

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9697/01</p>
----------------------

<p>Paper 1</p>
----------------

## General comments

The size of the entry continued to increase. The questions proved to be a fair test of candidates' understanding and knowledge of the syllabus. Candidates were required to answer a source-based question and three essay questions. Candidates who were awarded marks in the middle or higher bands usually wrote four answers of even quality. A characteristic of the weaker scripts was that their answers to the source-based question were more successful than their essay answers.

The overall standard of the scripts was satisfactory. All Examiners read some excellent scripts, as well as scripts that unfortunately did not reach an acceptable standard. Only a few candidates did not answer four questions. Most used their time effectively and spent an appropriate time on each answer. The three hours for the examination includes reading time for the source-based question so it is valid to spend about one hour reading the material and writing an answer and about 40 minutes writing each essay answer, although this is only a rough guide. Candidates in some Centres are encouraged to practise writing essays more. Whilst marks are not given because of the length of answers, some were too brief and needed development to explain points adequately.

Most candidates handled the source-based question at least competently and some deserved very high marks for their answers. Comments on this question are given below. It is worth reminding candidates at this point about the basic requirements of answers to essay questions because they apply to all of Questions 2 - 8 and all such questions in any History component. **Relevance** means that candidates should concentrate on the Key Issue and this might mean not using other information about a topic that has been learned but is not needed for the question. For example, **Question 6** was about the causes of the 1905 Revolution in Russia. A brief comparison with the 1917 Revolutions might have been relevant but full accounts of the period from 1905 to 1917 could not be given much credit because they included irrelevant material. **Dates** mentioned in questions should be noted. **Question 2** ended in 1789; developments in France after that year could not be given credit. **Question 4** was based on Italian unification from 1848 to 1871. The best answers did examine developments in Italy after the creation of the kingdom of Italy in 1861. Whilst it is possible to argue that the most important stages of unification had taken place by that year, the process was not completed for another ten years and very high marks depended on some discussion of the later period. Some questions are **comparative**. For example, **Questions 7** and **8** each depended on two elements, Nazi Germany / Fascist Italy and Stalin / Lenin respectively. Such questions need a balanced approach with approximately equal attention to each element. **Question 3** asked candidates to support their arguments by discussing developments in at least two of three countries; Examiners did not expect detailed references because the scope of imperialism was almost world-wide but these **examples** were necessary to illustrate the points that were being made. Other questions ask **'Why?'** These are answered best by analysis, with points being presented in order of importance. **Structure** is important when awarding high marks. Answers should therefore be planned but briefly, with an introduction that refers cogently to the main issues to be discussed and a short conclusion that summarises the argument.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

This was a source-based question on the general topic of The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914. The specific topic in this examination was 'The Role of Kaiser William II in the Outbreak of World War I' and candidates were asked to consider the hypothesis that 'Kaiser William II was not to blame for the outbreak of war in 1914'. Most of the candidates approached the task effectively. They grouped the sources according to the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis. This is better than a sequential answer

(for example, Source A agrees with the hypothesis, Source B disagrees, Source C agrees etc.). Better answers analysed the content of the extracts and applied some evaluation, considering how far they could be trusted as reliable. However, there was sometimes confusion between reliability and usefulness. An historical source might be unreliable but still useful as an expression of a particular point of view. Better answers avoided excessively long summaries or paraphrases (for example, Source A says that... It then says... It then says...) but used the content to shape an argument. There were cross-references between the sources, showing how far they complemented or contradicted each other. (For example, William II was willing to blame Britain for the threat of war in Source B whilst Tirpitz in Source D claimed that the Kaiser saw no danger from Britain.) candidates could use their own knowledge briefly to support their assessments of the sources. Good answers came to a clear conclusion that indicated how far the hypothesis was justified. A few answers comprised general knowledge almost wholly and hardly used the sources; this could not merit a satisfactory mark. Good answers focused on the sources and used general knowledge to support arguments. Moderate answers tended to make inconclusive judgements, simply repeating what each said for and against the hypothesis but not indicating which is more persuasive. There were some sound analyses of the sources. For example, it was worthwhile to note that even a strong ruler such as William II could recognise the importance of public opinion in Source A. On the other hand, his claim that he was trying to secure an agreement between Austria and Russia was undermined by his encouragement of Austria to take a strong line against Serbia, Russia's ally. The Kaiser's hand-written notes in Source B were very revealing. Their extreme tone, as well as their content, betrayed somebody who did not take a conciliatory stance during the crisis. Some candidates did not note the contrast in Source B between the views of the German Ambassador with his report of Britain's support for mediation, and William II's dismissal of this moderation. Candidates gained credit when they noticed that Source E was written by a leading British politician, one who was anxious to justify Britain's stance in World War I and, by implication, his role as a war leader. Weak answers tended to accept the sources at face value or assessed their reliability in a mechanical way without looking at their content. For example, some claimed that Source A was evidently reliable because it was a personal telegram from the Kaiser to the Tsar. This claim needed to be tested against the content of the source and against contextual knowledge of the relations between Germany and Russia after the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand. Whilst it is important to note when sources are written it is wrong to assume that later sources are less reliable. A source written in the heat of the moment, such as the Kaiser's notes in Source B might be less reliable than a memoir written later. Some claimed unconvincingly that the hypothesis was correct because the majority of the extracts were German in origin and therefore supported William II. The truth or otherwise of a hypothesis in a source-based question does not depend on the number of sources that support or contradict it.

## **Section B**

### **Question 2**

The Key Issue was the reasons for the collapse of the ancien régime in France in 1789. There were a number of sound answers that were analytical and considered a variety of factors, explaining why some reasons were more important than others. The arguments were supported by appropriate knowledge. The answers that were awarded the highest marks were usually those that included developments in the 1780s, such as the critical financial situation, poor harvests and the resistance of the nobility to schemes of reform. Such points helped to explain why the ancien régime, which had survived so long in spite of problems, finally broke down. Moderate and unsatisfactory answers were sometimes limited to broad accounts of the social structure and seemed to assume that the end of the ancien régime in 1789 was inevitable. Whilst it might be argued that its end was certain at some point, why did it happen in 1789 and why in the form of a revolution? Some candidates went beyond the terms of the question to describe developments after 1789 but most candidates kept to the chronological limit of the question.

