

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.....	9
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 standard of the candidates was satisfactory. Most scripts demonstrated a reasonable level of understanding and knowledge and a worthwhile number contained answers that reached a high standard. The most important qualities that are required to do well in this component are relevance, sound arguments and accurate knowledge. Relevance is the ability to select appropriate knowledge from the material that has been learned and apply it to a particular question. The most successful candidates performed this task effectively but some less successful candidates would have gained higher marks if they had taken more care to answer the exact questions that were set, instead of writing general accounts. For example, **Question 2** was not a general question about Napoleon but asked candidates to link his rule with the French Revolution.

Every question had a key instruction that candidates could use to frame a good argument. For example, **Question 2** asked 'How far..?' and **Question 6** asked 'How true..?' When answering these questions, candidates gained the highest marks when they explained arguments that could support the claim in the questions and those that provided alternative explanation, then justifying which are the more convincing. **Question 3** and **Question 4** asked candidates to 'Analyse'. Analysis requires the explanation of relevant elements of a topic as its relevant parts are examined. Using these key instructions to answer questions is advisable because it helps candidates to avoid narrative – the tendency to tell a story that is not linked to an argument.

Each question also has a key issue that candidates need to focus on. The key issue in **Question 3** was pre-industrial and post-industrial society and the social issues were more important than technological change. The key issue in **Question 5** was what was 'new' about late nineteenth century imperialism. Answers that described general changes in the Industrial Revolution or reviewed imperialism without considering what was new could not merit high marks. However, this Report should point out that most candidates did pay attention to the key issues.

It is important that candidates use their time effectively. Most candidates completed four answers as required. Some scripts showed evidence that the last question was weaker than the other three but this was usually explained by weaknesses of knowledge rather than by a shortage of time. Previous Reports have encouraged candidates to spend a short time in planning answers. This can be very helpful in organising answers because it is difficult to write and plan answers at the same time. Such plans should be brief; they are not marked and are designed only to help candidates to work out the main issues that they intend to discuss. They contribute to the good organisation of answers. Candidates should ask themselves, 'What do I know that is useful to answer this question? How do points link to the question that is asked? Which are the most important points that should be mentioned first?'

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The question asked candidates to use five sources to consider the claim that Austria-Hungary was not to blame for the quarrel with Serbia. It is not necessary to use one's own knowledge in answers to **Question 1**, although this can be helpful in evaluating the sources. It is possible to reach a moderate but probably not a very good standard, by dealing with the sources sequentially, that is Source A followed by Source B, followed by Source C and so on. Poor answers usually described them in sequence but did not try to assess which sources supported the claim and which contradicted it. The most successful answers compared the sources and often tried to place them in groups. The best candidates came to a conclusion that showed their own judgement about the claim.

More credit was given when candidates explained how each source fitted into an argument, but some answers spent too much time summarising the extracts (Source A says that... Source B says that...). Quotations from the sources could be brief but the sources should be used specifically.

Source A was an anonymous article that was published in an American magazine in 1894. A few candidates could not understand why it was relevant to the question. It shows the confused nature of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, although the writer believed that it was fundamentally strong. One can conclude that Austria-Hungary would be very concerned about the activities of small groups and states that might threaten its unity. The writer is anonymous and the article appeared in an American magazine, not in a learned journal. This might limit its value. However, the writer's views are confirmed by what we know of Austria-Hungary at the end of the nineteenth century.

Most candidates noted that Source B confirmed the claim because it is aggressive in its language. However, the best answers pointed out that it was the constitution of a small terrorist group and did not necessarily represent the views of the Serbian government or of most Serbians. This limits the extent to which we can say that it confirms the claim in the question. Sources D and E agreed with each other in their confirmation of the claim in the question. The highest credit was given to the answers that considered the provenance, or origin, of the sources. Some candidates noted the close alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary that helps to explain Source D. Both of these countries were hostile to Serbia, especially after the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, and this influenced these Sources.

Most candidates noted that the Source that most clearly disagreed with the claim was Source C. Moderately successful answers tended to accept uncritically the Serbian despatch to its embassies, but thoughtful candidates realised that Pasic, the Serbian Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, would have been trying to defend the policies and actions of his country.

Most candidates were convincing in their assessments of the sources' reliability. Source A can be regarded as neutral; it realises the problems as well as the strengths of Austria-Hungary. Some candidates did not differentiate between the reliability of Source B as the constitution of a terrorist group and its value in depicting the attitude of the Serbian government. Moderately successful candidates often accepted the reliability of Sources C, D and E too easily because they were official statements, but official statements can be unreliable, especially in times of crisis, as in the summer of 1914.

