

# 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 although there were variations between the levels of achievement of individual Centres. The number of candidates increased significantly when compared with 2001. Most candidates had prepared carefully for the demands of the examination but some displayed unsatisfactory qualities of argument and knowledge. Examiners were pleased to read some very interesting and well-informed scripts.

Centres are particularly advised to read carefully the comments below about **Question 1**, the source-based question, because this type of question is new to most candidates. In one sense, the question is predictable because candidates are informed that they will be presented with a group of primary sources on the First World War, and that they will be required to use all of the sources to discuss a specified question. A guide to answering source-based questions is available from Cambridge International Examinations, and Centres are advised to use that guide in conjunction with this report.

In **Questions 2 to 8**, the essay questions, the highest marks were given to answers that were explanatory or analytical rather than descriptive or narrative in approach. Examiners were looking for relevant arguments that were supported by appropriate historical knowledge. Candidates should note the key instruction in questions ('Explain why', 'Assess' 'To what extent'), and they should concentrate their argument on the key issue. This will help them to avoid mere narratives or general descriptions. The key instructions and key issues in the essay questions are noted below.

Most candidates answered the required four questions. Each question carried equal marks (25 out of 100) and therefore candidates should spend a similar amount of time answering each question. However, about 15 minutes of the 3 hours examination time should be spent reading the sources and preparing the answer to **Question 1**. It is a good idea to write a brief plan to outline the main qualities, similarities and differences in the sources. Indeed, it is also a good idea to write a brief plan for essay answers.

### Comments on specific questions

#### Question 1

*'War would have been less likely in 1941 if Britain had taken a stronger stance against Germany'. Use sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.*

The standard of the answers to this question was more variable than in the more orthodox essay questions. The lowest level of answer ignored the sources and provided only a general essay about the causes of the First World War. This approach could not merit a satisfactory mark because the question asked 'Use Sources A - E to show...'. Answers in the middle mark bands often summarised the sources and provided brief accounts of their importance but they did not examine their similarities or differences. Paraphrases without comment could not be given a high mark. The more successful answers did not only deal with the source in a sequence, but tried to decide which confirmed and which contradicted the claim that war would have been less likely if Britain had taken a stronger stance against Germany. For example, Source A demanded that the British navy should be enlarged against the German threat. In Source D, Grey warned of British intervention if German went to war with France. These sources support the claim. On the other hand, Source B shows Grey as being evasive, promising only neutrality whilst the British Foreign Minister's stance in Source C was unclear. Source E claims that Britain was dragged into war by its allies in the Triple Entente. These sources contradict the claim. The best answers went further to assess the reliability of the

sources. Some made too much of the fact that the writer of Source A was anonymous; there might be several explanations of this. However, the date (1901) was well before the real danger of war was apparent and this diminishes its importance. The source was printed in a journal and, like newspapers, journal articles are often unreliable. Sources B and C were records of formal interviews by diplomats; they were reliable statements of what was said but they did not necessarily reflect Grey's true feelings. Sources D and E were written from a German viewpoint. As the Ambassador to Britain, Lichnowsky would have been familiar with British politicians, but his post-war Memoirs were not necessarily completely reliable. The tone of Source E shows that Brandenburg, although a German, was sympathetic to Britain's dilemma in 1914. Candidates' background knowledge could be used as further aids to assessments of the sources.

## **Question 2**

The key instruction was 'Explain why', and the key issue was the establishment of Napoleon's strong autocratic government in France. The highest marks were awarded to answers that were analytical, providing reasons for Napoleon's ability to establish an autocracy. Narratives that only told a story were awarded fewer marks. Good answers focused on Napoleon's government. It was possible to examine economic, religious and social policies but these were given most credit when they were linked to the autocratic regime. It was very relevant to consider Napoleon's role. A structure of central and local government was established that gave him direct or indirect control over most officials in France. Some candidates also pointed out the use of harsh police measures to control any opposition.

