

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9697/01</p>

<p>Paper 1</p>

General comments

The general standard of answers was satisfactory and examiners were pleased to read some excellent scripts that reflected sound levels of understanding and good knowledge. The most successful scripts demonstrated a variety of qualities appropriate to the study of history at this level. The most important quality is relevance. It is important to keep to the dates in questions. For example, **Q4** was about Bismarck's leadership of Germany to 1871. Discussions of his later career could not be given credit because they fell outside the scope of the question.

The most effective answers concentrated on the key issues in the questions. Less satisfactory answers dealt more generally with topics. For example, **Q7** asked, 'Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Mussolini as leader of Italy in domestic affairs from 1922 to 1939'. High marks were awarded when candidates took care to select and explain what they perceived to be Mussolini's strengths and weaknesses and focused on domestic issues. Less satisfactory answers gave less attention to judgements about his strengths and weaknesses. If present at all, these tended to be implied rather than specified, which is not good enough.

Candidates were given higher marks when they noted the key institutions in questions. For example, **Q2** asked 'Why?' This instruction means that candidates needed to analyse issues and give reasons, using their knowledge to support arguments. **Qs4** and **5** asked 'How far ...?' The best approach to these questions was to consider different arguments and judge which were the more convincing. **Q5** asked how far public opinion determined imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century. High marks were awarded when answers (i) explained how and why public opinion was important and (ii) also considered other factors such as strategic and economic interests. Very good answers indicated which were the most important reasons.

Very good candidates usually found it helpful to make plans or brief notes before beginning to write. These can be made in a few minutes but they help candidates to compose and organise their thoughts. In particular, they enable candidates to put their points in order of importance and avoid repetition.

Almost all Centres discharged their administrative tasks efficiently. Several are reminded, however, that candidates should secure their pages with a tag or string – so that they do not get lost.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Within the specified topic of The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914, the question was about Belgian Neutrality in 1914. Candidates were given five sources to consider when examining the hypothesis that 'Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914 was completely unjustifiable.'

Examiners reported that the standard of answers to this question continued the improvement in using sources that has been evident in recent years. The number of candidates who only paraphrased or summarised the sources in sequence without comment or judgement was comparatively small. A commendable proportion of answers deserved high marks.

The most successful candidates grouped the sources according to the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis. For example, Source A agreed with the hypothesis, claiming that Germany would respect Belgian neutrality. Source C was the Belgian government's statement that neutrality was guaranteed by international treaties and any invasion would be unjustifiable. Source D represented Britain's

condemnation of Germany's invasion of Belgium. On the other hand, Source B was Germany's defence of a possible invasion in view of a French threat. Source E, whilst admitting that the invasion was wrong, justified it for several reasons and relegated the guarantee of neutrality to the status of 'a scrap of paper'.

Credit was given when candidates considered the provenance, or origins, of the sources to assess their reliability and value. Source A was a report in a German newspaper of a meeting of German ministers and politicians. Some candidates pointed out that they were unlikely to announce aggressive policies, weakening the reliability of the extract. Source C was a message from the Belgian government to the German government. It was not necessarily reliable because it was a communication between governments as some candidates claimed. However, the extract only records established facts about the treaties that guaranteed Belgian independence. It is reliable as an account of international law. Source D offered several tests of reliability. It was an extract from a popular British newspaper, making it very likely to support British policy in a time of crisis. It also reported, probably accurately, the words of the British Prime Minister who was quoting direct events leading to the outbreak of war. This makes it reliable about these events. However, the Prime Minister was not seeking to give a balanced view of developments. Source E was interesting because, although it was an interview in a German newspaper by a leading German politician, it does admit certain wrongs by Germany. However, the justification for war was broadened to include issues other than Belgian neutrality that persuaded Britain to go to war and provided some justification for Germany. Examiners read some effective assessments that made a number of these points.

It was relevant to comment on the time when the extracts were written. Source A originated more than a year before the war but the other 4 sources were issued within 3 days of each other, showing the crisis caused by the issue of Belgian neutrality.

