

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9697/01

Modern European History, 1789 – 1939

## General comments

The overall standard of the scripts was satisfactory. Examiners were encouraged because they read some scripts that reached an excellent standard. On the other hand, there were also weak candidates whose work lacked understanding and knowledge. The Question Paper in this component is in two parts. **Section A** is a source-based exercise. It relies on candidates' ability to use sources, usually primary evidence, to discuss a problem and come to a judgement. This is very similar to the way in which historians work. They examine a range of primary material, which is usually written, consider the views of other historians and come to their own conclusions. They never accept primary sources or secondary material at face value but ask questions about their usefulness and reliability. For example, why has a source been written? What was the audience? How much was the writer likely to know? Whilst in one sense, all primary evidence and all secondary sources are biased because the writers have their particular viewpoints, they all have some value because they illustrate opinions. For example, in this session's Question Paper, Source C was a highly charged attack on Britain by the German Kaiser. At face value, it might be dismissed as valueless because of its extreme tone. However, a closer examination shows that it reflected strong anti-British sentiments held by somebody who was very prominent in the German government. All governments, including that of Germany, sought to justify themselves in the summer of 1914. Background knowledge could then be used to judge how far the members of the Triple Entente tried to use the Serbian crisis as an excuse, as the Kaiser alleged, and how far they tried to defuse the situation. Both the Kaiser and his Chancellor in Source B referred to the 'encirclement' of Germany; historians would examine how far this was justified and they would consider why Germany felt itself to be encircled. An historian would not necessarily write about the sources in the order that he or she had read them. The sources would be grouped to reflect the extent of their agreement or disagreement. Similarly, good answers to source-based questions are always better when they avoid a sequential treatment and the candidates group the extracts. Like historians, candidates are encouraged to compare sources to point out their areas of agreement and contrast them to note their differences.

The questions in **Section B** pose a series of problems that must answered in essay form. Candidates are encouraged to practise their skills in essay writing. Examiners look for a coherent and relevant but brief introduction. Points should then be presented and explained in order. These points should be supported by appropriate knowledge. Higher marks are awarded when answers indicate which are the more important parts of the argument and which are the less significant. Important points should always be explained first. A brief conclusion can summarise the main points that a candidate wishes to make.

Any dates that are mentioned in questions should be noted carefully and developments before or after these dates should only be included if they are linked to the questions. For example, **Question 2** asked about developments in France from 1789 to 1815. Discussions of the problems of the ancien régime before 1789 could not be given credit unless they were linked with developments from 1789. Answers that began in 1799 with Napoleon's triumph over the Directory were relevant but incomplete because they neglected the period from 1789 to 1799. **Question 4** was focused on Italian unification from 1848 to 1871. Therefore developments in Italy before 1848 should have been included only when they were compared with the post-1848 situation and answers that ended with Cavour's contribution did not cover the whole period in the Question.

Every essay question contains a key instruction, usually at the beginning. This indicates to candidates how the question should be tackled. For example, **Questions 2 and 3** asked 'Why...?'. Such questions look for analyses of reasons. These reasons should be presented in order of importance and, if possible, the reasons for this relative importance should be explained. **Questions 4 and 6** asked candidates to 'Assess'. Good answers present a series of factors, support the argument with appropriate knowledge and again explain their relative importance. **Questions 7 and 8** asked 'How far...?'. High marks are awarded when candidates explain the arguments in favour of a claim and those that contradict it, coming to a conclusion about the balance of judgement.

Most candidates used their time effectively. There were very few incomplete scripts. On the other hand, the scripts of some candidates indicated that they needed more practice in writing essays for about 40–45 minutes because their answers were too brief. Examiners do not give marks merely because of the length of answers but very short answers cannot contain the range and development that are needed for high marks.

It is worth reminding candidates again to write a short plan as an aid to the organisation of answers. The time allowed in the examination enables candidates to spend up to five minutes writing such plans. Plans help recall and structure. Answers are weakened when it is apparent that candidates suddenly remember different points late in essays and insert them awkwardly in the middle of other arguments. Good answers move from one point to another in a connected manner.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section A**

##### **Question 1**

This was a source-based Question on the general topic of The Origins of World War I, 1870–1914. The specific topic in this examination was 'Britain's attitude to Germany before World War I'. Candidates were asked to use four sources to assess the claim that 'Britain's attitude to Germany before World War I was unnecessarily hostile'. Few candidates had problems in understanding and interpreting the sources. Moderate answers tended to summarise them in sequence, sometimes with extensive paraphrases or quotations but little explanation. There was no attempt to discern similarities or differences between the extracts. In the middle ranges, answers often grouped the sources according to whether or not they agreed with the statement in the question, but did not evaluate them to assess their reliability or usefulness. The conclusions were sometimes very brief, for example only 'Therefore overall the sources prove that...' The highest marks were given to answers that attempted to assess the extracts and when this assessment went beyond bald and sometimes dubious statements. For example, Source A was not necessarily reliable or unreliable because it was a memorandum written by a civil servant. One needs to look at the content of the extract. What did he say and how can we use our own knowledge to test its reliability? Candidates were given credit when they considered the Kaiser's tone in Source C. A number of candidates did not note that Source B could be used to argue for and against the claim that Britain was unnecessarily hostile. Lloyd George was anxious to reassure the German Chancellor that Britain was not hostile, whilst Bethmann Hollweg saw British policy as a threat, seeing a particular danger of the encirclement of Germany, a country that he alleged Britain hated.