Section B

Question 2

How far did Napoleon Bonaparte maintain the ideals of the French Revolution during the period 1799 -1815?

The question asked candidates to consider how far Napoleon Bonaparte maintained the ideals of the French Revolution. These ideals could be summarised quickly and there was no need to spend a long time in describing the origin of the French Revolution and developments from 1789 to 1799. The focus of good answers was on Napoleon Bonaparte. High credit was given when the answers examined developments such as Napoleon's government and administration. How far did his autocracy contradict revolutionary ideals? It was relevant to examine factors such as his relations with the church, education and the Napoleonic Code. Some candidates spent too much time describing the events in foreign policy. This was unnecessary and usually irrelevant. Although it was allowable to explain how far his foreign policy promoted or contracted revolutionary ideals, candidates should not have spent much time narrating foreign events.

Question 3

*Analyse the most important differences between a pre-industrial society and an industrial society in the nineteenth century. (You should refer to developments in **at least two** of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)*

The answers that were awarded the highest marks concentrated on social issues and supported their argument by brief references to at least two countries. For example, they considered the growth of an urban working class ('proletariat') and the increasing importance of a middle class that benefited from industrialisation. The decline of the aristocracy in the nineteenth century should not be exaggerated but the nobility was not as dominant in a post-industrial society than in pre-industrial Europe. Some candidates would have been awarded higher marks if they had devoted more time to social factors and less to describing the technical changes that were involved in industrialisation.

Question 4

Analyse the reasons for the growth of nationalism in Europe during the period from 1815 to the unification of Germany and Italy (1870-71).

The Examiners read some interesting and informed accounts of the growth of nationalism in Europe. The most successful answers were balanced in their discussions of Germany and Italy and they linked the achievements of leaders such as Bismarck, Cavour and Mazzini to the conditions that enabled nationalism to increase. These answers tried to examine developments from 1815, for example the influence of the Vienna Settlement and the early attempts in the 1820s and 1830s either to express or suppress nationalism. Low marks were awarded to answers that only told the story of a few politicians, usually Bismarck and Cavour, and assumed that they represented nationalism. These answers did not demonstrate the range of understanding and knowledge that was necessary for a high reward.

Question 5

What was 'new' about imperialism in the later years of the nineteenth century?

The term 'New Imperialism' was familiar to most candidates and Examiners read answers that were very relevant and well-organised. The most important weakness in moderate and poor answers was the lack of examples or supporting knowledge that could have substantiated general claims about what was 'new' in imperialism. Examiners do not require comprehensive examples in this topic because candidates can study imperialism in the context of different regions, for example Africa or Asia, but it is necessary to be able to provide examples to illustrate general claims.

Question 6

'The First World War was the most important cause of the Russian Revolution.' How true is this claim?

Most candidates were able to make effective links between the First World War and the outbreak of the Russian Revolution. There were very few irrelevant answers. The highest marks were usually awarded to answers that analysed the importance of the War and considered the comparative importance of other causes of the Revolution, for example the contrast between Nicholas II, a weak but inflexible Tsar, and the demands of an autocratic government, the failure of policies from 1906 to carry out effective reforms and the relative importance of the opposition. Some candidates described Russia's involvement in the War but did not explain why it caused a revolution to break out.

Question 7

How similar were the methods by which Hitler and Stalin governed Germany and the USSR respectively during the 1930s.

Examiners were pleased with the quality of most of the answers to this question. The best candidates wrote answers that concentrated on comparisons of Hitler and Stalin. They devoted approximately equal time to each leader. Some answers in the middle bands could have been organised better. The first half dealt with one leader and the second half with the other; the comparison was limited to conclusions. These conclusions were usually valid but the material could have been used more successfully to concentrate on the comparison throughout the answers. Some weak answers displayed knowledge of only one leader.

Question 8

Which was the greater threat to autocracy in the nineteenth century, industrialisation or political liberalism?

The key aspects of the question (autocracy, industrialisation and political liberalism) are specified in the syllabus, but the quality of the answers tended to be disappointing. The most important reason why higher marks were not awarded was usually that candidates found difficulty in explaining liberalism. Some answers lacked examples of any of the key aspects. However, it was pleasing to read some well informed and persuasive answers to this question. Most candidates used Russia as an example of autocracy but some discussed France or Germany.