### **Question 3**

The Key Issue was the effects of industrial development on European governments: were the governments strengthened or weakened? The quality of the answers was variable, mainly because weaker answers did not focus on the Key Issue but confined themselves to general accounts of industrialisation. Some unsatisfactory essays only described the progress of the Industrial Revolution and did not include any references to specific countries. Credit was given when candidates distinguished between their selected countries, using examples from at least two of Britain, France and Germany. Answers that deserved high marks linked industrial developments to governments. For example, governments were strengthened by the increase in the wealth that was generated by industry. There were military advantages because governments could afford to spend more, Britain on its navy and Germany on its army. On other hand, governments had to deal with some problems and traditional classes in government came under pressure. In Britain, France and Germany, the rapidly increasing urban labourers were able to put pressure on

governments to introduce political and social reforms. In Britain, the franchise was extended first to the middle classes and then to most of the working classes and this changed the balance of power in Parliament. In post-Napoleonic France, there was a continuing political struggle for power; the consequences of industrial developments were a factor in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848. The Zollverein played an important role in German unification and, whilst Bismarck maintained the authoritarian position of the Prussian monarchy and the Junkers in the new German Empire, he had to confront the growing support for socialism after unification was achieved. Socialism grew because of industrial development. The governments of industrialised countries had to deal with trade unions and wider demands for social and economic reforms.

#### Question 4

The Key Issue was the reasons why Piedmont played a leading role in Italian unification from 1848 to 1871. The overall quality of the answers was satisfactory and there were some excellent essays. A characteristic of these was that they continued the argument to 1871 whereas less commendable answers stopped with Cavour's death in 1861. These omitted to explain Piedmont's leading role in the later stages of unification with the incorporation of Venetia and Rome into the kingdom of Italy. Very successful candidates sometimes contrasted Piedmont's success with the failure of other schemes to unify Italy in 1848 although the question did not require explanation of developments before 1848. They showed how Piedmont emerged as the most probable champion of unification although the 1848-49 revolutions failed to unite Italy. These candidates also went beyond surveys of Cavour's work to explain the other advantages of Piedmont, for example rulers (first Charles Albert then Victor Emanuel II) who were interested in unification or at least in expanding Piedmont's influence in Italy. Piedmont had a monarchy and a comparatively liberal constitution that did not alienate other major countries in western Europe. Its economy was the most advanced in Italy.

#### Question 5

The Key Issue was the reasons why imperialism caused rivalries between European countries in the later nineteenth century. The most frequent discriminating factor between the good and the disappointing essays was that the former clearly focused on the Key Issue whereas the latter spent more time on explaining the causes of late nineteenth-century imperialism without explaining the consequent rivalries. For example, candidates who explained the economic causes of imperial expansion in this period and then explained why it caused rivalry between European countries, with some examples, deserved higher marks than those who described economic factors as causes but did not show the link to rivalry. Credit was also given when candidates provided some examples to support claims; general mentions of 'Africa' or 'Asia' were insufficiently specific. Candidates were given credit when they explained how rivalries could appear when European countries sought to expand their empires in similar regions, for example Britain and France in Egypt. The search for raw materials could point countries to the same or neighbouring regions. Sometimes, it was the less specific but still powerful attraction of grandeur or the fear of losing influence that caused two nations to become rivals in a region. The question referred to the late nineteenth century but candidates were allowed some tolerance when they examined developments in the early years of the twentieth century, for example in Morocco. Of course, this was not necessary in any answer and their omission was not regarded as a gap in arguments.

#### Question 6

The Key Issue was the underlying causes of the 1905 Revolution in Russia and particularly the extent to which they were political. Credit was given when answers referred to disturbances other than Bloody Sunday. There were strikes in many Russian cities and the Potemkin mutiny signified unrest in the navy. Most candidates agreed with the claim in the question that the Revolution was not primarily political in origin but the best candidates did examine the extent and nature of political dissatisfaction, for example, the programmes of, and support for, the Liberals and more extreme radicals. The unsuccessful war with Japan was often used relevantly as an example of a political factor. There were some creditable accounts of social and economic problems in Russia and some candidates explained how some economic progress under Witte had unfortunate repercussions for many of the population. It was possible but not necessary to point out that Nicholas II's offer of mild political concessions was able to restore order. This contradicts the claim that Russia was a hotbed of political agitation in 1905. A few candidates confused the Revolutions of 1905 and 1917 or attributed to 1905 factors that were only important in 1917, such as Rasputin's unpopularity.

#### Question 7

The Key Issue was a comparison of dictatorship in Germany and Italy to 1939. A high proportion of the answers deserved credit for their relevance and candidates' ability to structure their answers effectively. A

continuous comparison was usually more successful than two sequential accounts of Hitler's and Mussolini's dictatorship followed by a brief concluding comparison. Most essays were reasonably balanced between Germany and Italy. The most usual reason why some essays were awarded a mark in a middle rather than a high band was that they did not discern any differences between the dictatorships. Although outwardly similar in their authoritarian and suppressive traits, Italian Fascism was less violent and repressive than German Nazism. They were different in their policies to religion, although both made agreements with the Papacy, and their racial policies diverged, at least to 1939. Only a few answers deserved low marks because of their considerable imbalance.

### **Question 8**

The Key Issue was a comparison of Stalin and Lenin to 1939 and particularly the extent to which the former continued the policies of the latter. Candidates were usually confident explaining Stalin's policies although some answers were unnecessarily limited to his economic reforms. However, there were commendable points about his political measures in some answers and a few candidates scored highly when they compared the extent to which Stalin and Lenin pursued Marxist theories. The more successful essays were usually more capable of dealing with Lenin. Weaker answers often made assertions about continuity or discontinuity without substantiating them. There were broad references to Lenin's War Communism and the NEP but less was known about the political and administrative structures that he put in place. In the lower bands, candidates were more confident about Stalin than about Lenin. As in **Question 7**, the best candidates structured their answers around a continuous comparison.

