

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9697/01

Paper 1

## General comments

The general standards of the answers were satisfactory and were close to those of previous years. Most scripts demonstrated creditable qualities. The majority of candidates displayed the different qualities needed to handle the Sources in **Section A Question 1** and the essay questions in **Section B**. Examiners were pleased to read some scripts that were of an extremely high standard. These candidates used the Sources thoughtfully in **Question 1**; they integrated the interpretation of the extracts with their own knowledge and examined how reliable the passages were. They came to a judgement about the claim in the Question. They organised their answers to the essay Questions, dealing first with the most important points and then with the less significant aspects. They supported the explanation with appropriate knowledge. Their scripts were evenly balanced in the time given to each of the questions. Some candidates showed potential but did not achieve high marks because they did not do these things as well. Essays were sometimes poorly organised. Other answers showed thin knowledge so that claims remained as vague assertions.

Candidates are allowed three hours to answer four questions and they should spend a similar time on each answer. It may be demanding for some candidates to write for about 45 minutes and the exercise needs practice. Marks are not given merely for the length of answers. Some long answers can be rambling, wandering into irrelevant issues. Some candidates can write cogently but effectively. But the majority of candidates need the 45 minutes to write a cohesive and developed answer. Questions are designed to take this time to answer. The problems that they pose reflect a variety of reasons, issues or developments. Examiners read some brief answers, especially to the essay questions. These were often undeveloped in their arguments, perhaps mentioning one point, and the supporting knowledge was thin. High marks require both arguments and knowledge.

The third requirement is relevance. Candidates must be careful to answer the particular questions that are asked. Each of the questions arises directly from the syllabus and is based on a key issue which should be apparent to candidates. These key issues are referred to in the comments below on specific questions. For example, candidates are guaranteed a question on the Industrial Revolution but this session's question was based on the importance of communications. Therefore, credit could only be given to points in answers that were linked to this factor.

## 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 German Foreign Policy before World War I. Candidates were given five Sources to consider when examining the statement that 'During the period from 1896 to 1914, German leaders were determined to go to war'. The most successful candidates grouped the extracts according to the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the claim. For example, Source B showed a vigorous attitude to war. Kaiser William II advocated military preparations whilst Moltke suggested that propaganda should also be used to enhance support from the German people. Source D was a call to arms to the German nation; it preferred military rather than peaceful attitudes. Source E was a clear contrast, a speech by the German Chancellor that denied German responsibility for the war. Most of Source C defended Germany's peaceful intentions although the Prince Regent of Bavaria, a German state, believed the contrary. Source A might be interpreted in either of two ways. Some saw it as defending war in order to break Britain's hegemony whilst others considered that it showed that Germany was on the defensive against Britain. This sort of grouping was more creditable than answers that were sequential in the discussion of the Sources: 'Source A agrees, Source B agrees, Source C disagrees etc.' The better answers also provided an overall judgement whereas limited essays often did

not attempt an overview. Credit was given when candidates attempted to assess the Sources; this was preferable to answers that accepted the extracts at face value. Some weak answers accepted all of the Sources as equally reliable, although their differences were noted, and did not attempt an overall judgement. Some candidates made the valid point that all of the sources were written by Germans and that it would be useful to have the opinions of other nationalities. Others made the equally valid point that the Sources were useful because they showed various opinions within the German hierarchy. The more successful candidates used valid tests to assess the Sources whereas the less creditable answers tended to contain mechanical tests that were not always successful. For, example, Source A is not necessarily reliable because it is a memorandum. Source C is not necessarily reliable because it came from a politician's private notes. On the whole the assessments were sound. For example, most candidates appreciated that Source E was an attempt by the German Chancellor to win support from his Parliament and by extension from the wider German people. Credit was given when candidates used their own knowledge to evaluate the Sources. Some referred to the events of Summer 1914 to assess Source E.

The standard of answers to **Question 1** is improving. The number of candidates who wrote general essays about the topic with slight or no reference to the printed Sources is very small and these were usually candidates who were also ill-equipped to answer the essay questions. Most of the answers were planned sufficiently well. Some deserved high credit because they integrated explanations of the Sources, their assessment and own knowledge. Some answers in the middle bands could have been organised better. For example, they first summarised all of the Sources, then they evaluated them and then they provided their own knowledge. The overall effect was often satisfactory but a different plan would probably have secured higher marks.

