For example, many candidates pointed out that Source A, whilst stating that the UN mounted 18 peacekeeping missions during the Cold War, deals primarily with how

such missions were organised and makes no comment regarding their effectiveness. Source A is therefore of limited value in addressing the question. Source B clearly implies that the UN operation in Suez was a success in that it maintained peace with minimum rights and functions. Candidates rightly pointed out that it deals with only one example of UN peacekeeping. Many commented that as it is from a UN publication it might have a vested interest in stressing the organisation's successes rather than its failures. It is also implicit in Source B that the Suez operation could only have worked with the compliance of the nations involved. Many candidates cross-referenced this point with Source C, where the Secretary-General himself explains that UN peacekeeping '*can only work through persuasion, the moral force of international and diplomatic pressure.*' Indeed, in stating that '*the majority of nations have opted for the rule of international authority and law in their relations with each other*', Source C clearly implies that a minority of governments have not. Under such circumstances UN peacekeeping could not be successful, a point confirmed by the failure of the UN mission in Lebanon (Source D) and the failure of UN attempts to maintain peace in places such as Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia (Source E). Many candidates felt that Source E was the most useful evidence in that it provides a balanced and honest assessment of UN peacekeeping direct from the Secretary-General himself, who might have been expected to exaggerate the UN's successes. A number of candidates successfully linked Source E's concluding statement that UN peacekeeping is '*not the solution to every conflict*' to the argument put forward in Source C that the UN should maintain the right to invoke Chapter Seven and deploy more forceful means where necessary.

Only a small minority of candidates achieved the top level of performance for **Question 1**. They did this by stating, usually in the final paragraph, that the quality of evidence either for or against the hypothesis was stronger on one side of the argument. This was achieved by evaluating the evidence on both sides of the argument, beyond face value, and then explaining how and why the quality of evidence differed. Alternatively, after offering an effective evaluation of the sources beyond face value, candidates were able to use the argument presented to suggest a change in the hypothesis. Generally, this took the form of stating that UN peacekeeping could only be successful if the countries involved were prepared to accept its jurisdiction and if members of the Security Council were prepared to support it.

Section B

Question 2

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cold War in Europe, and to decide if misunderstanding between the USA and USSR was the main cause of the Cold War. The vast majority of candidates displayed sound knowledge of the events in Europe following the end of the Second World War. Most recognised that the question reflects the post-revisionist interpretation of the outbreak and early development of the Cold War between 1945 and 1949. Those who wrote in general terms about the causes and early development of the Cold War, or simply about the historical debate surrounding these issues, without constructing a balanced argument focused on the specific needs of the question, did not score highly. The most effective responses contained relevant analysis, supported by precise and accurate factual content. Many candidates argued that the Cold War was indeed caused by misunderstandings between the two superpowers. For example, the USA misunderstood the reasons why the USSR established communist regimes in Eastern Europe, whilst the USSR misinterpreted the USA's motives in developing the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Thus, the Cold War developed because of the fear and insecurity created by each side's false assumptions regarding the motives and actions of the other. Disappointingly a large number of candidates failed to see the necessity to achieve balance by analysing other interpretations of events. More effective responses reflected the need to develop a balanced argument, exploring the traditional argument that it was the aggressive expansionism of the USSR which provoked the Cold War. Many also considered the revisionist view that President Truman's vehemently anti-communist policies, together with the USA's desire to extend her economic interests in Europe, made confrontation inevitable.

Question 3

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the USA's containment policy and to use this to evaluate how successful it was between 1950 and 1989. Most candidates displayed sound knowledge of the USA's involvement in Korea, Vietnam and Cuba and many were able to provide further examples in Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. A relatively small number covered the full time period in the question; this was usually achieved by discussing American failure to remove Soviet forces from Afghanistan. In general responses tended to be heavily descriptive, with little focus on the specific needs of the question. To a large extent, this was because too many candidates failed to provide an adequate definition of 'containment'. They were therefore unable to differentiate between 'containment' and

other strategies such as 'roll back'. As a result many responses were based on the assumption that all American involvement in issues around the world was due to containment. For example, many candidates claimed that containment failed in the Korean War because the USA was not able to create a non-communist regime in North Korea. While there were a few excellent responses to this question, the vast majority were unfocused and lacking in analytical depth.