# HISTORY (SOUTHEAST ASIA)

---

Paper 9697/02

Paper 2

## General comments

Many of the candidates produced good quality answers to the source-based question and also at times very pleasing essays on the **Questions 2 to 8**. However, there were still some problems in that some candidates did not allow sufficient time for their final answer and so this was hurried with an inevitable decline in standard. Also it is vital that candidates have both a solid factual knowledge of each topic and then use this subject material in an analytical manner to answer the questions asked. Each answer is worth 25 marks and so timing and coverage are both very important. The examination taken as a whole produced a wide range of marks which represents the nature of the candidates who sat the examination in November 2008. At the top end of the cohort examination scripts were excellent and this is a credit to both the candidates and their teachers.

## Specific Question Comments

### Question 1

The source-based question asked the candidates to examine and interpret four sources and answer the question 'There was never any real prospect of the communists taking over the PAP.' How far do Sources A-D support this statement? To gain access to Band 3 the candidates must use the sources to show that there are two views that can be taken from the sources. To access Band 5 marks the candidates must use the source content but also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the 4 sources and to gain a Band 6 mark there must be an overall evaluation of the sources and a summative conclusion and possibly an alternative hypothesis presented. Many candidates accessed Band 3 but fewer made the transition to Band 5 or Band 6. This requires both an understanding of the sources and also good examination technique. Evaluation of the sources can be achieved by both a study of the nature, origin and purpose of the sources and also by contextual knowledge, or indeed both.

### Question 2

**'In economic terms, Asian peoples were better off under colonial domination than they had been before.' How far do you agree with this judgement?**

This essay required candidates to discuss whether the penetration of Western economic conditions brought greater prosperity than pre-colonial economies. They should have examined particular factors such as stability of the pre-colonial economies compared with the destabilizing effects of capitalism. These could have been contrasted with the potential benefits the latter might have brought. The opinion in the quote was usually put forward by colonial powers who saw capitalism as progressive and pre-colonial economies as backward. Examples from the French in Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies were needed. This was a popular question and produced some top quality answers.

### Question 3

**Why was it that colonial regimes encouraged the development of plural societies?**

This essay required candidates to examine the relationship between socio-economic pluralism and ethnic pluralism in Colonial Societies. Candidates had to observe that ethnic pluralism was a consequence of the artificial boundaries imposed by the colonial powers. The migration of peoples needed examination. Stronger candidates looked at the impact of education and of an indigenous administrative class. Examples from Burma, Malaya, the Dutch East Indies and French Indo-China would all be helpful in this essay.

#### **Question 4**

**How far did the Japanese achieve their aim of a 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere' from 1941 to 1945?**

Candidates were expected to examine the political and economic structures put in place by the Japanese and question the extent to which these were co-operative, rather than coercive. The essay needed an explanation of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere and then a country by country examination. For example, French Indo-China, Malaya, Thailand, Burma, Borneo and the Dutch East Indies. An in depth subject knowledge of the regional impact of this Japanese policy was needed. This was a popular question and produced some excellent answers.

#### **Question 5**

**How effectively did colonial governments respond to the rise of Nationalism in Southeast Asia up to World War Two?**

A detailed examination of the roles and responses of colonial governments is required for this essay. Examples could come from the Dutch in Indonesia, the French in Indo-China, and the British in both Malaya and Burma. It is worth noting that the British did not face a nationalist movement but rather pressure from the indigenous rulers in the Malay states for greater devolution of power. In Burma the British were under pressure both from within Burma and also from India and the nationalist movements. Thus Burma was given formal independence in the 1930s.

#### **Question 6**

**Examine the influence of the superpowers over decolonisation in Southeast Asia after World War Two.**

Candidates were expected to examine the extent of superpower influence in the wake of the Second World War. A discussion was needed as to whether the superpowers were prepared to allow the situation just to develop rather than intervening themselves. They were also required to examine why superpower influence differed over different territories. In some cases independence was gained because of superpower intervention whilst in others their policies had little effect. Examples from the actions of the USA and France in Indo-China and Vietnam were needed. Examples such as Indonesia and Malaya needed to be examined. It was important that candidates did not simply focus on Japanese Occupation. This question was popular but at times the focus was not appropriate to the question asked but where the superpowers were really studied some excellent work was produced.

#### **Question 7**

**How far has it been state participation that has determined economic success or failure in newly independent Southeast Asian states?**

This was not a popular question and was rarely attempted. Candidates were expected to explore the differing levels of state intervention in the different territories of Southeast Asia and to assess whether state intervention has helped or hindered economic growth. Stronger candidates would have explored the differing contexts and linked the nature of the state intervention to the political nature of each state. Examples from Burma and Laos as examples of state intervention could be contrasted with Singapore. The case of the catastrophic intervention by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia could have been used.

#### **Question 8**

**Assess the causes of rivalry and conflict between the newly-independent states of Southeast Asia.**

Candidates were expected to examine in detail the range of disputes that took place to explore whether there is any common regional causality. They might have explored factors such as colonial legacy, ethnic tensions, and also resource exploitation. Stronger candidates could have investigated how much the establishment of regionalism, especially ASEAN has resolved these disputes. Examples from the Malaysia-Philippines dispute over Sabah, and also the Malaysia- Indonesia dispute over the Sipadan and Ligitan Islands were needed. Border disputes between Thailand and Burma were needed to show the importance of ethnic minorities and the invasion of Cambodia by Vietnam could have been used to highlight political



regime change rather than territorial gain. This question was again not a popular choice amongst candidates.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 9697/03</b></p>
-----------------------------

<p><b>Paper 3</b></p>
-----------------------

## General comments

Overall, the performance on the examination paper was satisfactory. The vast majority of candidates attempted and completed the four questions required for the examination. Very few candidates contravened the rubric and answered both **Questions 3** and **4**. The examination paper produced a wide range of responses. The most successful candidates attempted **Question 1** first. Those candidates who produced a short plan before answering tended to order their answers in a more logical coherent way. Some candidates underachieved because they did not always back up some excellent analytical points with detailed supporting factual knowledge. There was a slight improvement in the answers to **Question 1**, the case Study. More candidates were willing to go beyond the face value of the sources and provided either cross-referencing of information between sources, the production of contextual knowledge or an evaluation of the provenance of sources to support and sustain the case made.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A*

#### **Question 1**

#### **The UN Secretary-General and the Congo Crisis**

The question required candidates to study five sources on the role of the UN Secretary-General in the Congo Crisis and then to evaluate a hypothesis which involved an assessment of the role of UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld.