Candidates could use other relevant knowledge to support or contradict the evidence in the sources. The Schlieffen Plan was relevant because it was drawn up before the events of 1914 and was based on the defeat of France through an invasion of Belgium in order to free the German army for a war against Russia in the east. This ignored Belgium's neutrality. Candidates needed to focus on Belgium because this was the key issue in the question but brief references to other factors could be given credit in order to assess the claim in Source E that Belgium was a minor reason for British intervention.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the reasons why Napoleon Bonaparte was able to become Emperor of France. Examiners were pleased with the general standard of the responses, with candidates being able to define and then explain a number of reasons. They read a good number of very creditable answers. The most successful answers were usually more able to explain developments from 1799 to 1804 under the Consulate. They pointed out how Napoleon secured his power through control of central and local government and exercised an autocratic rule as First Consul. His legislation in the Code Napoleon brought him wide support because it restored order and appeared to guarantee certain liberties. The Concordat with the Papacy was popular because the Roman Catholic religion was popular with most French people, whilst the Concordat did not represent a return to Church authority that was unpopular during the most reforming years of the French Revolution after 1789. Land that had been transferred after 1789 was guaranteed to the new owners. These property rights were especially welcomed by the middle classes, whom Napoleon recognised as important. Support for the family, which meant essentially the confirmation of the rights of husbands and fathers, was another popular step. Women were not important politically at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Some answers virtually ended in 1799 with the *coup d'état* of Brumaire. Such answers deserved credit for explanations of this event but they could not be awarded the highest marks because they were incomplete, often assuming that Napoleon was then able to become Emperor automatically. It was relevant to explain the background of instability to the events of 1799 and Napoleon's rise to power in that year but some essays spent too long on the early years of the Revolution. The period from 1789 to 1795 when the Directory took power, could have been summarised quickly.

Question 3

The key issue was the main differences between pre-industrial and industrial societies in nineteenth-century Europe. Candidates were asked to refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in their answers. References did not need to be detailed but were required to avoid answers being too general. The most successful essays did include useful references whereas weak responses were usually vague. Some answers were limited to lists of inventions. These were relevant but higher credit was given when candidates explained how they changed societies. For example, what were the main effects of factories and

railways on society? Many candidates explained that women and children worked in factories, at least until some factory reform acts were introduced. However, the labour of working-class women and children was not introduced by the Industrial Revolution. Both groups worked hard on pre-industrial farms. Craftsmen worked alongside craftswomen. There were a number of sound answers that focused on differences and were comparative in approach. Moderate answers sometimes only described industrialised societies and assumed that pre-industrial conditions were different.

Question 4

The key issue was a judgement of Bismarck: whether he planned the unification of Germany or whether he responded more to events. The most creditable answers considered both possibilities and came to a clear conclusion. Answers in the middle ranges of marks sometimes opted for one argument without examining the other to explain why it was preferable. The most successful answers were able to distinguish between the two vital stages in 1866, when the North German Confederation was established, and 1871, when the southern states were incorporated in the new German Empire. Many candidates were able to describe accurately the succession of wars in which Bismarck was involved but the better answers were able to link them to the key issue of unification. They also explained why relations with foreign countries were important, showing how Austria was outwitted and why France was then seen as a threat because of its strategic importance and its Roman Catholic affinities to the southern German states that were less enthusiastic about being incorporated in a Germany dominated by Prussia.

Question 5

The key issue was the role of public opinion in the 'New Imperialism' of the later nineteenth century. It is worth repeating a point that has been made in previous reports, that answers to questions about imperialism need the inclusion of overseas examples. Some candidates listed the reasons for imperial expansion without suggesting which were more important than others. Some did not refer to individual European countries. These answers could not merit a high mark. However, Examiners were pleased to read answers that included some appropriate examples to support well-argued cases. They linked motives to individual countries. It was not necessary to agree that public opinion was the most important reasons. Candidates could argue that other factors took precedence but worthwhile answers considered this factor. Other factors included strategic and economic interests. Some essays noted issues such as Social Darwinism and religious enthusiasm but without linking them to public opinion. Bismarck was initially unconvinced about the value of overseas territories for Germany but was won over by the direct pressure of public opinion and the indirect awareness that imperialism could be an attractive policy in winning elections. Disraeli in Britain was suspicious at first about imperial engagements but became an enthusiastic imperialist when it became clear that it would be popular with the public (and Queen Victoria). Other countries in which public opinion backed imperial ventures were France and Italy, both of which favoured overseas expansion although for different reasons. In many European countries, the press and popular literature supported imperialism.

Question 6

The key issue was Lenin's success in overcoming the problems facing the Bolshevik government by 1924. The question asked 'How far', inviting candidates to examine his successes and failures before coming to an overall conclusion. The general standard of the answers was pleasing. There was little irrelevance. For example, few candidates included accounts of the rise of Lenin and the Bolsheviks to October 1917. Some very good answers began by defining the most serious problems that the Bolsheviks faced when they came to power in 1917. These included the war with Germany and an impending civil war because Bolshevik rule was not unchallenged. The condition of the economy was parlous. Lenin had made promises of 'Peace, Land and Bread' that were difficult to implement. Many candidates were able to explain clearly how far Lenin and his government were able to deal with their problems and a creditable number included accounts of successes and failures by 1924. A common factor in the less worthwhile answers was that they were less sure about political developments, including the creation of a one-party and dictatorial state, although Examiners did read some essays that were very persuasive about this. Explanations of the Russian economy were usually sound.