Question 4

This question was more popular and generally led to more effective responses than the alternative **Question 3**. It required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cuban Missile Crisis and to assess the significance of the USA's reaction to Castro's Cuban revolution. Most candidates were able to display an impressive level of knowledge about the Cuban Missile Crisis, although too many produced narrative accounts with no explicit reference to the wording of the question. A surprisingly large number of candidates misinterpreted the question and described, often at considerable length, the American reaction to the discovery that the USSR had placed nuclear weapons in Cuba. In many cases, this was because of the assumption that, being a communist, Castro immediately sought Soviet assistance once he had deposed the pro-American government of Batista. The most effective responses were able to show that the USA became alarmed by the overthrow of Batista, along with Castro's nationalistic policies which were perceived as being against American interests. Both Eisenhower and Kennedy made failed attempts to remove Castro. Combined with the imposition of economic sanctions, this forced Cuba to seek assistance from the USSR. Some argued that US policy towards Cuba created the problem by turning Castro from a nationalistic freedom fighter into a staunch supporter of communism. However, in order to maintain balance, it was necessary to show that this alone would not have led to the missile crisis. The best responses provided an explanation of Soviet motives in installing missiles on the island and Castro's own motives in seeking Soviet assistance and pledging himself and his country to communism.

Question 5

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the factors which led to the ending of the Cold War, and to evaluate the relative importance of Gorbachev. The vast majority of candidates demonstrated an impressive amount of knowledge regarding Gorbachev and the collapse of the Soviet Union. They were able to describe the impact of his policies of glasnost and perestroika and of his decision to abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine. Many argued that it was Gorbachev's policies which destroyed the Soviet Union and therefore they must have led to the end of the Cold War. Such responses, however, tended to be heavily descriptive and extremely unbalanced. More effective responses attempted to place Gorbachev and his reforms in context, demonstrating that he was faced with numerous seemingly insurmountable problems; a stagnating political system, a failing economy, nationalism both inside and outside the USSR, an unsuccessful war in Afghanistan and an already impossible commitment to the arms race which was made worse by Reagan's Star Wars initiative. It was often argued that Gorbachev had little choice but to undertake major reform within the Soviet Union in order to address these problems and to seek talks with the USA on issues such as arms reduction. The willingness of US Presidents Reagan and Bush to negotiate with Gorbachev was also mentioned as a key element in the ending of the Cold War.

Question 6

The question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the attempts to control nuclear weapons between 1968 and 1988 and to discuss whether attempts to control proliferation were more successful than attempts at reduction. In general, this question produced poor responses. Too many candidates failed to address the specific requirements of the question, tending instead to provide a narrative account of the build up of nuclear weapons and a chronological account of the attempts made to control them. Whilst such responses often revealed an impressive amount of factual knowledge, they tended to stray outside the time frame established by the question and usually showed a lack of understanding of the difference between 'proliferation' and 'reduction'. While most candidates referred to the Non Proliferation Treaty of 1968, very few engaged in an evaluation of what it was trying to achieve or how successful it was in meeting its aims. Indeed, the implication in the vast majority of responses was that nuclear weapons constitute an issue which involved only the superpowers. There were a few more effective responses which made an explicit attempt to evaluate the impact over time of the Non Proliferation Treaty. The best responses also applied similar analytical depth to the SALT Treaties and the INF Treaty of 1988. In general these reached the conclusion that attempts to reduce nuclear weapons were ultimately more successful than attempts to prevent their proliferation.

Question 7

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Japanese economy was able to develop so effectively in the post-war period, and to evaluate the relative importance of assistance from the USA. It was attempted by a small number of candidates. The weakest responses were characterised by a lack of appropriate knowledge and consisted of highly generalised, unsupported assertions. The majority of answers contained a great deal of relevant factual material which was often presented as a narrative with little reference to the terms of the question. However, there were a number of responses which were focused, balanced and well-argued. These tended to argue that assistance from the USA played a significant role in kick-starting the 'Japanese miracle' through financial assistance, favourable trading rights, advantages derived from the Korean War and removing the need for Japan to fund its own military security. Internal factors such as the role of the Japanese government through its education, economic and protectionist measures, the importance of MITI and the hard work and enterprise of the Japanese people were frequently mentioned. These were also seen as being highly significant for sustaining economic growth in the longer term.

