

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

Key Messages

- To score the highest marks in **Section A** there has to be real evidence of both evaluation and interpretation of the sources, both individually and as a group.
- Careful consideration of the provenance of all the sources proved to be important in gaining high marks in **Section A**.
- Prepared answers for **Section B** essays were sometimes highly irrelevant.
- The best answers in **Section B** came from those able to 'assess' when asked or to reflect when asked to consider 'how far'.

General Comments

Good responses showed awareness that a different approach was needed for **Section A** responses than those for **Section B**. In **Section A** responses it was good to see a greater willingness to use the sources and not just to précis them. Good contextual knowledge was often present in the better answers but sometimes source evaluation was a limited afterthought. The best responses really considered a sources' provenance prior to its utilisation in an answer and provided evidence of reflection on its utility.

The better responses in **Section B** came from those who really were prepared to 'assess' or give a considered answer to a 'why did...' question. A clear answer being offered at the start of an essay helps, and it is a good idea to ensure that the objective of each paragraph is made clear, and that points made are supported with both relevant and accurate detail. Many candidates write long and sometimes irrelevant 'introductions' to essays, frequently taking up nearly a side of writing. This can then lead to difficulty in completing their essay. In addition, some candidates ended with a conclusion which did not seem to bear any relationship with the general focus of their essay. The best responses started with a clear case and developed it in detail. The majority of marks are awarded for analysis at this level and therefore essay technique needs to reflect that. All Examiners commented on the significant numbers of prepared answers which candidates produced regardless of the question set. It is very important for candidates to think very carefully about the full implications of a title and reflect on exactly what is being asked.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The hypothesis about whether Germany was being 'defensive' or not provoked some excellent debates. The best responses tended to group the sources in a 'for or against' structure and make judicious use of the sources and avoid the tendency just to précis them. There was usually some good contextual knowledge – the 'blank cheque' and the Schlieffen Plan were favourites. However, outstanding responses were able to demonstrate reflection on the source's utility, validity and provenance. Some responses gave insufficient emphasis to source evaluation and interpretation, limiting this to a comment in the last sentence of the final paragraph. Good answers really considered why, for example in Source B, the Kaiser might wish to make such speeches on those particular days and how they should be viewed.

Section B

Question 2

The better responses identified a range of problems covering the whole period from 1789 to 1793 and then spent time 'assessing' them. Some explained how different problems proved to have greater impact at different times, and what problems there were in 1789, which diminished in importance as time moved on. The main reasons for underperformance tended to be either writing an essay on the causes of the French Revolution, which of course had very limited relevance, or just focusing on 1789 itself. Reflection on what was required for an 'assess' answer paid dividends, with good responses putting the problems in order of importance at the time, and giving clear reasons for their order or priority.

Question 3

This proved to be a popular question; those responses which showed consideration of what were the advantages that Britain possessed when compared to France and Germany, achieved the best marks. It was important that candidates avoided just listing causes of why there was an Industrial Revolution in Britain. Inevitably many responses tended to include more detail on Britain than on the other two countries. The preceding Agricultural Revolution was often well discussed and factors like ease of communication, both internal and external, and the social and political structure of Britain were sensibly commented on. There could often be rather sweeping generalisations about how Britain was never at war in the 18th Century and few commented on the fact that not only was Britain often at war but that war could be a stimulant to economic growth as well. There were quite a lot of digressions onto the impact of the revolution on the working classes and details on poor working conditions, which were of limited relevance.

Question 4

It was rare to see a poor response to this question. Some dealt with the two countries separately and systematically while others looked at certain common themes, such as the lack of unity amongst the revolutionaries and geographical factors and used a thematic approach. Both countries tended to get equal coverage, though there were some candidates who had an outstanding knowledge of Italy and Mazzini, but really did not seem to know as much about Germany. Some candidates tended just to write lists of reasons as an 'explanation', with the better responses identifying which were the most important reasons in each case and giving their own explanation of what they felt were the most important.

Question 5

The strongest answers demonstrated awareness that the focus of the answer should be on the European 'continental countries', and not really on Britain, and also that the answer should not just be confined to Africa, but that Asia should and could be considered as well. This included looking at the role that competition with Britain did play, and then looking at all the other factors which motivated countries like France, Germany, Belgium and Italy. The best responses considered all these countries and kept the focus very much on them. Those candidates who did not perform as well tended just to write generalised lists of the causes of the Scramble for Africa, or just had a focus on single countries. Belgium in the Congo was one example of this, and France in Indo-China another. Often a prepared answer appeared which was of very limited relevance, frequently with many references to Livingstone and Social Darwinism.

Question 6

The key to success here was to ensure that the whole period was covered. While huge amounts of detail on the early part were not expected, it could not be ignored. Coverage of Lenin's activities in exile, his writings and his role in the ideology and development of the party were looked for in the years before 1917. Some responses were extremely good on 1917, with references to the April Theses, the July Days and above all Lenin's difficulties in persuading others that the time was right to overthrow the Provisional Government. Evidence of balanced thinking really helped, considering what Lenin did well and where there were flaws in his leadership. There could be a tendency to simply list Lenin's work and leave the conclusion to the Examiner. Some of the better responses argued that final outcome was a good indication of Lenin's qualities. Weaker responses tended to ignore the period before 1917.

Question 7

A popular question and frequently well done. Many candidates really reflected on the 'how far' element of the question and gave a good picture of the nature and extent of the changes made. There was usually a sharper focus on society than on the economy but many answers were very good at comparing the situation in 1939 with the latter days of Weimar. The twofold focus of the question proved to be useful in helping candidates organise their answers. The notion of change and continuity in the question was not understood by all candidates, but when it was grasped fully, some very impressive answers were produced. Prepared answers on how Hitler got into power and/or stayed there, of which there were quite a few, did not do well as there was little of relevance. There was also a lack of balance in some answers, with quite good knowledge on social change and its extent, but limited focus on economic matters beyond building roads.

Question 8

There was a wide range of different responses to the question. The best responses remained focused on the economy generally and did not just focus on agriculture, while at the same time ensuring that all the periods were covered. There were some responses with a great deal of accurate and relevant detail on the work of Witte and Stolypin, commenting very well on the effectiveness of their work in both the long and the short term. Other responses were good on Lenin and Stalin, but tended to assume that Lenin was a disaster and Stalin a great success. The outstanding responses really reflected on what 'effective' management of the various problems might be, identifying the fact that the problems that the rulers perceived were not necessarily the problems that their subjects felt were of the highest priority. There were some fine comments on the Stalinist approach to the economy, the implications of collectivisation and the rapid industrialisation on 'effective problem management.' It was good to note how many responses there were which really did look at the 'big picture' with some perspective and produced some very sound and interesting ideas.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

Key Messages

- To score the highest marks in **Section A** there has to be real evidence of both evaluation and interpretation of the sources, both individually and as a group.
- Careful consideration of the provenance of all the sources proved to be important in gaining high marks in **Section A**.
- Prepared answers for **Section B** essays were sometimes highly irrelevant.
- The best answers in **Section B** came from those prepared to 'evaluate' or 'assess' when asked or to reflect when asked to consider 'how far'.

General Comments

Good responses showed awareness that a different approach was needed for **Section A** responses than those for **Section B**. In **Section A** responses it was good to see a greater willingness to use the sources and not just to précis them. Good contextual knowledge was often present in the better answers but sometimes source evaluation was a limited afterthought. The best responses really considered a sources' provenance prior to its utilisation in an answer and provided evidence of reflection on its utility.

The better responses in **Section B** came from those who really were prepared to 'assess' or give a considered answer to a 'why did...' question. A clear answer being offered at the start of an essay helps, and it is a good idea to ensure that the objective of each paragraph is made clear, and that points made are supported with both relevant and accurate detail. Many candidates write long and sometimes irrelevant 'introductions' to essays, frequently taking up nearly a side of writing. This can then lead to difficulty in completing their essay. In addition, some candidates ended with a conclusion which did not seem to bear any relationship with the general focus of their essay. The best responses started with a clear case and developed it in detail. The majority of marks are awarded for analysis at this level and therefore essay technique needs to reflect that. All Examiners commented on the significant numbers of prepared answers which candidates produced regardless of the question set. It is very important for candidates to think very carefully about the full implications of a title and reflect on exactly what is being asked.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The hypothesis about whether Germany was the 'guilty party' or not provoked some excellent debates. The best responses tended to group the sources in a 'for or against' structure and make judicious use of the sources and avoid the tendency just to précis them. There was usually some good contextual knowledge – the 'blank cheque' and the Schlieffen Plan were favourites. However, outstanding responses were able to demonstrate reflection on the source's utility, validity and provenance. Some responses gave insufficient emphasis to source evaluation and interpretation, limiting this to a comment in the last sentence of the final paragraph. Good responses really considered why, for example in Source B, the German government might wish to send such a message to Belgium via the Dutch. Others realised the agenda which might be driving the author of Source C and did not really take that source at face value. Some did not note the date of Source E, or realise that it was not the Dutch government that was the author of B. Careful reflection on who wrote the source, when and why always paid dividends.

Section B

Question 2

This proved to be a very popular question but candidates did find it difficult to get the right focus. The best approach proved to be to look at the many different reasons why individuals and groups from all sections of France and French society wanted change. There were some perceptive comments from candidates who realised that many of those who wanted change had no desire to actually become revolutionaries. Good focus on the nature and extent of the ambitions and policies of those who wished France to change led to some very good responses. As always, those who really tried to 'assess' did well whilst other candidates went into too much detail on the causes of the French Revolution or simply gave a narrative of events from c.1780 through to 1815.

Question 3

The most successful approach was usually a 'case for and then a case against' method. Good examples were given of what gains there were; often well into the nineteenth century which was then balanced by the numerous downsides. The better responses avoided too many sweeping generalisations about bad living conditions and slums and brought in a good range of specific examples from either Germany or France (or both) as well as from Britain. There were a significant number of responses which had an almost exclusive focus on the middle class, while others went into a lot of detail on the causes of the Industrial revolution. The key to success, as always, was in answering the question set.