<p style="text-align: center;">Paper 9697/03</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Paper 3 – International History, 1945 - 1991</p>
--

General comments

The general comments for this examination are much the same as for earlier examinations. Too many candidates underachieve because they do not answer the specific question set. This time, **Question 6** was the most extreme example of this tendency. They usually have a sound knowledge of the topic but they cannot apply it effectively. It is so important that candidates, before they start answering each question, make sure that they have clearly identified the key issues which the question asks them and requires them to consider. Ideally, they should also continue to check that they are keeping to the point as they write the essay.

This failure to keep to the point is more marked with essay questions. When it comes to **Question 1**, there are very few who write about the topic and thus restrict themselves to Level 1. Most analyse the sources and show how they do or do not support the hypothesis. Most, however, go no further. They fail to evaluate the sources. They must question the content of the sources and thus assess their worth, if they are to reach Level 4 or higher. This is the element of the examination which at present is the biggest bar to improvement of results. It is worth stressing that candidates who do evaluate at least one source for and one against will reach Level 5. The rewards of doing so are therefore considerable. It is hoped that the complete answer to **Question 1** in the next section will give a clearer idea of the approach that candidates need to take in order to break the Level 3 barrier.

Almost all candidates answered four questions. There was a handful of candidates who ignored the instruction to choose either **Question 3** or **Question 4** and thus paid the penalty of having only the better of their two answers included in their final mark. Most candidates wrote three reasonably solid essays: the most common combination was **Question 2**, **Question 4** and **Question 5**. Of the three, **Question 5** caused the most problems. Quality of English was usually good and often impressive. The main problem was neither coverage of the syllabus nor writing skills. It was that candidates too often forgot the golden rule: answer the question set.

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

Source-based question: How far do Sources A-E support the view that 'international efforts to curb the growth of international terrorism in the period 1945-1991 were worthless'?

The following is a complete answer to this question which might help provide a clearer idea of how candidates should approach the compulsory source-based question (minor errors of English have been corrected).

Source A states that the international community has had a detrimental effect on terrorism: rather than curbing it, it furthered it by actively supporting the terrorists in the case of Palestine. This source, however, does not imply that the international community, or more specifically the UN, has no role to play in future efforts to combat terrorism: it actively suggests that a thorough investigation of the problem is carried out and implies that something can be done. Taken at face value, it halfway supports the hypothesis that *'international efforts to curb the growth of terrorism ...were worthless'*: it suggests that while in the past there has produced nothing of value [sic], the future has potential and opportunity.

However, this source discusses only the issue of Israel/Palestine: an issue that is always contentious and subject to emotionalism. Mr Abdallah, while a UN delegate and so presumably well informed as to current affairs, is strongly biased against Israel. The *'Zionist terrorist organisation'* is given a *'large portion of Palestine'*; the Palestinian retaliation, on the other hand, is a *'sacred duty'*. This does not conform entirely to the facts – Jewish peoples were given a home in Palestine as far back as 1918, with the Balfour Declaration – and while the Palestinians were miserably treated, it places doubt on the reliability of the author's other statements. His theory that the elevation of so-called terrorism *'to a state doctrine'* led to the spread of international terrorism appears particularly dubious. However, his point that international intervention perpetuated terrorism in at least one instance – Palestine – remains sound and, as such, supports the theory that international efforts to curb terrorism did nothing.

Source B is again directed largely at a specific form of terrorism: in this case the Soviet re-naming and condoning of international terrorism. The author places terrorism in the light of the Cold War, excusing the UN's ineffectiveness by suggesting that *'political polarisation'* made action impossible. The author implicitly suggests that the Soviet Union supports terrorist action by stating that it *'at no time condemned terrorist activitiesas long as the conflict could be regarded as revolutionary'*. This source appears to say, as Source A did, that the international community has done little to diminish terrorism. However, in this case it points the finger at the capitalist [sic] bloc.

Source B is not particularly reliable or exact: as it was written at the height of the second Cold War, from a British perspective, it understandably paints the USSR in a negative light. The author is also vague about what terroristic activities the UN did support: most of the conflicts that the USSR did support were genuine revolutionary movements, states imposed cannot really be regarded as terrorism [?]. Hence the author does not offer much convincing evidence.

Source C, unlike the other sources, suggests that collective action *'does matter'*. It does not mention the UN and, unlike Sources A and B which while both purporting to talk about international terrorism seem to refer more to internal struggle, talks entirely about hijackings and the measures put in place to stop them. This source is unique in adopting a positive tone.

C suggests that international co-operation can counteract terrorism; however, it refers only to Western countries – no mention is made of the USSR – and it deals with a very specific threat, not a general trend. While it is relatively easy to implement security measures in airports, it is much more difficult to apply them to a whole society. And it fails to address the issue stressed in Source A: the root of the problem.