A very small number of candidates produced answers which merely described parts of some sources. These answers received a low mark. In contrast, a large number of candidates made reference to apposite parts of the sources which were deemed relevant to addressing the hypothesis. Information was provided from sources both for and against the hypothesis with a brief conclusion, which made an assessment. In using source information, at face value, these candidates were only able to achieve approximately half marks, even though they used relevant material to construct a logical case. Those candidates who went beyond the face value of the sources achieved much higher marks. They were able to achieve higher marks because they were able to cross-reference information between sources, in constructing a strong, logical case and/or they referred to their own knowledge which enabled them to place the role of the Secretary-General in the Congo Crisis in historical context. Finally, and most frequently candidates made reference to the provenance of the sources as a way of evaluating the value and/or utility of the sources in addressing the hypothesis. For instance, several candidates noted that three sources ( A, C and E) emanated from the UN or UN officials. This was felt by some to limit their utility.

Several candidates provided a concluding paragraph, which offered an overall assessment of the hypothesis. In this paragraph a number of candidates stated that the quality and strength of argument on one side of the hypothesis was stronger. However, to achieve the highest marks candidates were expected to explain why this was the case. Similarly, a number of candidates stated that, in light of the evidence presented in their answer, the hypothesis should be modified. However, only those candidates who explained why this was the case through reference to arguments put forward earlier in the answer, received reward.



**Section B**

**Question 2**

**How far was the Cold War, in the period 1945 to 1949, caused by Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe?**

This question proved to be the most popular in **Section B**. A large number of candidates displayed sound knowledge of the causes and development of the Cold War in Europe, covering the years 1945 to 1949. Many were able to provide detailed knowledge of Soviet expansion into eastern and central Europe in the years from 1945 and the response this caused from the USA and the West.

Many candidates took the opportunity to consider the historical debate on the origins of the Cold War in Europe. Part of the traditional interpretation of the debate has regarded Stalin's takeover of Eastern Europe as an example of Soviet imperialism. Those candidates, who were able to refer to the post post-revisionist view, as enunciated by historians such as John Lewis Gaddis since 1991, also were able to state that Stalin and the Soviet leadership did have plans to expand communist influence across Europe beyond the boundaries of the USSR. However, those candidates who scored high marks were able to link historical events involving Soviet expansionism to the historical debate.

Similarly, when considering other historical interpretations of the causes and development of the Cold War in Europe in the years 1945 to 1949, it was those candidates who linked reference to debate with apposite historical knowledge who performed well. In their answer several candidates mentioned that Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe was purely defensive. A more important factor was the development of the US policy of containment. Alternatively, many considered the post-revisionist view which highlighted misjudgement and misinterpretation of each superpower's aims and motives by the other.

**Question 3**

**'The Cold War, in the period 1950 to 1979, showed that the USA's fear of communist world domination was irrational.' How far do you agree?**

This question was far more popular than its optional alternative, **Question 4**. Most candidates displayed sound knowledge of several events in the globalisation of the Cold War, most notably the Korean War, the conflict in Vietnam and the Cuban Missile Crisis. However, in many cases such information was used in a narrative chronological manner without direct reference to whether or not US policy was irrational. A minority of candidates did not limit themselves to the date parameters mentioned in the question and wrote lengthy passages on the development of the Cold War in Europe in the period before 1950.

The question allowed candidates the opportunity to consider the factors underlying the globalisation of the Cold War. One such factor was the US fear of a global communist conspiracy which was dominated by the USSR and Communist China. The belief that the Soviet Union and China worked together persisted after the Sino-Soviet split had developed. It was only with the advent of détente that the divisions between the USSR and China were accepted by the USA.

Also, many candidates mentioned the policies of containment and roll back as part of the US belief in a global communist threat. In more specific terms, many mentioned the domino theory as put forward initially by Eisenhower. Although it applied to South East Asia, it can be cited as an example of US fears of communism.

The candidates who achieved the higher marks produced a balanced analytical answer which contained sections which cited aspects of US policy which was deemed rational and logical and areas where US policy was deemed irrational. In supporting the former, most candidates cited the Korean War and the Cuban Missile Crisis. In defence of the latter, US policy towards Vietnam, Africa and Chile were usually provided as examples.

#### Question 4

##### **How far was the direct US military intervention in Vietnam due to President Lyndon Johnson?**

This question was answered by only a small minority of candidates. Invariably, the majority of responses provided a narrative-chronology of US involvement in Vietnam. Such responses did not score highly. Those candidates who evaluated Johnson's role and compared and contrasted it with the actions of other presidents such as Eisenhower and Kennedy produced the best answers.

In response to the idea that Johnson was mainly responsible, candidates mentioned the Gulf of Tonkin Incident and Resolution of 1964, and the decision to commit combat troops to South Vietnam in March 1965. In addition, candidates mentioned the large troop deployment from 1965 to 1968, which saw US troop levels reach 565 000. In many ways the US war in Vietnam was Johnson's War.

As a counter-argument, many candidates cited the Eisenhower administration's decision to offer military aid to the Diem regime as the beginning of the process. Others blamed John F. Kennedy. His decision to increase the number of military advisers, his covert operations in Laos and the assassination of Diem in November 1963 all placed Johnson in a very difficult position. Either he could withdraw and leave South Vietnam to communism or increase military support.