Question 4

There were some very strong responses to this question, often with a good level of detail known about Mazzini and above all a real attempt to evaluate and weigh up his overall contribution to the unification process. A range of good points were made about Mazzini's work with Young Italy and also the Roman Republic and there were some excellent answers which looked at his career as a whole and had some very perceptive comments on the part he played in the whole unification process. Good balance in answers helped, contrasting Mazzini's persistence and idealism with the lack of realism in 1848/9 and his republicanism. Some candidates decided that the question required a contrast between Mazzini's contribution to that of Cavour and Garibaldi (and possibly the Pope/Napoleon/ Victor Emmanuel as well) which meant Mazzini was reduced to quite a small part of the essay. Although a degree of comparison was acceptable, the bulk of the essay needed to focus on Mazzini.

Question 5

While a popular question, and there were some really good answers. Candidates tended to spend some time identifying problems which faced European imperialists in both Africa and Asia (and gave some detailed coverage of both continents) and then adopting a compare/contrast approach. The problems ranged from cost effectiveness and local resistance to causing tension between European powers such as the Fashoda incident and the commercial expansion into China. There were a very large number of responses which did no more than list the motives behind the 'New' imperialism in Africa (Asia was rarely mentioned) and had little or no 'nation specific' examples. It was noticeable that there were a large number of prepared answers, which had little to do with the question set.

Question 6

This question produced some of the best answers in **Section B**. Often 'why' questions produce little more than lists of facts, but in this case there were a significant number of responses which demonstrated careful thought about the reasons why February 1917 proved to be more serious a threat than 1905. A large number of different factors were usually debated, ranging from the impact of the two wars which preceded them to the disillusionment felt by many over the failures of the Dumas. There were some good arguments based on the different social and economic factors prevalent in 1905 and 1917 while other arguments had more of a 'political' focus. What was really good to see was the prevalence of well-focused debates where candidates had looked at both events, thought about the nature and extent of the threat posed to Nicholas, and then argued a good case for them.

Question 7

This was a popular question and there was often a really good grasp of the background detail demonstrated. However there were very few really good responses as the majority of candidates tended to write an essay on how Mussolini retained power or on how he got into power, or wrote a list of events from 1919 onwards. There were some good responses which focused on Mussolini's aims and what he was trying to achieve. Additionally there were responses that tended to look at other possible aims, such as the expansion into Africa, expansion into the Balkans and then look at his economic policies and 'Battles' and try and make some sense of the ideas behind the Corporate State. Some tentatively suggested the autarky idea and also the 'world statesman' view suggested by Mussolini's role at Locarno and Munich.

Question 8

There was invariably much more detail and grasp after 1917 than before. Few candidates really knew much about the 'former serf' issue and the work of Stolypin and there were a lot of generalisations about the proportion of peasants in Russia (and often candidates stopped referring to peasants and started to talk about the 'working classes' instead.) There was a lot of detail known about War Communism, the NEP and collectivisation, but quite how to link that into the question proved to be challenging for many. The few really good responses tended to consider how and why the peasantry (and not the working class as a whole) were a 'problem' for Nicholas, Lenin and Stalin with the best responses suggesting that it was primarily down to extremely bad leadership on the part of all of them.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

Key Messages

- To score the highest marks in **Section A** there has to be real evidence of both evaluation and interpretation of the sources—both individually and as a group.
- Careful consideration of the provenance of all the sources proved to be important in gaining high marks in **Section A**.
- Prepared answers for **Section B** essays were often highly irrelevant.
- The best answers in **Section B** came from those prepared to ‘evaluate’ or ‘assess’ when asked or really reflected when asked to consider ‘how far?’

General Comments

Good responses showed awareness that a different approach was needed for **Section A** responses than those for **Section B**. In **Section A** responses it was good to see a greater willingness to use the sources and not just to précis them. Good contextual knowledge was often present in the better answers but sometimes source evaluation was a limited afterthought. The best responses really considered a sources’ provenance prior to its utilisation in an answer and provided evidence of reflection on its utility.

The better responses in **Section B** came from those who really were prepared to ‘assess’ or give a considered answer to a ‘why did...’ question. A clear answer being offered at the start of an essay helps, and it is a good idea to ensure that the objective of each paragraph is made clear, and that points made are supported with both relevant and accurate detail. Many candidates write long and sometimes irrelevant ‘introductions’ to essays, frequently taking up nearly a side of writing. This can then lead to difficulty in completing their essay. In addition, some candidates ended with a conclusion which did not seem to bear any relationship with the general focus of their essay. The best responses started with a clear case and developed it in detail. The majority of marks are awarded for analysis at this level and therefore essay technique needs to reflect that. All Examiners commented on the significant numbers of prepared answers which candidates produced regardless of the question set. It is very important for candidates to think very carefully about the full implications of a title and reflect on exactly what is being asked.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The hypothesis about whether Serbia was responsible for Balkan tension provoked some excellent debates. What was also particularly encouraging to see was the increasingly high level of source evaluation and interpretation. Source E, the online encyclopaedia, led to a large number of very interesting, and appropriate, comments on the reliability and validity of such sources of information. At the same time the level of comment on Sources like C and D was high. Source D produced some very perceptive points about what Giolitti might have to offer of value to the hypothesis and it also provided ample scope for bringing in contextual knowledge about the Triple Entente as well. Not many grasped the point that Source A, dealing with the annexation of Bosnia by Austria-Hungary, might in itself have contributed to Balkan tension and some responses did suggest that the source had no relevance to the debate at all. The poorer responses tended to do little more than précis, and took everything that was written at face value. Some of the good answers grouped the sources in a for/against, approach while other, equally good answers, dealt with them in a systematic way. The key to high marks, as always in the source based question, is to keep the focus on the question and make sure there is ample evaluation and interpretation. Just copying the sources does not achieve many marks.

Section B

Question 2

This was a popular question with a number of very competent responses. The best answers really tackled the issue of 'how far' from the outset, while those who spent the bulk of the essay describing what Napoleon did and then ending it with statements such as 'thus therefore we can see that France did attain some liberty and equality, but not very much' did not achieve so well. Good answers separated the two concepts, in some cases arguing that while there was greater equality than before, for some there was less liberty. While there was often a great deal of information provided on topics such as the Concordat, there could be a real reluctance to actually explain the relevance of the information provided. Some did well by contrasting what had happened during the Ancien Regime with what happened during Napoleon's rule, while others pointed out that given the chaos which preceded 1799 Napoleon actually managed to get as far down the route towards the revolutionary ideals as was possible.

Question 3

This was a popular question and it produced a few very good responses. Those who did well really looked at the whole topic from the point of view of governments, considering factors such as income from taxation, trade, status and sheer industrial power. Some pointed out how the ability to move troops quickly by rail and how improved communications made the job of government much more straightforward. However there was a tendency to generalise and not bring in specific examples. The majority of responses kept their focus very firmly on the word 'benefits', preferring to write essays on which class benefited most, while some just wrote a list of the causes of the Industrial Revolution. There were also a number of responses which largely ignored the question.

Question 4

Unification as always attracted some very good answers. Different approaches could be adopted. Some adopted a thematic approach, identifying a range of problems and then seeing how they impacted on Italy and Germany, doing the comparison as they went along. That tended to be more successful than studying each country separately and then trying to 'compare' at the end, as the final analysis could be confusing. Candidates who spent a few minutes planning the essay did very well. The more the focus was kept on the 'problems' the better the response. There were quite a lot of very detailed narratives of events in both countries, often going back to 1815, which did not achieve so well.

Question 5

The best answers to this question invariably started with an identification of both the problems and benefits which arose, looking at both Africa and Asia, and dealing with at least two of the countries named in some depth. There were some answers which were very good at identifying gains and losses, but lacked much in the way of specific examples, or just confined it all to a single issue like Fashoda. Some candidates wrote at length about the causes of the 'new' imperialism and the motivation behind people like Rhodes and Livingstone. Detailed analysis of Social Darwinism, while frequent, had little relevance. There could be a lot of sweeping generalisations about the cost of colonies, but little specific detail. Some good responses weighed up the advantages of gaining 'prestige' with the problems of trying to administer and defend distant countries which proved to have little of the raw materials and wealth they were hoping for.

Question 6

This produced some excellent responses, particularly from those who dealt with the words 'unexpected' and 'incomplete' quite separately. Those who started with a narrative of events often found that it did not work well as they had to reconsider what 'incomplete' involved in terms of coverage. The best responses considered how unexpected the events of October 1917 were, given the work of the Provisional Government, the implications of the war and Lenin and the Bolsheviks. There were some very good arguments each way, with some excellent responses coming up with very different answers. Approaches to the 'incomplete' part of the question varied. A minority of responses just ignored it which proved to be expensive in terms of marks. Some kept their focus very much on events of 1917/18, while others carried on until 1922 or even to Lenin's death. Reflection on what might be an 'incomplete' revolution was the key to high marks here. As ever those candidates who focused on the actual wording in the title achieved well.

Question 7

The responses which had a primarily analytical focus did best here. Those who avoided writing a list of the factors which explained how Hitler retained power and kept the focus on which of the two factors suggested was the more important, did well. Some of the very good responses looked at other factors as well, such as the disunity of opposition, but did take care to keep their primary focus on propaganda and terror. There could be confusion between propaganda and indoctrination at times and a great deal of detail emerged on Nazi social policy which was of limited relevance. There was also a lot of time spent on the Holocaust, particularly on events after 1939 which did not always fit comfortably under the 'terror' umbrella or the suggested timescale. The very best responses demonstrated real thought about the impact of the two factors on the German people and their support for the Nazi regime and produced a convincing argument one way or the other.

Question 8

Insufficient responses were seen to this question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/21

Paper 21

Key Messages

1. On the source based question it is vital to use all the sources and then divide them into support and challenge sources. The sources must be evaluated for strengths and weaknesses and finally the conclusion should look at which sources are preferred or offer a supported alternative hypothesis.
2. For the essay questions it is very important that essays are analytical and have sufficient factual material to support this analysis. There must be a clear focus on the question.
3. Timing is important. A weak final essay may severely harm a candidate's final grade.

