

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
HISTORY.....	2
GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level.....	2
Paper 9697/01 Paper 1 – Modern European History, 1789 - 1939	2
Paper 9697/03 Paper 3 – International History, 1945 - 1991	5
Paper 9697/05 Paper 5 History of USA c. 1840 - 1968.....	8
Paper 9697/06 Paper 6 – Caribbean History, 1794 - 1900	11

FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**

HISTORY

GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

Paper 9697/01

Paper 1 – Modern European History, 1789 - 1939

General comments

The overall quality of the scripts was satisfactory although there was a variation between the standards of different Centres. The most important reasons why some candidates gained high or very high marks were that their answers were relevant, the arguments were clear and the historical knowledge was appropriate, but not necessarily detailed. The most important reason why some candidates were awarded low marks was that their answers were irrelevant and often vague. They showed insufficient knowledge of key developments.

The component requires candidates to answer four questions, a compulsory source-based question and three essay questions from a choice of seven. The source-based question is based on a defined topic, 'The Origins of World War I, 1870 - 1914'. Six of the essay questions are drawn from defined topics and one is cross-thematic. Most candidates completed the required four answers but a number of scripts contained only three answers and some contained fewer. Examiners would emphasise the advantage of giving candidates practice in writing first one extended answer in essay form, and then developing the exercise by requiring them to write several extended answers so that they have experience in meeting the demands of the examination. Most of the answers were of an adequate length. Marks are not awarded simply because answers are long, but some were too brief and they could not consider an adequate variety of points.

It is a good idea to write a brief plan before writing an answer. This can help candidates to organise their ideas. This can be particularly helpful when answering **Question 1**, the source-based question. Candidates can use their plan to see how far the individual sources either agree or disagree with the claim in the question, note the weight of evidence and make provenance on their usefulness. This might help to avoid the less useful technique of discussing each source in sequence, omitting any comparison or evaluative comments.

The more successful answers did more than tell a story, but they concentrated on explanation. For example, weak candidates who answered **Question 1** described Napoleon's rise to power and some of his policies. Better answers concentrated on the key words in the question. In **Question 2**, they were 'How far...?' and 'achieve his aims'. **Questions 4** and **8** were based on comparisons of two people and the highest marks were awarded to answers that were balanced in the time that was given to each person. Less creditable answers only described what happened under each of the specified people, and did not compare them.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

'Germany's policies in the Morocco Crisis (1911) were unreasonable'. Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

The overall standard of the answers was satisfactory. The most successful candidates wrote very relevant answers that considered each of the five sources and considered how far they confirmed or contradicted the claim that Germany's policies in the Morocco Crisis of 1911 were unreasonable. Higher marks were awarded when the answers compared and contrasted the extracts, whereas answers in the middle and lower bands of marks often considered them sequentially and did not examine their similarities and differences. Some poor answers only summarised the extracts and did not comment on them. Some candidates did not

note the relevance to the question of Source A, the extract from the Entente Cordiale, but the agreement between Britain and France reflects the way in which these countries saw Morocco as their exclusive sphere of influence, and Germany was implicitly excluded. This would be reflected in the later crisis when Germany's intervention was seen as unreasonable by Britain and France. The aggressive nature of Source B was understood by most candidates. Some answers did not show that, in Source C, Kaiser William II was apparently more moderate than his politicians because he feared for the effects of their extreme policies. As a handwritten note to a leading German politician, there is no need to doubt its reliability, although William II was unpredictable. In Source D, Tirpitz criticised German policies in the Morocco Crisis. Some answers gained credit when they pointed out that his Memoirs were published after World War I and that he might have been trying to discredit German politicians. Source E was a speech by Lloyd George and speeches must be treated carefully as evidence because their purpose is usually to convince an audience. The extract did demonstrate the concern of a leading British politician and it showed that Britain was willing to negotiate but was threatened if British interests were not maintained. There is no reason to doubt that Britain would have preferred to resolve the problem by negotiation. Higher marks were awarded when the answers came to a justified conclusion that weighed the evidence and stated a balance of judgement. Some weak answers only summarised the extracts and did not assess them.

Section B

Question 2

How far did Napoleon Bonaparte achieve his aims in domestic policy?

The key issue was the extent to which Napoleon Bonaparte achieved his aims in domestic policy. Good answers defined his aims and then explained his domestic policies. They came to a judgement about the extent to which achievements matched aims. The question clearly excluded foreign policy and therefore no credit could be given to discussions of external events because they were irrelevant. Most answers considered a reasonable range of factors, including the Code, the Concordat and relations with the Roman Catholic Church and economic policy. However, some candidates could have examined in more detail the nature of Napoleon's government and especially the nature and extent of his autocracy. Some excellent answers pointed out his use of censorship and a police force.

Question 3

Why has industrialisation in the nineteenth century been described as a 'revolution'?