## **Question 3**

The key instruction was 'Assess', and the key issue was the political and social effects of industrialisation. Weaker answers tended to describe the causes of industrialisation. These causes could be given credit as an introduction, but they did not deserve a high mark because they did not focus on the key issue. The best answers concentrated on assessments, considering the extent to which Europe was changed by industrialisation. The social impact was usually dealt with more successfully than the political effects. A number of essays assessed a range of social changes. Among the political changes that might have been considered were the growing strength of the urban working classes, seen in the demands for the franchise, and the rise of the industrial middle classes. The traditional landed aristocracy still retained much political power in Britain, France and Germany at the end of the nineteenth century, but the new classes were challenging their monopoly. Industrialisation also helped to make Britain and Germany more powerful countries.

## **Question 4**

The key issue involved a comparison, and the key issue was the success of Cavour and Mazzini in uniting most of Italy. Candidates are advised to avoid sequential descriptions when answering comparative questions (i.e. dealing first with one statesman then the other). Higher marks were awarded when candidates selected and discussed particular issues in turn, for example, their aims, their attitudes to foreign intervention, their support and their response to their problems. Examiners were looking for balanced answers that gave approximately equal attention to Cavour and Mazzini. Such answers often gained high marks whilst those that concentrated on Cavour and said much less about Mazzini could not achieve a high mark band. A point that some candidates could have noted is that Cavour was not responsible for the unification of Venezia and Rome within Italy, which took place after his death.

## **Question 5**

The key instruction was 'Why' and Examiners rewarded most highly the answers that included a series of reasons. The key issue was the growing interest in imperial expansion. The general standard of the answers was good, but some candidates would have been awarded higher marks if they had illustrated their arguments with more examples. Some very moderate essays made relevant but vague claims about imperialism and lacked examples. The scope of the topic is wide and Examiners did not expect examples from all over the world, but a selection of such examples was necessary as historical knowledge to support claims.

## **Question 6**

The key instruction was 'how stable', and the most successful answers considered evidence for stability and instability in Russia. The key issue was the condition of Russia from 1906 to 1914. It was relevant to explain the background to 1906, for example the Russo-Japanese War and the 1905 Revolution, and candidates could refer to the effects of the First World War on Russia and the outbreak of the Russian Revolution.

However, these could only be given credit as introductions and conclusions; they were not a necessary part of the answer, in view of the time-period that the question specified. The highest marks were awarded to answers that were analytical rather than descriptive or narrative. They showed a good knowledge of the period from 1906 to 1914. Answers in the middle bands were either unbalanced or more narrative. For example, they claimed either that the tsarist regime was either completely stable or completely unstable, or they described a sequence of events with little comment. The least successful answers usually outlined the situation in 1914 and then described the developments to the outbreak of the revolution in 1917.

### Question 7

The key instruction was 'Why', and therefore Examiners awarded the highest bands of marks to answers that were analytical. The key issue was the support of Germans for Hitler's Nazi regime. Some answers gained credit when they pointed out that Hitler did not enjoy universal support in Germany. Candidates examined the appeal of Hitler's political, economic, foreign and social policies. Some candidates were well aware of the effectiveness of Nazi propaganda. The overall standard of the answers was good.

### Question 8

The key issue was 'To what extent', and the most successful answers examined the extent and limits of change in Russia. The key issue was the establishment by Lenin and Stalin of a Marxist regime in the Soviet Union. It was helpful when the answers tried to define what is meant by a Marxist regime, and some very good essays noted the contradictions in the policies of Lenin and Stalin. Some answers would have been given a higher mark if they had been more balanced between the two leaders. Answers that showed a good knowledge of one and thin understanding of the other could not get beyond one of the middle mark bands. Examiners were impressed by the way in which some candidates demonstrated their ability to explain the main features of Marxism and link these to the policies of the two leaders.

**Paper 9697/03**

**Paper 3**

### General comments

Compared with either of the 2001 examinations, there was a great growth in the number of Centres entering candidates for this paper. An unusual feature of this summer's entry was that more than half of the Centres entered either one or two candidates only. These Centres were often geographically isolated, which reduces the possibility of staff coming together to help each other prepare their candidates. For such Centres in particular this report – and other distance support provided by CIE – becomes even more important.