The essay questions have instructions that should be followed. **Questions 2, 3 and 5** asked 'Why..?' The best way to answer such questions is to suggest a series of reasons, organise them in order of importance, support the reasons with factual knowledge and come to an overall judgement. **Question 4** asked 'How far do you agree with this claim?' Higher marks were awarded when candidates considered why the claim in the question might be justified, why other claims might be valid, and judged which was the most convincing. **Question 7** also asked 'How far?' and needed a similar approach. **Question 5** asked 'Explain the reasons'. Examiners looked for a variety of reasons, again in some order of priority, and explanations that were based on knowledge. **Question 8** was based on a comparison. Comparative questions are best organised when points of similarity and/or differences are discussed. This is better than two sequential accounts that conclude with some brief comparative comments. Candidates might practise how to plan answers with similar instructions on the same material. For example, candidates who study the French Revolution and Napoleon might plan a 'Why', 'How far?' 'Explain the reasons' and comparative question on the same topic. Very similar factual knowledge might be appropriate but it will be used in different ways.

In conclusion, it worth repeating the opinion of the Examiners that most candidates had worked hard and showed creditable understanding of the topics that they had studied. Some achieved extremely impressive standards. Those who wish to improve their standards might try to apply the points that are made in this Report.

## SECTION B

### Question 2

The key issue in the Question was the reasons why Louis XVI's policies from 1789 failed to prevent his execution in 1793. The Question asked 'Why' and the most successful answers were analytical, considering a series of reasons and supporting them with appropriate knowledge. These deserved high marks. Answers that comprised only narratives of events in which the reasons were implicit could not merit high marks. The question mentioned two dates: 1789 and 1793. It was relevant to explain the background to the outbreak of the French Revolution but long surveys of this background were unnecessary because there was not significant support for Louis' execution in 1789. The most successful candidates focused on the period in the Question, continuing the argument to 1793. They understood Louis XVI's policies, for example to the constitutional changes that were demanded, to religious reforms and to the intervention of foreign countries, and linked these to the key issue. Some candidates were able to explain why Louis was unpopular but were less able to explain the sequence of events and developments to his execution. Some answers were unsatisfactory because they were limited to the causes of the Revolution in 1789.

### Question 3

The key issue was the importance of communications to industrialisation and candidates were asked to refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany. Examiners read some very sound essays that combined effective explanations and good knowledge. These were given high marks. In the middle bands were answers that were able to describe some changes in communications, for example improvements in roads, canals, railways and shipping, but were less convincing in linking these to industrial change. Candidates should always give priority to discussing the key issues in Questions and some answers would have benefited if they had concentrated less on general descriptions of industrialisation to focus more on improvements in communications. Such answers could often only be awarded a low mark.

### Question 4

The key issue was Austria's suppression of the revolutions in Italy and Germany in 1848-49. Candidates were asked to assess the divisions among the revolutionaries. There were many sound answers that deserved high marks. These contained a balance between Italy and Germany, they examined the reasons why Austria succeeded in quelling revolutions and they compared the importance of the divisions among the revolutionaries with other factors. Some successful answers were able to discuss aspects of Austrian strength, especially the ultimate effectiveness of its army. In the middle bands were answers that explained some relevant reasons but which were often uncertain about divisions among the revolutionaries. These essays sometimes contained general knowledge. For example, they would have been improved if they had referred to Mazzini, Garibaldi and other Italian revolutionaries. Some weak answers were limited to accounts of the causes of the revolutions, which was not required.

### Question 5

The key issue was the reasons why two European countries were involved in 'new imperialism'. The most frequent discriminating factor between good answers that deserved high marks and moderate, even weak, essays was the ability to go beyond general discussions of imperialism and to focus on two countries. The most creditable candidates also supported their arguments with appropriate overseas examples. Answers in the middle bands were often relevant but they were less successful in supporting their arguments by references to particular countries, for example Britain and France, and they contained few overseas examples. Vague answers that referred imprecisely to 'new imperialism' and lacked sufficient knowledge could only merit low marks.

### Question 6

The key issue was the contrast between the success of the tsarist regime in 1905 and its failure in February 1917. The quality of most of the answers was satisfactory and some candidates deserved very high marks. The standard of many arguments was sound and candidates could display accurate knowledge. The best answers were equally balanced between 1905 and 1917 and they concentrated on explaining a variety of reasons, justifying why some were more important than others, for example the different attitudes of the army to Nicholas II's government. Some candidates were confused about developments in 1917. The Bolsheviks seized power in the October Revolution, after Nicholas II had abdicated and they played a comparatively minor role in the February Revolution.

### Question 7

The key issue was the rise of totalitarian regimes in Europe between World War I and World War II. Candidates were asked to consider how far their rise depended on the effects of World War I. Examiners read many competent answers that linked the regimes to the consequences of World War I. The most successful answers explained why these regimes can be described as totalitarian and why totalitarian, rather than liberal, governments prevailed in a selection from Germany, Italy and Russia. Credit was given to candidates who considered other reasons because the Question asked 'How far..?' Some candidates who wrote about Russia only mentioned Stalin and made broad references to the reasons why he could establish a totalitarian government. Their answers would have benefited if they had pointed out the key role of World War I in bringing the Bolsheviks to power and the ways in which Lenin established a one-party state.