High marks were awarded to answers that analysed the reasons why industrial change in the nineteenth century has been described as a revolution. The question asked 'Why...?' and therefore Examiners were looking for analytical answers. Some excellent candidates referred to the extent and pace of change. High credit was given when the answers noted the political and social developments that were involved. For example, industrialisation saw the rise of the urban middle class and the emergence of the large urban working class or proletariat. Good candidates assessed the effects of change. They also supported claims with specific examples. Some limited answers only described some changes and did not explain why they were revolutionary. A few weak answers spent too much time describing changes in the agricultural revolution in the eighteenth century.

Question 4

The aims and methods of Cavour were completely different from those of Mazzini. How far do you agree with this judgement?

The question involved a comparison of Cavour and Mazzini. Therefore, the highest answers were given to answers that were reasonably balanced between the two Italian leaders. Answers in the lower and middle bands sometimes contained sequential accounts of Cavour and Mazzini followed by a brief conclusion, but the most effective essays took a more thoroughly comparative approach. It was relevant to consider issues such as their views of a united Italy (Cavour preferred a unified northern Italy whereas Mazzini advocated a fully united peninsula), Cavour's adherence to monarchy that contrasted with Mazzini's republicanism, and their different attitudes to foreign intervention.

Question 5

Explain the factors which attracted European imperialism either to Africa or to Asia in the later nineteenth century.

The key issue was the factors that attracted European imperialism either Africa or to Asia. The main discriminating factor between moderate and good answers was usually their relative success in providing examples. There was a tendency in moderate essays to list factors but not to provide supporting knowledge, as evidence of general claims. The most successful candidates combined the explanation of relevant points with specific examples of European imperialism.

Question 6

Why did Lenin and the Bolsheviks gain power in 1917?

Examiners read some very good answers to this question. High marks were awarded to some answers that focused narrowly on developments in Russia in 1917. It was relevant to discuss the background to 1917, including the problems of the tsarist regime from about 1905, but the higher marks were awarded when these issues were linked directly to the question. Some limited answers only described the causes of the Russian Revolution without explaining sufficiently why Lenin and the Bolsheviks were able to seize power. Good answers were able to contrast the failure of Kerensky and the Provisional Government with the success of Lenin.

Question 7

How important was the 'cult of personality' to Hitler's role in the period to 1939?

The main difference between moderate and good answers was usually candidates' success in dealing with Hitler's 'cult of personality'. Answers could examine his personal influence, the use of propaganda to emphasise his importance and then assess the importance of these factors against other aspects of Hitler's rule in Germany. 'How important...?' meant that the cult of personality had to be put into the context of other issues. Most answers were sufficiently well informed about the nature of Nazi government and Hitler's policies but some candidates did not use their knowledge sufficiently to frame an argument. They were descriptive rather than explanatory.

Question 8

Nicholas II and Stalin were both autocrats. Why then, was Stalin more successful than Nicholas II in governing Russia?

The question required candidates to compare the success of Nicholas II and Stalin as Russian autocrats. There were some very effective answers that contained sound arguments and good knowledge. High marks were awarded when the answers were reasonably balanced between the two rulers; some essays were awarded lower marks because they were too unbalanced. For example, some only asserted that Stalin was more successful but did not prove this by showing the comparative lack of success of Nicholas II. Examiners read some well-organised answers that avoided a sequential study of Nicholas II and Stalin but highlighted similarities and differences. For example, these candidates compared their personalities, their suppression of critics and the strength of opposition. Answers were awarded higher marks when they linked factors directly to autocracy. For example, some referred to industrialisation without making it clear how this issue was linked to the question.

Paper 9697/03
Paper 3 – International History, 1945 - 1991

General comments

Of the two parts of the examination paper, it is the compulsory source-based question which continues to cause the greatest problem.

When it comes to **Section B**, to the essays, candidates will do well if they have a sound knowledge and understanding of the topic and they have been trained to answer the question analytically. Most do have these skills and so do well. Which is not to say that all are outstanding on **Section B**. More could do even better, were they to focus more sharply on the question and write an argumentative, if balanced answer. Note that balance concerns process, not outcome. If the evidence fits, one argument could be completely dismissed, another wholly accepted. Balance does not mean coming down in the middle between two points of view. Candidates are prone to do so, to hedge their bets because they are cautious and often worry that a one-sided conclusion might lose them marks. It will not, if the evidence supports it. Examiners welcome a well argued, well supported answer.

Section A remains the problem. Some candidates leave **Question 1** until the end, presumably because they have more confidence in their essays, if only because they are on familiar topics. Answering **Question 1** last is a dangerous tactic, if only because there is a danger of running out of time. The problems concerning **Question 1** probably have two causes, unfamiliarity with the topic and uncertainty about technique. The former cannot be taken away. The topic has to be taken from a broad range of subjects, if with the common theme of the United Nations. Uncertainty about technique can be addressed. The detailed comments on **Question 1** attempt to help clarify what candidates should and should not do. If they can apply some of these points, then this more than any other single factor should help improve their marks and grades.

Comments on specific questions**Section A****Question 1**

Source-based Question: The response of the UNHCR to international refugee crises, 1950-1991.

The most recent report on **Question 1** finished as follows:

Though candidates will sometimes be faced with unfamiliar subjects, they should be reassured that the sources should provide enough opportunities for evaluation.