Question 8

This question required candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the impact on the Third World of decolonization and to discuss whether it caused more problems than it solved. Few candidates attempted this question, and the majority of responses were of a poor standard, reflecting limited factual knowledge and the assumption that the whole of the 'Third World' responded in exactly the same way to the experience of decolonization. As a result most responses consisted of generalisations, simplifications and unsupported assertions. Very few candidates attempted to provide examples of how individual countries responded to decolonization and even these tended to do so in an uncoordinated manner with little clear focus on the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

General comments

Examiners were pleased to see that some candidates produced very good quality answers. These were highly relevant, focused on the questions, explanatory or analytical in nature and with clearly structured arguments backed by good quality evidence. However, the overall performance of many candidates was weak in terms of their understanding and knowledge. Many answers were focused on the topic rather than the question. Responses were also frequently too brief with points undeveloped or unsupported. Some were prone to guesswork and irrelevant material. Encouragingly there were signs of improvement in the quality of answers for the compulsory source based question. It is still the case, however, that very many candidates here were unable to evaluate sources in their historical context. There were no major rubric infringements but far too many candidates did not answer all 4 questions as required.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The best candidates evaluated the sources in their historical context, gave the case for and against the stated hypothesis that *'Lincoln's election meant that armed conflict between North and South became unavoidable'* and made good use of relevant knowledge. These responses were able to access the highest levels of the mark scheme. Many candidates simply described and commented on the sources taking them at face value and summarising their content. Frequently sources were described as 'biased' without adequate explanation. Opinionated extracts are still valuable sources as they indicate the strongly held views of the originators which may be of great significance. Most candidates were able to recognise which sources on the face of it challenged the hypothesis (Sources B and D), which supported it (Sources B and C), and which contained elements of both support and challenge (Source E).

Section B

Question 2

This proved to be a very popular question and attracted some very good responses. Candidates were generally aware of the concept of Manifest Destiny, its provenance and its implications for Native Americans, Mexico and Canada. The consequences were quite well described, including the defeat of Mexico and huge gains in territory which turned the US into a transcontinental power for the first time. A minority of candidates went on to discuss the revival of the issue of slavery expansion, which it was thought had been settled by the Missouri Compromise of 1820, and gained credit for their thoughtful approach. Too many candidates only answered one half of the question, focusing on either 'why' or 'with what consequences', usually the latter. None mentioned the importance of railroads for opening up vast new territories. Sometimes candidates' grasp of chronology was vague.

Question 3

Many candidates gave the impression that they did not understand Lincoln's comment and ignored it, choosing to present a pre-prepared Lincoln essay instead. Clearly this lack of focus on the terms of the actual question limited the marks they were able to achieve. Too often responses were unstructured and vague. Certain situations were out of Lincoln's hands, for example the secession of South Carolina and the formation of the Confederacy, the attack on Fort Sumter and Lee's successful defensive strategy in 1864. However, in many cases, Lincoln imposed his own will with quite definite results. Examples of this could have included the Emancipation Proclamation, conscription, the suspension of basic civil liberties and his generous Reconstruction programme. Some answers portrayed Lincoln as a figurehead whose victory was achieved by his generals. Curiously enough the most common criticism of Lincoln was that he was a dictator. It was however, Lincoln who appointed the generals and had ultimate authority. Even though Commander in Chief he did not attempt to interfere in questions of strategy but dismissed those who could not perform. Few candidates considered that Lincoln is usually rated by historians as the most outstanding President in US history.

Question 4

This question, requiring candidates to assess the part played by innovation and invention on the US economy, was often too broadly interpreted and this resulted in a great deal of irrelevance. Few answers gave detailed examples, with Ford's Model T automobile receiving great prominence. Many answers provided little more than generalisations which ignored the given time period of 1865 – 1914, with television and the cotton gin being provided as examples. The invitation in the question to assess the connection between technical advances and economic development was largely ignored. A handful of candidates examined the factors behind the dramatic economic development in this period. At the start of the period the US was an agrarian economy, by the end it was the largest industrial economy in the world.

Question 5

The overwhelming impression in responses to this question was that candidates were determined to use their prepared material on African-American civil rights irrespective of what the question required. Answers displayed little detailed information on Native Americans with limited discussion of aspects of their culture, lifestyle or deteriorating socio-economic experience. Answers focused almost entirely on African-Americans with the argument that somehow Native American concerns were pushed to the margins. There is of course an element of truth in this, but it is only one of many factors. Quarrels between the numerous tribes and nations and a lack of effective organisation until very late were both relevant. It needs to be emphasised strongly that it is very risky for candidates to attempt answers where they lack specific knowledge relating to that topic.

Question 6

Candidates were required to discuss how fair it was to describe the period between 1921 and 1933, under Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover as '*wasted years*'. This proved to be a popular question and was generally well answered. The best responses critically examined the three Presidents and supported their points with relevant and accurate detail. In weaker responses evaluations were sometimes rather general, with Hoover often being personally blamed for the Wall St. Crash and with little specific comment made about Harding. Some answers provided a broad survey of the 1920s but made little or no mention of the Presidents. Some candidates wrote about them in the wrong order or included Wilson and Roosevelt. Surprisingly few discussed the positive features of the 1920s such as new industries like aviation, the cinema, electrical goods and most important of all, the automobile industry, which was to become almost literally the motor of the US economy. The criticism implied in the quotation '*wasted years*' was usually ignored. The fact that all three Presidents received huge electoral mandates was rarely mentioned.