**Question 8**

The key issue was the comparison of German nationalism in the policies of Bismarck and Hitler. Some answers could not be given high marks because they contained only general comparisons of the two leaders. The higher marks were awarded when the answers focused on nationalism. For example, some candidates deserved high credit when they pointed out that Bismarck was preoccupied for much of his career with the interests of Prussia and his attitude to German nationalism must be seen in this context. On the other hand, Hitler did not have such a limited view. However, it can be argued that Hitler's idea of nationalism was more limited in other respects; he saw true Germans as excluding minority groups. Examiners read some answers that deserved high credit but others were much less successful. There were comparatively few in the middle bands.

# HISTORY

---

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

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

## General comments

The overall standard of the candidates was satisfactory. Most scripts demonstrated a reasonable level of knowledge and understanding. The paper produced answers which covered the entire range of marks with a pleasing number of candidates producing some high quality answers. The most successful candidates used their knowledge and understanding of the topic to answer specifically the question on the examination paper. Knowledge was used to support and sustain an analytical argument which came to a specific conclusion. Some candidates underachieved because they tended to use their knowledge to write narrative and descriptive answers which contained only a limited amount of analysis.

The most frequently answered optional question was **Question 2**, followed (in order) by 4, 5, 6, 3, 7 and 8. The wide range of marks achieved in all questions implied that all questions provided candidates with a fair opportunity to display evidence of their historical ability and understanding.

The weakest answers came in response to **Question 8**. This was due largely to inadequate factual knowledge and insufficient understanding of the scope and requirements of the question. In most cases, **Question 8** was the last question attempted. Although **Question 7** was answered by relatively few candidates, it did produce a full range of answers, including several excellent responses.

Each question on the examination paper focused on one of the topic areas contained within the syllabus. In **Question 1**, candidates were asked to assess the hypothesis that the UN Peacekeeping in Cyprus, in March 1964, was biased towards the Greek Cypriots. The command instruction of 'how far' required candidates to offer an analytical answer 'for' and 'against' the proposition in the question, using source information and contextual knowledge to support their answers.

The essay questions (**Questions 2-8**) were all framed in a similar way to enable candidates to engage in analysis. Command instructions such as 'to what extent' and 'how far' required candidates to produce a balanced analysis in direct response to the question. Given the limited time available in the examination, lengthy contextual sections which 'set the scene' unfortunately limit the time available for direct coverage of the issue in the question. Although it is useful to plan an answer, candidates should be aware that this exercise should take only a few minutes for each answer.

Very few candidates failed to attempt four questions. However, a number of candidates failed to finish their final answer and this was presumably due to pressure of time.

## Comments on specific questions

### SECTION A

#### Question 1

This question required candidates to assess the validity of the hypothesis that the United Nations was biased in favour of Greek Cypriots in its peacekeeping operation of March 1964. The overwhelming majority of candidates were able to demonstrate some level of understanding of the key issues.

In response to the information provided in Source A, many candidates were able to state that there did not seem to be bias by the United Nations because it consulted a wide variety of governments in the lead up to the creation of the UN Peacekeeping Force. In Paragraph 2 of Source A it stated that; 'The Force shall be established in consultation with the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom.'

In Source B, many candidates noted that U Thant, the UN Secretary-General stated, 'While maintaining law and order rests with the Government of Cyprus, the leaders and members of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities also bear a heavy responsibility in bringing an end to the violence...' This statement suggests that the UN was not biased in favour of one particular group within Cyprus.

However, Source C does suggest that the UN was biased. It describes the Cypriot Government, which was dominated by Greeks, as illegal. Therefore, it claims that the UN recognised an illegal Greek Cypriot dominated government.

Source D also suggests that the UN was biased. It claims that 'At the time it seemed that Resolution 186 had put the Greek Cypriots officially and ominously in charge of Cyprus'. This is supported by the final sentence of the Source which states that the Turkish Cypriot leader was very upset at Resolution 186. It also states that the Greek Cypriots were jubilant with the passing of Resolution 186.

Finally, in Source E, it states that, 'the Greek Cypriot-controlled Government saw the (peacekeeping) operation as assisting it in ending a Turkish Cypriot revolt'. However, later in the Source it states that U Thant, the UN Secretary-General saw the peacekeeping force as 'an impartial agency with no responsibility for imposing political solutions.'