This session's examination provided one such unfamiliar subject, the work of the United Nations' High Commissioner for Refugees. But the sources were chosen to allow candidates to evaluate by means of cross-reference. Four of the five passages refer to the problem of refugees from Indochina. This should have enabled plenty of opportunities for cross-referencing. Thus Passage B could be used to evaluate the claims of David Martin in Passage C. Mr Martin praises the 1989 Comprehensive Plan of Action to deal with asylum seekers from Indochina. Yet Passage B shows that refugees from Indochina had been a problem in 1979 and probably earlier. Candidates might know from their studies of the Cold War that South Vietnam fell in 1975, which presumably meant a large number of people would try to escape Communist rule. If they do not, then Source E provides a big hint when it talks about 'larger refugee movements of the 1970s in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam'. This means that it took ten, maybe fifteen years before an effective plan was put into effect, which hardly supports the case that the UNHCR responded effectively to international crises.

The important point that needs to be made is that a little careful analysis of unfamiliar sources on an unfamiliar topic can result in sound and relevant evaluation. Instead, most candidates trod a well-worn path: summarise each source in turn, explaining how it does or does not support the assertion, and then reach a conclusion. Some are aware that highest marks are awarded for providing a modification to the assertion. This they do, but without evaluating the sources first. This short-circuits the various stages and is 'not allowed'. The key skill is that of evaluation. Candidates must critically analyse the arguments being made by a source and then conclude as a result of their analysis whether the source does support or challenge the hypothesis. And though most evaluations result in the undermining of the initial 'surface' assessment, sometimes they will confirm it.

If candidates are reluctant to analyse and evaluate the passages, they are usually very keen to make valued judgements about the authors of the passages. Comments about the author of Source C, identified as an African postgraduate student, were often revealing, especially as the source itself referred to events in Africa. Some argued that this made the source more reliable. As an African, some argued, Mr Chiusiwa is bound to be reliable on events on Africa. This is a bit like saying that a European is bound to understand events in Bosnia in the 1990s. Some dismissed his arguments because he was a postgraduate student, arguing that he could not know a great deal. Conversely, candidates always assume that lawyers are reliable and academic lawyers doubly so. Thus Source C was given a great deal of weight. However, lawyers are trained to argue their client's case. They will select from the evidence the points that strengthen that case. It might be worth pointing out that many politicians trained as lawyers. In general, candidates must avoid judging the worth of written passages simply or mainly on their judgement of their authors and their nationality - or occupation - or position. In this respect, Passage A revealed two different approaches. Many said that the source could be trusted because its author was head of the UNHCR and/or he was receiving the Nobel Peace Prize. However, as the other approach argued, Mr Hartling, because he was the head of the UNHCR, was bound to exaggerate its achievements, especially as he was given a public speech. No one pointed out - as they could have done - that some of those who have received the Nobel Peace Prize have not always been fully committed to peace.

One final point worth mentioning concerns the link between the sources and the assertion. The question asks whether the sources, individually and collectively, support the assertion, not whether they prove it. In other words, on balance, after evaluation, does a source provide evidence which gives some weight to the assertion? It is most unlikely that a source will prove an assertion which usually covers a period of thirty or forty years. The sources will rarely be that black or white. Candidates, however, often - and mistakenly - categorise a source because it does not conclusively prove the assertion. Their judgements should be more tentative. History is more about grey than black or white.

So how well did candidates answer this question? The vast majority did not get beyond surface evaluation and this kept them to Level 3. A minority did evaluate, though rarely consistently and fully. Very few went on to reach Level 6.

So what message to give to candidates? That they must:

- read the passages carefully, looking for cross-references as they do so
- focus on the passages, not their authors
- critically examine the passages in relation to the question
- use the other sources to do so as well as their own knowledge
- *think* (in order to analyse and evaluate)
- finally, after careful evaluation of the individual sources, provide a judgement about the sources as a group.

These requirements mean that this question should not be answered in the same way as an essay question. For the latter, candidates should think about the question and plan their answer for a couple of minutes. For the source-based question, they should spend much longer reading and analysing the passages before constructing their argument. Examiners so often read long descriptive answers to **Question 1**. They would much prefer short analytical answers.

Section B

Question 2

How far do you agree that the development of the US policy of containment in the late 1940s was based on a mistaken interpretation of Soviet aims and ambitions?

As always, this was the most popular of the essay questions. It was usually well answered. The best answers analysed the factors which caused the US government to decide on containment, in other words the key features of the traditional or orthodox thesis about the origins of the Cold War. Two different lines of argument were valid. One was to argue that Soviet aims and ambitions were not as the Americans believed them to be. In other words, the USSR was not expansionist. The Americans got it wrong. The other line of argument was the belief that the US had reasons of their own for developing containment. They needed to ensure a viable European economy in order to sustain their own economy, vastly expanded by the Second World War. This required in particular the revival of the (West) German economy. Both arguments are part of the revisionist thesis.

Those who know their historical theories know there is a third thesis, the post-revisionist, which argues both sides misunderstood each other, in part blinded by their ideological obsessions. So long as it was based on analysis of relevant evidence, this approach was also valid.