Question 7

The key issue was the strengths and weaknesses of Mussolini. The question specified that the relevant period was from 1922 to 1939. Whilst it was allowable to make a brief reference to the period after 1939 in a conclusion, long discussions of the war period and the fall of Mussolini could not be given credit. The question asked about domestic affairs. Some essays contained sections on foreign policy which could not be given credit because they were linked to domestic issues. For example, it is possible to argue that foreign

policy was intended to be a reflection of Mussolini's ability as a ruler, winning domestic support. There were a number of sound discussions that focused on strengths and weaknesses, indicating which were more important. Among issues that candidates considered was the extent of his political power as a dictator. Some discussed how far he was a totalitarian ruler. There were considerations of his personal style of leadership and of the extent to which propaganda exaggerated his achievements. Most candidates dealt adequately with economic policies although some essays were only descriptive, explaining the policies but not assessing their effectiveness. There were some good analyses of Mussolini's relations with the Roman Catholic Church. Relevant comparisons are given credit as long as they are made briefly. Answering this question, some candidates made useful comparisons with Hitler and Stalin.

Question 8

The key issue was the comparative political effects of the French Revolution and the industrial Revolution on Europe by 1850. The standard of the answers was variable. The most frequent reason why some essays were unsatisfactory was that they did not address the political effects of the two revolutions and did consider developments to about 1850. Some contained outlines of the French Revolution and Napoleon to 1815 but did not examine European aspects to the middle of the nineteenth century. For example, the French Revolution aroused feelings of nationalism and Liberalism that contributed to the outbreaks of unrest in Germany and Italy, culminating in the 'Year of Revolutions' in 1848. The political effects of the Industrial Revolution included the rise of the urban middle classes and the creation of a larger urban working class. Marx published the Communist Manifesto in 1848. In Britain, Chartism appeared as a mass movement. These developments challenged the established authorities although their effects were limited by the middle of the century. Examiners were pleased to read answers that concentrated on the key issue and contained arguments that were balanced between the two revolutions. There were some thoughtful comparisons.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9697/03</p>

<p>Paper 3</p>

General comments

Some candidates produced excellent scripts, which was a testimony to their ability and hard work and to the quality of teaching in their Centres. On the other hand, more weaker scripts were seen this year, and some candidates wrote very little indeed. The quality of performance on **Question 1** was similar to last year, producing a wide range of answers. Better responses were able to produce a clear argument, for and against the hypothesis in the question, using information from the sources to support and sustain a logical argument. In addition, these candidates were able to cross reference information between sources and use contextual knowledge. Finally, these candidates were able to evaluate the quality of the evidence presented in the sources through reference to the provenance of sources, with the best candidates able to assess the relative value of the sources in relation to the argument presented.

In **Section B, Questions 2 and 3** proved to be the most popular choices. **Question 5** was the next popular followed by **Questions 6, 7 and 8**, in that order.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE KOREAN WAR

The question required candidates to study five sources and to evaluate and assess a hypothesis on that suggested that the United Nations was the puppet of the United States during the early phase of the Korean War. The majority of candidates were able to evaluate the sources effectively. They were able to use apposite information from within the sources to construct a clear argument in relation to the question. Many candidates stated that Source A did not support the hypothesis but laid the blame on the shoulders of the USA and USSR. It also suggested that the UN, in the final paragraph, that the UN had attempted to prevent the conflict if internally supervised elections had taken place. In Source B, candidates noted that the UNO was accused of following the views of the USA, a view supported by Source E. In Sources C and D, the suggestion was that the UNO acted according to its Charter and the USA merely supported the UNO in this role. For those candidates who achieved marks in the upper levels of the mark scheme the sources required evaluation beyond face value. In doing so, many answers displayed very effective cross-referencing of information between sources as a way of producing a logical and coherent argument. In addition, many candidates displayed sound factual knowledge of the early stages of the Korean War which was used to very good effect as supporting contextual evidence. Most of these candidates referred to the provenance of the sources as a means of testing their value as evidence in evaluating the hypothesis.

Some candidates used the opportunity of the concluding paragraph to make an overall assessment of the evidence presented in their argument. These candidates took the opportunity of stating that the quality and strength of the evidence on one side of the argument was preferred and, in support of this claim, provided a sound argument. Alternatively, candidates could have stated that as a result of the evidence and evaluation presented in their argument they felt that some modification of the hypothesis was required. To achieve the higher marks it was those candidates who provided an explanation for their choice to modify who were rewarded. Merely, stating that one side of the argument was preferred or that modification of the hypothesis was required, without clear explanation, did not fall into that category.