To achieve the higher marks available for this question, candidates were expected to go beyond the 'face value' of information provided in the sources. This could be done through cross-referencing information between sources. For instance, some candidates linked the information in Sources A, B and E concerning UN intentions. Therefore, they were able to disconfirm the hypothesis through the inter-connection and cross-referencing of information from more than one source.

Candidates could also refer to the provenance of the source as a way of assessing the validity of the hypothesis. Many candidates noted that Source A was an official communiqué from the United Nations. This gave this source greater validity than other sources which had a political agenda. The source cited to illustrate this point was usually Source C, which had been published by the Turkish Cypriot Government of Northern Cyprus. Therefore, this source had a motive to be opposed to the Greek Cypriot-controlled Government of Cyprus. However, in assessing the views in Source C, many candidates used information contained in sources D and E to support and substantiate the view that the UN was biased in favour of Greek Cypriots.

Finally, those candidates who achieved the highest marks produced two types of answer. In one type of answer candidates were able to demonstrate, through apposite use of source material, cross-referencing and assessment of the provenance of the sources that evidence supporting one side of the hypothesis was stronger than evidence produced for the other side of the argument.

Alternatively, having assessed and analysed the source material, cross-referenced and analysed the provenance of the sources, the candidates were able to put forward a modified hypothesis which was based clearly and logically on the argument that they had put forward in their answer.

## **SECTION B**

### **Question 2**

This question proved to be the most popular of the optional essay questions. Most candidates were able to display a sound knowledge of the causes of the Cold War in Europe from 1945. However, not all candidates were able to assess the relative importance of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan as causes of the Cold War. Many candidates who displayed sound knowledge underachieved because they tended to write narrative-chronological style answers without the analysis mentioned above. Many candidates were able to refer to the historical debate on the causes of the Cold War. However, what was an encouraging feature of answers to this question, was the ability to link directly the role of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan to a specific historical interpretation combined with reasons why this was so.

### Question 3

This question was not popular. Perhaps, the main reason was the popularity of **Question 4**, the alternative question on 'The Globalisation of the Cold War'. Most answers adopted a narrative-chronological or narrative-descriptive format with an assessment of the relative roles of the Superpowers in the final paragraph. Unfortunately, this style of answer did not produce a high mark.

Those candidates that were able to offer a clear analysis of the role of the USSR in both the beginning of détente and in causing the start of the Second Cold War were able to achieve high marks. Those candidates who achieved the highest marks were able to balance the responsibility of the USSR with that of the USA and, in doing so, were able to support and sustain their case with apposite examples.

In support of Soviet responsibility, candidates could mention the Soviet role in the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968. They could also mention Brezhnev's role in the SALT talks leading to SALT 1 and II and the Helsinki Accords of 1975.

In support of causing the Second Cold War, candidates could have mentioned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the deployment of SS20 nuclear missiles in Europe in the early 1980s.

To counter this view, candidates could mention the roles of Kennedy, Nixon and Kissinger in creating the conditions for détente. They could also mention Reagan's role in creating the conditions for the Second Cold War: the massive arms build up of the USA from 1981, the deployment of Cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe in 1983 and NATO Operation Able Archer in 1983.

### Question 4

This question proved to be very popular and produced many very good answers. However, many candidates underachieved in this question by producing long narratives of the Cuban Missile Crisis with an analysis of the assertion in the question in the conclusion. Those candidates who achieved high marks were able to point out that the USSR could be regarded as a 'victor' in the Crisis. They received an assurance from the USA that Cuba would not be invaded. They were also able to get US Jupiter missiles removed from Turkey. The USA could claim victory, which they did at the time, through the removal of Soviet nuclear missiles from Cuba. Some candidates stated that both Superpowers were victors in the sense that the Crisis began a period of détente with the Partial Test Ban Treaty and the creation of the Molink between the Kremlin and the White House.

### Question 5

Many candidates displayed an impressive factual knowledge regarding the end of the Cold War and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union. However, fewer candidates displayed a specific knowledge of the role of Reagan in ending the Cold War. For many a narrative of the Reagan-Gorbachev negotiations was the main thrust of their answer. A majority of candidates wrote sparingly on Reagan and concentrated their answers on a detailed coverage of Gorbachev's policies within the USSR (perestroika and glasnost), without linking these directly to the end of the Cold War.

Reagan's decision to embark on a massive arms build-up from 1981 and his decision to launch the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) in 1983, forced the USSR to reciprocate. One of the results was to force the Soviet economy into further difficulty, creating the need for Gorbachev to end the nuclear and conventional arms race in order to save the Soviet economy from collapse.