The main message of this report is the value of working on the techniques of answering the compulsory source-based question. At present, able candidates are losing valuable marks simply because they do not do what **Question 1** asks of them. It is vital that candidates examine the sources carefully and critically. They must not take them at face value. If they do, they limit the marks they can receive to about half of the total, at best. Once they start to evaluate the sources, they can gain considerable reward. Evaluation requires careful reading of the passages. In their understandable hurry, candidates often misread and misinterpret. **Question 1** is a question where it pays to read and think and plan before writing the final answer to the question. In this respect, **Question 1** should not be approached in the same way as the three essay questions.

The essay questions are less of a problem. Unlike **Question 1**, they are set on a specific topic with which candidates will already be familiar. The question is normally clear enough. The candidates then use their prepared knowledge and understanding to answer the specific question. Normally they do so. Even here, however, in most cases there is room for improvement. Candidates still tend to describe and explain rather than argue and analyse. The latter is the more sophisticated skill and receives the greater credit. Candidates still tend to write about the topic rather than focus carefully on the particular question asked of them. Again, the latter receives more credit. Relevance is all.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

*Source-based question on the United Nations and Economic Development*

*How far do Sources A - D support the view that, in the period 1945-1991, the UN specialised agencies hindered the economic development of Third World states?*

The growth in the number taking this paper means that it is no longer possible to identify the proportions in the three broad categories mentioned in previous reports. In a way, as Teachers become more familiar with the requirements of this type of question, such information serves little useful purpose. What can remain from the previous report are the four forms of evaluation identified by Examiners, which provide a useful indication of different approaches candidates can take. They are as follows:

- By testing the reliability of what a source says against their own knowledge of the topic.

In the case of this topic, the role of specialised agencies, about which candidates are likely to know little, this form of evaluation is harder. This is not to say that candidates should go quite as far as one who wrote:

*Source B can be quite difficult to evaluate since the origin of the source comes from the Brandt report, which I've frankly never heard of before.*

Such honesty, while refreshing, gains no credit. (In fact, the comment was untypical of the rest of the candidate's answer.) Even if the Brandt Report is unknown to candidates, they can still evaluate its arguments. Has the IMF assisted developing countries? Did GATT's partial exemption of developing countries from its 'most favoured nation' rule, really help such countries? It is likely that candidates will have some knowledge which will help evaluate the source, even if it is quite general or has been gained outside the history classroom.

- By testing the reliability of what a source says against what another source says.

There are some distinct differences between Sources A and B, which argued against the assertion, and Source D, which argued in favour. (Source C was harder for candidates to assess, as explained later.) Thus candidates could point out these differences, as a result of which they could decide how much value to give to each of the sources.

- By analysing the language and content of the source to indicate its bias.

If Source C is harder to evaluate, then insight is gained by carefully considering its language. The contribution of the newly-independent third world states is described as 'increasingly distorted'. The distortion is then explained as 'a crusade against private enterprise and open markets', with multi-national corporations being described as 'demons'. In other words, *The Economist* is critical of third world countries, which it sees as eventually harming its own self interest by limiting private investment by multi-national corporations. If these corporations were limited in their freedom of action, then presumably they could take their business elsewhere.

Many misread this passage, taking it to mean that the actions of UNCTAD helped the third world states. This is a good example of the dangers of taking a source at its face value.

- By analysing the language and argument of the source in relation to the author's purpose or audience.

Source C provides the best example here. If *The Economist* is a British journal, it is likely to be read by British business men, many of whom will be managers of multi-national corporations. They will want to read articles which support the work of such companies. In an argument between developing companies and multi-national corporations, *The Economist* will not be neutral. This type of evaluation helps reinforce the judgement reached by analysis of its content.

Some candidates evaluated Source A in this way, arguing that a British economist writing in 1955, at the height of the Cold War, and before decolonisation has really got underway, is likely to give a favourable view of the work of the World Bank.

In terms of approaches to the question, the vast majority of candidates considered each passage in turn. The danger with this approach is that it can cause the candidate to lose sight of the question. Many evaluated the sources but then failed to use that evaluation to answer the question. And when they did remember the question, candidates often ended up writing an answer to a different question, namely

*Using Sources A - D, explain how far you agree with the view that.....*

The type of question being used here does not ask for the candidate's view. It requires the candidate to evaluate how far a given set of sources support a particular hypothesis.

The best way of keeping the question in focus is to use it as the framework for evaluating the sources. In this case, the key issue is hindering economic development of third world countries. One half of the essay could be on evaluated evidence from the sources in favour of hindering and the other half on evidence against. This is a more sophisticated approach but at least it keeps the question in mind.