Question 7

This was a popular question which attracted some clearly argued and well supported responses. Some candidates focused almost entirely on isolationism and it was useful for them to provide a definition of this term. The best responses contrasted isolationism with active US diplomacy in a number of fields such as the Washington Naval Agreements and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Surprisingly there was infrequent mention of the Neutrality Acts which severely limited the President's freedom of action. The marked shift in US foreign policy after 1938 was often overlooked, as was FDR's steadily increasing material assistance to the Allies in 1940. A significant minority of candidates ignored the time period given and discussed Pearl Harbour and US involvement in World War II at great length, ignoring the terms of the actual question.

Question 8

Too many candidates used this question on the change in composition and location of the US population as a vehicle to write general comments about post-war America. Civil Rights featured very prominently in responses but the terms of the question were overlooked. Post-war immigration reached record levels and combined with the baby boom to bring about a large increase in population. The agreement with Mexico led to a large increase in legal and illegal migrants from that country to the US. The 'location' part of the question was too frequently ignored. The South and West gained in population, California becoming the largest populated state with one resident in two having been born outside that state. 'White flight' from cities to suburbs was mentioned in passing but the profound social consequences were largely ignored.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

General comments

The general standard was quite acceptable with many candidates demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding throughout their responses. Rubric infringements were rare and only a handful of candidates failed to answer 4 questions. Many scripts were really excellent in quality, being relevant in answering the actual questions on the paper rather than merely addressing the topic. Such responses were often analytical and explanatory, rather than descriptive or narrative and a great many answers benefited from clearly structured arguments, supported by good quality evidence. However a large number of candidates still preferred to adopt a narrative approach, often with elements of the question being ignored. For example 'analyse' in **Question 2** and 'assess' in **Question 7** were often overlooked. Candidates who focused on the topic rather than the question could only expect to attain the lower levels of the mark scheme. The standard of the compulsory source based **Question 1** showed a marked improvement over previous years, with more candidates being able to link the sources to their historical context.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Many responses opted for safety in describing, comparing and commenting on the sources and only taking them at face value. It was also the case that too few candidates saw the need to put the case for and against the stated hypothesis that '*Slavery was somehow the cause of the war.*' Better candidates evaluated sources in their historical context. In Source A, South Carolina was not a typical slave state; it had always been the most extreme in secessionist sentiment having threatened to secede as early as 1850. Sources B and C are quite different in their importance; B is a private letter from Lincoln to a newspaper magnate at a time when things were going badly for the Union while Source C is an inaugural address to the nation when Union victory was assured. Source D was written 8 years after the war had ended with complete defeat for the Confederacy and all the slaves being freed. It is quite possible Davis was trying to rewrite history in his own favour by downplaying the importance of the slave issue in bringing about secession. Several candidates put forward a revised hypothesis, but to attain the highest level this had to be firmly based on the foundations of a fully contextual response. It cannot be simply bolted on to an answer which only considers the sources at face value and which ignores their context.

Section B

Question 2

This proved to be a very popular question with the focus often being firmly on the consequences of the annexation of Texas rather than the causes. The latter needed to be addressed with the key point being that the only time Mexico had ever recognised Texan independence was when Santa Anna was a prisoner. As soon as he was released he revoked recognition as being made under duress. Moreover, when Texas was finally admitted to the Union in December 1845 its boundary with Mexico was unclear. At this point Mexico broke off diplomatic relations with the United States. Hence war with Mexico became inevitable once President Polk came to office with a very aggressive policy of asserting the Rio Grande as the boundary between Mexico and Texas. Most answers concentrated on describing the war which was highly successful and resulted in Mexico ceding half her national territory, including California, to the United States, thus making America a transcontinental power from Atlantic to Pacific. Better responses dealt with the revival of the slavery issue with the huge new territories as part of the United States. Texas was admitted as a slave state but few candidates went on to point out that an acceptable compromise for both Sections proved impossible to be maintained from 1846 to the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860.