General Comments

1. Allow equal time for each question as each question carries equal marks.
2. Try to ensure full and thorough revision of the factual material before the examination.
3. A direct and analytical focus is needed to access the higher levels. Try to avoid simple narrative or a country by country survey.
4. Try to ensure each essay answer has a clear introduction, a logical theme and a summative conclusion. Examples from around the region and across the time span of the question will enhance the quality of the essays.
5. Try to focus on legibility of hand writing.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

This is the source based question and requires candidates to use all the sources provided and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. Some sources may both support and challenge. Having used the sources to support or challenge the hypothesis, it is also very important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. This may be by looking at the provenance of the source, the type of source, the origin of the source and the purpose. This evaluation can also be achieved by using contextual knowledge to put the source in a proper historical context. To access the very highest level, it is necessary to decide which sources are to be preferred and why, or to offer an alternative hypothesis. When stating which sources are preferred it is important to explain why and similarly with the alternative hypothesis, it is necessary to explain the reasoning behind this. Many candidates did look at both support and challenge sources but sometimes did not evaluate them and conclusions looking at which sources were preferred or offering an alternative hypothesis were quite rare. It is not sufficient to offer an alternative hypothesis without supporting material.

Question 2

This was a popular question and done well. Candidates were frequently able to offer an analytical explanation of the motives of the colonial powers. Candidates needed to look at a broad range of countries and why they were colonised. It was also important to examine the change over time of the motives of the colonial powers. Economics and trade were prime motives, for example in Malaya, Philippines, Burma and Singapore. The growth of formal control and the growing importance of prestige, politics and international standing also needed examining. The interaction of domestic politics and colonial policy could have usefully been examined. France is a good example, in trying to restore their prestige after the defeat of 1870 against

Prussia. Religion, Imperial Destiny, the popularity of imperialism at home could all be explored. The best answers would look at varying countries, change over time and offer a wide range of examples.

Question 3

This question was less popular and often produced slightly weaker responses. Candidates had to look at the growth of urbanisation and the impact that this had in Southeast Asia. The impact of trade on the growth of urban Centres was central to this question. Examples such as Rangoon, Bangkok, Jakarta, Manila, Singapore and Saigon could have been considered. Raw materials and the growth of markets, improved communications and international trade could also have been explored. Immigration was a key development and this led to the improvement of transport and social and economic improvements. It is worth noting that urban growth was not a general occurrence and was limited to the major cities. The role of education, increasing urban economic elites, and the growth of political awareness could usefully be examined. The more diverse social structures of the cities should have been commented upon. The key point was to examine the importance and to ensure that essays were analytical and looked at a variety of characteristics and why they were important.

Question 4

This was again a popular question. Many candidates attempted this question with varying degrees of success. The Great Depression had great impact on the colonies in Southeast Asia. The reliance on the export of a small number of products meant that the depression severely affected these colonies. The fall of commodity prices, for example rubber, critically affected economies. Those countries that were able to diversify were able to prosper. Those who were able to take advantage of cheaper commodity prices prospered. A key point is the variety of experience depending upon the nature of the colony's economy, ability to diversify and also the differing impact upon differing groups in each country. Malaya, Singapore, and The Philippines could have been examined to show the diverse experiences of the Great Depression.

Question 5

This was a very popular question and often done very well. Candidates had a good grasp of the issues and also the material to answer this question. The answer was not however, just a general essay on the causes of nationalism and candidates did have to address repression and then look at the other causes of nationalism. The essay had to be multi-causal and then assess the significance of repression amongst the other factors examined. Repression in French Indo China and Dutch policies in Southeast Asia could usefully have been discussed and also Burma under the British. Economic oppression and the exploitation of labour needed consideration. However, other causes such as education, nationalist leaders, and economic difficulties during the Great Depression and concessions from colonial powers could all have been evaluated.

Question 6

This was another popular question and allowed candidates to show their knowledge and understanding of the Japanese Occupation, defeat and other causes of the growth of movements for independence. The Japanese defeat left a power vacuum that needed filling. The defeat of Japan led to the return of the West and enhanced their image briefly. Under Japanese rule nationalist groups had gained experience and colonial powers found it hard to return and reassert their control, for example the Dutch. In Burma the defeat of Japan delayed the handover of power to the local population. In French Indo China communism had gained a hold and they were determined to eject the French. A key point about this essay is that it was on the defeat of Japan and not on the Japanese occupation and rule. Some candidates simply wrote about Japanese rule in World War Two.

Question 7

This question was more rarely attempted. The question needed a realisation that nationalism encouraged awareness amongst ethnic groups and some felt that they were still discriminated against. Singapore might be seen as a success for ethnic integration, English was used as a neutral language, and there was a unifying education system and universal military service. In North Vietnam and Laos the need to have the support of most of the population led to a marked decrease in the persecution of minorities. There are plenty of examples of oppression and these could have been highlighted and explained, for example in The Philippines, Indonesia and Burma. Candidates needed to consider the criteria for success and analyse whether national integration based on repression was as effective as integration brought about by greater cooperation and encouragement of a shared national culture.

Question 8

This was a very popular question and needed the candidates to look at the variety of causes of tension and disputes between the newly independent states. Candidates could have looked at Indonesia's invasion of East Timor, conflicts between The Philippines and Malaysia and also between Malaysia and Singapore. Disputes in the South China Sea over energy between Brunei, Indonesia, Malaya, The Philippines and Vietnam could have been analysed. Naval clashes, refugee problems and internal conflict spilling into international conflict, for example the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia, all provided further material that candidates could usefully have used and analysed. Better answers considered the different types of conflict and their causes, rather than just describing a series of conflicts. As always, analysis is to be preferred over simple narrative.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/22

Paper 22

Key Messages

1. On the source based question it is vital to use all the sources and then divide them into support and challenge sources. The sources must be evaluated for strengths and weaknesses and finally the conclusion should look at which sources are preferred or offer a supported alternative hypothesis.
2. For the essay questions it is very important that essays are analytical and have sufficient factual material to support this analysis. There must be a clear focus on the question.
3. Timing is important. A weak final essay may severely harm a candidate's final grade.

General Comments

1. Allow equal time for each question as each question carries equal marks.
2. Try to ensure full and thorough revision of the factual material before the examination.
3. A direct and analytical focus is needed to access the higher levels. Try to avoid simple narrative or a country by country survey.
4. Try to ensure each essay answer has a clear introduction, a logical theme and a summative conclusion. Examples from around the region and across the time span of the question will enhance the quality of the essays.
5. Try to focus on legibility of hand writing.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

This is the source based question and requires candidates to use all the sources provided and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. Some sources may both support and challenge. Having used the sources to support or challenge the hypothesis, it is also very important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. This may be by looking at the provenance of the source, the type of source, the origin of the source and the purpose. This evaluation can also be achieved by using contextual knowledge to put the source in a proper historical context. To access the very highest level, it is necessary to decide which sources are to be preferred and why, or to offer an alternative hypothesis. When stating which sources are preferred it is important to explain why and similarly with the alternative hypothesis, it is necessary to explain the reasoning behind this. Many candidates did look at both support and challenge sources but sometimes did not evaluate them and conclusions looking at which sources were preferred or offering an alternative hypothesis were quite rare. It is not sufficient to offer an alternative hypothesis without supporting material.

Question 2

This was a popular question and done well. Candidates were frequently able to offer an analytical explanation of the motives of the colonial powers. Candidates needed to look at a broad range of countries and why they were colonised. It was also important to examine the change over time of the motives of the colonial powers. Economics and trade were prime motives, for example in Malaya, Philippines, Burma and Singapore. The growth of formal control and the growing importance of prestige, politics and international standing also needed examining. The interaction of domestic politics and colonial policy could have usefully been examined. France is a good example, in trying to restore their prestige after the defeat of 1870 against

Prussia. Religion, Imperial Destiny, the popularity of imperialism at home could all be explored. The best answers would look at varying countries, change over time and offer a wide range of examples.

Question 3

This question was less popular and often produced slightly weaker responses. Candidates had to look at the growth of urbanisation and the impact that this had in Southeast Asia. The impact of trade on the growth of urban Centres was central to this question. Examples such as Rangoon, Bangkok, Jakarta, Manila, Singapore and Saigon could have been considered. Raw materials and the growth of markets, improved communications and international trade could also have been explored. Immigration was a key development and this led to the improvement of transport and social and economic improvements. It is worth noting that urban growth was not a general occurrence and was limited to the major cities. The role of education, increasing urban economic elites, and the growth of political awareness could usefully be examined. The more diverse social structures of the cities should have been commented upon. The key point was to examine the importance and to ensure that essays were analytical and looked at a variety of characteristics and why they were important.

Question 4

This was again a popular question. Many candidates attempted this question with varying degrees of success. The Great Depression had great impact on the colonies in Southeast Asia. The reliance on the export of a small number of products meant that the depression severely affected these colonies. The fall of commodity prices, for example rubber, critically affected economies. Those countries that were able to diversify were able to prosper. Those who were able to take advantage of cheaper commodity prices prospered. A key point is the variety of experience depending upon the nature of the colony's economy, ability to diversify and also the differing impact upon differing groups in each country. Malaya, Singapore, and The Philippines could have been examined to show the diverse experiences of the Great Depression.

Question 5

This was a very popular question and often done very well. Candidates had a good grasp of the issues and also the material to answer this question. The answer was not however, just a general essay on the causes of nationalism and candidates did have to address repression and then look at the other causes of nationalism. The essay had to be multi-causal and then assess the significance of repression amongst the other factors examined. Repression in French Indo China and Dutch policies in Southeast Asia could usefully have been discussed and also Burma under the British. Economic oppression and the exploitation of labour needed consideration. However, other causes such as education, nationalist leaders, and economic difficulties during the Great Depression and concessions from colonial powers could all have been evaluated.