Whichever approach is used – and especially with the first, more usual method – a considered conclusion is absolutely essential. Only in the conclusion can candidates really reach level 6. Only in a conclusion can they provide a reasoned argument why one set of evaluated evidence is to be preferred. Or, if that is not the case, why the hypothesis needs modifying in some way or other. All candidates need to be encouraged to write a full and reasoned conclusion to **Question 1**. At the very least, they are likely to reach a higher level and mark than they would have done otherwise.

## **Question 2**

*How far do you agree that the Cold War in Europe broke out because Soviet and Western leaders misinterpreted each other's words and actions?*

This, the most popular of the essay questions, was usually well answered. Candidates have a sound knowledge and understanding of the origins of the Cold War and of subsequent historical debates. Thus most were able to answer the question. They explained how misinterpretations arose on both sides before considering other causes. The most popular alternative was that the Cold War was driven by ideology. Many realised that the 'misinterpretation' thesis was part of the post-revisionist hypothesis and so were able to include the traditional and revisionist arguments as well.

## **Question 3**

*'More often than not, superpowers, rather than causing regional conflicts, were reluctantly drawn into them.' How far does your study of the Cold War in the period 1950-80 support this view?*

Of the two questions on the globalisation of the Cold War, **Question 3** and **Question 4**, this was by far the more popular. As with **Question 2**, most candidates were very familiar with the topic. They considered, often in some detail, regional conflicts such as the Korean War, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Vietnam War, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Most used their knowledge to provide a useful and relevant analysis.

Few, however, really considered the significance of 'reluctantly'. The best answers considered not whether the superpowers were drawn into the conflict, but whether they went in reluctantly, as a last resort, because there were no other options. Thus many answers were not quite as sharply focused as they should have been. Nevertheless, most were still sound answers to a challenging question.

## **Question 4**

*Compare and contrast the policies of the USA and the USSR towards Vietnam in the 1960s and 1970s.*

A minority chose this question in preference to **Question 3**. The approach they usually took was a narrative one, which straight away limited their answer in that the comparison and contrast was not as explicit as it should have been. Furthermore, the narrative often started in the 1950s, with the withdrawal of the French, which meant that the answer contained more irrelevant material than was desirable.

Answers were further imbalanced by candidates' greater familiarity with the policies of the USA. So long as candidates have some awareness of Soviet policies and particularly of any alterations in those policies, this need not be a problem. The comparison is based more on an understanding of policies over two decades, than on a specific knowledge of Soviet policy in, say, 1972.

### **Question 5**

*How valid is the view that the Cold War came to an end only because American and Soviet politicians lost control of events in 1989?*

This popular question was frequently misinterpreted. The final two words were often ignored. Thus candidates, instead of concentrating on developments of the late 1980s, considered the end of the Cold War in a much broader context, often from the 1970s. (In this context, it is worth noting the candidates perceive the détente of the 1970s as leading to the end of the Cold War in the 1980s; the so-called 'Second Cold War' of the early 1980s seems to have been forgotten.)

The idea behind the question was that Gorbachev in particular lost control of events both in the USSR and in eastern Europe in 1989. He had to accept the end of the Iron Curtain and the reunification of Germany, which in effect meant the end of the Cold War in Europe. Whether he intended this outcome is a matter of debate. There is also some evidence that Bush dithered in deciding how the USA should respond to the developments of 1988-9, which is not all that surprising, given their unprecedented nature.

Most candidates, however, explained and analysed the policies of Gorbachev and Reagan; Bush, the one-term president, was often overlooked. Such an approach ensured an adequate answer to the question. However, the best answer required a more focused analysis.

### **Question 6**

*'Though less successful than the Partial Test Ban Treaty (1963), the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968) should still be counted as a success.' How far do you agree?*

The minority who attempted this question lacked a detailed knowledge of the consequences of the two treaties to be able to answer with any conviction. They often knew the main terms of the treaties. However the success of a treaty can be measured only by considering how far those terms have been carried out. The Non-Proliferation Treaty has not prevented the development of nuclear weapons by some states. That development has perhaps been limited by the existence of the treaty, by the restraints it imposes on nuclear powers and by its effect on international public opinion.