Source D, written by a British expert in international terrorism, provides a reasonable assessment of the whole situation. It speaks of both the UN and other general measures as having a role; points out the divisive effect of the East-West divide – *'mutual accusation by the superpowers'* – thus supporting Source B; and speaks of the difficulty of dealing with terrorist activities perceived as *'legitimate armed struggles'* (Source A – the Palestinian view of terrorism; Source B – the USSR designation of terrorism as *'revolutionary'*). It says that it may take a while for international enforcement to occur – again supporting Source A – and sums up by pointing out that the policies on air-piracy and protection of diplomats were effective.

This source is useful in that it appears reliable and supports a significant proportion of the evidence from the other sources, hence increasing their reliability. It does not disregard international measures as worthless; however, it does point out their significant limitations to small and self-contained areas.

The final source speaks only of governmental attitudes towards terrorism, arguing that the majority ignore terrorism and that this is tantamount to supporting it. This appears a valid point but the author provides no evidence to support his theory and he is an Israeli politician writing in 1986 (after the first *intifada* with its violent terrorist action) in a book called *'How the West can win'*, which makes his words rather suspect. All in all, his point that pretending that something does not exist allows it to flourish is correct, but it adds little evidence of value – other than to support Source A, in that international action with regard to Israel was ineffective.

In conclusion, sources A-E both support and disprove the hypothesis that international efforts did little to curb the growth of international terrorism. Source D sums things up most effectively: international co-operation has been obstructed by obstacles but some measures have been effective. However, all the sources are from a relatively narrow time period – 1977 to 1986 – and so do not fully address the time period specified in the question. Furthermore, it appears from the sources that at no point was the question posed in Source A – the actual cause of the problem – addressed. Without investigating and understanding the problem, all measures are but superficial.

This answer was awarded full marks. It is not perfect. There is certainly one factual error: the first intifada began in 1987, after Source E was written and not before. The concluding argument about the limited time period of the passages is not the strongest; sources will rarely cover the whole period. The question only ever asks whether the sources support the hypothesis, not whether they prove it. However, this is a very impressive answer: all sources are evaluated and there is an attempt in the conclusion to evaluate the sources as a group. It was written in 45 minutes by someone who had no prior knowledge of either the sources or the topic. The latter is a point worth stressing. Centres often worry that their candidates will find an unfamiliar topic almost impossible to answer. This candidate would not have studied international

terrorism in detail. However, the candidate was able to use some contextual knowledge of the Middle East question to help evaluate the sources. More importantly, this candidate had the skills of evaluation, which were applied effectively, if not perfectly. Developing the skills is more important than gaining the knowledge. The latter should come from studying international history from 1945 to 1991, as is required to answer the essay questions. Admittedly, something extra needs to be provided on the United Nations during the Cold War. However, for **Question 1**, practising the skills of evaluation is the most important requirement.

The reality is that most candidates do not evaluate the sources. They explain the sources, often at great length and they show how the sources support or undermine the hypothesis. Assuming that they find evidence both for and against, they usually reach Level 3. They take the information at face value. They do not question the worth of the information and/or argument of each passage. In addition, they often question the source of the passage. Many argued that Source A was valid simply because it was taken from a report of a United Nations organisation: if it is from the UN, it must be reliable. Similarly, candidates tend to assume that a Western source taken from the Cold War must be anti-Soviet. Such automatic responses to sources are to be discouraged. Candidates should concentrate on what the source says rather than who the source is. Once candidates evaluate the evidence before them, judging their worth against their own knowledge or against other sources, then they will go through the barrier of level 3.

There are three further points about **Question 1** which need to be made. Firstly, there was a small but growing number of candidates who wrote a general essay on the topic in which they used brief references to the sources to support the points they were making. Such answers received Level 1 marks because the sources were used in a secondary role when they should have been the centre of the candidate's attention. Secondly, some candidates leave **Question 1** to last. There is a great danger in doing so, namely that **Question 1** is not given enough time and the answer is rushed and incomplete. Usually the conclusion is sacrificed. Which leads to the third point, namely that in answering **Question 1** a conclusion is absolutely essential. A conclusion, where the relative value of evidence for and against is measured, is the only chance of reaching Level 6. Sources have to be evaluated first but once evaluated they must be reviewed in that all-important conclusion.

Section B

Question 2

How far do you agree that the Cold War broke out in Europe because the USA and the USSR disagreed fundamentally about how they should treat the shattered European economy?