#### **Section B**

##### **Question 2**

The Key Issue was the reasons why, during the period 1789 to 1815, Napoleon Bonaparte was more successful than earlier French leaders in maintaining himself in power. The most successful candidates paid attention to the dates that were mentioned in the Question and discussed French leaders from 1789. They explained why Louis XVI failed to hold on to power after the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789, why a succession of revolutionary leaders fell after comparatively brief periods of power, and why the Directory lasted a relatively brief time. These reasons were linked to Napoleon's success. The highest marks were awarded to answers that were organised in a fully comparative way. For example, they examined Napoleon's methods of government and compared them with those who governed France from 1789 to 1799. They then discussed economic aspects and so on. The less successful answers were usually limited to surveys of Napoleon that did not compare him with other leaders. Some answers mentioned some leaders by name, for example Louis XVI and Robespierre, but did not provide any details. The discussions of Louis XVI's reign before 1789 were not relevant because they went outside the dates that were mentioned in the Question.

### Question 3

The Key Issue was the reasons why Britain was industrialised earlier than France and Germany. The most frequent discriminating factor between good and less creditable answers was candidates' ability to explain the slower progress of France and Germany. The discussions of the Industrial Revolution in Britain were usually at least satisfactory and sometimes very good. The Question asked 'Why...' and the best approach was to present an analysis of reasons. These answers were usually awarded higher marks than those that were highly descriptive and referred to reasons indirectly. Some candidates devoted much attention to agriculture but would have been more successful if they had explained the links between the Agricultural and the Industrial Revolutions.

### Question 4

The Key Issue was the reasons why Italy became unified during the period from 1848 to 1871. The quality of most answers was satisfactory and Examiners were pleased to read some excellent essays. These dealt confidently with the main reasons for Italian unification. They noted the key dates in the Question and their answers showed a good coverage of the period from 1848 to 1871. The Question did not require candidates to agree that the assistance of foreign powers was the most important reason but successful answers gave this factor adequate attention and compared its importance with other factors. Some answers would have been improved if their range had been wider. For example, some candidates only discussed foreign intervention. This was relevant but it did not explain whether it was the most important reason. Some answers were limited chronologically. They explained Cavour's relations with Napoleon III, which led to the inclusion of Lombardy, but neglected later stages that lead to unification with Venetia and Rome. Some candidates should note the death of Cavour in 1861; he was not responsible for the later stages of unification.

### Question 5

The Key Issue was the effects of New Imperialism and candidates were asked to consider whether the most important outcome was to increase tensions between governments. The least creditable essays sometimes focused on the causes of imperial expansion. Little credit could be given to these points because they were not linked to the Key Issue of effects. In the middle ranges, Examiners read answers that considered some results but very generally; these lacked examples although the argument was inherently valid. The most successful supported the argument with some appropriate examples, for example Fashoda was given as an example of Franco-British tension or the significance of the Morocco crises was examined. Examiners did read some excellent answers that combined convincing discussions of consequences and pertinent examples.

### Question 6

The Key Issue was the Bolshevik victory in October 1917. Most of the answers were competent and some were very effective, deserving high marks. There were two possible approaches to the Question. Candidates could take a long-term approach, beginning in about 1905 and concluding with the October Revolution. However, the danger in this approach was that candidates might write descriptive narratives that did not link earlier developments with the Bolsheviks' victory. The other approach was to focus narrowly on 1917, beginning with the February Revolution. There were some perceptive analyses of the Provisional Government, its weaknesses and its mistakes. This was complemented with judgements about the Bolsheviks in 1917, for example the leadership of Lenin, the influence of Trotsky and their appeal to a wide section of the population. Some good answers would have been excellent if they had devoted some more time to the October Revolution itself.

### Question 7

The Key Issue was the nature of Mussolini's rule in Italy from 1922 to 1939. Answers were given credit when they provided a definition, either implicitly or preferably explicitly, of a totalitarian regime. It was possible to compare and contrast Mussolini's government with those of Hitler and Stalin, usually to point out that the former's regime was not as extreme. There were some excellent answers that combined valid arguments with sound knowledge; these considered the limitations of Mussolini's authoritarian government. For example, whilst there was state-approved art, non-fascist art continued, as did non-fascist newspapers. The monarchy continued although the King had few powers whilst Mussolini agreed to the Concordat, a compromise with the powerful Papacy. Less successful answers were usually relevant but lightweight. For example, social reforms were described but not Mussolini's pattern of government. Economic measures were sometimes not linked to the Key Issue.

**Question 8**

The Key Issue was the comparison of Stalin and the Romanovs: did he carry out more extensive social and economic reforms in the period to 1939? The highest marks were awarded to answers that were reasonably balanced between Stalin and the Romanovs. Some excellent answers argued that, whilst Stalin was more of a reformer, some changes had been introduced by the Romanovs, although limited in scope and often reluctantly. The moderate and weak candidates usually confined themselves to accounts of Stalin and ignored the Romanovs. This did not meet the requirements of the Question, which was based on a comparison. It was interesting to read a few answers that were completely uncritical of Stalin, for example ignoring the purges and other hardships suffered by so many Russians.