Question 3

'The Cold War was essentially a war of words.' How far does a study of the Cold War, as 'fought' in the 1960s and 1970s in any **two** regions of your choice, support this assertion?

This question worked well in that it included several elements which helped differentiate between candidates.

Firstly, the dates. Some forgot to focus on the 1960s and 1970s, including the Korean War in the 1950s and the Soviet-Afghan War of the 1980s. (Some allowance was made for the latter because the USSR invaded Afghanistan in December 1979. Candidates should be reminded that they help themselves if they mention such fine distinctions.)

Secondly, the nature of Cold War conflicts. Many contrasted the Cuban missile crisis (no fighting) with the Vietnam War (lots of fighting). Only the stronger candidates went on to say that the Vietnam War involved no fighting between American and Soviet troops. And it could be argued that the Cuban missile crisis was a form of military conflict, one for the nuclear age. A naval blockade is more than just words. And at the height of the crisis a Soviet anti-aircraft battery in Cuba did shot down a U-2 reconnaissance plane, killing the pilot.

Thirdly, 'essentially'. Most questions, especially quotations, have a key word around which arguments turn. What was the essence of the Cold War? No one considered this aspect of the question. Had they done so, so long as their arguments were supported by relevant evidence as well, they would have been well rewarded.

In terms of actual responses, most kept to the 1960s and 1970s but few made the finer distinctions about the nature of warfare in the Cold War.

Question 4

Assess the impact of the Cold War upon the Arab-Israeli issue in the period 1956-79.

Candidates who chose this question did so because they knew their history of the Middle East since 1948. This question probably produced more high-quality answers than any other. Candidates might have simply repeated their understanding of the history of Arab-Israeli relations but, to their credit, most did not. They focused on the impact of the Cold War. This meant they had to consider how the context of US-USSR rivalry and disputes affected the regional disputes between Arabs and Israelis. The superficial analysis is to argue that the USA backed Israel and the USSR the Arabs, thus making the regional dispute more unstable. Most avoided this second danger as well. The reality was more complex. In the 1956 Suez crisis, the Americans and the Soviets were on the same side in wanting to stop the Anglo-French-Israeli collusion to attack Egypt. In the 1973 Yom Kippur war, the superpowers followed the same, contradictory policy of rearming their client state(s) while also working to end the war. Many pointed out points such as these, which meant that they provided a sound and subtle analysis.

Question 5

Which did more to cause the collapse of Soviet communism by 1991, developments inside or outside the USSR?

This was another question which worked well in that it helped differentiate between candidates. First is the need for sound background knowledge. Some candidates still see Eastern Europe as part of the USSR. They will often write about Poland and Ukraine and the Baltic states all in the same sentence. It is important that they know which came within the borders of the USSR and which did not. Eastern Europe was part of the (informal) Soviet empire but that is not the same as the USSR itself. Second is the need for balance. Some wrote mainly - or entirely - about internal or external developments and in doing so limited the marks they could receive. Third is the need to focus on the collapse of communism. So many answers start in 1953 and provide several sides of narrative of the USSR before reaching the later 1980s, by when time is starting to run out. Far better to start in 1991 and work backwards. It is possible to see the failure of Khrushchevism as a cause of decline which preceded collapse but the case must be argued. So many assumed it were so.

Overall, the quality of answers was high. Coverage was good, analysis balanced and a final answer given which was based on the evidence provided.

Question 6

Compare and contrast the SALT treaties and the START treaties as means of controlling nuclear weapons.

This was easily the least popular essay question. Those who chose it usually preferred to write about the test-ban and non-proliferation treaties as much as SALT and START. For doing so, they received little credit.

'Compare and contrast' requires identifying similarities and differences. Thus, though some analysis of the details of the treaties is needed, the question is not just about the dry bones of four treaties. Some consideration can also be given to wider contexts. One is US-USSR relations. That SALT only slowed the growth of nuclear missiles (but not warheads), whereas START reversed that growth, is a result of their being signed in different eras of the Cold War. In this context START would seem more effective than SALT. The other is the issue of nuclear arms control, which forms a key, if overlooked part of the question. In this particular context, neither set of treaties can be seen as a great success.

Question 7

How far, in the period 1945-1991, was the success of the international economy dependent upon the success of the US economy?

This was perhaps more popular than had been anticipated. Answers tended to fall into one of two groups, good and not-so-good. The better answers did what was needed and focused on the development of the international economy, explaining the contribution of the US economy to that development but also considering the role of other bodies or factors, such as GATT and freer trade. The not-so-good answers concentrated on the US economy, often keeping to its international importance in the late 1940s and early 1950s. This made them marginal and incomplete.

Question 8

Account for the emergence of the Asian Tiger economies.

This also was more popular than expected and, unlike **Question 7**, was almost always well answered. The only problem was deciding which states count as an Asian Tiger. Japan and China do not. The core group is South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, though Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia were not excluded. Most candidates made the right choices. They were also able to explain the importance of both the policies of the Asia Tigers and of the favourable context within which those economies developed.