As always, the question on the origins of the Cold War was the most popular of all. It was usually well answered. The main problem for candidates was balance: how long should they spend on economic issues and how long on other issues, mainly political? Many spent far too long on economic matters, assuming they had to prove that they were the cause of the Cold War. Others gave economics short shrift and moved quickly on, in one of two directions. The majority chose the narrative approach, which often took them back to the depths of the Second World War. A minority wanted to explain the three schools of interpretation, orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist; the detail of the period was rarely mentioned.

Examiners were looking for a properly balanced approach in terms of coverage, approximately equal attention being given to economic and non-economic factors. Which is not to say that candidates' arguments had to be balanced, giving both sets of causes equal value. Candidates can argue strongly in one direction, just so long as they explain why the counter-argument is unconvincing.

Question 3

Why did the Cold War spread to the Third World in the 1960s and 1970s?

Of the two questions on the globalisation of the Cold War, this was the less popular. It was also less well answered, most candidates describing how the Cold War spread rather than why. They provided lengthy accounts of the Cuban missile crisis and the Vietnam war. Sometimes narratives contained reasons, such as the policy of containment, but they did not provide the full and balanced analysis that focus on the causes would have brought.

Question 4

How far do you agree that none of the great powers involved in the Korean War had expansionist ambitions?

This was popular and usually well answered. A fair proportion of candidates knew their post-cold war history of the Korean War; Soviet documents released in the 1990s showed that both Stalin and Mao were reluctant to launch an attack on the South, that North Korea was the keenest to go to war. Knowledge of US actions and possible motives was also sound; many analysed how those motives might have changed in response to the changing balance of forces during the war.

The most frequent mistakes were to spend too long describing the situation of Korea before 1950 and to consider only the USA and the USSR as relevant great powers. China should have been considered as well, as indicated by the 'none' in the question.

Question 5

How far was the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 responsible for the collapse of the USSR in 1991?

In trying to answer this question, most candidates fell into one of several traps. The first was to write almost exclusively about the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, often (again) with a great deal of marginal background material. The second was to concentrate on the USSR, omitting Eastern Europe almost completely. The third was to write about events in Eastern Europe and in the USSR but without making any causal connection between the two.

The third approach came closest to meeting the requirements of the question. However without trying to identify cause and effect, candidates were providing descriptive answers only. The most likely link between Eastern Europe in 1989 and the USSR in 1991 was that the former served as example for the latter. The non-Russian nationalities within the USSR, especially in the Baltic provinces, looked to Poland, East Germany and Czechoslovakia in 1988-89 and were encouraged to take their own independence. On the other hand, they could not have done so but for Yeltsin, who by 1989-90 was working to subvert the existence of the USSR. Those who explained the collapse of the USSR by reference to Gorbachev's glasnost and perestroika had a point but they did not have the complete answer.

There is one important point of knowledge that often let candidates down. Many did not know which states were part of the USSR and which belonged to Eastern Europe. The Ukraine and the Baltic provinces were frequently located in Eastern Europe. A proper understanding of the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the USSR requires a proper knowledge of the political geography of the two regions.

Question 6

Analyse the reasons why the nuclear arms race between the superpowers ended in the 1980s.

The majority of answers to this question consisted of a description of the nuclear arms race from 1945. Only in the final few paragraphs did candidates start to provide relevant information. Even then, the material was often descriptive rather than analytical, 'how' rather than 'why'. Such answers could receive only limited credit. Candidates must be reminded of the need to look very carefully at the question and to ask themselves 'what exactly do I have to write about?' A brief attempt to answer the question will receive more credit than a lengthy attempt to write about the topic.

Question 7

'The development of the international economy in the period 1945-1991 favoured rich countries at the expense of the poor.' How far do you agree?

This was more popular than had been expected. Most turned the question into a discussion about the role of the IMF, World Bank, GATT and multi-national corporations. That discussion was unhistorical in that it showed no sense of the changing context within which these institutions worked. Virtually everyone who took this approach used their evidence to support the question.

There are two points to be made about such an approach. Firstly, the question was about the development of the international economy rather than global economic institutions. Thus candidates needed to show some awareness of change over time, of the different stages in the development of the international economy, for example, the impact of the oil price crises of the 1970s or the Third World debt crisis of the 1980s. Secondly, every question in the form of an assertion has two sides to it. Some poorer countries have benefited from the changing international economy, especially those in Asia. To be fair, the better candidates did consider the examples of Singapore, Thailand and Taiwan. However, they were very much in the minority.

Question 8

Account for the rise of Islamic fundamentalism in the Cold War era.

