

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

GCE Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

**MARK SCHEME for the November 2003 question papers**

**9697 HISTORY**

<b>9697/01</b>	<b>Paper 1 (Modern European History, 1789-1939), maximum mark 100</b>
<b>9697/02</b>	<b>Paper 2 (Southeast Asia: From Colonies to Nations 1870 – 1980), maximum mark 100</b>
<b>9697/03</b>	<b>Paper 3 (International History, 1945-1991), maximum mark 100</b>
<b>9697/04</b>	<b>Paper 4 (The History of Tropical Africa, 1855 – 1914), maximum mark 100</b>
<b>9697/05</b>	<b>Paper 5 (The History of the USA, c.1840-1968), maximum mark 100</b>

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2003 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level syllabuses.

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	

## GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners should note the changes in the mark bands from those used in previous examinations. These changes will make it neither easier nor more difficult for candidates to reach a particular grade boundary but should facilitate decisions about grade boundaries by widening the range of marks awarded to each grade. Examiners can note the grade boundaries given below.

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21-25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18-20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer had been provided.
3	16-17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14-15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be more organised more effectively.
5	11-13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8-10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries which lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0-7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments which do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.



**November 2003**

**GCE AS AND A LEVEL**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 100**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/01**

**HISTORY**

**Paper 1 (Modern European History, 1789-1939)**



Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	1

## SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870 - 1914

### Paper 1 Marking Notes

[Note: all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and essay questions.]

#### 1 Source-Based Question

**'Belgium's insistence on maintaining its neutrality brought about Germany's invasion. Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.'**

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1-5]

These answers write about the invasion of Belgium as a cause of war but will ignore the phrase *"Belgium's insistence on maintaining its neutrality"*, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypotheses.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6-8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

*For example, 'Source A states that France would not invade Belgium and that Germany had stated that it would not invade. Source B shows the fears of Germany that France would invade Belgium. Source C says that neither Britain nor France had sent soldiers to Belgium before it was invaded. Source D also states that Britain did not plan to send an army to Belgium until the German invasion. Source E claims that the German invasion as the cause of war and that Britain had promised to guarantee Belgian neutrality.'*

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9-13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

*For example, 'There is evidence for and against the claim that Belgium's insistence on maintaining its neutrality brought about Germany's invasion. Source records the French guarantee that there would not be an invasion of Belgium by that country. Source C denies German claims that Britain and France planned to invade Belgium. Source D confirms that Britain did not have an agreement to send soldiers to Belgium before the German invasion. Source E states that the German invasion of Belgium was the cause of the war. On the other hand, Source A shows that the German Chancellor had promised that Belgian neutrality would be respected although this policy could not be made public. Source B demonstrates the importance of Belgium to Germany, which feared a French invasion through that country. Source D states that Germany accused Britain of sending troops to Belgium, which would be a threat to Germany.'*

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	1

- L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14-16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

*For example, 'The Sources mostly support the claim that Belgium's insistence on maintaining its neutrality brought about Germany's invasion. All of the sources were written at the time of the crisis, which adds to their reliability. The writer of Source A records the views of both French and German officials and would have wished to give an accurate version to other Belgian ambassadors. Source B is by the German ambassador and he was trying to defend the policies of his government. Source C is an official and public statement of the British government and shows the concern of that government. Source D is a report by somebody who knew a lot about British policy and it points that there were no British plans to invade Belgium. Source E shows the public support in Britain for the view that Germany caused the Belgian crisis.'*

- L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FIND EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17-21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both conformation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

*For example, (L4 plus) '...However, the Sources also point to another explanation. The writer of Source A might not have been fully aware of French and German policies. Source B shows the reasons why Germany did not wish its policy to Belgium to be publicised; but feared a French invasion of Belgium. The note is marked 'Very Confidential', which confirms the concern of Germany not to encourage France. Although Source C is an official statement of the British government, it is not necessarily completely reliable because it would wish to defend British policy. Source D was also written by an enemy of Germany. Source E is an extreme criticism of Germany by somebody a British enemy of that country. He would probably exaggerate the responsibility of Germany for the outbreak of war.'*