Question 6

This was another popular question and allowed candidates to show their knowledge and understanding of the Japanese Occupation, defeat and other causes of the growth of movements for independence. The Japanese defeat left a power vacuum that needed filling. The defeat of Japan led to the return of the West and enhanced their image briefly. Under Japanese rule nationalist groups had gained experience and colonial powers found it hard to return and reassert their control, for example the Dutch. In Burma the defeat of Japan delayed the handover of power to the local population. In French Indo China communism had gained a hold and they were determined to eject the French. A key point about this essay is that it was on the defeat of Japan and not on the Japanese occupation and rule. Some candidates simply wrote about Japanese rule in World War Two.

Question 7

This question was more rarely attempted. The question needed a realisation that nationalism encouraged awareness amongst ethnic groups and some felt that they were still discriminated against. Singapore might be seen as a success for ethnic integration, English was used as a neutral language, and there was a unifying education system and universal military service. In North Vietnam and Laos the need to have the support of most of the population led to a marked decrease in the persecution of minorities. There are plenty of examples of oppression and these could have been highlighted and explained, for example in The Philippines, Indonesia and Burma. Candidates needed to consider the criteria for success and analyse whether national integration based on repression was as effective as integration brought about by greater cooperation and encouragement of a shared national culture.

Question 8

This was a very popular question and needed the candidates to look at the variety of causes of tension and disputes between the newly independent states. Candidates could have looked at Indonesia's invasion of East Timor, conflicts between The Philippines and Malaysia and also between Malaysia and Singapore. Disputes in the South China Sea over energy between Brunei, Indonesia, Malaya, The Philippines and Vietnam could have been analysed. Naval clashes, refugee problems and internal conflict spilling into international conflict, for example the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia, all provided further material that candidates could usefully have used and analysed. Better answers considered the different types of conflict and their causes, rather than just describing a series of conflicts. As always, analysis is to be preferred over simple narrative.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

Key messages

- The best responses to **Section A** went beyond face-value interpretation of the sources and developed balanced arguments which were focused on the hypothesis in the question.
- In **Section B** those responses which addressed the question rather than the topic, maintained a balanced approach and presented appropriately supported arguments were most highly rewarded. It is essential that candidates pay attention to any dates in the questions.

General comments

The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was some variation in the quality of scripts. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. They displayed a complete understanding of both sides of the argument, ensuring that their responses were balanced and relevant throughout. Those who wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis. Many went beyond face-value to interpret the sources in context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the use of appropriate knowledge. Less effective responses often demonstrated awareness of the need to apply analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly. Often these responses relied almost exclusively on vague assertions about source reliability.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent arguments which were focused on the question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. It is no coincidence that the majority of such responses were preceded by a plan. Some responses relied too heavily on a descriptive approach in which the accurate material they contained was not specifically related to the question. A small but significant number of essays ignored the timeframes established by the questions. A characteristic of weaker scripts was the lack of appropriate knowledge, so that responses tended to consist of general statements and assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates produced balanced arguments. Sources A and E were seen as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, while it was generally agreed that Sources B and D suggested that the USA was more responsible than China for the UN's failure to take action against the excesses of the Khmer Rouge.

The most impressive answers contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. For example, it was widely noted that Source A was an attempt by the Vietnamese UN delegate to justify his country's recent take-over of Cambodia, suggesting that its criticisms of China should be treated with caution. A large number of responses argued that these criticisms were supported by Source E (*'massive Chinese aid was the life-blood of the Khmer Rouge'*), which was generally considered a more reliable source. Some focused on the Cold War context by using Sources B, C and D to show how, following its defeat in the Vietnam War, the USA could not accept communist Vietnamese expansion into Cambodia. As a result, the USA and its western allies supported China in backing the Khmer Rouge in exile.

Most responses reflected awareness of the need to go beyond face-value interpretation of the sources, but attempts to do so were sometimes unconvincing. For example, many argued that Source A is bound to be biased because it is a speech by a Vietnamese delegate. In order to make this point effectively, it was necessary to show how and why the source is biased. In some cases, attempts to evaluate the provenance of sources led to contradictions; for example, it was not uncommon for responses to argue that Source B blamed the USA for the UN's failure to take effective measures against the Khmer Rouge, but then claim that the source is unreliable because it was written by an American.

The weakest responses generally provided an outline of the content of each source in sequence, with little or no attempt to address the hypothesis in the question.

Section B

Question 2

This was an extremely popular question and most answers contained accurate and detailed knowledge of the events which marked the early development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949. Most responses took the form of a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War, usually developing a chronological account of events which led to strained relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common approach involved developing a discussion of the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War, outlining the views of different groups of historians. As a result, most responses tended to be rather general with only limited focus on the terms of the question. The best responses used relevant knowledge to address the question directly by analysing Soviet motives for expansion in Eastern Europe and US motives for adopting hard-line policies against communism. The weakest answers were characterised by inaccurate chronology, assertions and, in some cases, a tendency to drift outside the given timeframe.

Question 3

Most responses displayed appropriate knowledge, covering issues such as the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War and superpower involvement in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. The best essays developed arguments which were balanced and focused throughout. Some found it difficult to use their knowledge to address terms of the question, tending to describe superpower involvement in regional conflicts rather than analysing motives. As a result, a number of responses offered a narrative account of a series of regional conflicts and the ways in which tensions were intensified by Cold War rivalry. Some appeared to be answering the rather different question of whether the USA or the USSR was primarily responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War. The weakest responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by inadequate content or arguments which were based on vague comments or assertions. A minority of answers drifted into irrelevance by writing about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

Most responses were well-informed on the Korean War and there were many impressive answers to this question. These were based on analysis of US motives for becoming directly involved in the Korean War, the reasons why the USA's initial aims changed during the war and the impact of the settlement of 1953 on the USA, both domestically and in terms of its international relationships. A number of responses, while containing much of the same material, were less focused on the terms of the question. Most of these adopted a descriptive approach, outlining the key events of the Korean War with limited explanation of what the USA was seeking to achieve. Such answers therefore lacked appropriate criteria by which to judge whether the USA gained or lost from its involvement in the war, focused analysis being confined to isolated statements such as '*containment succeeded but roll-back failed.*' Nevertheless, there were very few weak responses to this question, with those seen showing evidence of confusion between the Korean and Vietnam Wars.

Question 5

The best essays began by examining the similarities and differences between the problems which confronted Gorbachev and Deng in their respective countries. This provided a solid base for comparing and contrasting the strategies which they adopted in order to deal with their problems, ensuring that the argument remained relevant throughout. Less effective responses tended to opt for a more descriptive approach in which the reforms of Gorbachev and Deng were dealt with separately, with only limited analysis of what they were trying to achieve. As a result, there was little direct attempt to 'compare and contrast' their methods, relevant assessment usually confined to conclusions with statements such as '*Gorbachev tried to reform economically and politically, while Deng only carried out economic reforms.*' The weakest responses

described the reforms of one of the leaders but lacked sufficient knowledge of the policies adopted by the other.

Question 6

While most answers provided largely accurate accounts of the various attempts which were made to control the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons during the 1960s, relatively few focused on the key issue of how effective these attempts proved to be. The most impressive responses were based on analysis of what each attempt was seeking to achieve, the extent to which these aims were met and the factors which inhibited success. The weakest responses did not address the requirements of the question. For instance, a sizeable minority wrote unfocused, often very detailed, accounts of the Cuban missile crisis with little attempt to explain its relevance to subsequent efforts to reduce tension. Many wrote generally about the nuclear arms race throughout the period from 1945–1991, with no reference to attempts to control it. Ignoring the timeframe established by the question, a number wrote about SALT, SDI and START.

Question 7

Most responses displayed appropriate knowledge and understanding of at least some of the factors which led to Japan's 'economic miracle' after World War II. The best answers provided clear evidence of the ways in which US support facilitated economic recovery, while also analysing the relative significance of other causal factors. Some responses were based on a descriptive approach with limited analysis or focus on the question. Many of these answers seemed rather disjointed, each causal factor described in isolation and in no particular order. The weakest answers relied too heavily on assertions; for example, many argued that Japan's economic revival was indeed dependent on US support, but provided no evidence to show what support the USA gave or how it helped to generate economic growth in Japan.

Question 8

The best responses to this question were based on detailed knowledge and understanding of what the Brandt Report was seeking to achieve and the factors which inhibited its successful implementation. However, the majority of answers consisted of vague assertions about Third World poverty, with little or no reference to the Brandt Report.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

Key messages

- The best responses to **Section A** went beyond face-value interpretation of the sources and developed balanced arguments which were fully focused on the hypothesis in the question.
- In **Section B** those who addressed the question rather than the topic, maintained a balanced approach and ensured that arguments are appropriately supported were most highly rewarded. It is essential that candidates pay attention to any dates in the questions.

General comments

The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. Their responses displayed a clear understanding of both sides of the argument and were balanced and focused throughout. Those who read and wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many responses went beyond face-value and interpreted the sources in context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of background knowledge. Some demonstrated awareness of the need to apply analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly. Such answers tended to rely on unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability.