Question 3

This question on the inevitability of Union victory proved to be very popular but was indifferently answered. Most responses focused on the overwhelming superiority of the Union in population, industrial capacity, finance, railway network and maritime strength. From this they argued that Union victory was assured. A small minority of candidates observed that European opinion thought that the Confederacy would succeed in maintaining its independence. The Revolutionary War had shown how difficult it was for a numerically stronger army to defeat and occupy rebel territory. All the Confederacy had to do was to wage a defensive war, hoping to wear down the morale of the North. Better answers argued that a decisive factor was Lincoln being able to keep the border slave states of Kentucky, Missouri and Maryland in the Union. Few candidates discussed why it took so long, more than 4 years, to subdue the South. Most responses discussed at some length Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 which made the moral differences between the two sides much more clear-cut. However, until Sherman's capture of Atlanta in September 1864, Lincoln thought that he would be defeated in the Presidential election in November, an event which would have led to an armistice and very probably de facto recognition of the Confederacy.

Question 4

Only a few candidates answered this question and responses were characterised by irrelevance. The plight of small-scale family farmers in the decades following the Civil War was desperate. A steady decline of farm prices caused falling incomes. This factor, along with high freight charges for produce and heavy indebtedness to banks at high interest, led farmers to form the Granger Movement and later the People's Party, usually known as Populists. Unfortunately for the farmers America was becoming increasingly urbanised and their political influence was in decline. Many candidates wrote about irrelevant industrial issues and ignored the focus of the question on agriculture.

Question 5

This proved to be a very popular question and it attracted many good answers. The focus of the question was clearly Malcolm X but some responses chose to focus on Martin Luther King and his achievements, with the coverage of Malcolm X [Little] being highly negative. An argument often advanced was that his violent language and rejection of King's strategy of non violence was guaranteed to make race relations much worse by frightening the white population. A case can however be made for Malcolm X; he was in no way connected to organising violence and his advocacy of self reliance for Black Americans was a factor in increasing confidence among young African-Americans. It could also be argued that indirectly he assisted in gaining acceptance for King's more moderate policies. By presenting a more radical alternative to King he made it easier for white liberals to argue that it was essential to support Dr King's strategy of cooperation because the alternative was likely to be much more aggressive and threatening.

Question 6

The typical response to this popular question was to give a narrative account of the New Deal from 1933 onwards, with focus on the topic rather than the question. A few candidates made the obvious point that FDR's election triumphs in 1932 and 1936 had been so spectacular that it was highly unlikely that he would repeat them in 1940. Generally too little attention was paid to the difficulties of his second term; a rapid increase in unemployment in 1937, worsening relations with Congress in spite of the huge Democratic majorities in both Houses and his attempt to pack the Supreme Court with judges more amenable to his policies. Surprisingly, only a few candidates pointed out the general disquiet at his seeking a third term in office which no other President had attempted. International factors, with war in Europe going very badly for the Allies in 1940, were often overlooked. All the evidence is that the vast majority of Americans did not want US involvement in the conflict, but it was felt that FDR was moving America in that direction. Candidates did not consider Wendell Wilkie who was a new kind of Republican, much more electable, untainted by any association with Hoover and indeed a former New Deal supporter. These factors combined to make FDR's task more difficult but his margin of victory was still decisive.



Question 7

Too frequently candidates ignored the word 'assess' in this question on the contribution of the US to Allied victory in World War II. Instead rather too many preferred to describe the US contribution to allied victory in general terms. What was needed here was a clearly structured and well supported argument which answered the question. The key point was that without US help when it was neutral, Britain would probably have been compelled to sue for peace in 1940 or 1941. When Hitler inexplicably declared war on the United States the massive US contribution in manpower, ships, aircraft and munitions was vital in securing victory. Some candidates presented a 'shopping list' of the detail of US support which was helpful but not essential. Even the Russian defeat of Germany was aided considerably by huge American gifts of military equipment. A surprising number of candidates did not mention that the US was fighting two wars simultaneously and that even after victory in Europe, Japan remained unconquered.

Question 8

There were few good answers to this question with generalised comment on the American way of life being the norm. An effective response required some specific details of the strength of organised religion and what the different denominations actually achieved. There was a religious revival after 1950 with the great majority of Americans regarding themselves as members of a church. Leading figures, such as the evangelist Billy Graham, were national celebrities and reached much wider audiences due to television. It was essential for any candidate for public office to assert his membership of a religious group with Jews, Christian Scientists and Mormons becoming accepted holders of public office. Candidates needed to spend some time considering the influence of the religious groups. The Catholic Church was strongly anti-communist and was associated with policies of hostility to the Soviet Union and China. The Jewish community was largely responsible for the key American role in the creation of Israel. The African-American community was overwhelmingly Protestant, distinctively charismatic and highly significant in the civil rights movement. On the other hand it has been asserted that American religion was materialist rather than spiritual, serving little more purpose than to assert divine approval for the American way of life.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