- L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, **OR** (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22-25]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

*For example, 'Although 'Belgium's insistence on maintaining its neutrality brought about Germany's invasion, there is some evidence to challenge the claim that Germany was completely to blame. Germany felt surrounded by hostile countries and it was important that Belgium should not fall under their control. The writer of Source A provides a balanced, and probably accurate, account of the statements of both the French and German governments. There is no reason to doubt the claim in Source B that Belgium was important to Germany and Germany had good reason to fear French invasion, especially after the outcome of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. Source D, whilst a well-informed record of British policy, is unclear about what Britain intended to do. It does not make clear what Britain planned to do in the event of an invasion of Belgium. Source E states German guilt for the war, and especially for the invasion of Belgium, but its reliability is limited by the circumstances when it was written.'*

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>1</b>

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

*For example, 'The sources show that, whilst Belgium's insistence on maintaining its neutrality brought about Germany's invasion, other countries were also responsible. Germany must bear some blame for the Belgian crisis and France and Britain involved. It was in the interests of each of three countries that Belgium should remain neutral and they feared the results of an invasion of Belgium. Therefore each country followed a defensive policy although that policy might actually lead to an invasion of Belgium. Germany could best attack France through Belgium. France feared a German invasion, correctly in view of the Schlieffen Plan. Britain had interests in Belgium but did not make its policy sufficiently clear until the crisis had erupted. The Belgian crisis was as much the result of international misunderstanding as of Belgium's own actions and policies.'*

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	1

## Section B

### Essay Questions

- 2 Which of the grievances of the Third Estate in France in 1789 were the most important? Explain your answer.**

The key issue is the analysis of the grievances of 1789. The question allows candidates to explain the background to 1789 but a discriminating factor in reaching the 19-21 or 22-25 band will be the ability to concentrate on the situation immediately before and at the outbreak of the French Revolution. Answers in these bands will also provide a hierarchy of priorities: 'the most important?'. The grievances of the Third Estate, expressed in the cahiers, were predominantly economic. They should reforms of the fiscal system to end the unfair proportion of taxes that they had to bear. This reflected wider dissatisfaction with the privileges of the First and Second Estates. The meeting of the Estates General was followed immediately by the expression of political grievances, represented especially by the demand for voting by head. Very high credit will be given when candidates note that in 1789 the grievances were not against Louis XVI personally or against the monarchy as an institution. 11-13 marks can be given for basic accounts of the situation in France although these answers, and those worth 14-15, will say little specifically about 1789. There will probably be little discrimination between important and unimportant factors in answers in these bands. Some more valid comments will deserve 16-18 marks. 19-21 can be awarded to answers that are mostly sound but which miss some possible lines of discussion about 1789; there might be too much unconnected background. Well-focused answers that show good ability to analyse will be awarded 22-25 marks.

- 3 Did the Industrial Revolution result in more advantages than disadvantages for the working classes in nineteenth-century Europe? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)**

The key issue is the effects of industrialisation on the working classes. Candidates can argue for and against the balance of advantage but Examiners will look for reasoned and supported assessments. The direction to refer to at least two countries should guide candidates away from vague discussion but the mark will not depend on whether they discuss two or three countries. The most important issue, as always, will be the quality of the discussion. Advantages included, for the most part, higher employment. There were periodic periods of depression and therefore unemployment but these were not worse than those suffered by agrarian workers. Industrialised societies created the opportunity for organisation by which workers could put pressure on the establishment to give social and sometimes political concessions. By the end of the century, the franchise had widened to include most of the male working class. Disadvantages included the end of an independent life-style. Workers were units in larger economic groups. Living conditions in cities might be examined but it is arguable whether these were worse than in the countryside. 11-13 answers will probably contain only relevant but general discussions of industrialisation. Gains and losses will be asserted rather than explained. Fuller descriptions can be awarded 14-15 marks. These answers might be very one-sided. More explanatory comments with the ability to something of advantages and disadvantages, supported by some valid examples, will deserve 16-18 marks. 19-21 answers will be able to compare advantages and disadvantages but they will be less complete than the essays that are worth 22-25 marks.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	1