The best answers to **Section B** contained clear, consistent arguments which were focused on the terms of the question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate factual material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a plan. A number of answers relied too heavily on a descriptive approach, in which the accurate material they contained was not used to address the demands of question set. A significant number of candidates ignored the timeframe established by the questions. Weaker scripts tended to lack relevant knowledge, so that responses consisted largely of generalised statements or assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates produced balanced arguments. Sources B and E were commonly seen as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, suggesting that Makarios deliberately denied the Turkish Cypriot community political rights and did all he could to undermine the UN's attempts to restore peace. Conversely, Sources A and D were seen as implying that the Turkish Cypriots themselves, supported by the Turkish government, were the main cause of the on-going dispute. Based on evidence from Sources B, C and E, it was widely suggested that the UN was responsible for failing to restore peace. It was recognised that the UN failed to consult both the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities before embarking on its mission, was seen to be one-sided in the dispute and provided insufficient troops to deal with the escalating violence.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. For example, Sources A and B were seen as being biased towards the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities respectively. It was noted that, while Source A argues that Makarios' reforms were necessary because the Turkish Cypriots were making the constitution unworkable, Source B claims that they were designed to deny political rights to the Turkish community. Some disputed Source B's claim that the UN made a '*gigantic blunder*' in failing to

consult both communities before embarking on its mission to restore peace. To do this they explained how the UN can only take action in a country with the permission of its government, which in this case and as a result of Makarios' reforms, was entirely dominated by Greek Cypriots. They showed how this explains the frustration felt by the UN soldier depicted in Source C. There were widely differing interpretations of Source D. Some argued that it supported Source A's claim that Turkey, '*in furtherance of its designs based on territorial aggrandisement*', was inciting insurrection by the Turkish Cypriot community. Others suggested that Turkey was merely trying to protect Turkish Cypriots from Makarios' government. A small number of responses explained that President Johnson was concerned about a possible war between two of its allies and the potential Cold War implications.

It was evident that most were aware of the need to go beyond face-value interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were sometimes unconvincing. For example, many stated that Sources A and B are both biased but did not explain how or why. Similarly, some missed the key point of the cartoon and suggested, without explanation, that Source C must be biased because of Britain's own interests in Cyprus. The fact that President Johnson's claim (Source D) that the UN has been '*more successful in reducing the incidents of violence*' is contradicted in Source E was widely noted, but the relevance of this to the question was rarely established.

Section B

Question 2

Most responses displayed detailed knowledge of the events which marked the early development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949. The majority presented a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War, usually pursuing a chronological account of the events which led to strained relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common approach involved developing a discussion of the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War, outlining the views of different groups of historians. As a result, most responses tended to be rather general with only limited focus on the actual question, comments usually confined to conclusions. The best answers used knowledge to address the question directly and in a balanced way. The weakest responses were characterised by inaccurate chronology, unsupported assertions or a tendency to drift outside the prescribed timeframe.

Question 3

The quality of responses to this question varied enormously. The most impressive demonstrated that it was in the interests of both the USA and the USSR to seek mutual understanding, leading to the SALT negotiations, the Helsinki Agreement and West Germany's acceptance of the existence of East Germany. Balance was maintained by showing how tensions remained, evidenced by the superpowers' continued encouragement of global communist/anti-communist groups, the growing influence of the political right in the USA and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. It was clear that many lacked the depth of knowledge required to address this question effectively. Such responses generally discussed the reasons why détente began in the early 1970s, or why it ended in the late 1970s, rather than addressing the question. The weakest responses showed some confusion regarding the terms of the question and wrote about why relations between the USA and the USSR were poor throughout the period from 1945 to 1991, with no attempt to consider the 1970s. It was evident that a significant proportion of candidates had limited understanding of the term 'détente'.

Question 4

Many answers displayed sound knowledge of US involvement in the Korean War. The best responses appreciated the need to identify criteria by which to evaluate whether the war was a victory or a defeat for the USA. This involved an analysis of the USA's war aims, noting how they developed from Acheson's defence speech which omitted Korea entirely, the implementation of containment to protect South Korea, and the subsequent adoption of roll-back in an attempt to unify Korea under a non-communist regime. This usually led to the balanced conclusion that successfully containing communism at the 38th parallel could be seen as a victory for the USA, while the failure of roll-back constituted a defeat with serious long-term implications. The majority of responses, while containing much of the same information, did not address the question directly. Most adopted a descriptive approach, outlining the USA's involvement in the war with little or no analysis of motives or implications. A small number drifted into irrelevance by explaining, sometimes in considerable detail, how US actions in Korea were subsequently replicated in Vietnam.

Question 5

Virtually all responses contained good knowledge of the factors which led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. A smaller proportion used this to answer the question directly. Most responses were based on a narrative, the various causal factors outlined in turn with limited analysis of how they might be connected. As a result, there tended to be insufficient focus on the nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe, coverage of which was often confined to brief statements in introductions or conclusions. The most impressive responses were focused on the question throughout, based on a balanced and analytical explanation of the reasons for and the impact of events in Eastern Europe. They explained why Gorbachev felt the need to introduce reform, in particular ending the Brezhnev Doctrine, the effects of reform in Eastern Europe and the impetus which this gave to nationalist movements and political instability within the USSR itself. The most common conclusion, based on such analysis of the links between the various factors which led to the collapse of the Soviet Union, was that nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe were both a cause and an effect.

Question 6

There were many high quality responses to this question, characterised by a focused and balanced assessment of the evidence. Many answers showed how the threat of nuclear war had reached its peak with the Cuban missile crisis. This had shown the inherent dangers of brinkmanship and led to MAD, flexible response and attempts to control the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons during the 1960s. Conversely, it was noted that there were significant weaknesses in the Partial Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968), and that the USA and the USSR continued to develop their nuclear arsenals throughout the decade. Some answers contained appropriate detail about the nuclear arms race during the 1960s, but did not use this to develop an argument focused on the terms of the question. The weakest responses relied too heavily on assertions or contained inaccurate content. Some ignored the timeframe established by the question and wrote generally about the arms race throughout the period from 1945 to 1991.

Question 7

Most responses contained accurate knowledge of at least some of the factors which led to Japan's 'economic miracle' after World War II. The best responses provided clear evidence of how MITI's actions facilitated economic recovery, while also analysing the relative significance of other causal factors. Less effective answers were based on a more descriptive approach with limited analysis or focus on the question. Many such responses seemed rather disjointed, each causal factor described in isolation and in no logical order. The weakest answers relied too heavily on assertions; for example, the statement that '*Japan's recovery was dependent on the USA*' requires explanation of what the USA actually did and how this assisted the revival of Japan's economy.

Question 8

Responses to this question, which was attempted by a sizeable minority, varied enormously in quality. There were some very high quality essays, characterised by well-argued and focused arguments, effectively supported with relevant material. The remaining responses were generally based on inadequate knowledge, leading to the presence of vague comments and assertions. In a small number of scripts the question was misinterpreted and answers concentrated on the impact of colonialism on African states prior to independence.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

Key messages

- The best responses to **Section A** went beyond face-value interpretation of the sources and developed balanced arguments which were fully focused on the hypothesis in the question.
- In **Section B** those who addressed the question rather than the topic, maintained a balanced approach and ensured that arguments are appropriately supported were most highly rewarded. It is essential that candidates pay attention to any dates in the questions.

General comments

The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This enabled them to show clear understanding of both sides of the argument, thereby ensuring that their responses were balanced and focused throughout. Those who wrote about each source in turn invariably found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many went beyond face-value and interpreted the sources in context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of appropriate knowledge. Some were clearly aware of the need to apply such analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying on vague assertions regarding reliability.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained consistent and sustained arguments which were focused on the terms of the questions and based on a balanced analysis of relevant material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a plan. Many responses relied too heavily on a descriptive approach, in which the accurate material they contained was not used to address the demands of the specific question. A significant number of responses too readily ignored timeframes established by questions. Characteristic of weaker scripts was the lack of accurate detail, so that responses tended to consist largely of generalised statements or assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates produced balanced responses. Source E was generally seen as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, based on its claim that *'responsibility for...the massacre of over half a million people lies on the shoulders of the United Nations, which has failed to resolve the issue'* over several decades. Conversely, Source A was seen as directly challenging the hypothesis through the statement that *'the UN is not to blame for the political stagnation over the Kashmir issue'*, holding the intractable nature of the dispute between India and Pakistan responsible instead. There was less consistency in the interpretation of the other sources. For example, while some argued that Source B blamed India for the fact that no permanent solution has been found to the Kashmir problem, others suggested that the source held the UN responsible as a result of its failure to force India to accept its resolutions by holding a plebiscite in the disputed region. Similarly, there were contrasting opinions regarding whether Source D was blaming Pakistan for its *'terrorist'* activities in Kashmir, or the UN for failing to impose its will on Pakistan. Interpretation of Source C varied enormously: some suggested that the source was praising the UN for its consistent attempts to resolve the dispute and for encouraging the Kashmiri nationalist movement; others felt that the source was critical of the UN, both for framing the Kashmir dispute *'as an India-Pakistan conflict'* and for passing resolutions which were merely *'recommendatory in nature'*.

The most impressive answers contained detailed analysis of the sources, based on provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and use of contextual knowledge. For example, it was widely noted that Source D is an attempt by an Indian academic to justify India's refusal to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir and that its criticisms of Pakistan are heavily biased. Some candidates noted that, despite the largely unreliable nature of the source, it is technically correct in claiming that '*Kashmir is an integral part of India*', Source A confirming that '*Kashmir acceded to Indian rule*' in 1947. Based on their knowledge of the UN Charter, which prevents UN involvement in a country without the permission of its government, a small number argued that Source D is right to state that '*the UN has no jurisdiction on Kashmir*' and cannot be held responsible for failing to resolve the dispute. Similarities between Sources C and E were commonly noted – both are of Kashmiri origin and reflect the anger and frustration felt by the people of Kashmir that they have not been granted independence and that their country remains dangerously disputed between India and Pakistan. Source A was often seen as providing the most reliable evidence, both because of its balanced assessment of the dispute and because it was written by an Australian academic who has no vested interest in the region.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond face-value interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were sometimes unconvincing. For example, many suggested that, because it was written by an Indian academic, Source D must be biased. In order to make this point effectively, it was necessary to show how and why the source is biased. A significant number argued that Source B, being written by an American, is seeking to blame India for the dispute in order to deflect responsibility away from the UN. This view is based on an assumption which ignores the implied criticisms of UN weaknesses which run throughout the source.

Section B

Question 2

Most responses displayed accurate and detailed knowledge of the events which marked the early development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949. Many took the form of a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War, usually pursuing a chronological account of events which led to strained relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common approach involved developing an account of the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War. As a result, some responses became rather generalised with only limited focus on the question, comments being confined to conclusions. The best responses analysed the political and economic motives behind Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe and the USA's adoption of hard-line policies against communism. The weakest answers were characterised by inaccurate chronology, unsupported assertions or a tendency to drift outside the given timeframe.