General comments

The general standard was quite acceptable with many candidates demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding throughout their responses. Rubric infringements were rare and only a handful of candidates failed to answer 4 questions. Many scripts were really excellent in quality, being relevant in answering the actual questions on the paper rather than merely addressing the topic. Such responses were often analytical and explanatory, rather than descriptive or narrative and a great many answers benefited from clearly structured arguments, supported by good quality evidence. However a large number of candidates still preferred to adopt a narrative approach, often with elements of the question being ignored. For example 'analyse' in **Question 2** and 'assess' in **Question 7** were often overlooked. Candidates who focused on the topic rather than the question could only expect to attain the lower levels of the mark scheme. The standard of the compulsory source based **Question 1** showed a marked improvement over previous years, with more candidates being able to link the sources to their historical context.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Many responses opted for safety in describing, comparing and commenting on the sources and only taking them at face value. It was also the case that too few candidates saw the need to put the case for and against the stated hypothesis that '*Slavery was somehow the cause of the war.*' Better candidates evaluated sources in their historical context. In Source A, South Carolina was not a typical slave state; it had always been the most extreme in secessionist sentiment having threatened to secede as early as 1850. Sources B and C are quite different in their importance; B is a private letter from Lincoln to a newspaper magnate at a time when things were going badly for the Union while Source C is an inaugural address to the nation when Union victory was assured. Source D was written 8 years after the war had ended with complete defeat for the Confederacy and all the slaves being freed. It is quite possible Davis was trying to rewrite history in his own favour by downplaying the importance of the slave issue in bringing about secession. Several candidates put forward a revised hypothesis, but to attain the highest level this had to be firmly based on the foundations of a fully contextual response. It cannot be simply bolted on to an answer which only considers the sources at face value and which ignores their context.

Section B

Question 2

This proved to be a very popular question with the focus often being firmly on the consequences of the annexation of Texas rather than the causes. The latter needed to be addressed with the key point being that the only time Mexico had ever recognised Texan independence was when Santa Anna was a prisoner. As soon as he was released he revoked recognition as being made under duress. Moreover, when Texas was finally admitted to the Union in December 1845 its boundary with Mexico was unclear. At this point Mexico broke off diplomatic relations with the United States. Hence war with Mexico became inevitable once President Polk came to office with a very aggressive policy of asserting the Rio Grande as the boundary between Mexico and Texas. Most answers concentrated on describing the war which was highly successful and resulted in Mexico ceding half her national territory, including California, to the United States, thus making America a transcontinental power from Atlantic to Pacific. Better responses dealt with the revival of the slavery issue with the huge new territories as part of the United States. Texas was admitted as a slave state but few candidates went on to point out that an acceptable compromise for both Sections proved impossible to be maintained from 1846 to the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860.



Question 3

This question on the inevitability of Union victory proved to be very popular but was indifferently answered. Most responses focused on the overwhelming superiority of the Union in population, industrial capacity, finance, railway network and maritime strength. From this they argued that Union victory was assured. A small minority of candidates observed that European opinion thought that the Confederacy would succeed in maintaining its independence. The Revolutionary War had shown how difficult it was for a numerically stronger army to defeat and occupy rebel territory. All the Confederacy had to do was to wage a defensive war, hoping to wear down the morale of the North. Better answers argued that a decisive factor was Lincoln being able to keep the border slave states of Kentucky, Missouri and Maryland in the Union. Few candidates discussed why it took so long, more than 4 years, to subdue the South. Most responses discussed at some length Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 which made the moral differences between the two sides much more clear-cut. However, until Sherman's capture of Atlanta in September 1864, Lincoln thought that he would be defeated in the Presidential election in November, an event which would have led to an armistice and very probably de facto recognition of the Confederacy.

Question 4

Only a few candidates answered this question and responses were characterised by irrelevance. The plight of small-scale family farmers in the decades following the Civil War was desperate. A steady decline of farm prices caused falling incomes. This factor, along with high freight charges for produce and heavy indebtedness to banks at high interest, led farmers to form the Granger Movement and later the People's Party, usually known as Populists. Unfortunately for the farmers America was becoming increasingly urbanised and their political influence was in decline. Many candidates wrote about irrelevant industrial issues and ignored the focus of the question on agriculture.