**4 How similar were the aims and methods of Bismarck and Cavour in the unification of Germany and Italy?**

The key issue is the comparison of Bismarck and Cavour. 11-13 marks can be awarded to answers that demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of both statesmen. 14-15 marks will require fuller descriptions. The answers in these bands will probably be very narrative and there will be little about their aims and little comparison. The 16-18 band will require some more comparison and some more convincing explanations of aims and methods. A focus on the key words ('similar', 'aims', 'methods') will take answers to 19-21 or 22-25. The 19-21 answers will be mostly sound but will miss some possible lines of discussion. Both Bismarck and Cavour were concerned primarily with the interests of their states rather than of their countries as a whole. Both saw Austria as their major enemy. They changed to a wider commitment to unification. Bismarck wished to retain the control of the traditional authorities in Prussia (King and Junkers); Cavour also defended the monarchy although he was not as dependent on the traditional landed aristocracy. Both were careful to secure the assistance of other powerful countries, either through benevolent neutrality or positive co-operation. There were differences and 'How similar...?' invites candidates to explore these differences. Prussia's army was stronger than Piedmont's. Bismarck was not challenged, as Cavour was, by rival leaders in the development of unification. Credit should be given when candidates that Cavour died before complete unification had been achieved whereas Bismarck lived to see the establishment of the new German Empire. The events leading to unification can be explained within the consent of such points.

**5 How important were economic rivalries as a reason for imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century?**

The key issue is the extent to which economic rivalries were a reason for imperialism in this period. 'How important...?' allows candidates to discuss other factors such as military/strategic interests, the pressure of public opinion, personal interventions and religious motives. However, 11-13 marks will require a basic understanding of economic interests. Answers in this band and in the 14-15 band will probably be very descriptive about economic factors. 16+ will require the combination of general claims and appropriate examples but these can be drawn from particular regions. There was a search for raw materials to support the industries that were developing fast in Europe. Some of these were unobtainable in Europe, e.g. oil, rubber. Valuable deposits of gold and diamonds in Africa were an inducement. Investment might be referred to and the view that imperialism was 'the highest form of capitalism'. There was the hope of overseas markets. Some candidate might interpret some social factors as economic, for example the possibility that the new colonies might give the opportunity to deal with increased populations. This should be given credit.

**6 How far, by 1924, had Lenin established a Marxist state in Russia?**

The key issue is the establishment of a Marxist state in 1924. 22-25 can be awarded to answers that show a firm grasp of Marxism and can apply it to Lenin's Russia. 'How far...' invites candidates to examine the extent and limits of the claim that Russia became a Marxist country. 19-21 answers will make some valid points about Marxism but will be more uneven. The answers in the other bands will probably deal more generally with communism. The 16-18 bands will probably include many answers that are mostly descriptive but which also make some valid comments of explanation or assessment. 14-15 can be given to quite detailed narrative that lack comments and 11-13 answers will contain basic description or narrative. Lenin sought to establish a Marxist state through the dictatorship of the proletariat, reflected in a partnership between the soviets and the Bolshevik party. In practice, the Bolsheviks became supreme. War communism represented Marxist theory but was probably implemented



Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	1

more for pragmatic reasons, to feed the population after the disastrous effects of the First World War and the Revolution. The NEP was a withdrawal to a more mixed economy. Most candidates will see Lenin as establishing a Bolshevik dictatorship and the use of the Cheka was important. However, credit should be given to candidates who understand that the supremacy of the party and of Lenin himself did not mean the disappearance of other groups, e.g. Mensheviks and Social Democrats by 1924, although their influence was much reduced.