### **Question 7**

*'The Japanese economic miracle was as much a consequence of favourable external circumstances as it was of domestic policies and practices.' Discuss*

Very much a minority choice, this question was attempted by those who usually did know something about the topic. Answers usually showed a balanced understanding, to which a few also added some convincing detail about Japan's internal and external situation.

### **Question 8**

*Analyse the causes and consequences of the third world debt crisis which broke out in 1982, when Mexico defaulted on its international debt repayments.*

The reference to Mexico was included to show that a specific historical answer was required rather than a more general commentary on the continuing third world debt crisis. Of the few answers, most still took the general approach. However, it is pleasing to report that there were a few candidates who had a detailed knowledge and a sound understanding of the debt crisis of the early 1980s. They were suitably rewarded.

Paper 9697/05

Paper 5 History of USA c 1840 - 1968

**General comments**

There were 623 candidates, the largest cohort being from the Caribbean Centres, mostly at A2 level with a minority at AS level. As this is the first year the subject has been offered at A2 level, no direct comparisons are possible, but the former 9025/07 paper offered by OCR was very similar, except that the document question (now called source-based) was *not* compulsory for overseas candidates and the number of essay questions, hence choice, was much larger.

The overall impression is that the standard attained by candidates has been much higher, with a firmer grasp of factual material, better planning of essay answers, and in particular greater relevance. However there were some Centres at AS level where none of these characteristics featured, resulting in weak performances.

The compulsory source-based **Question 1** clearly gives problems to many candidates, and Teachers are urged to carefully study the marking notes for this type of question in specimen papers previously circulated and available from CIE. The key difference between the present syllabus and 9025/07 is that while the range, time period, number and type of sources are similar, there is *one* essay type question which takes the form of an assertion (or hypothesis) which candidates are invited to evaluate, in the light of the sources.

The key to attaining higher marks from 14 to 25, is to evaluate the sources in their *historical context*-to list specific examples external to the sources and to explain evidence to challenge *and* support the hypothesis, and at best, demonstrate which is to be preferred in an argued, evidential way.

**Comments on specific questions**

**Question 1**

*'There was never any real prospect that the 1850 Compromise would satisfactorily resolve the sectional tensions which arose out of the Mexican War.'* Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence supports this statement.

Though there were some excellent responses, most candidates appeared ill at ease with having to answer this type of question. It is advised that constant practice is desirable and **Question 1 (c)** of former UCLES and OCR papers from 1985 onwards can be used for this purpose. Many make the point that Source E was written long after the event, but this account can be used to give insights and approaches into the evaluation required. While most seemed to know who Clay was, few seemed familiar with the context of the 1850 Compromise.

**Question 2**

*Explain how and why belief in America's 'Manifest Destiny' proved so strong in the 1840s.*

A very popular question, with some good answers. The origins of the term were correctly spelled out by candidates, though not all grasped the implication that it embraced the whole North American landmass as destined to be American by God-given right, with little or no regard to the rights of existing inhabitants (Indians, Canadians, Mexicans). However the reasons for and the process by which (the 'why and how') this was to be achieved were dealt with less adequately. Only better candidates grasped the key point of why it was in the 1840s, rather than earlier or later, that this occurred. Weaker scripts spent too long on narrative descriptions of the Mexican War.

### Question 3

*To what extent did the former slaves benefit from Reconstruction policies between 1865 and 1877?*

A very popular question. Not all candidates observed the time limit and while the significance of 1865 (end of the Civil War) was generally recognised, that of 1877 (withdrawal of Federal troops from the South and the return of full state rights to the white majority) was not grasped. Candidates who started from 1863, the date of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation were not penalised. The approach adopted was generally descriptive or narrative rather than analytical or explanatory. Differences between Johnson's programme and the more radical one adopted by Congress were not explored and few candidates gave a convincing answer to the question posed. The right to citizenship proved to be meaningless in the South. The rights to vote and to hold public office were taken away by ingenious subterfuges (literacy tests and 'grandfather' clauses) largely because social structure of the Old South was not challenged by building an alliance between the freed men and the majority of whites who were not slave owners. This could only be done by redistributing land to both these groups once supported by financial backing and better educational opportunities.