A few candidates did attempt this question. The most common approach was to write about an aspect of the history of modern Islam, such as the Iranian Revolution of 1979, and then in a descriptive fashion. Some wrote off the topic, describing Arab-Israeli wars of the 1950s and 1960s, which showed only their confusion about the question. No one really analysed the factors which might explain the rise of Islamic fundamentalism: the context of the Cold War, of the materialist ideologies of West and East, of the intrusion into Islam societies of Western culture.

Paper 9697/05

Paper 5 – History of USA c. 1840 - 1968

General comments

Though the total number of candidates was significantly less than in 2002, there were still entries from all the world's continents (except for Oceania). As always, there was considerable variation in standards. The work for some candidates was excellent and a delight to read. Responses were characterised by relevance, focusing on the precise demands of questions set, good quality material in many cases illuminated by an awareness of the work of historians past and present, and above all an analytical and/or explanatory approach to questions. One got the impression, to quote from the Generic Mark Scheme for Essays in History (which should be required reading for all Centres), most candidates were fully in control of the argument(s) advanced.

However, it was disturbing to note the large number of responses which have little if any relevance to the question set. In many cases there was what appeared to be a prepared set answer to be put down irrespective of the question actually set. Such answers could only at best be placed in Band 4 (14–15 marks). A fault which was surprisingly frequent was to write only three answers instead of the required four. In no cases did it appear that this was because of time problems, but rather that the candidate was unable to find a fourth question to answer from the several available. It is suggested that candidates should prepare and revise in depth at least five of the seven topics listed in detail in the syllabus to allow for questions which appear uncongenial. In some cases candidates have shown clear ability in the three questions answered but would find it extremely difficult to obtain a high grade of the basis of three answers. **Question 4** was seriously misinterpreted by the majority of candidates responding. If one misses the point completely on a question, no marks can be given, so it is essential to avoid questions where one is uncertain as to the area covered.

Comments on specific questions**Section A****Question 1 (Source based question)**

'When Douglas put forward the principle of popular sovereignty he made a disastrous error'. Using Sources A - E discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

This question was indifferently answered by most candidates. Far too many candidates failed to realise that only limited marks (L2 6–8 marks) can be awarded if responses only support or challenge the hypothesis (assertion) put forward in the question. Most candidates simply used the sources at face value by summarising them to support and challenge the hypothesis. This approach can only earn L3 (9–13 marks). Marks in higher bands could only be earned by 'interpreting and/or evaluating the sources in their historical context'. Some candidates did this and were rewarded accordingly. Those responsible for preparing candidates were urged to familiarise themselves with the guidance given in the edition of 'Documents on the Sectional Conflict in the United States' published by Cambridge Examinations and also with the marking notes referred to earlier, applicable to source-based questions. It is also good practice to answer this compulsory question first as it requires different techniques from the essay questions in **Section B** of the Paper.

Section B**Question 2**

'How significant in the period up to 1890 were the social and economic consequences of the westward expansion of the United States?'

This was the most popular essay question. The best candidates addressed both social and economic consequences but weaker ones used the question as an opportunity to relate a narrative about acquisition of territory, the Mexican War and Oregon question. Most made some reference to Manifest Destiny. Commencement and terminal dates were at times ignored. 1890 was stated in the question and c. 1840 in the rubric heading of the Paper.

Question 3

Evaluate the factors that secured the victory of the Union in the Civil War.

A very popular question; one had the impression that candidates had too much material and were not quite certain what to do with it. Too few 'evaluated' factors as required, being content to describe the obvious factors such as the Union's higher population, greater industrial, railway and financial resources and the ability to mount an effective naval blockade of the Confederacy. Better candidates pointed to the Confederacy's early victories as evidence that victory for the Union was by no means inevitable.

Question 4

Why was it so difficult for governments to regulate big business effectively in the period 1865 to 1890?

Few responses, and poorly done. At least half the candidates misread the question to refer to the reconstruction period of the post war. Familiarity with the published syllabus would show that reconstruction is a separate topic, examined (if selected as a question) by **Question 3**. Those answers that were relevant tended to be very general and unfocused, though some pointed to the strong political influence by lobbying, favours and straight forward corruption that the Trusts exercised over Federal and State governments.

Question 5

Explain the principle factors which secured successes for the Civil Rights Movement between 1950 and 1968.

A very popular question with some outstanding answers, while others were little more than generalised rhetoric. One was looking for *explanations*, for example, a preacher like Dr Martin Luther King in the 1930s would have been either lynched or more likely driven out of the South, never to return. A wave of post-war liberalism, the effect of television on millions of people or for Southern Blacks to see the affluent lifestyle of Northern Whites, all played a part. Also the effect of the Cold War on America as the 'land of the free' and 'leader of the free world', and the groundbreaking Brown case so that for the first time Afro-Americans had the law on their side in trying to desegregate schools, transport, and public places. Responses did not stress sufficiently the importance of the Voting Rights Act and other federal Civil Rights legislation. The best answers queried the *extent* of the successes.