**7 How far do you agree that economic reasons were the most important cause of the rise of a totalitarian government in either Germany or Italy during the 1920s and 1930s?**

The key issue is the causes of the rise of totalitarian government in Europe, using Germany or Italy as an example. Candidates might disagree with the claim in the question but the 11-13 band will depend on a basic understanding of this factor. The First World War caused the economic collapse of the German Empire and Weimar was faced with continuing economic problems as a result of the war and as a consequence of the Wall Street Crash. The rise of Mussolini preceded the Wall Street Crash but the post-war Italian economy was weak, hence Mussolini's emphasis on programmes of economic reform. Candidates can also explore other causes such as the political weakness of pre-totalitarian governments. The Weimar Republic was politically unstable and was governed by a series of weak governments. Right-wing politicians and their allies under-estimated Hitler and the Nazis. Italian democratic governments were unable to achieve stability. The potential for a Mussolini dictatorship was not realised. The opponents of the totalitarian rulers were divided. Some candidates will examine the positive appeal of the revolutionary/totalitarian groups. Very high credit will be given to candidates who consider why totalitarian governments emerged. In both Germany and Italy, this seemed to be by popular consent.

**8 How far do you agree that the consequence of the First World War were greater than any other war from 1789? (You should refer to the First World War and at least one other war in your answer.)**

This question allows candidates to draw on their study of two topics in the syllabus. The instruction to refer to at least two wars, 1914-18 and one other is to guide them away from vague discussions. The number of wars studied will not in itself affect the mark; the discriminating factor will be the comparative element although answers that can sustain a comparison across a number of wars will deserve a high mark. But 22-25 can be awarded for the study of the First World War and one other. Answers in the 22-25 band will focus on comparison and will select knowledge appropriately to support the argument; they will avoid long narratives. 19-21 can be awarded to comparative answers that are mostly secure but there will be some gaps in possible lines of discussion. 16-18 answers will contain some valid comparison in otherwise descriptive approaches. Answers in the 11-13 and 14-15 bands will probably fall into two categories: those that are highly sequential in their narratives or description, with little comparison and those that make some comparisons but which are very general in supporting evidence. The key issue is the consequences, not the causes, of war. The First World War led to revolution in Russia and to the fall of monarchies in Austria-Hungary and Germany. It destabilised diplomacy for a generation and, it can be argued, led to the outbreak of the Second World War. However, there were attempts to establish an international arbitrator in the League of Nations although the attempt was unsuccessful. Candidates need to quite specific on the effects of other wars. The points to be discussed will depend on their chosen examples. They are likely to have studied a selection from the French Revolutionary, and especially the Napoleonic wars, and/or Bismarck's wars that led to the unification of Germany.

**November 2003**

**GCE AS AND A LEVEL**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 100**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/02**

**HISTORY**

**Paper 2 (Southeast Asia: From Colonies to Nations 1870-1980)**

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	2

## SECTION A: THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SINGAPORE, 1945-65

### Paper 2 Marking Notes

[Note: all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and essay questions.]

#### 1 Source-Based Question

**'The merger was wanted, both in Malaya and Singapore, for no more than short term, tactical reasons: Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence supports this statement.'**

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1-5]

These answers will be about the merger, but will ignore the question i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Included in this level answers which give information taken from the sources, but only in producing an account of the events, rather than testing the hypothesis.

L2 USES INFORMATION FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6-8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

*For example Yes, as Source B suggests, Tunku wanted to prevent Singapore becoming a communist state. Or No, Source A shows how enthusiastic Lee Kuan Yew was.*

L3 USES INFORMATION FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9-13]

There is evidence for and against the view that it was purely for short-term advantages. Both Source A and Source D suggest a genuine enthusiasm for merger, though on the other hand Source B argues that Malaya wanted to reduce the communist threat and Source C that Singapore was looking for an accelerated route to independence.

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [14-16]

These answers are capable of using the sources as evidence i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

*For example Source A offers an ambitious blue-print for a united peninsula with long-term advantages for Singapore – made at a time when the political future was obscure: it can be seen as a bid for Singapore to be included in any future British plans. LKY's general philosophy is confirmed in Source E with his complaint about 'segregated communal parties' which was the reality with Malaysia. At face value, Source D and the reference to 'a multi-racial concept; in Source B back up this long-termism. Again, the short-term advantages for both sides are set out in Source B and Source C but that they had little in common is revealed in Source C and again in Source E. Although the Tunku had proposed 'a multi-racial concept' for Malaysia (Source B), Source E suggests how far short of this concept, Malaysia had fallen by its reference to 'segregated communal parties'.*

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	2

- L5 BY INTERPRETING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [17-21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and challenge the hypothesis and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and challenge are done at this level).