Question 3

Many answers demonstrated good knowledge, covering issues such as the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War and superpower involvement in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. The best responses contained arguments which were balanced and focused, evaluating the extent to which US policies (such as containment, NSC-68, roll-back, and flexible response) could be seen as responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War. Some found it difficult to use their knowledge to address the specific terms of the question, tending to describe superpower involvement in regional conflicts rather than analysing its motives. As a result, some responses gave an account of a series of regional conflicts and the ways in which tensions were intensified by Cold War rivalry. Some ignored the issue of US policy, focusing instead on the less relevant issue of whether the USA or the USSR was primarily responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War. The weakest responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by inadequate content, or arguments which were based on assertions. A small number drifted into irrelevance by writing about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

Almost all responses contained accurate knowledge of the Korean War and superpower involvement. The best were largely analytical, explaining why Truman felt compelled to adopt containment and roll-back strategies despite the fact that Korea had not been listed in Acheson's defence speech, while Stalin remained consistently determined to avoid direct involvement in the war. Some responses adopted a more descriptive approach, outlining the main events of the war with analysis restricted to generalised statements such as '*The USA was directly involved but the USSR was not.*' Such answers were significantly unbalanced, coverage of US policies and actions far outweighing consideration of Soviet motives, which were frequently outlined with the unsupported assertion that '*Stalin wanted a victory on the cheap.*'

Question 5

Virtually all those who attempted this question displayed sound knowledge of the factors which led to the collapse of the Soviet Union, but relatively few provided the analytical depth which the question required. Most responses were based on a narrative approach in which a description of Gorbachev's reforms was followed by an outline of other causal factors, such as weaknesses in the Soviet economy, nationalistic uprisings in Eastern Europe and the hard-line anti-communist approach adopted by Reagan. In most cases, there was little attempt to explain why Gorbachev felt it necessary to carry out his reforms or the impact of those reforms on the USSR. The most impressive responses showed how the various causal factors were inter-connected, thereby giving a context to Gorbachev's attempts to modernise the Soviet Union and providing a clear focus on the requirements of the question.

Question 6

There were some high quality responses to this question, characterised by a balanced and focused assessment of the impact of the nuclear arms race on international peace and security in the period from 1949 to 1963. Many concluded that the Cuban missile crisis marked the high point of the dangers implicit in brinkmanship, but also showed that both the USA and the USSR were desperate to find a solution which did not involve the use of nuclear weapons. While containing much of the same factual detail, many responses lacked such direct focus. There was a general tendency to describe the development of the superpowers' nuclear arsenals, with the (often implicit) assumption that this must have made the world more dangerous. The weakest responses drifted outside the 1949–1963 timeframe to describe attempts to control the development of proliferation of nuclear weapons and were often characterised by confused chronology.

Question 7

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

Question 8

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/41

Paper 41

Key Messages

- The development of appropriate examples is a key element in answering questions on this paper as they give the depth required for high quality answers.
- The evaluation and prioritising of factors is expected, followed by a concluding judgement which is based on this analysis. Discussing the relative importance of factors means comparing one factor with another and assessing their relative importance. Such comparative assessment is necessary for high grades.

General Comments

- There is a need to identify and address key words in questions for example, 'relative importance', 'last quarter of the nineteenth century', 'how far do you agree?' and any geographical areas specified.
- It is useful to check over the answers at the end to ensure that conclusions focus on what has been asked for in the question.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Although factors in the slave trade and its decline were well-known, candidates only achieved high marks if they compared the relative importance of these factors. A common misunderstanding was that African slaves were used in British industry rather than in the trans-Atlantic slave trade. Answers often focused on the Acts of 1807 and 1833 and the work of earlier humanitarians without using this information effectively as background material for a question on this paper dated 1855-1914.

Question 2

The comparison of Menelik and Samori Touré was a popular question. Generally, candidates who dealt with each ruler separately found it more difficult to offer a well-supported and detailed comparison. Candidates who chose themes for comparison such as fighting capacity, organisation of the state, personal qualities, identifying similarities and differences as they went along, often produced excellent answers.

Question 3

This question was popular. The better responses realised it did not ask for a comparison with Christianity and used previously learnt material accordingly.

Question 4

The 'triggers' which set off the scramble for African colonies were well known and many candidates used them effectively in an argument. Only the better responses focused on evaluating their importance. Links between factors were explained and most candidates wisely based their answer on events in Africa rather than Europe.

Question 5

Most candidates picked up the key words in the question which were 'indirect rule' and 'convenience and self-interest'. The best responses achieved a good balance and gave some consideration to the idea of 'principle'. This question gave ample scope for discussing both the theory and the practice of Lugard's ideas with examples being drawn from mainly Nigeria and Uganda. Answers which offered no examples and considered the question only in general terms were less well-rewarded.

Question 6

The focus for this question was the moderate nationalist movements emerging in Ghana and Nigeria from about 1890. Some candidates wisely used the example of the Creoles only as a background to what later Africans aimed for and achieved. Answers which focused only on the Creoles or on modern nationalism were not able to score high marks.

Question 7

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

Question 8

Candidates choosing this question often wrote general answers on the impact of Christian missionaries. Strong arguments were supported by developed examples and statistics illustrating this impact. Candidates opting for Central and East Africa often chose one or the other without noting that the question linked both areas.

Question 9

This was a popular question and most of the best answers compared the Ndebele-Shona rising of 1896-7 with the Maji-Maji rebellion of 1905-7. Strong candidates were able to analyse different types of rebellion and compare immediate and longer term causes and results. Practical matters such as similar grievances and the influences of traditional African religion provided the basis for a Band 3 answer. Neither Ethiopia nor Lewanika were appropriate choices for a question on opposition to colonial rulers.

Question 10

The better answers to this question focused on more than one colonial power, with depth analysis of the activities of trading companies or the spread of railways. Those candidates offering economic statistics in support of their argument were able to score high marks for supporting their points with appropriate evidence.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

Key Messages

The most important messages are worth emphasising.

- For all questions, read the wording very carefully. For each question, ask yourself what period you have to cover and what the key words in the question are. Use those words to provide the framework of your analysis and argument. Always write a conclusion which answers the question directly.
- For the compulsory source-based question, make sure you both analyse and evaluate the five sources. Again, write a conclusion which summarises your assessment of how accurately the sources support the hypothesis.
- For the essays, use your arguments to organise your work into paragraphs. Then make sure that your arguments are supported by examples which are both detailed and relevant.
- Keep a close eye on the clock.

B GENERAL COMMENTS

There are a wide variety of approaches to answering the questions. Virtually all candidates wrote four answers, one source-based question, and three essays as required. Some, however, were unable to find four questions which they could answer in more than but a few lines. Only a very few candidates ran out of time. Most candidates had some understanding of the topic and question but often lacked the detailed knowledge and the sharp focus on the question needed to ensure success. More specific comments are made below.

C COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Question 1

Candidates showed a range of responses to the sources, those responses often being affected by candidates' existing knowledge. When it came to **Source A**, a cartoon, many candidates did not know who the Democrats' candidates for president in 1860 were. Even if they had not studied the election in detail, they could have worked out that they were Douglas and Breckinridge from Source C in particular. Bell was a third-party candidate. Though the Source was normally used to support the assertion, careful analysis could legitimately suggest the opposite. Evaluation of Source A rarely extended beyond 'Source A is a cartoon and thus is unreliable', which is not enough for the higher levels. The information provided by the cartoon needs to be checked against either contextual knowledge or the other sources.

Some struggled to make sense of **Source B**, arguing it was irrelevant, mainly because it made no mention of the 1860 election. It is relevant, however. It is a pro-Democratic source written in election year which argues that the Democrats are united only by a desire to win government office. On key political principles, such as slavery, Source B argues that Democrats North and South are deeply divided. The election is but a few months away. Such deep divisions could not be healed in a matter of months and thus Source B supports the hypothesis. Cross-referencing Source B with Source D shows that these divisions still existed during the election campaign. If anything, they had become deeper. Fire-eating Southern Democrats actually wanted Lincoln to win. Thus, on evaluation, Source B still supports the hypothesis.

Candidates found **Sources C and D** to be more straightforward. **Source C** talks of the 1860 election and mentions 'the open split' in the Democratic party. Cross referencing to Source E shows Source C to be

much more reliable than Source A as its summary of Democratic expectations proves to be accurate. **Source D** shows part of the Democratic party actually preferring a Republican victory.

Source E rarely received careful analysis, perhaps because it was the fifth source and quite complex in its description of the actual election results. Most candidates argued that Source E clearly rejected the hypothesis. The evidence provided in the first paragraph of Source E contradicted this assertion. Attempts at evaluation usually relied on comments on the source itself. Many candidates saw the source as an autobiography, attributing it to William Yancey, when it was actually from a biography of Yancey written a generation later and thus likely to be more reliable.

Candidates could analyse the content of each source quite well but found evaluation more challenging. Few assessed the sources for their reliability. The sources had been chosen to provide plenty of opportunities for evaluation by cross-referencing. This should have helped those whose contextual knowledge might be limited. It is important that candidates realise the importance of source evaluation. Many describe what the sources tell them, often at great length. Summary descriptions should be shorter, thereby allowing more time to decide how reliable the sources might be.

Question 2

How important was the doctrine of Manifest Destiny to the westward expansion of the USA in the period 1840 to 1890?

This was the most popular of the essay questions. All candidates understood the meaning of the concept. Having defined manifest destiny, many went on to describe how westward expansion was driven by the American belief in manifest destiny. Only a minority did what the question asked of them, namely to assess the importance of the concept to westward expansion. Many people headed west without believing that they had a God-given right to do so. Some wanted to make their fortune, attracted to the West by discoveries of gold and silver. Some wanted to use the opportunities provided by laws such as the 1862 Homestead Act to make a living for themselves free from the pressures of urban life in the East or in Europe. The Mormons moved west to escape persecution in the east, to find lands which were empty and undeveloped, beyond the borders of the USA. Paradoxically, their efforts could be used as an example of a group which was not motivated by the Christian concept of manifest destiny.