# HISTORY AND HISTORY (SOUTHEAST ASIA)

---

Paper 9697/02

Paper 2

## General comments

In general the standard of the candidates was poorer than in past years. Candidates did not always seem to fully understand the demands of the sources question and in addition contextual knowledge for both the sources question and also the essays was at times a little weaker than in the past. There were no rubric error problems nor did timing seem to be a major problem for candidates but subject knowledge was a problem in some Centres.

## **Question 1**

This was the sources question and candidates were asked how far the sources supported the view that Britain's concerns over the threat to law and order in Singapore were exaggerated. Candidates had to examine both sides of this hypothesis using the sources to gain access to Band 3 and to evaluate the sources on both sides of the argument to gain a Band 5 mark. It was essential to have a valid summative conclusion to gain access to Band 6 marks and this also entailed having a good evaluation of all the sources and a sound conclusion or alternative hypothesis.

## **Essays**

There were seven essays and candidates had to select three to answer. It is important to remember that analytical essays, which actually engage with the question, will be better rewarded and that the analysis must be supported by sound contextual knowledge and regional examples. Each essay should have an introduction, a logical argument and a valid conclusion. Extensive narrative should be avoided.

## **Question 2**

This was asking candidates to examine how far Western Powers had achieved political control over Southeast Asia in the period 1870 to 1914. This has been a regular topic and is clearly subject material that has been studied extensively. Candidates could have examined Dutch rule in the East Indies, French rule in Indochina and then as a contrast, an examination of Siam and the Philippines would have been useful.

## **Question 3**

This was an economic question asking how well the rural populations of Southeast Asia responded to the economic opportunities and challenges of capitalism from 1900 to 1941. This essay needed a study of the change from pre-colonial villages and then the development of formal currencies, the Great Depression, tenant farming, and a more commercial approach. Examples and studies of Burma, Vietnam, Cambodia and Indonesia were possible and desirable.

## **Question 4**

The question was 'How significant was the growth of cities to the economy and politics of Southeast Asia before 1941?' This essay was fairly uniformly done poorly as it required concrete examples from specific cities and not just a more general overview of whole countries. It needed an examination of infrastructure, transport, the bureaucracy, local and city government, urban populations and their impact, the development of politics in cities and in particular it needed specific city examples.

**Question 5**

This question asked 'To what extent was nationalism in Southeast Asia up to 1941 based upon traditional ideas?' This essay needed a broad range of examples such as Indonesia, the Philippines, Indochina, Malaya, Siam, and Burma. The candidates were expected to be able to point out that Indonesia based nationalism upon Islam amongst other causes, whereas in Vietnam it was based upon communism. It is these types of example and analysis that were needed for this essay.

**Question 6**

This was a popular question and asked the candidates to assess the reasons why the Second World War was the turning point for nationalist movements in Southeast Asia. Candidates were expected to demonstrate an understanding of the character of anti-imperial movements before, during and after the Second World War and to assimilate those changes in the light of the events of the war. Examples from Indochina, the impact of the Japanese Occupation and the influence of the Super Powers after the war all needed to be examined.

**Question 7**

'How much were ethnic minorities allowed to participate in the politics of the newly-independent states of Southeast Asia?' This question was not popular and was infrequently attempted. Candidates were expected to examine the policies in Malaya, Indonesia, Singapore and Burma.

**Question 8**

'How successful were attempts at regional co-operation between the newly-independent states of Southeast Asia between 1960 and 1980?' This essay was again not popular and very rarely attempted. It required candidates to examine the 1960s, and the 1970s. In the 1960s there was much mutual distrust and trade rivalry was common. In 1967 ASEAN was formed. The role of ASEAN was the basis of this essay.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9697/03

International History, 1945 – 1991

## General comments

The examination paper for this session produced a wide range of responses in terms of quality. At the top end many candidates were able to produce answers to **Question 1 (Section A: The Source - based Question)** which offered effective evaluation of the sources in relation to the hypothesis in the question. This evaluation went beyond using information from the source at face value. However, only a small minority of candidates were able to reach Level 6, the top level of performance for **Question 1**.

It was apparent that those candidates who delayed answering **Question 1** to the end of the examination, as their fourth and final response, performed, in general, less well, than those candidates who attempted the question as their first response.

In **Section B**, the essay style questions, the most popular choices were **Question 2** and **5**, both questions dealing with aspects of the Cold War. The second most popular set of questions were **3, 4** and **6**, the first two on the globalisation of the Cold War and the latter on the development of nuclear weapons. Finally, only a minority of candidates attempted **Question 7** on the global economy in the 1970s and **Question 8** on the non-aligned movement.

A large number of candidates displayed sound knowledge of the subject matter of the questions attempted. However, several of these candidates did not achieve high marks because the knowledge and information was used in a narrative and/or descriptive way which did not always address directly the question on the examination paper. Those candidates who did achieve high marks used their knowledge and understanding of the subject to address the question directly. In these responses analysis of the question was consistent throughout the response. A useful device used by several candidates was to produce a short plan of what they planned to put in their answer. These plans were either in written form or in the form of a mindmap. Such plans enabled candidates to order the material they used in the answer in the most effective way to achieve a clear, balanced analysis in response to the question asked.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

#### **The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), 1982.**

*1 How far do Sources A–E support the view that UNLCOS was pointless and ineffective?*

**Question 1** produced a wide variety of responses in terms of quality and focus. The vast majority of candidates used information contained within the sources to construct a logical answer in response to the question asked. Most stated that Source A was supportive of UNCLOS. This was highlighted most clearly in the final paragraph of Source A where it was stated that UNCLOS 'identifies the appropriate balance between our interests (the USA) as a maritime state and our interests in coastal waters'. Support for UNCLOS also appeared in Source B. In the opening sentence it stated that UNLOS was 'vital to all those who use the seas'. This view was elaborated in paragraph 2. Source C also supported UNCLOS and stated that the Convention 'carefully balances the interests of states in controlling activities off their own coasts and the interests of all states in protecting the freedom to use the oceans without undue interference.'