Question 6

Why did the Wall Street Crash occur in 1929?

Generally weak answers, with too little specific knowledge displayed and lots of answers detailing the effects of the Crash (outside the question) or the details of the crash itself.

Question 7

To what extent was isolationism the key doctrine of US foreign policy from 1921 to 1941?

Not a popular question. Most responses stressed the active nature of US foreign policy in the 1920s and the reactions against Wilsonian internationalism. Few displayed any real conviction in showing how the US was slowly sucked into the European conflict from 1934 to 1941.

Question 8

How true is it that the quality of life for most Americans rose dramatically between 1945 and 1961?

Very few answered, and those that did so engaged in little more than guesswork.

Paper 9697/06

Paper 6 – Caribbean History, 1794 - 1900

General comments

Candidates produced much good work in the examination. Very full answers were given to **Questions 1, 2, 4 and 5** in particular. Though few candidates attempted **Questions 3 and 7**, both were well done in the majority of cases. **Question 6** required the careful selection of material by candidates. Many answers were quite brief on the relevant material and contained much that was not needed.

The majority of candidates produced four full answers. It was noted that there were instances in which the final answer was brief, in note form or unfinished and, in a few cases, two answers were very short. Obviously, the final results of these candidates would be affected.

There were many excellent complete scripts. In addition many candidates produced one or two strong essays. Work on **Questions 1, 2, 4 and 5** often reached the higher bands of marks. The work in answer to **Question 1** was particularly noted as an area where candidates had been successful. It was also the case that, where appropriate, examples from wider Caribbean territories were included in answers.

Some candidates did not make enough use of historical examples to illustrate and develop their answers. This was sometimes noted in **Questions 4 and 5** where answers could be very generalised.

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

'All over the Caribbean, after emancipation, former slaves deserted the sugar estates in favour of independent, peasant farming.' How far does the evidence of Sources A-E support this statement?

Five sources were given, four from British West Indian territories. Source A about Jamaica, quoting increases 'in the number of proprietors of small freeholds' between 1838 and 1840, states that they belong 'almost entirely to emancipated slaves'. Source B, written in 1840, quotes the example of one estate owner in Antigua who sold parts of 'her property in small lots' to labourers who worked the land and also 'earned wages on neighbouring estates' etc. Source C, about British Guiana, contains quotations from the Governor (in 1844) and a Stipendiary Magistrate (in 1841), explaining the situation of 'those labourers who have become independent, agricultural freeholders'. The writer of Source D was a Police Magistrate in Barbados. Commenting on factors limiting peasant development, he explains that 'there is little opportunity to obtain freeholds'. Source E, the only non-British source, deals with French islands. A quotation from a history book written in 1970 is followed by a table of statistics identified in the provenance as 'statistics about labour on sugar estates in the French West Indies', with material for the years 1846 and 1856 given for comparison. The figures for the workers in those two years are very similar, and, as the extract from the book explains, provide 'us with an answer as to whether there was a mass desertion of the plantations by freed people after emancipation'. Other figures given show a relatively stable situation, with sugar production growing in Guadeloupe. A note states 'There was no immigration before 1854.'

One key element in answers was to discuss the statement in the question, perhaps especially the words 'All over the Caribbean'. Another was to assess 'How far does the evidence of Sources A-E support this statement?'

Many candidates did well on this question. Few failed to mention the sources and most went meticulously through them, identifying each by letter.

Candidates made full use of the content of the sources, picking evidence to support the point being made. Sometimes sources were used on the basis of first impressions, for example, Source B was frequently taken as confirming the contention in the question despite the reference to freeholders continuing to work on estates. Candidates often went through all the figures in Source E rather than looking primarily at the workforce. However, there was much to commend about the use of sources, especially when used as information in relation to answering the question.

There were many mature and perceptive elements in answers; though Source E caused problems for some candidates, others speculated to good effect about the size of the workforce. Was it possible to take the numbers at face value or were there changes which were hidden within the overall picture?

Within what was a generally favourable impression given in candidates' responses to this question, there were some aspects which were widely omitted. The provenances, especially the dates given, were little used. Though some candidates looked at questions of bias and reliability, this was relatively unusual.

Section B**Question 2**

How significant a part did slaves play in ending Caribbean slavery?