### Question 4

*How far is it justified to speak of an 'agrarian revolt' among American farmers in the period 1867 – 1896?*

Few candidates answered this question and none answered it really well. Some interpreted the word 'revolt' in a very literal insurrectionary sense. Though there was no lawlessness on a large scale, let alone an uprising of farmers, there was widespread discontent and few candidates probed why this was so. Nevertheless, there was a deep sense of anger and betrayal among the large community of small farmers at what they regarded with some justification, as the disregard of their interests and general neglect at the hands of the financial and industrial elite who came to dominate America in the post Civil War period.

Owing to technical advance, agricultural production soared, but this simply meant lower prices particularly as grain and meat exporting overseas in Canada, Australia and Russia had entered the market. Banks were notoriously unresponsive to the particular needs of the farmer's financial cycle, and pitiless in repossessing farms if loans were in default. Farmers were also held to ransom by the railroad companies who overcharged them to take their produce to market, thus making them subsidise the large Trusts. Few candidates divulged these points though most mentioned the Granger Movement and its evolution into the Peoples Party which for a time challenged the dominance of Democrats and Republicans. Few analysed why these movements failed, in the short term, or how their demands were absorbed into Bryan's unsuccessful but dramatic Presidential campaign of 1896.

### Question 5

*Why, in the great battles over Civil Rights in the 1960's, was the plight of the Native American Indians largely ignored?*

A very popular question. Because of the relative sparseness of literature on Indian struggles, answers which laid the emphasis on African-American struggles, which are much better documented, were not disadvantaged by this approach. Responses dealing primarily with the civil rights of African-Americans followed a broadly similar path, starting with the Supreme Court judgement in *Brown V Board of Education of Topeka*. This outlawed all forms of discrimination in public (i.e. state) schools and ordered desegregation 'with all deliberate speed.' This landmark was the work of long series of test cases by the N. A. A. C. P, the oldest and most 'respectable' of black pressure groups. Most candidates focused on Martin Luther King's role as leader of 'civil disobedience' tactics in the face of great provocation, to ensure publicity for his people's causes. Some candidates dealt with Malcolm X's rival approach, more militant and significantly with no mention of 'non-violence'. King's links with the Democratic establishment were strong, and it can be argued Kennedy's open support for King in 1960 was a key factor in winning Black votes in the North and hence his election as President in 1960. Few candidates gave much emphasis to Native Americans. The obvious points, were: they were much fewer in number; they did not live in cities but in remote rural areas, often in reservations; crucially they had no desire to be part of the 'American Dream' or mainstream American life, hence they had never tried to forge political links like the more astute Blacks. African-Americans also, wanted to be treated like other Americans - as part of the mainstream, excepting fringe 'Back to Africa' movements.



## Question 6

*Evaluate the factors that caused the Great Depression in the United States.*

The key is 'evaluate' not 'enumerate'. However, most accounts did the latter, presenting narrative accounts with little analysis. In general terms, the capacity to produce exceeded the capacity to consume. Large sections of the workforce - farmers, workers in coal, textiles and traditional industries, did not share in the febrile and fragile prosperity of the 1920's. This combined with the natural trade cycle of boom-bust, and above all, the fact that the stock price boom was based increasingly on credit, bearing little relation to the underlying value of assets, meant that a spectacular fall in share prices was inevitable. Responses were weak in evaluating how the stock market collapse in October 1929 led to spectacular depression in all sections of the economy. Here, the fact that only a third of US banks were in the Federal Reserve System and the sharp *deflationary* measures which were taken, all made matters worse. No candidates drew attention to the vulnerability of US exports to European countries taking out US loans, which if defaulted on, had a knock-on effect on US industrial output. Better candidates mentioned the Florida land boom collapse as a precursor of things to come.

## Question 7

*Why, in spite of its stated policy of neutrality, did America enter World War I in 1917?*

This question was popular, but almost invariably a narrative approach was adopted which would only attain, at best, the middle pass mark bands. US neutrality was always one-sided due to first, the Anglophile and Francophone sympathies of the US political and financial elite; second, the willingness of the US government to sanction massive US credits and trade with Britain in particular. This led to an increasing reliance on the Allies avoiding defeat if these loans were to be honoured. Also, the US acceptance of the British naval blockade on trade with Germany, clearly favoured the Allied cause. A series of German blunders, in particular the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare, and the notorious Zimmermann telegram, plus the fall of the Russian autocracy, all pushed the US into involvement.