*For example However some of the Sources do suggest that long-term as well as short-term advantages were being considered. For instance, on one interpretation Sources A and D may both be long-term visions of a future united peninsula. Yet Source A may be no more than a cynical ploy and in Source D the Barisan Socialists by supporting the merger may be considering how far the merger will enable them to fulfil their long-term aims of creating a socialist state.*

- L6 AS L5 PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS PREFERRED. [22-25]

For (a) the arguments must be that the evidence of challenging/supporting is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why other evidence is worse. For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it e.g. argues that while the parties were ill-matched, and short-term advantages were in the minds of both parties, other factors such as long-term political or economic advantages may also have been a consideration.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	2

## SECTION B

- 2** 'Everywhere in Southeast Asia, Europeans sought to modernise traditional societies'. How far do you agree with this assessment of their role during the period 1870-1914?

Answers to this question may draw on the history of several SEA counties to illustrate the justice (or otherwise) of this assertion.

- i) One familiar line will turn upon the shading off of indirect rule into direct rule in the historical experience of Malaya, running from 1874 to Federation in 1896, to the further encroachments brought about by the 1909 Treaty and the incorporation of the Northern Malay States and the consequent declining power of the traditional authorities.
- ii) The contrasting experience of Burma and Thailand: in Burma, the replacement of all traditional authorities – monarch, local headmen, buddhist monks – by direct rule. In Thailand, where at the centre European experts and advisers set up a state with a European façade and at the local level central government became more invasive.
- iii) In Indonesia, indirect rule was generally maintained but as the Ethical Policy was implemented its educational/welfare policies became increasingly intrusive.
- iv) In general candidates are likely to refer to the introduction of Western-type legal systems, although in many colonies this was mediated by the force of local custom.

- 3** 'The economic development of Southeast Asia owed more to immigrants than to the indigenous peoples'. How true was this of the period 1870-1914?

This question calls for an examination of the impact of migrants, principally Chinese and Indian on the economies of Southeast Asian colonies. Good candidates will examine the varied contribution of the Chinese in, say Malaya and Singapore, and the economic roles they fulfilled in Indonesia or Thailand. Gain, Indian migrants acted as essential labour for rubber plantations in Malaya whereas in Burma they became middle men and money lenders within the rural economy. The question would allow for a discussion of European 'migrants' as entrepreneurs and experts such as engineers in Malaya, Indonesia or Burma.

- 4** To what extent did colonial governments before the Second World War prepare their subjects for self-government?

This question allows candidates to consider the varied response of colonial authorities to what came to be seen as a major responsibility in the light of the widely-accepted 'principle of self-determination'. This response varied from the Volksraad in Indonesia to the Burmese experience of devolved government. Again candidates are likely to compare France's repressive policies in Vietnam and the complete absence of any preparation for self-government with America's policy in the Philippines of transferring political power to the Filipinos and setting a date (1946) for full independence.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	2

**5 Why, in general, did nationalist movements attract so little support in the period 1919-41?**

Candidates are called on to examine the reasons why effective nationalist movements were slow to develop in Southeast Asian countries. Clearly one factor common to all was the watchful eye of the ruling power which was unwilling to see its control challenged. Candidates may choose to exemplify this by reference to the Dutch in Indonesia or the French in Vietnam. The slow development of higher education was another important factor for colonial authorities would be aware that educated men would demand a career open to talents with political power as the ultimate goal. In colonies where the mass were either peasants or unskilled workers subsistence was more important than support for a nationalist programme. Good candidates are likely to consider other factors which hindered the development of a united movement such as the fragmentation of nationalist groups e.g. in Malaya or the role of religion in such colonies as Burma, Indonesia or Malaya.