Question 5

This proved to be a very popular question and it attracted many good answers. The focus of the question was clearly Malcolm X but some responses chose to focus on Martin Luther King and his achievements, with the coverage of Malcolm X [Little] being highly negative. An argument often advanced was that his violent language and rejection of King's strategy of non violence was guaranteed to make race relations much worse by frightening the white population. A case can however be made for Malcolm X; he was in no way connected to organising violence and his advocacy of self reliance for Black Americans was a factor in increasing confidence among young African-Americans. It could also be argued that indirectly he assisted in gaining acceptance for King's more moderate policies. By presenting a more radical alternative to King he made it easier for white liberals to argue that it was essential to support Dr King's strategy of cooperation because the alternative was likely to be much more aggressive and threatening.

Question 6

The typical response to this popular question was to give a narrative account of the New Deal from 1933 onwards, with focus on the topic rather than the question. A few candidates made the obvious point that FDR's election triumphs in 1932 and 1936 had been so spectacular that it was highly unlikely that he would repeat them in 1940. Generally too little attention was paid to the difficulties of his second term; a rapid increase in unemployment in 1937, worsening relations with Congress in spite of the huge Democratic majorities in both Houses and his attempt to pack the Supreme Court with judges more amenable to his policies. Surprisingly, only a few candidates pointed out the general disquiet at his seeking a third term in office which no other President had attempted. International factors, with war in Europe going very badly for the Allies in 1940, were often overlooked. All the evidence is that the vast majority of Americans did not want US involvement in the conflict, but it was felt that FDR was moving America in that direction. Candidates did not consider Wendell Wilkie who was a new kind of Republican, much more electable, untainted by any association with Hoover and indeed a former New Deal supporter. These factors combined to make FDR's task more difficult but his margin of victory was still decisive.

Question 7

Too frequently candidates ignored the word 'assess' in this question on the contribution of the US to Allied victory in World War II. Instead rather too many preferred to describe the US contribution to allied victory in general terms. What was needed here was a clearly structured and well supported argument which answered the question. The key point was that without US help when it was neutral, Britain would probably have been compelled to sue for peace in 1940 or 1941. When Hitler inexplicably declared war on the United States the massive US contribution in manpower, ships, aircraft and munitions was vital in securing victory. Some candidates presented a 'shopping list' of the detail of US support which was helpful but not essential. Even the Russian defeat of Germany was aided considerably by huge American gifts of military equipment. A surprising number of candidates did not mention that the US was fighting two wars simultaneously and that even after victory in Europe, Japan remained unconquered.

Question 8

There were few good answers to this question with generalised comment on the American way of life being the norm. An effective response required some specific details of the strength of organised religion and what the different denominations actually achieved. There was a religious revival after 1950 with the great majority of Americans regarding themselves as members of a church. Leading figures, such as the evangelist Billy Graham, were national celebrities and reached much wider audiences due to television. It was essential for any candidate for public office to assert his membership of a religious group with Jews, Christian Scientists and Mormons becoming accepted holders of public office. Candidates needed to spend some time considering the influence of the religious groups. The Catholic Church was strongly anti-communist and was associated with policies of hostility to the Soviet Union and China. The Jewish community was largely responsible for the key American role in the creation of Israel. The African-American community was overwhelmingly Protestant, distinctively charismatic and highly significant in the civil rights movement. On the other hand it has been asserted that American religion was materialist rather than spiritual, serving little more purpose than to assert divine approval for the American way of life.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/06

Paper 6

The responses of candidates to this paper were good, some very good. **Question 1** answers showed some positive qualities but rarely reached the highest levels of the mark range. Responses to essay questions were mainly sound, though there were some weaknesses. Many answers lacked specific illustrations, especially in **Questions 4, 5, and 6**, and there was a tendency to omit the element of change over time.

Some candidates who entered the examination with well prepared material failed to pick out important words in the questions and therefore did not make the best use of their knowledge. The wording of **Question 4** asked *why* there were attempts to control labour. Many answers were dominated by *how* those attempts were made. In **Question 2** the element of 'How important' was often ignored, wholly or partly, in favour of details of resistance by the enslaved over a long period, often before the dates in the syllabus. Details of dramatic events, such as the Haitian struggle or the Jamaica Revolt, were often omitted. Other factors were mentioned, usually briefly. A concentration on the various factors close to the dates of emancipation would have been more effective.

SECTION A

Question 1, the compulsory source based question centred on the reactions to the provision of education in the British Caribbean after 1835. The question required candidates to consider how far the evidence provided supported the statement '*After 1835, the provision made for education was welcomed by the ex-slaves and the ex-masters.*'

Most candidates answered the question fully, using all the sources and appearing to have completed their answer to the best of their ability. A very few may have answered this question last and have misjudged the time available. The consequence was a shorter, even truncated, answer.