#### Question 5

##### **Who, or what, was responsible for the Sino-Soviet conflict?**

This question provided a wide variety of answers. Only a minority of candidates provided a narrative-chronology of the development of Sino-Soviet relations from the 1950s to the 1970s. Far more candidates saw the main cause of the Sino-Soviet split as a clash of personalities between Khrushchev and Mao. A minority of candidates saw the split as historically inevitable.

Many stated that Mao's desire to be the world leader of communism, following the death of Stalin, was almost bound to lead to rivalry. Also Mao developed an alternative version of communism based on peasant, agricultural communism which offered a rival to the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of communism within the USSR. This enabled Mao to dispense with Soviet industrial experts in the late 1950s enabling China to engage in the 'Great Leap Forward', with disastrous consequences. Also the Cultural Revolution heightened tension between the USSR and China, leading eventually to the Ussuri River Incident.

In offering a counter argument, several suggested that following the denunciation of Stalin in 1956, the two communist superpowers began to diverge.

#### Question 6

##### **Assess the impact of the nuclear arms race on the development of the Cold War from 1949 to 1989.**

This question was answered by only a minority of candidates. Many responses offered a narrative-chronology of the development of nuclear weapons from 1949 to 1989. Although many of these responses provided detailed factual information, they did not achieve the higher marks. These went to those responses which offered a balanced, analytical argument on the impact of nuclear weapons on the development of the Cold War.

On one side the nuclear arms race led to the development of massive retaliation, MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) and flexible response. It also prevented the two superpowers from direct military confrontation, except for Cuba in October 1962. It also forced the two superpowers to develop ways of limiting the possibility of a nuclear war: the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty of 1968; SALT, START and the ABM treaty.

As a result of the nuclear 'stand-off' between the two superpowers, they became involved in proxy wars in areas such as Vietnam, Angola and the Horn of Africa.

### Question 7

**'The most important factor in the growth of the international economy, from 1945 to 1980, was the continual movement towards free trade.' How far do you agree?**

This question was attempted by only a small number of candidates. In many cases a narrative-chronology of the development of the international economy was made. Most candidates concentrated on the 1945 to 1955 period and made reference to the creation of the Bretton Woods system, the Marshall Plan and the recovery of the western European economy. Only a few candidates were able to make direct references to the impact of GATT and the various rounds of GATT agreements such as the Kennedy Round and the Uruguay Round. Only a few candidates offered an alternative to the importance of free trade as the most important factor affecting global economic growth. In most cases, reference was made to the importance of the US economy in global economic development. Candidates could have mentioned the Japanese economic miracle which depended heavily on protection of the home market and the EEC/EC can be regarded as a protectionist block against the rest of the world.

### Question 8

**To what extent have the problems facing Third World countries, in the period 1973 to 1991, been the result of the oil crises of 1973 and 1979?**

This question was answered by a very small number of candidates. Only a minority were able to place the oil crises of the 1970s in historical context and say how this impacted directly upon the Third World. The quadrupling of the world price of oil in 1973 and its doubling in 1979 placed the international economy into a period of recession. Third World countries found it increasingly difficult to sell their goods abroad. Also, the debts incurred as a result virtually crippled many economies in Latin America and Africa.

To counter the argument, candidates could have mentioned natural disasters such as famine in the Horn of Africa; warfare (which afflicted much of sub-Saharan Africa), corrupt governments and exploitation by more successful 'First World' economies.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9697/04

The History of Tropical Africa, 1855-1914

## General Comments

- Candidates used the full range of questions with the most popular ones being **Question 6** and **Question 9**. Very few candidates did not attempt four questions, and this year there was an increasing number producing four essays of equal length, thus showing good time management. There were some very high quality responses showing that candidates had worked hard to prepare for the exam, and also read the question carefully each time before responding.
- On the other hand, there were instances of candidates not having read the question carefully, of only responding to part of it, or hoping to get by with a prepared response to a similar question from a previous year's paper. Although the vast majority of scripts were legible, and most with a high standard of written English, there was evidence of such economy in the use of paper that margins were frequently too narrow for Examiners; annotations or recording of marks. Rubric infringements were very rare indeed.
- The better candidates showed a commendable grasp of African History and met the wide scope of this paper.

## Comments on Specific Questions

### Question 1

**What was the 'House System'? Explain, with examples, the origins and importance of the system in the city states of the Niger Delta.**

Few candidates answered this question. Most who did were able to provide a definition of the 'House System' and knew some details about Jaja of Opobo. As the question asks for examples it was necessary to include others such as 'The Order of Blood Men' and Alali of the Anna Pepple House to do well. Answers to the last part of the question – analysing the importance of the House System – were thin, and candidates would be advised to improve their techniques of evaluation and assessment as they prepare for such questions. For example, Jaja was a bridge between the old (cultures which he sought to preserve), and the new (men he represented, who had risen to prominence by merit, and made their living from trading on their own terms with Europeans, in products which were becoming much sought after. Jaja was a catalyst for colonialism as British traders and missionaries saw him as an obstacle and so pushed for annexation of the Delta states.

### Question 2

**Assess the achievements of the Creoles in West Africa and explain why Britain changed its attitude and policy towards them late in the nineteenth century.**

The problem with this question was that it required specific examples of Creoles who achieved remarkably and for a top mark more than just a mention of their name was expected. Few candidates went on to say why a particular Creole's achievement in law, education, linguistics, or the church was so very important in the development of Sierra Leone or the coastal regions of West Africa. When a question asks a candidate to 'assess ...' this is the development the Examiner is looking for. In response to the second part of the question, there was knowledge of Social Darwinism, and of Governor Cardew and the Mende-Temne Rising, but these threads were not always drawn together into a convincing argument about why British policy changed.