### Question 6

This question produced some exceptional answers where candidates displayed an in-depth knowledge and understanding of the issues cited in the question. However, most candidates took the opportunity to write a narrative-chronology of the nuclear arms race, with some limited assessment confined to the concluding paragraph.

Those candidates who achieved high marks were able to explain the reasons behind the development of such strategies as Mutually Assured Destruction and flexible response. The advent of the Soviet ability to develop its own nuclear arsenal, in the early 1950s, helped force the USA to develop MAD. However, it was also a response to the need to confront the USSR without the requirement to possess massive conventional armed forces.

Similarly, in the early 1980s the decision to deploy Pershing II and Cruise missiles was a response to the development of and deployment of the SS20.

Finally, candidates could have mentioned that SDI was the logical result to end a nuclear threat by the USSR.

### **Question 7**

This question was rarely attempted. Invariably it was either the third or fourth response by candidates. Candidates could have mentioned that political stability in post-war Japan created the foundations for economic success. The dominance of the Liberal Party meant there was a continuity in economic policy based on developing Japan's export trade.

Also the Ministry of International Trade and Investment (MITI) developed an effective economic strategy for exploiting world markets to Japan's advantage.

Candidates could also have mentioned the Japanese work ethic and Japan's human capital (skilled workers and economic ethos) that survived the devastation caused to the Japanese economy in the latter years of the Second World War.

To counter the argument candidates could have mentioned the preferential status given to Japan by the USA in the US market. They could have also mentioned the impact of the Korean War as a catalyst for Japanese economic growth in the 1950s. They could have mentioned the ability of Japan to exploit the technology based industries of 1960s and 1970s due to weaknesses in the North American and European economies.

### **Question 8**

In many ways responses to **Question 8** were similar to responses to **Question 7**. The question was usually the last one attempted by candidates. In most cases candidates displayed a general knowledge of the impact of international aid on developing countries. The majority of responses were narrative-descriptive in format. Only a minority of answers were able to cite specific examples where international aid encouraged corruption. Candidates may have mentioned the example of Nigeria and the Central African Republic as states noted for corruption. Also, few candidates were able to cite examples where international aid did, in fact, lead to relief of poverty.

Candidates could have mentioned the various types of international aid as part of their assessment of its impact. There has been aid from government to government; international aid from specific charities such as Liveaid, Save the Children etc.; aid from international organisations such as the United Nations and the European Union; military aid from government to government.



# HISTORY

---

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

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

## General comments

The entry continues to rise on this paper.

The general standard was better than last year: some Centres produced masterly, thorough, analytical scripts. It was noticeable that some Centres had clearly taken note of comments in previous reports and had prepared candidates in line with recommendations, leading to significantly higher marks. A far too common fault was excessive brevity in essay responses for **Section B**. While there is never a correlation between length of an answer and its quality, it is not possible to deal in any way adequately with an essay question in half a page of standard sized writing.

Time periods were frequently transcended or overlooked, particularly in **Questions 2 and 4**. The use of abbreviations such as MLK (for Martin Luther King) should be discouraged. The most common weakness in both Source-based and essay questions was heavy reliance on an exclusively narrative or descriptive approach instead of the analytical/explanatory one, which is needed to attain Bands 1-3. There were no serious rubric infringements

## Comments on Specific Questions

### SECTION A

#### Question 1

**'The South seceded reluctantly.'** Using Sources A-E, discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

The compulsory source-based question was better answered than in previous sessions but still far too many candidates simply summarised the contents of the Sources, not using them as evidence but simply concluding with an assertion as to the correctness or otherwise of the hypothesis stated in the question. Also very common were responses which simply argued a case for **or** against the opinion stated in the question. To attain Level 4 and above the response has to advance evidence both to challenge **and** support the assertion before coming to a reasoned conclusion. There were too few candidates prepared to evaluate the Sources in their historical context, but this is essential to reach Level 4 upwards. For example, Cobb's change of heart from 1851 as a Unionist: 'I offer my hand and my heart to the good cause of the Union' to a secessionist in 1861: 'I entertain no doubt either of your right or duty to secede from the Union', can only be explained with reference to the South's weakening position in the 1850s; the rise of abolitionism in Kansas-Nebraska controversy, the founding of the Republican Party, and culminating in Lincoln's election as President in November 1860. No candidate mentioned that the decision to secede was carried quite narrowly in Cobb's state of Georgia, indicating a unionist minority even in 1861. Too many candidates referred to Lincoln as an abolitionist. While this was believed in the South, he was in fact simply opposed to any extension of slavery on any pretext, while accepting the constitutional rights of the 13 existing slave states to maintain the institution. No candidate pointed out that four of the Sources emanated from the one state of Georgia. No one mentioned that four of the slave states (Kentucky, Missouri, Maryland and Delaware) remained in the Union, though in the case of Maryland this was probably due to coercion by Union troops.