Below is an evaluation/assessment grid of the sources.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE KOREAN WAR

	Content	Analysis L2-3		EVALUATION	L4-5	
A	UN source.	Suggests that UN made the decision to get involved with both USA and USSR partly to blame.	N	X-ref with C and D.	Source's utility limited because of provenance.	Y/N
B	contemporary Soviet source.	Highly critical of UN role and sees it as puppet of USA.	Y	X-ref with E.	Source takes negative view, but offers a contemporary Soviet view after outbreak.	Y
C	contemporary US source.	Takes the view that UN was primarily responsible for UN involvement.	N	X-ref A and D.	Source is from US president who might be attempting to justify US position.	Y/N
D	secondary US source.	Takes a balanced view stating that UN had to take decisive action and USA had to do make Un do it.	Y/N	X-ref with A and C.	Source written in hindsight as an attempt to justify US actions.	Y/N
E	secondary North Korean source.	Takes view that US used UNO as a puppet.	Y	X-ref with B.	Source from N Korea, totalitarian regime under threat from US. Sees US as a constant threat.	Y
On balance, assertion is not supported.						

Section B**2 How far was Truman personally responsible for the development of the Cold War in Europe to 1949?**

Most displayed sound knowledge of the Cold War in Europe in 1945-49, but not everyone used this information effectively. Many wrote detailed accounts of the causes of the War. Those who achieved good marks were able to assess the role of Truman. They pointed out that on his accession to office he possessed limited knowledge of foreign policy. Also, his rather abrupt and aggressive manner led to a rapid deterioration in US/Soviet relations. Many candidates also cited the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan as examples of how Truman could be held responsible for escalating tensions in the Cold War. To support this viewpoint, several mentioned revisionist interpretations of Cold War developments. Some, however, wrote an effective assessment of Truman's role without considering other factors – which ignored the command 'how far ...?' which required Truman's role to be evaluated against other factors.

Those who scored high marks on this question provided clear balanced, analysis. They evaluated the role of Truman and assessed against other factors such as the policies of Stalin and the Soviet leadership. In support of this approach candidates mentioned the failure of Stalin to honour his pledges made at Yalta and Potsdam, the Soviet takeover of Eastern Europe and the Berlin Blockade crisis of 1948-49. In doing so some candidates referred to 'traditional'/'orthodox' and 'post-revisionist' interpretations of the development to support the argument presented. Also, some evaluated Truman's role in relation to the post-revisionist interpretation suggesting that both Truman and Stalin misinterpreted the other's intentions and actions.

3 'The US policy of containment was a failure in the years 1950 to 1975.' How far do you agree?

This question was also popular. Many defined the policy of containment and used this definition to evaluate the success/failure of the policy in the period cited by the question. The vast majority used three exemplars to support their case: the Korean War, Cuba and the Vietnam conflict. Others added issues associated with Central America, Africa and the Middle East.

Many were able to display sound factual knowledge. However, this was not always used effectively. Several candidates wrote lengthy narratives of the Korean War, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam conflict with only limited links to the question asked. Those candidates who achieved good marks were able to assess each area under discussion directly with the policy of containment. In Korea, most candidates claimed that containment was a success because the US prevented the overthrow of South Korea. Some

candidates attempted to suggest that containment and the policy of 'roll back' were one and the same. Clearly the policy of 'roll back' failed as Chinese intervention prevented the fall of North Korea.

In the case of Cuba, candidates put forward several views. The creation and survival of the Castro regime were cited as examples of the failure of containment as a communist regime was established in the Americas. However, other candidates claimed that containment was a success because of Kennedy's policy during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

All who mentioned Vietnam concluded that containment failed. Not only was South Vietnam 'lost' to communism, but also a partial domino effect occurred with the fall to communism of Laos and Cambodia.

In relation to Africa, candidates claimed that the creation of Zaire under Mobutu thwarted the creation of a pro-Soviet regime under Lumumba. However, the fall of the Portuguese African Empire, in 1975, saw the creation of pro-Soviet regimes in Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique. In contrast, US policy in the Middle East saw the containment of Soviet influence through the success of Israel in 1967 and its survival in the Yom Kippur War.

4 'Neither the USSR nor the USA gained anything from involvement in the Arab-Israeli Conflict from 1948 to the Camp David Accords'. How far do you agree?

This question produced a minority of answers. Many candidates took the opportunity to write lengthy narratives of the Arab-Israeli conflict with only a limited attempt to link this information with the assertion in the question.

Many candidates claimed that the USA did gain something from the conflict. The creation and survival of Israel created a strong American ally in the Middle East, which in military terms dominated the region. However, candidates were also able to point out that US support for Israel came at a cost with the creation of tension between the USA and several Arab countries, most notable Egypt and Syria for most of the period.

Far fewer engaged in an evaluation of the USSR's position. Until 1956, the USSR had very limited influence in the region. However, following the nationalisation of the Suez Canal and the subsequent crisis involving Britain, France and Israel, Soviet influence began to increase through economic and military aid to Egypt and Syria. From 1956, the USSR became the major supplier of military equipment to these states. In addition, through its influence in Egypt, Soviet influence developed in Yemen and South Yemen.