**Question 3**

**What were the reasons for the Ngoni invasions of Central and East Africa? Assess the consequences of these invasions.**

Reasons for the Ngoni invasions were generally well-known. The second part of the question required an assessment, not a narration to reach a high mark band. A basic division into 'positive' and 'negative' consequences, or 'constructive', such as giving the impetus for the growth of new communities and large states, and 'destructive', such as the raiding for cattle and food crops and the upsurge in the slave trade was expected. Such a classification did not appear often. Such analysis as this would have shown the Examiner that a candidate has understood the impact of geographical facts learnt about the Ngoni movements and it would have been highly rewarded.

**Question 4**

**What do you understand by the terms 'informal empire' and 'formal empire'? When, how and why did the latter replace the former in Tropical Africa?**

The focus of this question was the 'Scramble for Africa', and after a successful definition of 'informal' and 'formal', it was hoped that candidates would identify such 'triggers' or 'accelerators' as the activities of Leopold II in the Congo, De Brazza's treaty with Makoko, the British occupation of Egypt, and Bismarck's entering into the colonial race by calling a Conference on West Africa which defined 'effective occupation' and also his ventures to claim the remaining 'spheres' of Africa for Germany. Candidates should have been able to identify the crucial importance of the 1875-1885 decade in the colonising process. Although most of the candidates attempting this question knew that the above mentioned events were important, few constructed a convincing argument incorporating them.

**Question 5**

**With reference to specific examples, account for the emergence and growth of independent African churches in West Africa and assess their importance in the region.**

This was a question on the Independent African Churches of West Africa and did not require an answer about John Chilembwe. This is an illustration of how important it is to read the question carefully. The specific examples hoped for were Majola Agbebi and William Wade Harris. Not many candidates found the right focus for their answer. Fortunately for them, the reasons for breakaway churches are very similar throughout Africa, as is their importance. In West Africa, independent church leaders were opposed to using violence to achieve their aims of bringing more and better education, development and justice for Africans. Candidates should have been able to recognise the seeds of early nationalism in the breakaway churches such as the African Baptist, United Native and Bethel Churches, and this was perhaps their main importance. Some candidates failed to recognise that the question was not on Bishop Crowther, who belongs to the earlier period of Ethiopianism in mission churches, and who remained an Anglican Bishop and missionary, not the founder of an Independent African Church.

**Question 6**

**Why did the efforts of Samori Touré to resist the European conquest of his territory fail, whilst those of Menelik II succeeded?**

A very popular question, done well by many candidates. Some chose to write about Samori and Menelik separately, others to compare as they went along. Both approaches were valid. Some candidates wrote about Samori's strengths, either as a prelude to his eventual failure, or as their chosen answer. This was a pity, as the question, although comprehensive, was generally a manageable one and invited strong answers.

Samori's failure to defeat the French was a more challenging task for candidates, as past questions have focused on his strengths. Candidates needed to identify for themselves the bases of his defeat in his earlier actions even when his empire was strong, for example, in his religious policy and his scorched earth policy, both of which made future enemies. Luck was not on his side with regard to arms and ammunition supply routes or the geographical position of his capital. He unwisely chose to attack Sikasso, and his armies had already fought the French for 16 years. All this on top of the vastly superior French military machine meant certain defeat. Menelik's success is well documented, and candidates had no problem analysing it, but unless they had a strong section on Samori, the resultant imbalance could have brought their mark down to Band 5.

**Question 7**

**How far do you agree with the view that the establishment of European colonialism in Africa helped the spread of Islam more than that of Christianity?**

This question was open ended and covered the whole of Tropical Africa. It was only attempted on a minority of scripts. Candidates generally selected areas they knew well, or chose contrasting areas to illustrate their argument. They were expected to challenge as well as support the premise before reaching a judgement, and good candidates recognised that the situation differed in different parts of Africa. Many candidates pointed out that Islam had advantages in having been long established in some areas, and not being associated with the mission churches. Also, the mission churches discouraged active proselytising in Muslim areas after the Berlin West Africa Conference defined 'spheres of influence'. However, a good case could be made out for the spread of Christianity in, for example, Yorubaland and Malawi, and both religions spread very rapidly in the 25 years before 1914.

**Question 8**

**Assess the view that 'Africans who resisted Europeans were bound to fail; those who collaborated were certain to gain'. Answer with reference to the history of Central and East Africa.**

Good candidates were expected to challenge the truth of this view. It is also an open ended question, so candidates could select their examples on each side, although the limits of Central and East Africa needed to be observed. Some weaker candidates chose to use material on Samori again, or focus on West Africa. The usual examples chosen were the Maji Maji Rising, Lobengula and Lewanika. These were apt examples as each could be used to challenge and support the question premise, and so could form the basis of an argument. Although collaborators may have gained in the short-term (e.g. Lewanika), they lost in the end as their land was colonised; although the resisters lost in the short-term (e.g. Maji Maji), they gained a less oppressive German system of ruling in the longer-term. The only resister who really 'bucked the trend' was Menelik, whose country was not colonised. Elsewhere, both collaborators and resisters were colonised, so may be said to have 'lost'. Answers on these lines, reaching a balanced judgement based on evidence used convincingly, would be awarded a mark in the top two bands.

**Question 9**

**What were the differences between the French colonial administrative systems of 'assimilation' and 'association'? When and why did 'association' begin to replace 'assimilation'?**

This was one of the most popular questions and candidates recognised that it required two definitions and a comparison, then a 'When?' and a 'Why?'. Assimilation was usually well explained, although not always with the connection to the four Senegalese Communes; some candidates preferred the Crowder definition of 'paternalism' for association. Not all candidates saw the French way of ruling as different from the British 'indirect rule' here, but most could make a valid comparison.

Some thought the change began in 1880, but this was a little early. It was about 1900 when association began to replace assimilation, for obvious reasons of cost and difficulty of implementation of the latter. Most candidates identified the fear of Frenchmen that the African 'citizens' might eventually outnumber them in their parliament and take their trading monopolies if they were to remain of equal status. Africans, too, were losing any desire for becoming Frenchmen, preferring to glory in their own culture and traditions.