Question 3

The Civil War and Reconstruction is a popular period to study. This question proved a challenge for many and mainly because their knowledge of President Grant's reconstruction policies was limited. For many, the only feature of the Grant presidency they could mention was the corruption revealed in his second term in office. Grant was a two-term president, the first since Andrew Jackson in the 1830s, and reconstruction was a key feature of his eight years as president. His approach was similar to that of the Radical Republicans who dominated Congress; both took a strong line against white supremacists such as the Ku Klux Klan. Candidates knew more about the reconstruction policies of Lincoln and Johnson and thus were able to make some broad comparisons of those policies and the context in which they were developed and implemented. A full answer, however, required equal consideration of Grant's policies.

Two specific features of the period are worth emphasising. Firstly, Presidents have no formal role in the process of amending the constitution. This process is in the hands of the US Congress and the member states of the USA. Presidents can use their 'bully pulpit' to encourage either rejection or acceptance of an amendment but that is all they can do. Secondly, President Johnson was impeached by Congress in 1868. The Senate, which is judge and jury, failed to gain the necessary supermajority to find him guilty of the charges which the House of Representatives laid before them.

Question 4

There were very few answers to this question, most of which wrote about the key figures in steel and oil, namely Carnegie and Rockefeller rather than the industries and their impact. The financial sector was usually overlooked, despite its centrality to US economic growth between the civil war and the First World War.

Question 5

The question on African Americans and ethnic minorities proved popular. The vast majority of answers read the question as 'Describe the progress of the civil rights movement from the late nineteenth century to the

mid twentieth century'. 'Describe' enabled them to provide a narrative account rather than the analytical one which the question required. The long narrative of some 60-80 years gave little space to the key period, which was the 1960s. Many explained the goals and strategies of people such as Booker T Washington and W E B Du Bois. Furthermore, many candidates overlooked the phrase 'other ethnic minorities', writing entirely about the experience of African Americans. Native Americans and Hispanics – though the latter is not formally identified as an ethnic minority – could have been mentioned as well. Thus answers were imbalanced. The focus should have been on how far all minority groups had achieved parity with the white majority by 1968 in terms of their political, social and economic rights.

Question 6

This was a popular and accessible question. Most candidates had a sound knowledge of the popular images of prohibition: gangsters, speakeasies and bootlegging. Most answers mentioned Al Capone. These features highlighted the negative impact of prohibition. Hardly anyone, however, considered whether there were any positive benefits, especially in terms of a decline in consumption of alcohol and thus of alcohol-related illnesses such as cirrhosis of the liver. In reality, alcohol consumption declined by some 20-30% in the early 1920s before increasing in the later 1920s. Furthermore alcohol consumption had been declining for several decades. Thus it is possible to argue that prohibition actually increased alcohol consumption. Much of this moonshine alcohol would have been of dubious quality. The prohibition of alcohol production in the 1920s is a classic example of a reform having the opposite effect from the one intended by its supporters.

Question 7

This was answered by a minority of candidates. Most found it hard to organise the material into a coherent and relevant answer. Few knew about both the Versailles peace conference of 1919 and the Yalta and Potsdam conferences of 1945. They concentrated on one or the other, in each case providing a narrative account. There are some significant differences as well as several similarities between the American role in 1919 with that role in 1945 which could be highlighted: the aims and influence of Wilson vs. Roosevelt – and Truman; the context of the end of the two wars; the greater importance of the USA to the winning of the Second World War. A genuinely comparative answer required a sound understanding of the two wars and their endings rather than detailed knowledge of those finales.

Question 8

This question was not very popular. The few who answered the question wrote as much about the US economy in this era than they did about US society. The very few who concentrated on US society usually concluded that the differences between the two decades were greater than the similarities. On the evidence of these answers, the popular image of the swinging, revolutionary sixties prevails over the more mundane reality.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

Key Messages

The most important messages are worth emphasising.

- For all questions, read the wording very carefully. For each question, ask yourself what period you have to cover and what the key words in the question are. Use those words to provide the framework of your analysis and argument. Always write a conclusion which answers the question directly.
- For the compulsory source-based question, make sure you both analyse and evaluate the five sources. Again, write a conclusion which summarises your assessment of how accurately the sources support the hypothesis.
- For the essays, use your arguments to organise your work into paragraphs. Then make sure that your arguments are supported by examples which are both detailed and relevant.
- Keep a close eye on the clock.

B GENERAL COMMENTS

There are a wide variety of approaches to answering the questions. Virtually all candidates wrote four answers, one source-based question, and three essays as required. Some, however, were unable to find four questions which they could answer in more than but a few lines. Only a very few candidates ran out of time. Most candidates had some understanding of the topic and question but often lacked the detailed knowledge and the sharp focus on the question needed to ensure success. More specific comments are made below.

C COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Question 1

Candidates showed a range of responses to the sources, those responses often being affected by candidates' existing knowledge. When it came to **Source A**, a cartoon, many candidates did not know who the Democrats' candidates for president in 1860 were. Even if they had not studied the election in detail, they could have worked out that they were Douglas and Breckinridge from Source C in particular. Bell was a third-party candidate. Though the Source was normally used to support the assertion, careful analysis could legitimately suggest the opposite. Evaluation of Source A rarely extended beyond 'Source A is a cartoon and thus is unreliable', which is not enough for the higher levels. The information provided by the cartoon needs to be checked against either contextual knowledge or the other sources.

Some struggled to make sense of **Source B**, arguing it was irrelevant, mainly because it made no mention of the 1860 election. It is relevant, however. It is a pro-Democratic source written in election year which argues that the Democrats are united only by a desire to win government office. On key political principles, such as slavery, Source B argues that Democrats North and South are deeply divided. The election is but a few months away. Such deep divisions could not be healed in a matter of months and thus Source B supports the hypothesis. Cross-referencing Source B with Source D shows that these divisions still existed during the election campaign. If anything, they had become deeper. Fire-eating Southern Democrats actually wanted Lincoln to win. Thus, on evaluation, Source B still supports the hypothesis.

Candidates found **Sources C and D** to be more straightforward. **Source C** talks of the 1860 election and mentions 'the open split' in the Democratic party. Cross referencing to Source E shows Source C to be

much more reliable than Source A as its summary of Democratic expectations proves to be accurate. **Source D** shows part of the Democratic party actually preferring a Republican victory.

Source E rarely received careful analysis, perhaps because it was the fifth source and quite complex in its description of the actual election results. Most candidates argued that Source E clearly rejected the hypothesis. The evidence provided in the first paragraph of Source E contradicted this assertion. Attempts at evaluation usually relied on comments on the source itself. Many candidates saw the source as an autobiography, attributing it to William Yancey, when it was actually from a biography of Yancey written a generation later and thus likely to be more reliable.

Candidates could analyse the content of each source quite well but found evaluation more challenging. Few assessed the sources for their reliability. The sources had been chosen to provide plenty of opportunities for evaluation by cross-referencing. This should have helped those whose contextual knowledge might be limited. It is important that candidates realise the importance of source evaluation. Many describe what the sources tell them, often at great length. Summary descriptions should be shorter, thereby allowing more time to decide how reliable the sources might be.

Question 2

How important was the doctrine of Manifest Destiny to the westward expansion of the USA in the period 1840 to 1890?

This was the most popular of the essay questions. All candidates understood the meaning of the concept. Having defined manifest destiny, many went on to describe how westward expansion was driven by the American belief in manifest destiny. Only a minority did what the question asked of them, namely to assess the importance of the concept to westward expansion. Many people headed west without believing that they had a God-given right to do so. Some wanted to make their fortune, attracted to the West by discoveries of gold and silver. Some wanted to use the opportunities provided by laws such as the 1862 Homestead Act to make a living for themselves free from the pressures of urban life in the East or in Europe. The Mormons moved west to escape persecution in the east, to find lands which were empty and undeveloped, beyond the borders of the USA. Paradoxically, their efforts could be used as an example of a group which was not motivated by the Christian concept of manifest destiny.

Question 3

The Civil War and Reconstruction is a popular period to study. This question proved a challenge for many and mainly because their knowledge of President Grant's reconstruction policies was limited. For many, the only feature of the Grant presidency they could mention was the corruption revealed in his second term in office. Grant was a two-term president, the first since Andrew Jackson in the 1830s, and reconstruction was a key feature of his eight years as president. His approach was similar to that of the Radical Republicans who dominated Congress; both took a strong line against white supremacists such as the Ku Klux Klan. Candidates knew more about the reconstruction policies of Lincoln and Johnson and thus were able to make some broad comparisons of those policies and the context in which they were developed and implemented. A full answer, however, required equal consideration of Grant's policies.

Two specific features of the period are worth emphasising. Firstly, Presidents have no formal role in the process of amending the constitution. This process is in the hands of the US Congress and the member states of the USA. Presidents can use their 'bully pulpit' to encourage either rejection or acceptance of an amendment but that is all they can do. Secondly, President Johnson was impeached by Congress in 1868. The Senate, which is judge and jury, failed to gain the necessary supermajority to find him guilty of the charges which the House of Representatives laid before them.

Question 4

There were very few answers to this question, most of which wrote about the key figures in steel and oil, namely Carnegie and Rockefeller rather than the industries and their impact. The financial sector was usually overlooked, despite its centrality to US economic growth between the civil war and the First World War.