However, both sources D and E took a different view. In the opening sentence of Source D it stated that UNCLOS was 'a bad deal for the USA'. This view was then explained in the rest of the source. In Source E, the opening sentence stated that it was 'a terrible idea when President Reagan (of the USA) refused to sign it in 1982'. It then explained why LOST (The Law of the Sea Treaty) was both pointless and likely to be ineffective.

However, to achieve high marks in this question candidates were expected to go beyond using source information at face value. For instance, the sources that opposed UNCLOS did so from purely a US perspective. Also, the provenance of sources D and E could be used to evaluate the quality of the opposition argument to UNCLOS. Both sources were by US conservatives. This offered only a limited range of opinion in opposition to UNCLOS. Candidates could also mention that the provenance of sources, in support of UNCLOS, could also be used to define the quality of argument. Source A was by the US Deputy Secretary for Oceans. This could be used in support of the view that the author either had expertise in the subject and/or may have had a vested interest in supporting and defending UNCLOS.

Also, in going beyond face value, several candidates developed a strong argument for and against the hypothesis through cross-referencing information between sources.

Finally, only a small minority of candidates achieved Level 6, the top level of performance for **Question 1**. They did this by stating, usually, in a final a paragraph, that the quality of evidence either for or against the hypothesis was stronger on one side of the argument. This was achieved by evaluating the evidence, on both sides of the argument, beyond face value, and then explaining why and how the quality of evidence differed. Alternatively, after offering an effective evaluation of the sources beyond face value, candidates were able to use the argument presented to suggest a change in the hypothesis. This took the form of stating that UNCLOS was not pointless but was ineffective.

## Section B

**2** *'The Cold War in Europe was caused by the superpowers' misjudgement and misunderstanding of each other'. How far do you agree with this view?*

This question was the most popular in **Section B**. A large number of candidates displayed sound knowledge of the events in Europe between 1945 and 1949. Also many candidates recognised that the assertion in the question was linked to the post-revisionist view of the outbreak of the Cold War in Europe from 1945. In support of this view many candidates stated that the USA did not understand the USSR's desire for security following the destruction and devastation caused to the USSR in the Second World War. As a result, the creation of Soviet satellite government in Eastern Europe was perceived as Soviet expansionism. Also, the Soviet response to the creation of Bizonia with the Berlin Blockade of 1948–1949 was also seen as an aggressive act, not a defensive response to the possible reunification of Germany. Misjudgement could also account for the USSR response to the Marshall Plan. Hence, this led to the Soviet refusal to allow states such as Czechoslovakia to join. Also in direct response to the assertion in the question 'many candidates referred to the long term reasons for hostility between the USA and the USSR. Such contextual information went back to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and tension which occurred between the West and the USSR during the Second World War. Although the inclusion of this information was useful in constructing an argument, many candidates wrote at considerable length on the long term context of hostility between the USA and the USSR to the detriment of coverage of 1945 to 1949.

In balancing their arguments many candidates were able to refer to other schools of historical thought on the causes of the Cold War such as the traditional or orthodox view and the revisionist view. In doing so the most effective answers supported their analysis with precise and detailed examples. Those candidates who took the opportunity to write in general terms about the historical debate on the causes of the Cold war, without supporting and sustaining their argument with detailed factual knowledge, did not score highly.

**3** *'The USA and USSR did not globalise the Cold War; they simply were dragged unwillingly into regional conflicts'. How far do you agree?*

This question proved to be quite popular. Most candidates were able to identify incidents within the development of the Cold War from 1950 where the USA and USSR were dragged into conflict. Some candidates cited the Korean War as an example of where the USA was dragged into regional conflict. Others cited the Arab-Israeli Conflict and conflict in South East Asia. An example where candidates offered a counter argument was Cuba. Here candidates stated that the crises of 1961 (Bay of Pigs) and 1962 (Missile Crisis) were both caused by direct intervention by both superpowers, the USA in 1961 and the



USSR in 1962. Other regional conflicts cited by some candidates were in Africa (Congo, Angola and Mozambique) and Latin America.

Several candidates underachieved in this question for a variety of reasons. Firstly, some candidates concentrated on one regional conflict or regional conflicts which accessed only a limited range of time in the period from 1950. Such responses were regarded as unbalanced in terms of historical coverage. Other candidates decided to construct their answers in narrative-chronological format beginning with the Korean War in 1950. Invariably analysis tended to be concentrated in the final paragraph.

**4** *To what extent did the involvement of the USA and USSR make the Arab-Israeli conflicts difficult to solve?*

Of the two alternative questions on the globalisation of the Cold War, **Question 4** was least popular.

Many candidates pointed out that in the early years of the Arab-Israeli Conflict (1948–1956), superpower involvement was minimal. Many candidates pointed out that US and Soviet intervention in the Suez Crisis of 1956 actually brought the Suez War to an end. As a result, most candidates concentrated on the post-1956 period when the USSR became the main sponsor of Egypt and Syria and the USA the main sponsor of Israel. Exemplars were offered in terms of the Six Day War of 1967 and the Yom Kippur War of 1973. Candidates argued that in both wars, in particular the latter, the Arab-Israeli Conflict clearly became a regional aspect of the globalisation of the Cold War.