**Question 10**

**Analyse the similarities and differences in the ways the European powers economically exploited and developed their colonies in Tropical Africa**

Most weaker candidates attempting this question seemed to wish it had been on the railways. The diverse colonial economic systems were not well-known. The mark scheme required an examination of three different areas, different types of colonial economy, and at least a knowledge of British, French and Belgian policies for a mark in Band 1 or Band 2. Candidates' responses were generally weak. Few referred to peasant farming, plantation economy, settlers farming the land, or companies extracting its riches as the main categories, and specific examples of colonial enterprises were few. Information on the railways as the necessary infrastructure of commercial development could be markworthy if related to the question. In



general, this question was done badly with few candidates appreciating or responding to the wide coverage and detail envisaged in the mark scheme.

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9697/05</p>
----------------------

<p>Paper 5</p>
----------------

## General comments

There were no serious rubric infringements, though far too many candidates failed to answer four questions as required. The overall standard was slightly lower than last year's entry. Overall the main weaknesses were lack of relevance combined with a strong tendency to write descriptive answers which focused on the topic rather than the question and lacked analysis and/or explanation. In contrast, there was a substantial number of consistently analytical answers fully in command of the questions set, which were a pleasure to read.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1 Source - based Question

**'The Dred Scott decision demonstrated the Supreme Court's inability to deal with sectional issues in a satisfactory manner.'** Using Sources A-E discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

The question was indifferently answered. A significant number of candidates answered it last. As it requires different techniques from the essay questions and also involves a considerable amount of reading before commencing the response, it is better practice to answer it first. This can get candidates off to a good start to the paper and of course if it is answered last, time constraints may well be present. Far too many candidates relied on descriptions of the sources interspersed with some comments only attempting to address the question in the final paragraphs. To attain the higher Levels it is essential to place the sources in their historical context e.g. Did the views expressed in Source B represent anyone other than the editor or proprietor? Also Douglas in Source C was in the middle of a fiercely contested Senate election against Lincoln where he had to strike a delicate balance between upholding the Dred Scott judgement, which would offend his Northern supporters, or criticising it, which would offend Southern Democrats. Many candidates did not seem to know precisely what the role of the Supreme Court was in the American system of government or the status of its decisions in interpreting the Constitution. A few candidates gained credit by exploring whether it was possible for any decision of the Court to deal with sectional issues in a 'satisfactory manner', given the acute and profound divisions on this issue by 1857. Few candidates pointed out that Taney's judgement, apart from its aggressive tone, went far further than was necessary. It would have been quite enough to rule that Scott's status as a slave continued wherever he went, rather than the broad ruling actually made which among other things ruled that the Missouri Compromise of 1821, which had been regarded as a settlement of the slavery question, was in fact unconstitutional.

### Questions 2-8 Essay Questions

#### Question 2

**Why did the Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854) produce such a storm of political controversy?**

A popular question. The background to and the contents of the Act were usually stated correctly with the key point being that slavery could now be extended (at least in theory) anywhere in the remaining US Territories if the voters of the Territory concerned decided this should be so. Most responses stated that the Act was the brainchild of Senator Douglas. Some candidates pointed out that the Act clearly showed that the 1850 Compromise was merely an armistice rather than a settlement of the sectional issue as had been hoped at the time. Douglas's ingenious solution of popular sovereignty was not examined adequately and too few responses showed how it clearly failed when first put to the test in Kansas, producing two rival bodies claiming to be the government and a state of local civil war. Responses correctly pointed out that the Act caused an immediate rise in abolitionist sentiment; already fuelled by the application of the Fugitive Slave Act. Curiously, none mentioned the huge impact of Harriet Beecher Stowe's book *Uncle Tom's Cabin*,

published only two years previously and which apart from huge sales was produced in dramatic form all over the North during this controversy. Surprisingly few answers pointed out that even while passing through Congress, the Act caused a split in the Democratic Party, which in turn led to the formation of the Republican Party later on in 1854. This was ominous as the Republicans were a purely sectional party (unlike the Democrats) and their key plank was that there was to be no extension of slavery under any circumstances. Better answers pointed out the basic problem of the Act that made the sectional divide much worse by raising the suspicions of both sections; the North, that slavery was being extended into new territory, while the South focused on the huge increase in abolitionist sentiment in the North resulting from the Act.

### Question 3

**'He was hopelessly unfitted for the office of President.'** To what extent is this a fair judgement of Grant's two Presidential terms (1869-1877)?

This was a popular question. Most candidates focused on Grant's complete lack of political experience but by itself this need not have been an insuperable barrier (consider Eisenhower in 1952). What was much more serious was Grant's lack of interest in politics and the feeling that he did not appear to understand how the American political system actually worked. He regarded himself as a constitutional figurehead to reign rather than rule, leaving the functions of government to Cabinet and Congress. He also made the fatal error of appointing friends to high office and remaining loyal to them in the face of a large number of scandals. There was a surprising number of these and some were very close to Grant e.g. his Vice President and later on his personal secretary. Grant seemed quite content to stand aside and not get involved. Several candidates argued that the fact that he was elected for a second term in 1872 showed the assertion in the question to be incorrect. However, Grant was the only truly national hero in the country. He was widely regarded as being honest, if incompetent and distrust of the Democrats was still widespread. A case could be made out for Grant. He did enforce vigorously the outlawing of the Ku Klux Klan, he kept Federal troops in some of the former Confederate States and made no attempt to thwart the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment (the right to vote not to be denied on account of race, colour or previous servitude). He was also a more unifying figure, in contrast to his immediate predecessor, Andrew Johnson.