## **SECTION B**

### **Question 2**

#### **How far did the USA benefit economically from westward expansion after 1865?**

A very popular question, but with few convincing responses. After 1865 the full energies of the nation could be diverted away from slavery, secession and civil war to nation building. Most candidates discussed the significance of the transcontinental railroad (finished in 1869), which by 1914 had become five different routes, but did not develop its importance; it encouraged settled migration, the development of huge cattle and mining internal markets, the opening up of California and hence the Asian markets, and the expulsion of the Native American Plains Indians from their remaining lands. The Homestead Act needed some discussion of its cheap land policy, as did the development of huge inland cities of which Chicago was the leading example. Very few candidates discussed the significance of Turner's famous frontier thesis.

### **Question 3**

#### **Why did the South lose the Civil War?**

A very popular question with some excellent answers. Most responses treated the South's defeat as inevitable, yet the European view at the start of the conflict was that the Union would not be able to conquer and subdue people who wished to secede; as late as June 1864 there was great war weariness in the North with the seemingly never ending conflict and Lincoln himself thought he would be defeated in the November Presidential election which would have led to peace negotiations. Nearly all candidates pointed out the South's weakness in population, industrial production, and maritime fleets, though none mentioned its dependence on Northern financial markets. Better responses mentioned the South's strategic advantage, having simply to defend its territory with local knowledge and the motivation coming from protecting their homes. A surprising number argued that the Confederacy's military leaders were inferior to the Union's. This ignored the fact that early encounters were won by the South; the significance of Gettysburg was highlighted, as was the effectiveness of the Union blockade. Better candidates highlighted the weak political leadership of Davis, as contrasted with Lincoln, and also that the Confederacy was greatly hindered by its doctrine of States' rights which created serious difficulties for Lee and his commanders. Nearly all responses highlighted the failure of the Confederacy to secure recognition from Britain and France, as a decisive factor in ultimate failure.

### **Question 4**

#### **Assess the impact of immigration on American social and economic life from 1865 to 1914.**

Not a popular question and poorly answered. Responses were almost invariably narrative, with little factual content and too often containing wild generalisations not supported by evidence. No answer gave the extent of immigration; 26 million people, three times greater than the total of the preceding 250 years. Responses correctly indicated that there was a shift away from traditional sources of the British Isles and Northern Europe to migrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, often refugees from persecution or poverty. Social aspects were better handled than economic. Ghettos were formed in large cities, with slum conditions and public health problems, and reliance on local party machines like Tammany Hall for jobs and welfare. This in turn increased the scale of corruption in public offices.

Economic consequences were largely ignored. Cheap, motivated labour in unlimited quantity competing for jobs fuelled America's great economic expansion so that by 1914 the US economy had become the world's most powerful industrial economy. Very few answers assessed the impact of immigration, being content to describe it instead.

**Question 5**

**Examine the changing role of African-Americans in the nation's economic, social, and political life from 1900 to 1968.**

A very popular question with some excellent answers. It covered a long time period (including two world wars), with three different factors to analyse (social, economic and political), hence a synoptic approach was called for. Most answers played it safe, by briefly summarising Booker T Washington's and W E B Du Bois' rival philosophies for Black emancipation, then proceeding to the 1950s with Martin Luther King, the Brown judgement of the Supreme Court, Freedom Marches etc. culminating in the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act. A worthwhile approach would be to have looked at the condition of African-Americans in 1900-second class citizens in the North and lacking basic civil rights in the South and then to compare their condition in 1968 under the three different headings. It was of course essential to look at the different strategies pursued by Dr King, Malcolm X and others. Few pointed out that King's campaign was successful in its aims, and his strategy of enlisting the support of tough minded Democratic leaders such as Kennedy and Johnson did deliver civil rights in spite of the Southern Democratic bloc in the Senate. However, the position with regard to economic status was still very bleak, with poverty the normal situation if one examined employment, housing, income etc. Here Malcolm X's appeal was to young urban Blacks, but unlike King he made no attempt build coalitions with white liberals. Socially, great advances had been made, with media coverage, education, general acceptance of African-Americans as being equal fellow citizens with full entitlement to participation in the American Dream.

**Question 6**

**Consider the view that the New Deal was more significant politically than economically.**

Not a popular question and there was some uncertainty over how to tackle it. Given the shapeless, chaotic, at times contradictory nature of the New Deal, finding a coherent theme is difficult. Responses too often got bogged down in the plethora of alphabet agencies and initiatives, losing track of the central principle that the Federal Government had the responsibility to maintain the overall level of economic activity by appropriate interventionist measures. In practice this meant the President taking the lead. Few candidates looked at the economic record of the New Deal. By 1939, 17% of the working population were still unemployed and investment lagged. While manufacturing was back to the high 1929 level, it was not clear whether this was because of the New Deal measures or part of the normal economic cycle.