However, as a result of the Camp David Accords Soviet influence in Egypt diminished significantly.

5 'Deng Xiaoping's reforms created more problems than they solved in China'. How far do you agree?

This proved to be a popular question. However, many candidates engaged in detailed narrative-description leaving evaluation and assessment to the concluding paragraph. Those candidates who achieved high marks were able to integrate sound knowledge with analysis throughout their answer. For some candidates there was confusion between the Mao Zedong era before 1976 and Deng's period in office.

Many referred to the significant economic reforms under Deng. The abandonment of collectivised agriculture and the adoption of more capitalist styles of economic organisation helped transform China and inaugurate a period of significant economic growth. However, several candidates mentioned the environmental cost of such development through increased pollution and deforestation. Some also mentioned the migration of population from rural to urban areas creating slums and environmental pressures on city areas. Most referred to the development of demand for political change to mirror the transformation in social and economic policy. In this context, most mentioned the Tiananmen Square Massacre and the subsequent political crackdown.

6 How important were SALT I and SALT II to the limitation of nuclear weapons in the period 1970 to 1989?

This question was moderately popular. Many candidates took the opportunity to write narratives of the development of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons' diplomacy in the period mentioned in the question. A significant minority of candidate did not limited themselves to the period 1970-89 and engaged in a

coverage of the nuclear diplomacy of the 1960s such as the Partial Test Ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Those candidates who achieved good marks on this question displayed a sound knowledge of the two SALT treaties. Many stated that SALT II was never ratified by the US Senate and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 increased Cold War tension thereby offsetting any possible improvement in US/Soviet relations on the issue of nuclear weapons. Several candidates used the opportunity afforded by the question to compare the SALT treaties with the nuclear treaties of the 1980s.

7 'The World Bank and IMF have ensured economic stability in the international economy in the years 1945 to 1991'. How far do you agree?

This question was answered by a small minority of candidates. There was only a limited understanding of the role of the two institutions within the Bretton Woods system established at the end of the Second World War. More candidates were aware of the role and function of the IMF. Candidates mentioned how the IMF had saved several states from major economic crisis, while others stated that IMF set strict economic criteria for support which adversely affected social programmes in recipient states thus adding to political and economic instability. Candidates might have mentioned the role of the two institutions with other factors affecting economic stability in the period covered by the question such as the role of GATT/WTO, the dominance of the USA over much of the period and the economic development of states such as Japan, Brazil, China and the Asian Tigers which increased the wealth of the global economy.

8 To what extent was government involvement the reason for the rise and success of Asian Tiger economies?

This question was answered by a minority of candidates. Most candidates were able to identify examples of Asian Tiger economies such as South Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and Malaysia. Candidates mentioned that government policies on education enabled the development of an educated, skilled workforce which was able to take advantage of developments in electronics IT and textile production. Candidates could also have mentioned that in most Tiger economies the government made conscious attempts to support and sustain key industries which aided economic development. Also, many of the candidates who attempted this question cited other factors such as the work ethic of the populations of the states mentioned and the ability of the Asian Tiger economies to exploit the changing economic conditions of the international economy from the 1970s with the structural problems associated with the North American and western European economies.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/05

Paper 5

General Comments

The entry was up this year and most candidates had been well prepared by their teachers. Rubric infringements were rare, but a disturbing number of candidates submitted only three or even two answers. This makes it very difficult to attain any but the lower passing bands. It is suggested that candidates have detailed preparation for a minimum of five of the seven essay topics, thus allowing for any questions which they may find uncongenial. Question 1 is compulsory, but the subject is known in advance. It is strongly suggested that candidates answer the source-based Question first as it involves a different set of techniques from the essays and it needs more time for the response to be prepared. Answers to Question 1 this year showed welcome signs of improvement in that more candidates were able to place the Sources in their historical context. The essay questions were too often answered in far too descriptive a manner, with few candidates using explanation and/or analysis. Relevance was also often a serious problem: the wording of the question was simply ignored and responses focused exclusively on the broad topic, not the specific question set on it. Nevertheless, there were some outstanding scripts which were a pleasure to read and which scored very high marks.

Comments on specific questions.