### Question 4

**Why did it prove so difficult for both Federal and State governments to regulate big business effectively in the period 1865-1913?**

There were a reasonable number of answers to this question. This was the period of great American economic expansion from being a predominantly agrarian economy to becoming the leading industrial nation in the world. The Constitution was completely silent on social and economic matters and the Supreme Court consistently ruled against attempts by Congress to engage in economic regulation. The dominant philosophy was free market capitalism carried to extreme lengths. This was regarded as an integral part of the American way of life. This system quickly developed into huge cartels or Trusts which entered into agreements with each other so as to exercise unbridled power. The railroads in particular had complex tariffs where the impoverished farmers would in effect be subsidising the major oil and coal companies, the latter paying low tariffs, the former very high ones. Both political parties were dominated by business interests, particularly the Republicans. Attempts by third parties such as the Populists and later the Socialists to break open this duopoly never succeeded. The barriers to regulation were formidable. Many Congressmen and Senators were literally on the payrolls of business interests, while the lobbying impact of business was far greater than that of farmers or labour organisations. Few candidates pointed out the change that occurred in 1901 with the advent of the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt who along with his successors Taft and Wilson, pursued a quite different policy of regulation at all levels being quite prepared to stand up to the Trusts. It could, however, be pointed out that this may have simply been regarded as the minimum necessary to prevent the working class from going over to the Socialists who were making rapid gains in influence during this period.

**Question 5**

**Consider the view that the dramatic legal gains for African-Americans from 1945 to 1968 did little in practice to improve their social and economic position.**

A very popular question. Since the three key pieces of legislation—the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act and the 24<sup>th</sup> Amendment were only enacted in 1964-5, it is hardly surprising there was little economic or social effect by 1968. Many candidates perceptively pointed out that only in 2009 will there be an African-American President, Barack Obama. Too common was a narrative approach with the emphasis being on the first part of the question with little consideration of the social and economic aspects which were confined to a few paragraphs at the end. All candidates noted that the key starting point was the Brown judgements of the Supreme Court which outlawed racial discrimination in public Schools (and by implication all public places and amenities). Few pointed out that the decision was unanimous and though implementation was slow to start with, racially integrated Schools were universal by 1968. This naturally had a knock on effect to colleges and universities with 'affirmative action' policies being widespread, though these became subject to challenge in the courts. All candidates dealt at length with the remarkable campaigning activities of Dr Martin Luther King, but answers were usually totally uncritical. By 1968 King had moved to opposition to the Vietnam war and also in the direction of 'socialist' policies in welfare and social policies. Far too little attention was paid to King's critics in the civil rights movement e.g. Malcolm X. By 1968 a Black middle class in the professions had emerged but the problems of an African-American underclass trapped in a cycle of poor housing, unemployment and crime, with seemingly no way out remained acute. While this question is always popular, it requires a tighter structure and more analytical approach.

**Question 6**

**How far did Roosevelt's second term of office demonstrate that critics of the New Deal had been right all along?**

The best starting point is to ask, who were the critics of the New Deal? These can be divided into two broad categories. First, those who said it was too socialist, there was a huge cost to the relief projects, large budget deficits, interfering far too much with business enterprises and most basically giving far too much power to the federal government, in particular to one man i.e. Roosevelt, thus negating the checks and balances of the Constitution. Electorally these critics posed no threat to Roosevelt as the 1936 election showed, but more worrying were the second group, his radical critics who claimed that the New Deal was too timid. These are difficult to classify as they combined elements of both Left and Right, particularly Father Coughlan and Huey Long. They all advocated extreme solutions as a kind of quick fix, such as pensions of \$200 a month to the over 60s which had to be spent, the nationalization of the banks, a guaranteed minimum wage combined with restrictions of private wealth. What made these ideas so attractive was that by 1937 the New Deal seemed to have lost momentum, with unemployment still very high and a new recession. The Supreme Court controversy in that year and Roosevelt's reaction to it, led to accusations that he was becoming a dictator on the European model so prevalent in the 1930s. A surprising number of responses thought his critics were right, pointing to the fact that only the start of rearmament in 1938 pulled America out of recession. However, the conservative critics had no alternative strategy to the New Deal, while the radical policies could never have passed Congress and would have led to a collapse in business confidence which in turn would have led to a further and deeper recession. The conclusion remains that with all its faults the New Deal was the only programme with any realistic prospect of acceptance and success.

**Question 7**

**To what extent was isolationism the key doctrine of US foreign policy, 1919-1941?**

Answers to this question were unconvincing and weakly argued. Definitions of isolationism were rarely given and were usually wrong. It derived from Washington's farewell message rather than from the Monroe Doctrine and its key principal was that the US should steer clear of alliances with other powers. This was of course spectacularly breached by US entry into World War 1, though technically the US was not an ally of Britain and France but an Associated Power. Candidates correctly pointed out that starting with the rejection by the Senate of the League of Nations, America refused to commit itself to international agreements which could restrict its freedom of action. Few candidates grasped that in the 1920s US diplomacy was surprisingly active; good examples being the Kellogg-Briand pact outlawing war, the Washington Naval Agreement, membership of the International Labour Organisation, a US judge on the International Court of Justice and observers at League committee meetings. These could be described as active and independent policies rather than isolationist. Better scripts noted that as Japan, Italy and Germany became more aggressive from 1931 onwards, with the League proving ineffective, US public opinion was overwhelmingly against any

involvement in European conflicts, hence the three Neutrality Acts. This period can be described as isolationist but from 1940 onwards US policy was to help Britain and France by all means short of military involvement and after the fall of France in 1940 America and Britain were, in effect, allies. Pearl Harbour and the German declaration of war on the US shattered the isolationist doctrine completely.

### **Question 8**

#### **How far did the role of women in US society change from 1945 to 1968?**

A relatively small number of responses, none attaining the higher levels. Responses gave inaccurate statements about the status of women in 1945 and only vague generalisations about emancipation in later years. In 1945 they had possessed the vote for 25 years and women had served in Roosevelt's cabinet. Millions of women worked in factories in World War 2 while men were at war and this continued after war ended, giving women more social and economic independence. Increasingly, women went into higher education and gained access to all the professions. By the end of the period it seemed highly likely that an Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution would be passed; in fact this did not happen. Women took an active part in the protests of the 1960s and the phrase 'Women's Liberation' became increasingly in vogue, a movement that was to continue and grow in later decades.