Politically the story was quite different. The role of the Presidency was enhanced greatly, there was a shift from the States to the Federal Government, and for first time the Democrats became the natural party of government at all levels. Labour unions, women and minorities all had their status enhanced.

**Question 7**

**To what extent was American foreign policy 'isolationist' between 1920 and 1941?**

A very popular question, with the general quality being good. The balance of the responses was skewed heavily towards the last seven years of the period, at the expense of the 1920s. Candidates tended to overlook the key issue which was the extent to which the US was an active player on the world stage. While there was a sharp reaction to Wilson's internationalism and in particular, the League of Nations, and the wartime Allies, America did play an active but independent part in world affairs and one looked in vain for examples of this such as the Washington Naval Conference, the Kellogg-Briand Pact and US participation in League conferences. Responses concentrated on US policy in the late 1930s as the three aggressor nations, Japan Italy and Germany all pursued expansionist policies by force or threat of force. It was here, in particular with the four Neutrality Acts passed by Congress, that classic isolationism was displayed. The period from 1938 (Munich) to December 1941 (Pearl Harbor and Germany's declaration of War on the US) was a complex one. From the outset of war US public opinion and Congress were overwhelmingly against any American involvement but Roosevelt's policies increasingly, though deviously, helped Britain in a number of ways, in particular, Lend Lease. By autumn 1941 America was waging an undeclared naval war against Germany in the Atlantic, stopping just short of belligerency. Answers needed to show the steady drift away from isolationism from 1938 onwards, though as late as November 1940, Roosevelt pledged firmly that America would not enter the war.

**Question 8**

**Evaluate the impact of the mass media on America's political and social life from 1945 to 1968.**

A very popular question, though poorly answered. There was little evaluation, mostly anecdotal material—often trivial on TV programmes. Television did transform America's political life in a number of ways. Few responses discussed the impact of the first Presidential election debate between Kennedy and Nixon, which may have won the close fought 1960 election for Kennedy. None mentioned the earlier emotional 'Checkers' speech by Nixon in 1952 which saved his Vice-Presidency bid. However, the better candidates did assess the impact of television on the Civil Rights campaigns of King in the Deep South. Northern audiences perceived for the first time the way in which the Alabama police used sticks and fierce dogs against non-violent civil rights demonstrations. Only one candidate repeated the famous observation that 'Bull' Connor did as much as Martin Luther King to promote the civil rights cause. The Vietnam War (the first TV war) received attention, though few highlighted the Tet Offensive's impact on US opinion. It can be said that the constant TV coverage of Vietnam drove Johnson out of office. The print media received little attention, though the Washington Post and the New York Times had great influence among the power elite and opinion formers. Socially, television created a national audience and quickly became the main leisure time activity.

# HISTORY

---

<p>Paper 9697/06</p>
----------------------

<p>Paper 6</p>
----------------

## GENERAL COMMENTS

All candidates attempted the compulsory **Question 1 (Section A)** and nearly all completed three questions from **Section B**. There were few answers to **Questions 7 and 8** and **Question 6** was not a popular choice.

There was evidence that some candidates misjudged the time available in the examination. A number of candidates wrote very little on their final answer, just a paragraph or two, and there were examples of candidates making very hurried attempts at two questions. Some of this may have arisen because candidates took too long over **Question 1**. In the cases where candidates answered **Question 1** last, the response was often spoiled by the necessity of trying to deal with all the sources in a limited time.

One result of the miscalculations of time was that few candidates gained the higher level of marks. Most candidates produced good or acceptable answers to two or three questions. There were some very good answers to **Question 1** and to **Questions 2, 3 and 4**.

In general candidates did well when dealing with **Question 1**, making comparisons, contextual illustrations and appraising the sources. **Question 3** was often answered best and most fully, while **Question 2** was answered well by many who assembled an interesting range of points. Of the most popular choices, **Questions 5 and 6** were least fully or directly answered.

## Comments on specific sources

### SECTION A

#### **Question 1: Emancipation and its consequences: Indian Indentured Labour.**

**‘The supervision of Indian coolies in Trinidad and British Guiana failed to protect them.’ How far does the evidence of Sources A-E support this statement?**

Many candidates looked at the sources as a group rather than dealing with them one by one in letter order. The best examples of this were that Source B and E were linked together to illustrate the failures of supervision and B and C as the response (C) of one to the other (B). The ability of candidates to take this approach enhanced answers, though those who took sources in their printed order could achieve sound results. It was fairly common practice to comment that Sources A, B and E were from eye witnesses, and some refined this by pointing out that the author of A was an outside observer, whilst those of B and E were participants. Candidates were more likely to take Sources C and D at face value, or even enhanced value as official sources. A few made the comment about D that it appeared to be shifting the blame for the planters’ situation onto the immigrants.