## Question 8

*Examine the consequences of the great expansion of higher education in the United States from 1945 to 1968.*

Very few responses to this question, none of any great merit. It tended to be a 'last resort' of the desperate, and answers were highly generalised with little factual content or relevance.

In conclusion, the attention of all Centres is drawn to the seriousness of candidates not attempting a fourth question. This did not seem to be the result of poor time allocation, but of knowledge being too concentrated in a particular section of the syllabus. In the cases where only three questions were attempted, passing grades were very difficult to attain.

**Paper 9697/06**

**Paper 6**

## General comments

Almost all the candidates completed the four questions required for this paper, though there were some examples of candidates misjudging their time so that the final answer was very short or in note form. Occasionally a candidate wrote two very lengthy answers and two very hurried ones. In general, candidates showed a good understanding of the topics they chose though on many occasions essays were not properly focused on the direct demands of the question. There were few really outstanding scripts and very few which were really weak.

There were some good answers to **Questions 3** and **6** but these two also produced some of the least focused responses. In the case of **Question 3**, many candidates wrote mainly about the stipendiary magistrates as a part of a general description of the Apprenticeship scheme in the British West Indies. **Question 6** was often answered by material on the decline of the Jamaican sugar industry mainly in the

period of the 1840s and 1850s, ignoring the word 'proportion'; in the question and the wider implications of the question (see details in the specific comments section below). **Question 2** was answered by some candidates with an account of humanitarian activity on the slave question going back to the mid-eighteenth century, with no comparative or multi-causal element, nor material from anywhere but the British West Indies. Such answers did not meet the requirements of the question and could not score high marks.

Major new demands in this paper are the compulsory source based question and the widening of the scope of the syllabus to a Caribbean perspective. Detailed comments on the responses to **Question 1** are given below. On the Caribbean perspective, whether the question specifically demanded wider references (e.g. **Questions 2** and **3**) or whether the demands were more open ended, the use of detailed and varied illustrations would gain credit. In addition, not all candidates seemed to realise that the paper covers the period down to 1900. Both **Question 5** and **Question 6** can be seen in terms of the fuller context of years down to the end of the century.

There were many well produced scripts, showing evidence of careful preparation and learning. The demands of the new syllabus were met with varying success and there were examples of high quality responses to most of the questions.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

*'The use of Indian immigrant labour was a success.' How far does the evidence of Sources A-E support this statement?*

Answers varied greatly. In the lowest mark levels, a few candidates wrote an essay about immigration with little or no reference to the contents of the sources. Slightly more advanced, a quite regular response was to go through each source in turn, commenting on each about success or failure but with no overall theme or conclusion. These usually took the sources at face value, as sources of information. Fuller responses in various ways looked at the sources as evidence, responded to the hypothesis and reorganised the material in response.

Interesting points were raised. Candidates made comments about Source A, sometimes regarding it as trustworthy (You would expect Governors to know things like this), sometimes suspecting bias or the desire to put a good case. Source D was sometimes viewed as a 'one off' illustration needing further confirmation, though some candidates thought that the Immigrant Agent-General would be a reliable witness. Both Source B and Source E were seen to contain mixed messages. Discussion of the meaning of success led some candidates to use Source C as a, perhaps exaggerated, sign that for the immigrants there was a better life in the West Indies than in India. Others dismissed it as irrelevant, viewing success in terms of contributions to the economic goals.

The variety of responses and ideas resulted in many good answers. The highest level was only reached by a few candidates.

#### **Question 2**

*How important was humanitarian campaigning in bringing about slave emancipation in West Indian colonies? (You must illustrate your answer from two or more European countries.)*

Many candidates made good use of both British and French experiences in their answers and, less frequently, reference was made to the Dutch, Danish and Spanish situations. Candidates who looked at humanitarian campaigning as one factor alongside social, political, economic and revolt factors were able to produce full and effective answers.