This popular question was usually answered in one of two different ways. The less usual one was to consider the various factors which have been seen as causes of the ending of slavery. These often had four or five sections covering economics, humanitarian activity and political events and treated slave actions as one factor. Many candidates concentrated on various forms of rebellion, from Haiti to misuse of animals and tools. These actions were seen as undermining the production of sugar and creating apprehension among white planters. Some answers went further showing how slave action linked with the end of slavery, the direct link of rebellion and freedom in the case of Haiti and St Croix and the more complex links between slave actions, the interest of missionaries and humanitarians in Britain and France and the further link to political action in 1833 and 1848.

References to the wider Caribbean context were frequent, though some candidates gave generalised accounts of slave activities, including those of women, without much reference to their significance.

Question 3

How did the rulers of Haiti seek to restore the plantation economy from 1794 to 1820?

Though this question was rarely answered, candidates who chose it were usually well briefed on the Haitian leaders, Toussaint, Dessalines and Christophe, and their aims and methods. Sonthonox's proposals were less frequently seen.

Most answers were clear and to the point, though some candidates did spend unnecessary time on Pétion and Boyer. Other candidates ended their answer with Dessalines.

Question 4

Why did freed people move off the sugar estates after emancipation?

This was the most popular of all the questions except for the compulsory **Question 1**. It was a high mark scorer for many candidates who adapted their knowledge to the particular needs of the question.

The core topics in many answers concerned the wish of many freed people to get away from plantation labour and its links with slavery, planters actions in the British West Indies on wages, rents and the use of laws and the expectations of what many freed people thought would be connected with their new freedom. Some candidates dealt with the economic possibilities of moving away. 'Emancipation drove a section of the former slaves to the towns, another towards unoccupied land: it gave rise to artisans and small farmers'.

Some candidates used examples from a variety of territories.

Few candidates ventured beyond the immediate post-emancipation years in their answers.

Question 5

Why did some freed people have difficulties in obtaining land to cultivate after emancipation?

This question was often answered successfully and at length. For some it was their fourth choice and so was answered hurriedly as time was running out.

Candidates used material about the British and French West Indies as examples.

Access to land was a major component of many answers, showing the difference between the larger and smaller territories. The high cost of land, where it was available, and the restrictive practices of planters were well explained. Legal restrictions, especially in French islands, were noted and details about the situation in Barbados were particularly useful in the context of this question.

Question 6

Why was immigration so widely used in the Caribbean region between 1840 and 1900?

Candidates often disregarded the dates in the question which were intended to cover not only British colonies but other colonies whose use of immigrants followed the British example later in the century. Many candidates restricted their answers to British Guiana and Trinidad.

It was also the case that some candidates did not plan their answers with the precise wording of the question in mind. There were answers which dealt with the 'why' element in the question quite briefly and went on to write about experiments to find suitable sources of labour or about the effects of immigration.

However, there were answers which covered the labour 'shortage' following emancipation and the difficulty of obtaining a sufficient and reliable labour force for sugar production. Candidates often indicated particular problems such as the relative shortages of labour in Trinidad and British Guiana as 'new' sugar producers and the impact of the Sugar Duties Act. The question of reducing the labour costs of production by introducing competition in the wage market, was often mentioned too.

Illustrations from the wider region were sometimes insufficiently developed, though candidates did use some details about Suriname to explain why there was a labour shortage there.

Question 7

Why and how were health facilities developed in the English speaking Caribbean after emancipation?

There were not many attempts at this question. The candidates who did choose to do it usually had a great deal of knowledge about British Guiana and Trinidad though some took a wider perspective to include public health measures in Jamaica and Barbados.

The 'why' element in the question tended to cover the problems of medical provision after emancipation, the poor facilities in the countryside, the emergency of the cholera epidemic and the continuing problems of endemic diseases. The special issue of the health provision for immigrants in British Guiana and Trinidad was strongly made in essays which concentrated on those two areas.

Some candidates were very well informed about government actions to improve medical services in British Guiana as a particular example. Work under Governor Grant and others in Jamaica also figured in detail in some essays.

Question 8

Explain the changes brought to the English speaking Caribbean by the introduction of crown colony government between 1866 and 1900.

This question was answered by very few candidates. Possible areas for discussion could be:

- the changes made in the method of government by the introduction of crown colony government to replace the old representative system
- the record of useful tasks performed, public works, irrigation, legal reforms, education, medical services etc. and their limitations, for example, because of shortages of money and local pressures by influential whites
- criticisms, shortage of representative institutions and failure to devise vigorous schemes for social and economic development
- crown colony government was centralised and paternalistic and did not do enough to involve blacks and deal with their problems.