Question 5

The question on African Americans and ethnic minorities proved popular. The vast majority of answers read the question as 'Describe the progress of the civil rights movement from the late nineteenth century to the

mid twentieth century'. 'Describe' enabled them to provide a narrative account rather than the analytical one which the question required. The long narrative of some 60-80 years gave little space to the key period, which was the 1960s. Many explained the goals and strategies of people such as Booker T Washington and W E B Du Bois. Furthermore, many candidates overlooked the phrase 'other ethnic minorities', writing entirely about the experience of African Americans. Native Americans and Hispanics – though the latter is not formally identified as an ethnic minority – could have been mentioned as well. Thus answers were imbalanced. The focus should have been on how far all minority groups had achieved parity with the white majority by 1968 in terms of their political, social and economic rights.

Question 6

This was a popular and accessible question. Most candidates had a sound knowledge of the popular images of prohibition: gangsters, speakeasies and bootlegging. Most answers mentioned Al Capone. These features highlighted the negative impact of prohibition. Hardly anyone, however, considered whether there were any positive benefits, especially in terms of a decline in consumption of alcohol and thus of alcohol-related illnesses such as cirrhosis of the liver. In reality, alcohol consumption declined by some 20-30% in the early 1920s before increasing in the later 1920s. Furthermore alcohol consumption had been declining for several decades. Thus it is possible to argue that prohibition actually increased alcohol consumption. Much of this moonshine alcohol would have been of dubious quality. The prohibition of alcohol production in the 1920s is a classic example of a reform having the opposite effect from the one intended by its supporters.

Question 7

This was answered by a minority of candidates. Most found it hard to organise the material into a coherent and relevant answer. Few knew about both the Versailles peace conference of 1919 and the Yalta and Potsdam conferences of 1945. They concentrated on one or the other, in each case providing a narrative account. There are some significant differences as well as several similarities between the American role in 1919 with that role in 1945 which could be highlighted: the aims and influence of Wilson vs. Roosevelt – and Truman; the context of the end of the two wars; the greater importance of the USA to the winning of the Second World War. A genuinely comparative answer required a sound understanding of the two wars and their endings rather than detailed knowledge of those finales.

Question 8

This question was not very popular. The few who answered the question wrote as much about the US economy in this era than they did about US society. The very few who concentrated on US society usually concluded that the differences between the two decades were greater than the similarities. On the evidence of these answers, the popular image of the swinging, revolutionary sixties prevails over the more mundane reality.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

Key Messages

The most important messages are worth emphasising.

- For all questions, read the question very carefully. For each question, ask yourself what period you have to cover and what the key words in the question are. Use those words to provide the framework of your answer. Always write a conclusion which answers the question directly.
- For the compulsory source-based question, make sure you both analyse and evaluate the five sources. Again, write a conclusion which summarises your assessment of how accurately the sources support the hypothesis.
- For the essays, use your arguments to organise your work into paragraphs. Then make sure that your arguments are supported by examples which are both detailed and relevant.
- Keep a close eye on the clock.

B GENERAL COMMENTS

Most candidates were well prepared. Virtually all candidates wrote four answers, one source-based question, and three essays as required. Some, however, were unable to find four questions which they could answer in more but a few lines. Few seemed to run out of time. Most candidates had some understanding of the topic and question but often lacked the detailed knowledge and the sharp focus on the question needed to ensure success. A few candidates did have excellent knowledge and understanding and also wrote clear and literate answers. More specific comments are made below.

C COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Question 1

Candidates analysed the five sources, often at considerable length. Most also evaluated the sources, which is the higher-level skill and thus gaining more marks. If anything, the analysis tended to crowd out evaluation. Candidates would do better if they quickly analysed what each source was saying in relation to the hypothesis before evaluating their reliability at greater length.

Some candidates found **Source A**, the cartoon, problematic. This cartoon was meant to be a source which challenged the assertion that the Republican party was fully united behind Lincoln's candidacy. There are several pieces of evidence which support this interpretation: firstly, the Republican barge is in stormy waters and heading for the rocks; secondly, some want to eject a leading Republican from the party and in election year; thirdly, talk that the party might do better if divided; fourthly, the sub-heading of the cartoon, 'the Republican barge in danger'. (Very few, if any, candidates mentioned this sub-heading.) Despite all this, some candidates interpreted the cartoon as evidence for the assertion. They argued that by throwing Seward overboard the party was uniting behind Lincoln, who was an experienced pilot and thus able to steer the party away from the rocks. This interpretation has some plausibility but it caused problems for some who held it because they interpreted the other four sources as also supporting the assertion. This meant that they identified no sources as opposed to the assertion, which in turn limited their argument. It is important to remember that each set of sources will contain one source which challenges the assertion.

As for evaluating Source A, the other sources provide plenty of evidence, especially in relation to the ejection of Seward. Sources B, D and E show how Seward was a major figure in the party. Thus in one respect,

Source A is very unreliable indeed. Some candidates used their own knowledge to make this point about Seward and Lincoln, mentioning Seward's membership of Lincoln's cabinet in 1861. This also is valid evaluation of Source A.

Source B shows a pro-Seward state delegation eventually but willingly supporting Lincoln's nomination as presidential candidate. Thus it supports the assertion, though the time of and the audience for the speech suggests that Schurz would say that anyway, making it less than wholly reliable. Much the same goes for **Source C**, a campaign song performed at a state meeting to ratify Lincoln's candidacy. Many commented on the military imagery of the song, which they took literally and thereby linked with the outbreak of the civil war. The fifth line of the third verse, 'with ballots for bullets', shows this interpretation to be mistaken. It was a political war that the Republicans were so keen to wage.

Source D is important because it is from Seward himself, initially the favourite for nomination as the party's presidential candidate. It shows Seward to be fully behind Lincoln's candidacy. Seward is making this commitment in a public speech, however, and just two months before the election. His statement of support cannot be fully trusted, though Source E limits scepticism about its reliability, as mentioned below.

Source E is from an abolitionist and pro-Republican journal. Source E is similar to Source B in that Seward was its first choice, Lincoln it's second. It comments favourably on Seward's behaviour since losing the nomination before finding virtues in Lincoln's candidature. The source also mentions some divisions within the party over policy matters, which could be used to challenge the hypothesis that the party was fully united behind Lincoln.

Of the five sources, the cartoon and the song are clearly too subjective while Schurz and Seward are party politicians speaking in public. Source E is partisan but not narrowly party political. Contextual knowledge supports much of what it says. Thus it is probably the most reliable, if not necessarily the most useful of the five sources.

Question 2

This was both popular and well answered, if in rather general terms. Most candidates knew when the first transcontinental railroad was built – in the 1860s – and also knew that people had rushed to California in the late 1840s and early 1850s. Thus transcontinental railroads were a consequence of westward expansion. The second half of the assertion also needed consideration: how far did these railroads cause westward expansion? It's worth remembering that by the end of the nineteenth century there were five transcontinental railroads. These made travelling across the USA much easier, opening the West to people from the East and from Europe. Some railroad companies went so far as to advertise in Europe; the more people who travelled on their trains, the more business they would have. Many candidates did consider the consequential impact of the railroads, if less thoroughly than they did the causal relationship.

Question 3

This was popular, as is any question on the civil war and reconstruction. Candidates had a general understanding of the Emancipation Proclamation without appreciating some of the finer points surrounding its introduction and impact. In words, the proclamation freed slaves in eleven Southern states, some 75% of the four million slaves, and not the five border states which joined the North. In reality, slaves were freed only in those parts of the Southern states under Northern control, which in January 1863 meant a maximum of some 50,000, just over 1% of the total. Thus the immediate impact of the Proclamation was more symbolic than practical. However, it was a great symbol of the new focus of the North's war effort, as most candidates recognised.

There are three points of detail worth noting. Firstly, The Proclamation was an executive order of the President, issued under his powers as Commander-in-Chief. It was not legislation and it did not require Congressional approval. Secondly, the Proclamation was issued in two stages: the Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation in September 1862 and the full Proclamation in January 1863. Thirdly, the Preliminary Proclamation was issued after the North's first military success at Antietam. Many thought the relevant battle was Gettysburg.

Question 4

The question attracted too few responses for comments to be made.

Question 5

This question was very popular. It is pleasing to report that most candidates wrote answers which were relevant, thoughtful and balanced. They analysed arguments for and against the proposition, using detailed knowledge to support these arguments. Most also confined their answers to the first half of the twentieth century, resisting the temptation to refer to the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Few, however, considered changes in the position of African Americans between 1900 and 1950. What might have been true of differences between North and South in 1900 was often untrue fifty years later, especially during and after world war two.

Question 6

This question proved challenging for candidates. Many candidates were much more confident about the causes of the Great Crash, on which they focused for much of the essay. When it came to explaining the links between the Great Crash and the Great Depression, many assumed that the policies of President Hoover were either wholly or almost wholly to blame. The errors of the Federal Reserve were completely overlooked. The international dimension was almost always overlooked. According to the candidates who answered this question, the Great Depression was a solely American phenomenon. In reality, not only was the system of international banking and finance working badly by the early 1930s but there was no international consensus about how best to fix it. This international instability was bound to disrupt demand for American goods and finance.

Question 7

This was a demanding question but popular and reasonably well answered. Most candidates made some valid comparisons between US entry into the two world wars. When it came to the First World War, most saw the sinking of the *Lusitania* as a major factor. This assertion shows the importance of having some chronological knowledge. The *Lusitania* was sunk in May 1915, almost two years before the USA declared war on Germany. More relevant was the German return to the strategy of unrestricted submarine warfare in February 1917. It is also important to realise that President Wilson delivered his Fourteen Points in January 1918, well after the USA had joined the war and not before, as many candidates argued. For the Second World War, many candidates knew that Germany declared war on the USA after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour rather than the other way round, which showed a welcome command of the detail of the topic.

Question 8

This question on post war history attracted relatively few responses. Candidates did not need to know the details of economic growth in order to answer this question. They had to consider its consequences for US society. Long-term economic growth meant rising living standards. Greater prosperity in mid twentieth century America was more evenly spread across society – certainly white society – than is the case in the early 21st century. Particular beneficiaries were women, especially married women, and the young, especially teenagers and adolescents. This prosperity, much based on federal government expenditure, was also spread more evenly across the USA as technology such as air conditioning allowed more people to move to the south and south west.