1 'Lincoln was an opponent of slavery.' Using Sources A-E discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion. [Source-based Question]

The majority of responses had little difficulty in attaining Level 3 [10-14 marks] which only involved using the five Sources at face value and applying them to the stated hypothesis while both confirming and contradicting it. However, far too few candidates went on to interpret the Sources in their historical context i.e. not simply accepting them at face value. Many candidates correctly drew attention to the apparent conflict between Sources A and B and credit was given to those that said that Lincoln as a politician seeking election was toning down his views on the slavery issue when addressing an audience in South Carolina, later to be the first State to secede from the Union. Very few drew attention to Lincoln's comments in Source C that (it) i.e. slavery was 'an injury to free white men,' and explored what he meant by this. Few drew attention to the fact that the savage attack on Lincoln's sincerity in Source D was made as Lincoln was in the process of being elected President of the United States, hence being compelled to confront the slavery issue head on. Many candidates argued that the Sources showed (in particular Source E) that Lincoln's primary concern was to preserve the Union intact and he was prepared to accept not only slavery, but also matters that derived from that such as the return of fugitive slaves to their owners. Only two candidates drew attention to Lincoln's remark in Source C that slavery and freedom were in inexorable conflict the implication being that it was in the long run impossible to have a nation state where both co-existed. It was refreshing to note that many candidates revised the hypothesis in conformity with the requirement of Level 6 [B] of the Marking Scheme. The usual revised hypothesis put forward was that Lincoln 'was an opponent of the extension of slavery.' However, to attain 23-25 marks the candidates have to produce detailed arguments from the Sources taken in context leading to this conclusion. The mere assertion of a revised hypothesis without any supporting evidence would merit Level 4 or 5, but no further.

SECTION B

2 Assess the consequences of the Mexican War for the United States.

This was a very popular question with over 90% of candidates giving a response. However, relevance was seriously lacking in very many cases; few candidates 'assessed' or evaluated as required by the question and a surprising number gave detailed background of the causes and events of the war when the requirement was to consider the consequences. Virtually all responses stated the vast territorial gains made by the US which comprised the majority of territory held by Mexico before the war. As a result of the war

America became a transcontinental power which led in turn to the construction of a railroad from Atlantic to Pacific. California, in particular, had excellent harbours, fertile land and in 1849 gold was discovered. Few responses explored the social and economic implications of the above e.g. new migration to the conquered lands and not least the displacement of Native Americans from their homelands. While the majority of responses considered the effect of the war on sectional conflict a surprising number ignored it. Whitman's famous remark 'Mexico will poison us' was often used to good effect, but too few dealt with the Wilmot Proviso and the subsequent 1850 Compromise. While it is not possible to trace a direct causative link between the war and the Civil War the effect of the war was certainly to reopen at a deeper level the whole issue of slavery expansion which had been, it was thought, settled by the 1820 Missouri Compromise, The quality of discussion and analysis of the above factors, of which only a selection is given above, varied greatly from simplistic to the well structured analysis necessary to attain Bands I and II [18-25 marks].

3 Examine the view that Lincoln's contribution to the Union victory in the Civil War has been greatly exaggerated.

This was a very popular question, but it produced few good answers. One got the impression that many candidates had pre rehearsed answers on why the Union was bound to win or the Confederacy bound to lose the conflict and simply used these for their answers with only a passing reference to Lincoln. Many candidates seemed to have little idea of the powers and functions of the President of the United States and portrayed Lincoln as a figure in the background in Washington with little influence on events. The emphasis of the answers should be clearly on Lincoln and while it is true as some candidates pointed out that Lincoln himself said that he simply responded to events this clearly understates his role. Better scripts quoted Potter's remark that if Lincoln and Davis had changed positions then the Confederacy would have won. It was necessary to state how Lincoln's role was at different times; to be prepared in effect to suspend the Constitution to save the Union; to raise and equip vast armies; to dominate a Cabinet filled with ambitious rivals, not least to refuse any talk of compromise with the Confederacy when war weariness was acute; to use skilful diplomacy to thwart recognition by Britain and France of the Confederacy and not least the brilliant timing of the Emancipation Proclamation, which energised the Union population at a difficult time. Apart from the emancipation decree too few answers considered any of the above points. Even the many responses critical of Lincoln's role conceded that after several false starts his appointment of Grant was inspired as was his latter support for him. A precise evaluation of Lincoln's role is difficult, but it seems clear that the longer the war went on (originally it was thought it would finish by Christmas 1861), the more certain a defeat for the Confederacy was, provided that the Union leadership held its nerve and was prepared to accept the vast casualties occurring. Lincoln's role in this respect would appear crucial.

4 Account for the rise and fall of the People's Party (Populists).

There were few answers, almost uniformly of indifferent quality. Some missed the point of the question completely thinking it referred to trade unions and industrial workers. What was necessary was to point out that in the period of dramatic commercial and industrial advances in America from 1865 onwards the millions of small farmers had their interests ignored by the major parties. The prices for their crops consistently fell due to overseas competition and they were held to ransom by the railroad companies who overcharged them while favouring the big industrial concerns. They found themselves heavily indebted to banks which were ruthless in foreclosing if they fell behind in payments. Hence first the Granger Movement and then the People's Party were formed to advance their interests. While the Populists achieved many local gains the two-party system meant that the chances of Presidential victory were almost non-existent. In the 1892 Presidential election, only Kansas was carried by the Populists. The decision to support Bryan, the Democrat candidate, in 1896 appeared logical at the time, as standing as a third party against him would have guaranteed an automatic victory for McKinley. However in the longer term the Democrats simply absorbed the Populist's rural support and of course as farmers were a declining factor in the American population this meant there was little hope for them. Few of the above factors were discussed or stated in any coherent fashion by responses.