Two types of answer fell below the level of satisfactory. One was where only the British situation was detailed. Another was where candidates took humanitarian campaigning as the main theme, tracing its activities through eighteenth century court cases, abolition of the slave trade, amelioration and so on, with no reference to more immediate factors or comparisons.

Some candidates did mention economic and political factors but only briefly, and not in sufficient depth to develop a fuller answer.

### **Question 3**

*Why did the apprenticeship systems in British and Dutch West Indian colonies turn out to be unsuccessful?*

This was a question which not many candidates answered. Many who did had little to say about the Dutch colonies. Those who did deal with the Dutch tended to give a separate section of their essay over their experience rather than, for example, suggest that apprenticeship was contradictory, neither slave nor free, inevitably unsatisfactory, and illustrating the theme from both sets of colonies.

The majority of answers were entirely or mainly about the British West Indies. Many concentrated on the problems and failings of the Stipendiary Magistrates, while others tended to list the aims and abuses of apprenticeship but lacked discussion about its failure.

### **Question 4**

*Why was the labour of freed people unsatisfactory to employers after emancipation?*

The question placed emphasis on the employers' view of the situation in which they could no longer command the labour force in the way they had done in the days of slavery. Many answers outline the expectation of many planters that sugar production would continue with the same labour force but that, in varying ways and to differing extents, the freed people acted differently. Some answers would have been improved if more detail of the cultivation and processing of sugar had been added and used to bring emphasis.

Some candidates illustrated their answers effectively both from British colonies and the wider Caribbean. Others did not even mention a single colony by name. Many answers were graded in the middle bands of marks.

### **Question 5**

*Examine the circumstances which facilitated the establishment of peasant farming in the Caribbean after emancipation.*

This was attempted by most candidates. There were some well informed answers covering many reasons for the establishment of peasant farming and with a wide range of references to the British West Indies, the French West Indies, to Haiti and so on. Some answers carried the argument beyond the initial developments into the later nineteenth century, discussing peasant agriculture as a business, new or revived crops, exports and so on.

Some candidates wrote a significant amount about measures aimed at stopping the development of peasant farming. While this could be made relevant, it should not have been a major part of the essay. It was as much as half of some pieces of work.

There were also many general answers lacking in development and illustration.

### **Question 6**

*Why did the proportion of West Indian sugar exports produced by British colonies decline after 1846?*

Many candidates seemed to make the assumption that this was a question on the results of the Sugar Duties Act upon Jamaica and wrote lengthily on that theme alone. There were some candidates who simply accepted that there was a general decline in the quantity of sugar produced by British colonies.

More successfully, candidates pointed out that British West Indian Sugar did not decline absolutely, citing the examples of British Guiana, Trinidad and Barbados, but that British colonies were eclipsed by Cuba with its greater areas of suitable land, better technology and organisation, investment and superior quality of sugar.

Unfortunately, it was a minority who took the broader way to answer this question and the main quantity of responses was disappointing.

### **Question 7**

*In what ways and with what success did those in authority attempt to influence the labouring classes in the Caribbean after 1838?*

Many candidates chose this question and virtually all concentrated on restrictive legislation and the efforts of planters to tie the working classes to the plantations. This aspect was often well done, with the inclusion of a good deal of information about the French islands.

Good though these might be, such answers did leave out important aspects. Planters had other roles than as employers. Most candidates did not stress that the white elites continued to dominate the law making and law enforcing elements of government including police, prisons, taxation systems and regulation of drumming, noisy celebrations and other aspects of traditional black culture.

In addition to these cultural matters and the idea of cultural imperialism, education was an area of activity through which white ideas and expectations might be transmitted and social control exerted.

### **Question 8**

*What explains the recurrence of popular protests by Afro-Caribbean peoples in the second half of the nineteenth century?*

There were very few answers to the question, mostly of the weaker or narrative type e.g. giving accounts of the Angel Gabriel Riots, Morant Bay Rebellion and the Confederation Riots in Barbados.

One way of approaching the topic could lie in the fact that emancipation in itself did not create a new order and so there were continuing grievances and problems.

Among the responses were local demonstrations and strikes (sometimes with violence). Candidates could also relate the individual causes of the more high profile events (Angel Gabriel - economic, racial, religious), or try to discover linkages (white dominance continued in government etc.)