As part of the construction of a balanced, analytical argument many candidates offered other factors which helped explain the continuation of the Arab-Israeli conflict. These included the Palestinian Refugee Problem, the unwillingness of Arab states to recognise the state of Israel before the Camp David Agreement of 1978, the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon below the Litani River and the Israeli occupation of the Golan Heights of Syria.

**5** *How far were Gorbachev's policies the cause of the collapse of the USSR?*

This was a very popular question. A large number of candidates displayed detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the collapse of the USSR. They were also able to display detailed knowledge of and the impact of Gorbachev's policies of perestroika (restructuring) and glasnost (openness). To many, Gorbachev's domestic policies made a bad situation worse. His policies did not redress the economic decline of the USSR. Instead his policies undermined the authority of the Communist Party of the USSR. They also helped fuel the growth of nationalism and separatism in many Soviet republics, such as the Baltic States and the republics of Transcaucasia. A Gorbachev policy change identified by fewer candidates was the Sinatra Doctrine. This abandoned the Brezhnev Doctrine which sanctioned Soviet military intervention in eastern Europe if the satellite governments of that region were threatened. As a result, the Sinatra Doctrine was an important factor in explaining the collapse of Soviet style regimes across central and eastern Europe in 1989.

This collapse fuelled separatism and nationalism with the USSR. It also fuelled the backlash to Gorbachev's policies by conservatives such as Ligachev. The August Coup of 1991, which led to the end of the USSR, was an attempt to reverse Gorbachev's reforming policies.

**6** *'The Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 was more important than the SALT treaties of the 1970s in controlling the growth of nuclear weapons.' How far do you agree?*

This was a popular question. Many candidates displayed sound knowledge of the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 and the SALT Treaties of 1972 and 1978. Several candidates adopted a narrative-descriptive or narrative-chronological approach which displayed only limited analysis and assessment of the question. Assessment, in this type of response was usually limited to the concluding paragraph. The candidates who produced the best answers engaged in comparative analysis of the two sets of treaties throughout their answer. In doing so candidates mentioned that the Non-Proliferation Treaty attempted to limit the number of states who possessed nuclear weapons. However, by 1991 India, South Africa and Israel had all joined the nuclear club. Also, Pakistan was developing the capacity to produce nuclear weapons. Also, France refused to sign the treaty. In addition, the Non-proliferation Treaty did not stop the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons, in particular, the Anti-Ballistic Missile systems of the USA and USSR. It also failed to deal with the rapid growth in numbers of nuclear weapons held by the two superpowers.

The SALT treaties dealt directly with ABM systems. However, these treaties also contained limitations. They were treaties between the two superpowers. Also, SALT II was not ratified by the US Senate following

the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the inauguration of the Second Cold War. SALT also did not stop of the Reagan administration development SDI in the early 1980s.

**7** *To what extent were the oil crises of 1973 and 1979 the major problem facing the international economy during the 1970s?*

This question was answered by a minority of candidates. In most cases this question was the final response. Many responses displayed only a limited knowledge and understanding of the global economy in the 1970s. Candidates mentioned the two oil crises led to major price increases in the world price of oil. In 1973 oil prices quadrupled and in 1979 oil prices doubled. These two crises helped fuel recession in the international economy. They resulted in a major slow down in economic activity in both North America and western Europe. The oil crises also fuelled cost-push inflation which, in turn, led to factory closures and industrial unrest. The oil crises also saw the rise in power of OPEC (The Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries). The rise in oil prices brought considerable wealth to OPEC countries. In turn, western banks received large money balances from these countries. Western banks had already begun to lend large sums of money to Third World countries who intended to use such monies to fuel economic growth. The 1970s economic recession badly affected this process, resulting in the rapid growth of Third World debt.

In an attempt to offer a balanced, analytical response several candidates cited other factors which proved to be major problems affecting the international economy. These included the collapse of the Bretton Woods System of international exchange rates, in 1972 with the Smithsonian Agreement. Also candidates mentioned the decline of smokestack industries in North America and western Europe when faced with increased international competition from countries such as Japan. The example of car manufacturing was given to support this view.

**8** *How significant was the Bandung Conference of 1955 to the non-aligned movement?*

This question proved unpopular. In the vast majority of cases it was the fourth and final response.

Candidates are expected to assess the reasons behind the development of the non-aligned movement in the post 1950 era and, in doing so assess the importance of the Bandung Conference. The Conference should be seen within the context of the Cold War and decolonisation. Following the end of the Korean War and the French War in Indo-China states such as Indonesia, Burma, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka laid the foundation for an international organisation separate from the US dominated West and the Communist Bloc.

The Conference was successful in creating a non-aligned movement which survived throughout the post-1955 period. It created the Third World as a separate entity from the two Cold War blocs.

However, the non-aligned movement suffered from its own internal conflict. Examples are The Sino-Indian War of 1962, the Indo-Pakistan conflict and divisions between African and Asian states within the movement.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9697/04

The History of Tropical Africa, 1855 – 1914

## 1 Questions

**Questions 1, 6 and 8** appeared to present difficulties, and were the least well answered. This was because candidates lacked the appropriate knowledge rather than because of the wording of the questions. Comments on responses will be given in **Section 3**.