5 'Although highly skilled in self-promotion and networking with politicians and the media, Martin Luther King's role in obtaining civil rights for African-Americans has been overstated.' Discuss this view.

This was a very popular response, but was characterised by unsupported assertions and an absence of balance in either agreeing or disagreeing with the proposition. It was rare to find any kind of debate as to King's effectiveness taking place. There was often a limited knowledge range. Many overestimated Rosa Parks as a historically influential figure and not a few elevated Malcolm X as a rival of equal significance to King in terms of effectiveness. Few candidates appreciated the vital role played by President Lyndon Johnson, without whom the Voting Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act and the Constitutional Amendment Act would never have succeeded. Few seemed to appreciate how difficult it was for the President to insure

compliance with the legislation in the eleven States of the old Deep South. Some answers were critical of King, but for the wrong reasons. As African Americans were c.10% of the population, it was essential to build effective alliances among the white majority. In this sense, Malcolm X was useful to King in that if King's moderate non-violent approach were rejected by the power elites then the alternative was the more aggressive tactics of Malcolm X. Better scripts pointed out that King's appeal was to Southern African Americans and that his attempts to win support in the North did not succeed. The simple point that he was the first Black spokesman to become a major national political figure was frequently overlooked. In 1960, JFK's phone call to King's wife indicating support for her imprisoned husband may have been decisive in winning Kennedy the Presidency. The many candidates who portrayed King as simply a gifted public speaker with a shrewd eye for the TV cameras were underestimating his abilities.

6 'Flexibility was both his strength and his weakness.' How valid is this assessment of F.D. Roosevelt as President?

The term 'flexibility' seemed to create problems with many candidates and the general thrust of the question eluded some of them. There were graphic descriptions of the New Deal and frequently candidates took refuge in a detailed description of the major measures. Only the better ones pointed out that, by 1938, these had run their course and there was the 'Roosevelt recession' in their place. Candidates were reluctant to give examples of how FDR was prepared to try almost anything and if that did not work to move on to something completely different. There was little debate as to whether FDR was simply an opportunist lacking any serious convictions or a statesman needing to always keep the public and Congress on his side even if that meant appearing inconsistent. Foreign policy was frequently neglected by candidates which was a great pity as FDR's handling of international relations 1938-45 was a classic case of a world leader having to proceed very cautiously because of the constraints imposed by Congress and existing legislation.

7 Why was it that both Congress and the American people rejected the Versailles peace settlement negotiated by President Wilson?

This was not popular and responses were disappointing. They were vague, poorly informed and with little sense of having relevant knowledge with which to make an adequate response. The most common approach was to describe how America got into the war and then to go on to describe, in very general terms, the hostility to the Treaty negotiated by President Wilson. Some candidates listed some of the errors made by the President, e.g. having no leading Republicans in the American delegation to Paris. He made no attempt at any stage to discuss what was happening with Senator Lodge, the highly influential Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. Few candidates seemed aware that the 1918 mid-term elections had resulted in the Republicans gaining control of both Houses of Congress. With few exceptions, candidates did not show that the Treaty could have been carried through Congress had Wilson been prepared to make some compromises, e.g. on Article 10. Responses seemed aware that there was a profound unease that America would be compelled to surrender sovereignty in part to the new League of Nations, and might also be obliged to intervene in future conflicts overseas. There was little discussion of US public opinion in answers, yet there is little doubt that Congress reflected popular sentiment in believing that Wilson had been out manoeuvred by Lloyd George and Clemenceau and their selfish, nationalist goals.

8 How true was it that the quality of life for Americans improved dramatically from 1945 to 1968?

This was a popular question and most candidates attained at least Band V [11-13 marks]. There was the familiar problem with this section of the syllabus that most responses were very generalised when what was needed was specific content. No candidate attempted to define what was meant by the term 'quality of life', there was a lack of data on the long sustained economic boom. Only two candidates discussed the GI Bill, which transformed higher education in the US. Nearly all scripts focused on the revolutionary changes in the media with television being virtually universal by the 1950s. This of course had profound political effects as in the famous TV debates between Nixon and Kennedy in 1960. Rather surprisingly US involvement in two major armed conflicts, Korea and Viet Nam, both of which involved conscript armies, received little attention.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9697/06</p>

<p>Paper 6</p>

Most candidates answered four questions fully, though it was apparent that some had slightly misjudged the time. The result was a final answer which was short or incomplete. The compulsory **Question 1** was answered at great length by some candidates. There were some very strong answers. Most would have benefitted by giving more thought to the theme of benefit to whom and also by stronger reference back to the hypothesis, either in a conclusion or in dealing with each of the sources.