Paper 9697/05

Paper 5 History of USA c. 1840 - 1968

General comments

The cohort examined consisted of 501 candidates with the majority of Centres having a small number of entries. While the overall standard was sound, certain common weaknesses were evident. The most common, was failing to answer four questions or alternatively, offering only a few lines as answers. Also, there were some irrelevant answers which scored Band 7 (0-7 marks). The best scripts were, however, a pleasure to read, being consistently relevant, well structured, analytical or explanatory with good supporting evidence appropriately used. These scored Bands 1 and 2 (18-25 marks).

The compulsory source-based question, **Question 1**, was not answered well. To simply repeat and recycle the words of the sources with a few general remarks at the beginning and/or end of the response could at best only result in Level 3 (11-13 marks), and this is what most candidates did. To achieve the higher bands it was essential to use the sources as evidence, i.e. to interpret and evaluate them in their historical context.

The most common failing in the essay questions (**Questions 2 - 8**) was over reliance on narrative and descriptive responses, and weak or erratic relevance to the questions actually asked.

Comments on specific questions**Question 1**

'The Dred Scott decision made little practical difference to sectional divisions over the slavery issue. Using Sources A-E discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.'

The most frequent response was as stated above in the **General comments**. Two great weaknesses were the absence of evaluation in context and failure to put the case *for* and *against* the assertion before coming to a conclusion. No one pointed out that Taney and the six concurring judges *all* came from slave owning states, or that Douglas was probably the most influential U.S. Senator, was joint author of the 1850 Compromise and later the driving force behind the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which brought in 'popular sovereignty' at the local level to determine whether a Territory should allow slavery or not.

A better technique would have been to put the case against the assertion (Sources B, D and E) showing at all times an awareness of the historical context and then the case for the assertion (Source C). The case for the assertion would probably involve arguing that the real 'turning point' in the sectional divide was the Kansas - Nebraska Act of 1854, and that from then on there were a number of incidents all pointing towards greater tension. In this context the Dred Scott judgement made little practical difference, but was simply another incident in a continuing pattern.

Question 2

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

Very popular but poorly answered. Most responses had weak relevance, simply supplying a narrative from the American annexation of Texas through to the War and finally its consequences. In most responses the consequences, which alone were relevant, occupied only half the total space (and time). The assessment of the consequences was weak. Few made the point that the United States became for the first time a transcontinental power with direct access to the Far East, and vast new territories were opened up between lands won from Mexico and the Canadian border for later settlement. The Californian gold rush, the transcontinental railroad and the displacement of the Native American nations were dealt with adequately, but few dealt satisfactorily with the consequences for sectional tension of slavery expansion, which it can be argued, led directly to the secession crisis of 1860-61. Only four answers mentioned the Wilmot Proviso controversy, or the formation of the Republican Party as a direct consequence of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

Question 3

Compare Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis as war leaders.

A popular question with some excellent answers. It was very unclear in 1861 that the Union would be able to conquer and subdue the rebellion and Lincoln was judged to be a poor leader with little to commend him. However he grew in office and developed political and charismatic qualities as time went on. He was utterly ruthless in his emergency powers which in effect suspended the Constitution. Though lacking in military experience he always had control over his commanders in the field. He also steered with great skill between abolitionist demands and those who favoured concessions to the Confederacy. No response pointed out that Lincoln came very close to defeat in the 1864 Presidential election, saved by Sherman's capture of Atlanta. Davis by contrast did not grow in office. He displayed little political skill in dealing with colleagues and made no attempt to confront the two biggest problems confronting the Confederacy, slavery and states rights. The rewarding of 'loyal' slaves prepared to either fight for or do essential pioneer work for the Confederacy was never considered, and some Governors took the doctrine of states rights to its extreme. Nearly all responses correctly concluded that Lincoln was better, but the reasons were too often naive and superficial.

Question 4

Was the trend towards monopoly in the American economy beneficial in the period 1865-1914?

There were some well-argued answers with good material, but not very many. Too many responses were very vague, with very little detail or factual backing, and with both benefits and detriments being expressed generally and with little substance. Usually the harm was expressed as exceeding benefit. It would have been better if the impressive figures for US economic expansion in the period had been stated and the consequences in terms of lower prices and greater quantity and quality of goods produced. Only a few responses showed how the Interstate Commerce Commission, designed to regulate the Trusts in the national interest, was circumvented so that it became effectively dominated by them.

Question 5

How different were the philosophies and policies of Booker T. Washington and W.E. Du Bois on how best to attain full emancipation for Afro-Americans?

Over 90% of candidates answered this question, some very well. It was in fact the best answered question, with many answers being spirited and convincing. Most answers did convey some sense of what a remarkable man Washington was. Born a slave in 1856, he became a dinner guest at the White House and a behind the scenes adviser to President Theodore Roosevelt and many other politicians, including some from the South. His philosophy was one of accepting white rule politically and concentrating on economic self-advancement. 'Get some property-get a house of your own!' He believed this moderate approach would pay more dividends in the long term than confrontation. As most candidates pointed out, du Bois' approach was totally different. Born into a middle class family, he was the first Afro-American to graduate from Harvard. He favoured political action, and legal challenges to white supremacy in the South and discrimination in the North. He claimed Washington had ignored the leadership potential of educated blacks and du Bois was instrumental in the Niagara movement which created the influential NAACP which still flourishes today. He was to live to see the celebrated landmark Brown judgement of the Supreme Court which outlawed discrimination in all schools.