The answers considered both aspects of the question, challenge and support, and most made some effort to evaluate or interpret the sources in context rather than simply using the information contained within them. Few went the step further, either to evaluate the case overall in favour or against the quotation or to modify the quotation by making the case to amend its wording, for instance to suggest that ex-slaves were the more welcoming of the provisions made.

Well chosen quotations from the sources were a feature of many answers. Cautionary comments relating to the fact that only Trinidad, British Guiana and Jamaica were considered, references to dates and the tone of writing (Source B seems overdone) all appeared. On the other hand, some candidates tried to take a simple view of each source, for or against the question, and to make comments on their limitations (Source A was about ex-masters and Source B about ex-slaves) rather than making reference to the sources as a group. Taken together Sources A and B can be seen to cover support for the contention in the question. With reference to context, the dates of Sources A, B and D are soon after 1835, reflecting early impressions, enthusiasm and caution. Sources A and D are by the same author who, in D at least, seems to be tempering adverse criticism with diplomacy and may be hinting that the suspicious attitude described was typical of Jamaica. Source C is multi-faceted. The first sentence appears to support Source B, but then expresses disappointment at the situation in 1845. The ideas of the employers stated in Source C link to Source D and there is an important reference to 'the general introduction of an industrial system into schools.'

SECTION B

Question 2

Most candidates considered a number of factors including slave resistance, humanitarian or emancipationist campaigning and economic change in order to assess how important resistance was in bringing about emancipation. Some wrote lengthy accounts of slave resistance over a 200 year period but produced unbalanced answers because little or no detailed attention was paid to other factors. Many wrote exclusively about British colonies. Haiti was either not mentioned or not given detailed consideration. Similarly, Victor Schoelcher was mentioned but no great detail, either of his actions or emancipation in French colonies was given. The close links between many factors in the case of British emancipation were not examined.

Question 3

Candidates were required to assess the success of transitional arrangements between enslavement and freedom. The differences between the objectives of the schemes, such as apprenticeship and patronato, and their implementation were the usual theme of the answers. In the case of British colonies, the attitudes of planters and the difficulties of Stipendiary Magistrates were important themes. Those who gave details of the patronato in Cuba explained how the scheme seemed to decay by a mixture of phased emancipation and exploitation of opportunities to gain manumission on the part of patrocinados.

Question 4

A number of candidates wrote mainly about the methods used to curtail mobility and control labour after emancipation. Where explanation was given of why these methods were used, it was often in the form of an introduction to the actual details of restrictive measures and their implementation. Those candidates who did concentrate on causal issues made points about both planters and the formerly enslaved. Planters and governments wanted to retain the plantation system and the large, reliable labour force which they thought necessary. They wanted to retain the essence of the old ways. Those who had been slaves wanted to use the choices which opened up to them on emancipation. Use of this reasoning created opportunities for fuller and more effective answers. The experience of British colonies often dominated, though the French experience could be used to advantage.

Question 5

Candidates were required to explain the factors which enabled the peasantry to access land after emancipation. Most answers used the geographical variations between the different colonies to advantage. Some made general points about population density, while others took a more detailed, analytical approach. The situations in Barbados, with most good land under sugar production, and Trinidad, a 'new' sugar colony with a limited labour force and little land used for plantations, could be included to add depth to analysis. However the relationship between area and population was not the only issue. Land availability, high costs, restrictions on squatting or joint purchases, help from missionaries and the attitude of land owners all affected access to land. Some used knowledge about metayage to good effect. The determination of would-be peasants to find the means to develop holdings was another well made point. Results varied, mainly according to the amount of examples used in explanations. Some answers were rather general.

Question 6

Candidates usually defined the major issue in this question on the strategies used in the British Caribbean to retain and develop the sugar plantation economy after 1838, as that of labour. The sense of crisis by 1850 caused by emancipation, the Sugar Duties Act and competition in the markets formed the backdrop to many answers. The search for extra sources of labour was the major theme for most candidates. There were some long accounts of unsuccessful experiments in recruiting immigrants. Unfortunately these did not always lead to a detailed analysis of the advantages gained by the use of Indian labour. Other issues such as dealing with bankrupt estates in Jamaica, use of better methods in Trinidad and British Guiana, technology and organisation of estates were rarely dealt with as a major part of essays. The issues of success or failure were only hinted at in some responses. The most successful essays were those which used regional examples in some detail.

Question 7

There were a limited number of responses to this question on the provision of health facilities in the Caribbean post-slavery. Issues in British Guiana and Trinidad received most attention.

Question 8

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