## 2 Overall performance of the candidates

There was a big variation in the standard of performance from the different Centres, both in the quality of expression and in knowledge of the material. The best candidates spent time making essay plans and/or wrote an introductory paragraph which showed understanding of the demands of the question and indicated briefly their planned response which was developed in the body of the essay. Such candidates made a wise choice of questions based on the topics for which they had the appropriate knowledge. The question paper had a good range of questions on the syllabus, and questions were worded to test the abilities of the candidates to organise answers using their knowledge in an analytical response. Narrative predominated in the answers of the weaker candidates. Some scripts were of excessive length. Some candidates had difficulty writing in English as their second language and clarity of meaning suffered. Good candidates showed mastery of the language both in grammar and spelling and all candidates used paragraphs. There were many scripts of a very poor quality, badly expressed and lacking knowledge of the material.

## 3 Responses to individual questions

### Question 1

Answers to questions on this topic have often been weak, possibly because the most used text books (e.g. Tidy and Leeming) do not have a chapter exclusively devoted to the subject. There was a tendency to write at length about the abolition of slavery as an introduction. There is still an assumption that slaves were used extensively in European countries. Some knowledge was shown of the attempts to police the seas. Most answers referred to both East and West Africa, but knowledge of material on East Africa was scant. There was some relevant material on the continuation of slavery and the slave trade internally. There were no fully comprehensive answers meeting all the requirements of the question.

### Question 2

This was a very popular question and on the whole well answered, in that candidates saw the need to compare aims and achievements of the two rulers. There were only one or two answers with separate accounts. The best answers compared the two rulers on a topical basis, e.g. the army, administration, foreign relations, modernisation, pointing out similarities and differences throughout. Weaker responses made a token comment on comparison/contrast. Good candidates emphasised the initial success but ultimate failure of many of Tewodros's policies, and made a strong contrast between the foreign policies of the two rulers. There was good knowledge of the relevant material.

### Question 3

Answers to this two-part question tended to be uneven, with emphasis on the political, economic and social features as indicated in the question. Knowledge of factors contributing to success in empire building was sketchy, and lacked examples. Astute candidates realised that the features were contributory factors to building the Empire, but very few answers gave details of the military victories and diplomatic successes. Some answers digressed with irrelevant detail on the conflict with the French.

**Question 4**

This was a popular question and should have been straightforward with its three clear requirements, - reasons for calling the conference, the decisions made and their effects on both the colonial powers and on Africa. The few candidates who made a plan benefited in organising the material effectively. The explanation for summoning the conference caused problems in balancing general reasons for European interest in Africa against the more relevant immediate causes i.e. the chain of events culminating in Bismarck's involvement. Candidates did not find this easy. There was reasonable knowledge of the decisions and most answers commented on the effects on Africa as well as on the colonial powers. This was a demanding question. Knowledge was adequate to good, but ability to organise it effectively was often lacking.

**Question 5**

Only a few candidates had prepared this topic but knowledge was very limited. Developments were wrongly attributed to missionaries, and missionaries and mission stations were not named.

**Question 6**

There were very few answers to this question, all based on very limited knowledge.

**Question 7**

A popular question which attracted some good candidates who had both the relevant knowledge and the ability to adapt it to the demands of the question. Causes were dealt with more thoroughly than results. There were some effective running comparisons over a range of factors. Many candidates were unaware of the Rechenberg concessions, and some failed to distinguish between the results for the Shona and Ndebele. A few candidates were under the impression that Maji-Maji was the name of a tribe.

**Question 8**

Questions on railways are rarely well answered and this was true in this exam. Candidates are unable to identify railway networks in any detail, and have minimal knowledge of relevant economic developments. Many ignored the limitation to one region.

**Question 9**

This was a straightforward question and consequently there were some well-informed and clearly presented answers. There was an overlap of the reasons for adopting Indirect Rule and the strengths of the system which some weaker candidates found difficult to organise, but generally the responses showed that the teaching at good Centres recognises the nature and demands of the A Level syllabus. Weaker answers lacked knowledge of appropriate examples, in particular to demonstrate the weaknesses of Indirect Rule.

**Question 10**

Very few answers were seen.

**Other comments**

All candidates completed four questions without any suggestion that any were short of time. There were no common misinterpretations of the rubric.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9697/05

History of the USA, c. 1840 – 1968

## GENERAL COMMENTS

The general standard of the scripts was satisfactory and candidates had clearly been well prepared by their teachers for this examination. There were a number of excellent scripts and these were a pleasure to read, presenting relevant, analytical and well structured arguments using good quality material. However too many candidates seemed to think that writing about and around a topic would suffice, with little regard for the precise wording of the question. There were also too many very brief answers to **Section B** questions. While it is difficult to generalise it is not really possible to answer an essay question adequately, let alone fully, in less than one and a half pages. There were no major rubric infringements, but some candidates penalised themselves by answering less than the required four questions. It is desirable for candidates to revise thoroughly a minimum of five of the seven syllabus topics for essay questions so as to be able to avoid unpleasing questions on topics revised. Since the compulsory Source-based question (number 1) requires quite different techniques from that of the three essay questions, it is desirable that this question be answered first. Some candidates answered it last, a risky strategy when time constraints may be present.

## COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

### Question 1

#### **Compulsory Source Based Question:**

**'The 1860 Party Platforms proved that no further compromises between North and South would be possible.'** Using Sources A-D how far the evidence supports this assertion.

The great majority of candidates were able to attain Level 3, showing a good understanding of the Sources and giving evidence both for and against the assertion. However, to attain the higher marks from Level 4 upwards it was necessary to examine the Sources in their historical context, and this was attempted by only a minority of candidates and even then often only by a passing remark. To depict the Constitutional Union in Source A as unwilling to compromise showed a basic lack of knowledge, for it had been formed specifically for the purpose of bringing together the rival Sections in a compromise, hence its Platform avoided all contentious issues and focused solely on adherence to the Constitution, the Union and the Laws. However, this approach was unlikely to work because it presupposed a degree of trust between the Sections which was lacking e.g. the flat refusal of the North to accept the Dred Scott ruling of the Supreme Court. In Sources B and C candidates showed a lack of curiosity as to why there were two Democrat candidates and Platforms, which given the US voting system of first past the post, meant certain defeat for both of them and certain victory for their most feared opponent, Abraham Lincoln. Though the Sources appeared very similar most candidates realised that Source C was much more intransigent and had revived Calhoun's theory of state sovereignty i.e. the right to spread slavery into all US Territories. It was the only Source which showed that compromise with the Republicans in Source D would be exceptionally difficult. Most candidates pointed out that Source D was trying to marginalise the abolitionists and to broaden the appeal of the Republican Party. The continuance of slavery was impliedly (though not explicitly) accepted in the existing states where it was already lawful. This of course sat uneasily with the famous Preamble 'all men are created equal and have inalienable rights to life and liberty.' What united the party was unequivocal opposition to any expansion of slavery which set it in firm opposition to the Southern Democrats. Better candidates correctly noted the advocacy of a protective tariff (anathema to the Southern States) and also support for a Homestead Act which had great appeal in the crucial Mid Western States.

**Question 2**

**How valid was Turner's frontier thesis on the connection between the conquest of the frontier and the democratic national character of America?**

Answers varied from sound to really excellent. Candidates needed to show what the Turner thesis was. Drawing on the 1890 census report (which few candidates mentioned) Turner argued that the Frontier had now ended and with it a whole episode of American history which had formed the American national character, differentiating it sharply from its European origins. The qualities needed to subdue the huge American hinterland were hard work, pioneering instincts, rugged individualism, and social equality. All these in turn created the democratic national character of America. Too many answers confused Turner's thesis with the earlier notion of Manifest Destiny, though there were clearly similarities. The best answers marshalled a wide range of criticisms of Turner's thesis e.g. the role of the Federal Government, military conquest, and previous pioneering by Native Americans.

**Question 3**

**How was it that the original high ideals of post-war Reconstruction ended with the 1877 Compromise?**

Very popular. Most used rather descriptive narrative approaches which evaded the question put. Some candidates shrewdly argued that Reconstruction started in 1863 even before war ended. None queried the phrase 'high ideals'. However, while many Radical Republicans were determined to end the slave culture for good and all, others motives were much more self interested. The Republican ascendancy from 1860 onwards was based on very narrow electoral margins and an important factor in Republican calculations was to smash the political power of the planter class and to use the enfranchised Freedmen to secure permanent Republican dominance in the White House and Congress. The majority of candidates discussed Johnson's ambiguous approach to Reconstruction. He was the only Democrat Senator to remain loyal to the Union and while he detested the rich slave owners he was much closer in sympathy to the poor whites, who disliked and feared African-Americans; his main aim was to bring the 11 rebel States back into the Union as soon as possible. Surprisingly few candidates described the bitter clashes between President and Congress which got far worse after the 1866 elections, with the Radical Republicans in the ascendant; this in turn led to the attempt to remove President Johnson from office. Few responses drew attention to the lack of any serious attempt to win over the great majority of Southern whites who had never owned slaves, but this had to be done if the rebel States were to be successfully reintegrated into the Union. The key issue of land reform for the Freedmen was largely evaded; better scripts drew attention to this and also to advances in primary education for the Freedmen. After 1872 President and Congress seemed to lose interest in the plight of the Freedmen and the Southern whites were largely united in hostility to the new regime in the South. All this paved the way to the shady compromise of 1877 by which the Democrats conceded the Presidency to the Republican candidate who had almost certainly lost the election of 1876 and in return full States Rights were returned to all the rebel States and Federal troops were withdrawn from the South. However, the three Constitutional Amendments stood as a statement of what the Freedmen's right were in law, if not in practice. Most candidates described the various means by which Freedmen's rights to vote were thwarted, such as poll taxes, literacy tests and grand father clauses, not to mention violence and intimidation by the Ku Klux Klan.

**Question 4**

**Assess the role of technical innovation in the rapidly expanding US economy from 1865 to 1914.**

The responses were highly descriptive with only a few candidates offering an assessment rather than a list. Answers focused heavily on railroad expansion, rather than innovations and inventions from 1865 onwards, such as the steam turbine, the dynamo, the telegraph and telephone and Ford's assembly line production of automobiles to name but a few. All drove the US economy to record growth so that by 1914 it was the largest industrial economy in the world. Other factors were largely overlooked by candidates such as mass immigration of cheap highly motivated labour, huge financial investment from Europe, particularly Britain, a government and legal system which was pro business and hostile to organized labour, a culture of regarding unrestricted free enterprise as a moral imperative. No candidate pointed to the very large number of patents registered in the US in this period, nor to the influence of the Trusts such as Standard Oil on the economy. There were no statistics given to illustrate the huge growth in industrial production in this period.