Question 6

Account for the Republican Ascendancy in the 1920s.

A popular question but too few answered the question set which was to give reasons for the Republican dominance. Too few pointed out that this was not just confined to the Presidency but extended to all three wings of the Federal Government and also to the state governments outside the Old South, the sole exception being the mayoralties of some large cities. Answers were predominantly narrative and it was disturbing to see starting and terminal dates ignored by so many candidates. First, there was the sharp and sudden reaction against Wilson's progressivism, as symbolised by his near obsession with the League of Nations. The feeling grew very quickly that America had been tricked into entering the war by devious Allies who then reneged on their loan payments. These sentiments, along with the 'Red Scare' brought about by the Russian Revolution when US troops went to Russia, and a wave of post 1918 industrial militancy, ensured the victory of Warren Harding in 1920. His espousal of 'normalcy', and for America to cease international posturing, struck a deep chord amongst voters. No candidate noted that all three Presidents embodied different facets of the American dream. Harding, the simple Midwesterner (from Marion, Ohio), with no intellectual pretensions; Coolidge, the dour New England puritan, sworn in as President by his father on the family Bible in a log cabin in Vermont by the light of an oil lamp; Hoover, the poor boy made good, having waited at tables and sleeping rough as a student, then having to act as a human mule, dragging trucks down the mine rails. The business boom of the decade and growing living standards for most (though not all) Americans assisted the Republicans, always seen as the pro-business party. The Democrats were split seriously by social, sectional, religious and ethnic conflicts and found it difficult to field candidates who could unite the different factions of the party. Few answers noted the ambivalence of a decade characterised by great advances in technology, experimentation in the cinema and lifestyles, but also backward looking, resentful and insular. The latter tendencies were exemplified by the revived Ku Klux Klan, and the notorious 'Monkey Trial' in Dayton, Tennessee.

Question 7

To what extent did the foreign policy of the United States from 1921 to 1941 follow consistent principles?

A minority of candidates answered this question, but only a few tackled effectively the question of consistency. The usual approach was to discuss isolationism, and what this meant, with an attempt to explain the evident shifts in policy towards the end of the period. A few candidates answered the question ingeniously by arguing that US policy was consistent in that its aim was to defend American interests at all times over the whole period. While these scripts earned high marks, none explained convincingly why it was in American interests to avoid foreign entanglements in the period 1921-37 and then increasingly get involved in European affairs from 1938-1941. The better narrative answers focusing on isolationism did distinguish between being uninvolved and being uncommitted, going through a number of US initiatives such as the Kellogg-Brand Pact, and the Washington Naval Agreement, also US delegates to League conferences on drug trafficking and later joining the International Labor Organisation in 1934. A key point which remained unaddressed was that the US Administration was not prepared to see the whole Eastern seaboard of the Atlantic dominated by the Axis powers. After the fall of France and the evacuation of the B.E.F. for Dunkirk, this meant helping Britain avoid defeat by stretching the concept of neutrality to its ultimate limits. The problem of involvement in a second European war was solved by Germany and Italy declaring war on the United States in December 1941.

Question 8

Examine the influence of the mass media on American Society from 1945 to 1968.

Candidates from a few Centres answered this question but did not really do so well, answers lacking a clear structure. It was essential to define 'media' and this would embrace newspapers and periodical, radio, and television. Undoubtedly, the most powerful impact was from television, which by 1960 had reached over 90% of American households. Many answers went off on a tangent, writing exclusively about the civil rights movement. Though television radicalised, informed and motivated Northern opinion about conditions in the South, this represented only one important facet of its impact on society. It became impossible to insulate American society from overseas wars being fought in its name and the media were primarily responsible for making it politically impossible for Johnson to seek re-election as President in 1968. The contrast between Vietnam and Korea was particularly striking. Kennedy's narrow victory over Nixon in 1960 was partly due to his seeming superiority to Nixon in the two television debates. Significantly, the radio audiences when polled, thought that Nixon had won; the TV audience that Kennedy had. In broader terms, the commercial basis of television helped create new professions in marketing, labelling and product innovation. Some responses drew attention to Nixon saving his Vice-Presidential nomination by his 'Checkers' speech on TV in 1952. No candidate drew attention to Marshall McLuhan's analysis that, 'the medium was the message', which received such publicity and controversy in 1968.

Paper 9697/06

Paper 6 – Caribbean History, 1794 - 1900

General comments

Nearly all the candidates in this paper were able to complete the four full answers required of them. Many answers were written in a mature style, mainly free from spelling and grammatical errors and easy to read. The knowledge which candidates used was very full in many cases, and most of it was selected well in relation to the topics under discussion.