In **Section B**, most candidates answered **Question 2**, nearly as many answered **Question 4**. No candidate answered **Question 8**. Very few took **Question 3**. There were many good answers to the essay-style questions, but in some cases candidates covered a narrow range of points in **Questions 2** and **4**. Lack of a clear plan when answering **Question 5** led to candidates straying from the main theme of the obstructions to be overcome in the development of peasantries. **Question 6** was a question on the sugar industry generally, but many responses dealt only with immigration.

Section A

Question 1 (Source based)

'The impact of the development of the peasantry in the British Caribbean was beneficial.' How far do Sources A-E support this statement?

There were some excellent attempts to answer this question. The range of approaches here included comment on the interests of planters, peasants and government, use made of the dates when the sources were written, immediate responses in A and B, later ones in D (1897) and E, and occasionally reference to the tone or bias in the first two sources. Suitable quotations were made and some candidates modified the view given in the hypothesis which was largely one of support whilst finding explanations for why complete support was not appropriate.

At the other end of the scale, some responses were based on answering yes or no to each extract, frequently without reference to the hypothesis, except for a sort of arithmetic vote - two against and three for. In fact in all the sources except E points of agreement and disagreement can be found.

Section B (Essay questions)

Question 2

Evaluate the factors which contributed to the emancipation of slaves in British and French Caribbean colonies.

Where candidates made use of many factors, there tended to be little detail. This could have been overcome had candidates concentrated on the focal points of the British Emancipation Act in 1833 and the ending of slavery in French colonies in 1848. With this approach a multi-causal explanation would arise, stressing particular aspects such as humanitarian campaigns, slave resistance and rebellion or the declining economic importance of Caribbean colonial sugar in Europe.

Many answers concentrated on two themes, with little possibility for emphasis on evaluation. Detailed information was lacking, for example on the strength of anti-slavery feeling as expressed around 1830-33 in Britain and France in 1848. Much was written by some candidates about the anti-slave trade campaign. Material on France was often limited to a paragraph on Schoelcher.

Question 3

How successfully did the schemes to emancipate the slaves in the Spanish Caribbean colonies operate?

There were few answers written to this question. None was very detailed. Some material about emancipation in Puerto Rico and Cuba was given and the impact of the Ten Years' War was outlined, but the assessment of how successful the schemes were was not really attempted.

Question 4

Examine the options open to freed people after the abolition of slavery (after 1838).

Detailed answers were written which both outlined typical options and showed how there were variations between the different areas, British colonies and those of other countries. Probably about half the candidates attempted this style of response, suggesting the options of staying on estates or leaving to pursue either agricultural or alternative occupations. The remainder gave short coverage to possible alternatives, but without details of variations by area, or only a few of the possibilities being considered. Some went on to suggest how planters tried to retain labour which was really outside the scope of the question.

Question 5

Explain why and how obstructions were placed in the way of the development of peasantries in British and French Caribbean colonies.

The answers were often good without being outstanding. The 'why' part of the question was sometimes limited to an introductory paragraph without much development as the writing progressed. Detail and reasoning were usually fuller on the British colonies, though a good deal could have been written about the French. Where the French experience of introducing laws, creating institutions, administrative measures and policing, was added to that of British measures, high marks were earned.

Question 6

To what extent did immigrant labour help to maintain the Caribbean sugar industry after 1850?

Answers to this question most frequently looked at immigration only, showing that it was one of the ways that a major problem of sugar producers was met, the issue of the shortage of reliable and adaptable labour. Some answers considered the problems encountered by immigrants. A few hinted that other measures were taken, but did not explain in detail or assess their relative significance. A better strategy would have been to look at the various ways in which efforts were made to overcome difficulties in sugar production, to point out that, in the British Caribbean, British Guiana and Trinidad were the principal beneficiaries and that Cuba developed rapidly because of a range of factors, immigration being one, perhaps not the most impressive.

Question 7

Explain why there were differing opinions about providing educational opportunities in the British Caribbean from 1835 to 1900.

The few answers written to this question were of a good standard. Most explained the views of the planters and former slaves in the early post-1835 period. Some looked at the contribution of missionaries briefly. Views on industrial education and the hopes of social mobility came into some answers. An underlying appreciation of the development of educational provision was often lacking, as was the sense of change over time.

Question 8

Explain the causes and results of the Morant Bay Rebellion in Jamaica in 1865.

No candidate attempted this question.