**Question 5**

**Examine the contention that President Lyndon Johnson did far more in practice than Martin Luther King for the civil rights of African-Americans.**

A highly popular question. Johnson's role was downplayed considerably and many answers seemed to have little idea of the enormous influence a modern President has on legislation. Some candidates went as far as to suggest that his role was simply that of an official who signed off the Civil Rights legislation when it came before him. This was to seriously underestimate the skill, patience, ruthlessness with which Johnson guided through the two main Bills which became the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act. He used his experience as Majority Leader of Senate to contain and circumvent the Southern veto in the Senate, which had defeated all earlier attempts. After the Bills became law he went on to harass and bully recalcitrant State Governors into putting them into effect. He also pushed through the 24<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution which outlawed poll-taxes and similar devices. No one candidate mentioned this last feat, the first Civil Rights constitutional amendment for nearly 100 years. However, Dr King's role was crucial in a different way and without his charismatic gift of inspirational leadership there would not have been the necessary political climate for the President to act. Better scripts dealt on King's masterly use of the mass media, in particular television, which brought home to the nation the oppression suffered by African-Americans in the South who dared to press for civil rights. However, few candidates pointed to his great political skill in building effective contacts with liberal Democrats in the House and Senate, though he himself never stood for elected office. The shift in the Black vote from Republicans to Democrats occurred as a result of King's efforts, the turning point being the 1960 elections when Kennedy openly wooed the African-American vote by telephoning Mrs King while her husband was in prison. Many candidates pointed out correctly that there were other African-American leaders, such as Malcolm X, who appealed to parts of the community that King could not reach, e.g. young urban Blacks. But none pointed out that these leaders alienated white voters whose support was crucial in obtaining civil rights. King was the only political leader who brought together the disparate element of the community and was broadly acceptable to white Americans. Both Johnson and King had quite different roles, but each needed the other to attain their common goal.

**Question 6**

**How accurate is it to describe the 1920s as a decade of conformity, intolerance and conservatism?**

A very popular question. Rather like the decade itself answers often reflected two extremes, one the 20s as a decade of intolerance etc., the other as one of pleasure seeking, hedonism and liberation. Surprisingly few answers sought a balance. All answers focused on Prohibition and also the widespread bigotry against minorities, in its most extreme form by the revived Ku Klux Klan. Other examples given were the Red scare at the start of the decade and later the notorious 'Monkey Trial', which outlawed the teaching of evolution in schools. Few pointed to the massive election victories by the three Republican Presidents and also to the Republican dominance in both Houses of Congress throughout the decade and among State Governors. Only a few large cities, such as New York, were controlled by the Democrats. However, many positive things did occur in the 1920s; the automobile revolution, great economic expansion, and culturally the huge influence of the new movie industry based in Hollywood. This represented a cultural revolution affecting every aspect of American life. Most candidates mentioned jazz and female emancipation, though very few discussed the effect of women having obtained the vote for the first time.

**Question 7**

**'President Roosevelt's war policies from 1940 to 1945 were a mixture of the ruthless pursuit of US national interests and high-minded idealism'. To what extent is this a fair judgement?**

A popular question. Roosevelt was the most successful of all Presidents with his four victories, but it was difficult to analyse his policies. In 1939 he was bound by the Neutrality Acts and also overwhelming majorities in Congress opposed to any US intervention in the Second European war. In this they undoubtedly reflected public opinion. It would seem clear that the President had no intention of any direct involvement in the war. The fall of France in 1940 and the likelihood that Britain might have to sue for peace changed this scenario. Roosevelt's reading of US vital interests was that Germany and Italy had to be prevented from controlling the whole east Atlantic seaboard and this meant that US interests dictated stretching neutrality to its very limit by leasing war ships to Britain and Lend Lease which enabled Britain to continue the struggle. However, the price exacted by Roosevelt was very high, with 99 year leases in the West Indies and the insistence that the loans would have to be repaid in full. Pearl Harbour was dealt with poorly by several candidates who seemed to think that the US could have avoided war with Japan. Few

pointed out that the US did not declare war on Germany and Italy, only on Japan and it is by no means certain that the US would have done so had not Germany and Italy declared war on the USA first. Some candidates argued that the US deliberately postponed the liberation of France in 1943, being quite happy to see Germany and Russia inflict terrifying losses on each other with no US casualties. The Atlantic Charter and American support for the United Nations can be argued to be idealistic as were the US anti-colonial policies, but it could be argued that the US simply wanted to end British and French dominant influence in the Middle East and replace it with American. Some candidates discussed Roosevelt's conciliation of Stalin at Yalta; here there was little alternative but Roosevelt seemed content to let the Russians win the race for Berlin, though at the price of enormous casualties sustained by them ( but saving American lives).

### **Question 8**

#### **How much did US society change between 1945 and 1966?**

Only a small number of answers, none of which were of great merit. Candidates simply picked out one or two themes and ignored everything else. Some, in effect, duplicated their answers to **Question 5**, others talked rather vaguely about women's changing roles. The huge expansion of higher education was overlooked, as was the long economic boom, which lasted throughout this period. The great rise in population was ignored, but some answers discussed the student rebellion of the 1960s and the rise in student radicalism arising from the unpopular Vietnam War.