Question 1 was compulsory and, of the others, **Questions 3, 4, 5** and **6** were the most popular choices. **Question 2** was rather less popular and **Questions 7** and **8** were rarely answered.

In **Question 1**, there were many competent answers but very few good ones. In many cases candidates did not really evaluate and interpret the source material, and sometimes failed to make use of all the clues in the sources - dates and authors in particular. Also, the sources were not always read with the care needed to appreciate their possibilities. In many cases it would have helped candidates if they had seen the material in the context of its own time, when elementary education was being opened up.

As already stated, there were many scripts in which the candidates showed good knowledge of the subject matter of the questions. Only a few merited very high marks, however. This was usually due to candidates not adapting material to meet the precise demands of the question. For example in **Question 3**, candidates often had an abundance of descriptive material, but did not focus clearly on the wording of the question which began with, 'Why and with what success . . .?'. In **Question 4**, similarly, there was abundant factual material but too little emphasis on, 'How successful ...?'. There was little evidence of planning of essays in order to focus on the significant and specific demands encompassed in the words of the question.

It was often the case that answers which reached the middle range of marks could have been enhanced if there had been more appreciation that changes were taking place over time. **Question 5** on the development of peasantries was an example of this. Many candidates produced a type of snap-shot answer concerned with the immediate post emancipation period in British colonies. The development of peasantry in Jamaica, for example, was a much longer process. Parts of other questions could have been improved too, for example, in **Question 6** the picture painted by candidates about sugar production in Cuba did not take note of the huge advance between 1860 and 1895, and explain it within the context of Cuba's undisputed superiority over its Caribbean rivals.

Comments on specific questions**Section A****Question 1**

The source based question was on education in the British West Indies and was worded as follows:

'Little effective progress was made in providing elementary education in the nineteenth-century British West Indian colonies'. How far does the evidence of Sources A-E support this statement?

This question was compulsory. For most candidates this was the first question to be attempted, though a significant number left the question to be answered last. In the latter case, there were examples of hurried answers and, occasionally, ones which did not cover all the sources.

Many candidates gave answers based on the view that there was a simple answer, to agree or disagree, either on the whole question or in relation to each source. In answering how far the sources support the statement, it is possible to argue that the evidence for or against is preferred or that, in some way, the statement in the question should be modified.

Answers to the question varied greatly. A few candidates produced answers which did not refer to the sources at all, some quoted extensively using the words of the sources but with little or no reference back to the question. For the rest, candidates mostly used the material to illustrate answers which either said Yes or No to the statement, or found reasons to support and challenge it. Whilst few candidates reached the highest level, there were some careful and well-constructed answers.

There was general agreement in better answers that sources B, C and D supported the hypothesis, whilst there was evidence in A and E to challenge it. In detail, the sources may not be so clear cut either in what is stated or when taken as evidence to be evaluated. Source A on the surface suggests the existence of schools with competent teachers teaching a range of subjects. On the other hand the author may be a Moravian himself, writing from Jamaica with the idea of creating a good impression of progress. Also, by comparison with Source B, it may not be typical of schools in the 1850s. With Source D, some candidates pointed out that the main criticism is of poor attendance by pupils, not the lack of schools or of teachers, whose efforts are hampered by never being able to plan a regular course of instruction. Using Sources C and E together to discuss the experience in Jamaica, it is possible to argue that over time (some) progress has been made and, by the use of the dates given with the sources, to reinforce the impression.

In the syllabus for this examination, where the description of what is expected of candidates in the source based question is given, it states 'Questions will be based on sources that might be used by historians in building up an account of the period or topic. Candidates will be expected to have an understanding of the ways in which sources may be evaluated.' Examiners felt that candidates rarely demonstrated these qualities consistently in their answers, though there were many who showed evidence of careful thinking and observation in some of their comments. Candidates who only use sources to obtain information do not score in the higher levels of marks.

Section B**Question 2**

How similar were the terms of the emancipation laws for the Caribbean colonies of the different European countries?

This question stressed a Caribbean-wide and comparative approach narrowly focused on the laws preparing for slave emancipation. A few candidates dealt only with British emancipation laws, but the majority of candidates did cover other parts of the Caribbean. France and Spain were the most usual other examples.

Good responses showed knowledge of different schemes whose details were described in greater or less detail. Better answers made running comparisons by topics such as immediate or delayed emancipation, compensation to former owners, lack of it for ex-slaves, availability and terms of manumission. However, most usual were the descriptions of the laws of one country followed by those of another, with any direct comparisons coming in a conclusion.

This was not one of the more popular choices of questions. Candidates who attempted it were usually well briefed in the details of the laws.

Question 3

Why and with what success were schemes for periods of transition between slavery and full freedom implemented in the Caribbean?

Some candidates wrote about amelioration proposals or concentrated wholly on the British apprenticeship period. The majority did cover other schemes, giving most detail about Britain and patronato in Cuba.

Many of the fuller answers were divided into three sections, responding to the different elements in the question. These began by giving general reasons for introducing the schemes, often linking home governments with planter interests and the desire to preserve plantation sugar production. Details of schemes followed, with British apprenticeship being given most attention. Either integrated in this or separately, there was assessment of 'success', or, more usually, failure. This was usually well done and precise details of Dutch, Danish and Spanish experiences, illustrated many answers.