One group of candidates made interesting comments by taking the approach that all the sources were suspect to some extent, either as the evidence of a single person or as representative of a particular point of view. Many candidates made comments on particular phrases in the sources. Source E was particularly fruitful for that purpose. A few candidates wrote at extreme length either in paraphrasing the sources without much comment or by providing lengthy contextual asides. The best answers managed to integrate much into a more reasonable length and through comments and conclusions, emphasize their response to the quotation in the question.

## SECTION B

### **Question 2: Assess the significance of the Haitian Revolution (1794-1804) for European colonies in the Caribbean.**

Most candidates outlined features of events in Haiti which impacted on the wider region, the successful slave revolt leading to independence, the violence, the failures of French and British forces, the success of rebels which helped to smash some myths about the slaves as being incapable of organising themselves. The outer ripples of these events, with increased apprehension about slave revolts and unrest among slaves, were among issues raised. And further afield the impact of events both on metropolitan governments and the activities of emancipationists, especially in Britain, were often commented upon.

Constraints of time meant that many answers lacked detail but the significance of events was well captured. Some even commented on the short term effects of sugar planting in British colonies and the longer term boost to Cuban sugar.

### **Question 3: Compare the methods the European countries used to emancipate the enslaved in the Caribbean.**

This was not only a popular question but it was usually well done. Candidates gave a great deal of material on the patronato and apprenticeship, often pointing to patronato as a superior system. Some direct comparisons of details were made.

Other countries whose emancipations were cited were France, Denmark and the Netherlands. Denmark was well outlined by some. Most candidates tried to offer comparisons.

### **Question 4: Explain the policies of French governments towards former slaves in the years after 1848.**

Candidates who chose to answer this question had enough details about the policies, passports, passes, taxation and workhouses to illustrate how and why they were introduced. It was unusual, however, for the background of events in France to be linked with the apparent about-turn on the liberal emancipation terms of 1848.

### **Question 5: Analyse the reasons why some Caribbean territories were relatively unfavourable to the formation of peasantries after emancipation.**

This question was widely attempted but many candidates failed to concentrate on the direct requirements of the question. Some discussed, in general, why peasantry developed. Others quoted issues related particularly to Barbados but in general terms, high density and lack of available fertile land, before discussing various methods used to inhibit the growth of peasantry more generally, high prices of land, planter solidarity, and legal actions. Though the latter had a place, in the context of this question it would have been better to concentrate on their impact in the areas of greatest difficulty for forming a widespread peasant population. In Barbados a number of factors all contributed over and above the land to the population situation.

One issue which many candidates failed to address properly was the need for some detailed examination of points. Even the concept 'high density' was often taken as being widely understood and therefore not properly explained. Another comment on candidates' responses would be that they tended to think in terms of a static situation rather than one that was changing over time – as in Barbados, where the peasantry developed more towards 1900.

### **Question 6: Discuss the problems of recruiting and transporting immigrant labour to work on sugar estates after 1835.**

Many candidates failed to select the right material in response to this question, failing to deal at any great length with either recruitment or transportation and giving most attention to conditions under which immigrants lived in the Caribbean.

Few gave attention to why immigration was attempted, the post emancipation shortage of a large and reliable workforce, especially in Trinidad and British Guiana. The various early attempts to recruit from Europe or Africa did not cover the desire for numbers suitable to needs expressed by planters. With the more successful schemes of recruitment in India and China, many issues arose, including that of distance and expense of bringing immigrants to the Caribbean. These would be major themes. Some addressed the issues related to Asian immigrants well and others considered the various experiments with a wide range of possible sources but many were not sufficiently focused on the question.

**Question 7: Why and with what success did governments in the British Caribbean deal with the provision of health facilities during the post-slavery period to 1900?**

A small number of well-prepared candidates answered this question. The scale of the issues was usually well addressed - problems of epidemic disease, of town life, and of lack of provision in country areas. Provision of hospitals and public health services were also commented upon as were the situation and solutions found in British Guiana and Trinidad, largely as a result of issues involved with their immigrant populations.

**Question 8: Why were there riots and revolts in many parts of the Caribbean from 1848 to 1900?**

A small number of candidates attempted this question. They tended to be very general and short. References to Morant Bay and the Confederation Riots were made but answers gained few marks.