There was a tendency on the part of some candidates to describe the British situation fully and only to make brief references to what happened elsewhere.

Question 4

How successful were the efforts of governments and landowners to control labour in the British and French Caribbean colonies after emancipation?

There were some good and comprehensive answers covering both French and British colonies in roughly equal detail. Occasionally a candidate would write an essay about British colonies alone, or with only passing reference to the French Caribbean. In this situation the comments about the French amounted to the effect that things were much the same in their colonies.

Amongst the full answers, there were some which were effectively in two parts, one about the French and one about the British. These often took the form of descriptions of the situations, with little comment on success or otherwise. Some such answers were lifted to another level by the explanation that the French government measures and policing were more effective, as greater government concern was given to the implementation of the complicated schemes which were introduced.

Within the details in some essays, candidates made attempts to analyse the situations in terms of coercion and incentives. Some candidates introduced the topic of immigration, which was explained as a means of controlling labour by introducing an element of competition into the labour situation.

Comments on 'how successful' were often implied rather than being specifically dealt with and given prominence. This was the weakest part of many essays.

Question 5

Why were some parts of the Caribbean region more favourable than others to the development of peasantries?

The best answers started with a definition and continued with an analysis of factors such as availability of land, ease of acquisition, incentives to move off the plantations or stay, planter and government opposition etc., with specific regional details as evidence. Variations of these themes enabled candidates to cover the topic in some depth.

In general, knowledge of this topic was very good, though for many the organising of the answer proved to be difficult. Weaker answers usually began well enough, with land availability the key factor. Some answers consisted of little else but the ratio of land and population. Beyond this, introducing other factors sometimes led to a catalogue of relevant facts, randomly presented. Better preliminary planning was needed in many cases.

Candidates sometimes failed to make the best of the opportunities presented by the question because they linked area of land available directly with the formation of peasantries in an over-simplified way. British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica were favourable to the development of peasantries because they were big. Often that was the sum of the argument without a consideration of other factors which came into play, for example, the easing of the way to obtain land in Jamaica through the intervention of missionaries, or the greater availability of land with the abandonment of some estates after the Sugar Duties Act. With the passage of time there were greater opportunities to obtain land in Barbados than was implied in many answers.

Question 6

Examine how the Cuban sugar economy achieved undisputed superiority over its Caribbean rivals during the nineteenth century.

There were many full and well developed answers to this question. The reasons for Cuba's success were well known. On the other hand, some answers concentrated too much on the disadvantages of Cuba's rivals, resulting in unbalanced essays.

Candidates often enumerated reasons why Cuban sugar production expanded to such a great extent. Reasons such as extensive fertile virgin soil, organisation of estates and factories into large units (centrals and amalgamations), mechanisation, use of railways, access to markets, labour supply and links with the USA were cited by many. The combination of factors enabled Cuban sugar to compete for price not only with its neighbours but in a market where beet sugar was increasingly important. One problem for candidates was that some items were mentioned in outline only. For example, railways were built, but why is that important? One reason was that they played an important part in the use of large central factories, conveying cane which might spoil if not processed quickly across the greater distances from the cane fields to the factory, and it was a means of bulk transport to supply the machinery with the quantity of cane which made its use economic. Precise details of organisation and mechanisation were comparatively rare. Their inclusion, or other details, would enhance answers.

Some answers gave almost as much detail about the decline of Jamaican production as to the details about Cuba.

Few answers expanded on the phrase 'undisputed superiority' in the question.

Question 7

Explain the development of the Black and Coloured middle classes in the Caribbean after emancipation.

There were few answers to this question. Often the responses were short and lacked relevant detail and explanation in the answers. Few candidates started with a definition of middle classes in this context. Education and the development of the peasantry were cited as relevant factors, but there was little supporting material.

This was a question in which the concept of change over time is important. Though the coloured middle classes were an important feature of Jamaican society before 1860, much of the development of a black middle class within the period covered by this paper is found towards 1900. Opportunities opened through education for professional people to enhance their roles in society (teachers, civil servants), and increasing wealth for some (peasants who employed labour, shopkeepers), qualified them as voters and so on. These were developments which were gradual and were 'work in progress' in 1900. As opportunities opened to them, Black people were able to push back the barriers which had restrained them before.

Question 8

Why did emancipated Blacks fail to gain any share in the government of Jamaica and Barbados under the Old Representative System of colonial government?

Very few candidates attempted this question. Most only made a few points and did not gain many marks.

Answers could have concentrated on details of the system of government under the Old System and on the powers accumulated by the Assembly, itself dominated by the white elite of each island. The Colonial Office in London did not push for changes especially after the problems in Jamaica in 1838 and 1839.

The right to vote in elections to the Assembly was restricted by financial qualifications. Reforms in Barbados did little to widen the franchise. There was little or no encouragement to bring emancipated Blacks into politics and opportunities opened very slowly in the 50 years or so after emancipation.