**6 Was Japan's 'New Order' in Southeast Asia an improvement on the colonial regimes it replaced?**

The Japanese invasion of Southeast Asia created a cataclysmic change from which no colonial power was able to recover. Co-Prosperity was the promise and political progress was often the reality. One major argument may well turn on the extent to which Japan by eliminating the European presence allowed for local involvement, local advancement, the creation of indigenous military or paramilitary forces. Good answers will examine how far Japanese policy differed in different part so her newly-acquired empire where, for instance, in Ineon3sia nationalism was already a reality with leaders waiting in gaol to Malaya where effective nationalism hardly existed at all. In Malaya, the Japanese occupation st4engthend Malay political involvement – local rulers, and the use of Malays in such bodies as the police and para-military forces – all of which was to provide the basis for a new and united Malay nationalism in the post-war world. In Burma again Japan speeded up nationalist advance. In Vietnam, within Japan's New Order the French developed a policy of Vietnamisation (as a countermeasure to the Japanese presence) and finally, the Japanese as in Indonesia, established an independent regime. Improvements certainly. Good answers are likely to consider the reasons why Japan's policy ultimately failed: loss of naval superiority fostered economic decline; her insensitivity towards her new subject people. Reward candidates who provide a case study of the causes of her failure in countries such as Burma and why, in Vietnam and the Philippines, the Japanese occupation produced anti-Japanese resistance movements.

**7 To what extent did the experience of independence demonstrate that 'democratic government is not ideally suited to Southeast Asia'?**

This question calls for an examination of the alternative forms of government which Southeast Asian states established of which military rule was the most common. Southeast Asian states have often been ready t fall back on the army, in counties such as Burma, Thailand and the Philippines or in Vietnam, a state created by revolution and war. Again, candidates are likely to consider how far 'Guided Democracy' could be seen as democratic or even what limitations existed within states where a single party monopolized power. Good candidates may choose to discuss the relevance of the continuance of traditional elites in some SEA states to the form of government adopted.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	2

**8 How successful were Southeast Asian regional organisations in the period up to 1980?**

Some candidates may wish to explore the mutual self-help implicit in the creation of SEATO, a regional pact formed under American pressure as a SEA equivalent to NATO, with headquarters in Thailand. Again, Bandung (1955) may be cited as an attempt to distance SEA states from the dangers of the Cold War, leading on to the formation of SEA's own regional pact, ASEAN, in 1967.

We should expect a discussion of the background against which it was established: the Separation in 1965; the Confrontation and the Indonesian campaign against Malaysia; the perceived threat of communism. Against this background the Bangkok Declaration with its concept of 'collective political defence', and the refusal of the signatories to sign a military alliance which might involve them in international conflicts became a major force for resolving potential conflicts. Initially the six founder members were united by a fear of North Vietnam and China, and the possibility of communist infiltration. ASEAN was intended to counter communist subversion and deter external interference by fostering strong domestic economies. Good answers will seek to show how this concept of peaceful co-operation was extended by expanding membership to ten, including Vietnam, and to illustrate its success in terms of the absence of military confrontation between members and ASEAN's emphasis on conflict resolution.

There should be an evaluation of ASEAN's economic policies in working towards a free trade zone with the eventual abolition of import duties and a free flow of goods, services and investments. The best candidates will attempt to discuss how far, given the differing economic health of its members, benefits flowing from ASEAN membership were unequal and whether the absence of an effective enforcement mechanism was a significant factor in any overall assessment of its benefits.

**November 2003**

**GCE AS AND A LEVEL**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 100**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/03**

**HISTORY**

**Paper 3 (International History, 1945-1991)**





Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	3

[Note: generic mark bands will be used in addition to this marking scheme.]

## SECTION A

### 1. Source-based question: The United Nations and the Congo Crisis 1960-1

**‘How far do Sources A-E support the view that ‘the efforts’ of the United Nations in 1960-1 to resolve the crisis in the Congo were undermined more by the USSR than by the USA’?**

*L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1-5]*

These answers will be about the United Nations and the Congo crisis, but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources, but only in producing an account of the Secretary-General’s changing position, rather than for testing the hypothesis.

*L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6-8]*

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

*For example ‘Yes, it is true that the UN efforts to resolve the Congo crisis were undermined by the USSR than the USA. Source B illustrates this point’ OR ‘No, the USA did more to undermine the UN. You can tell this from Source D’.*

*L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9-13]*

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are still used only at face value.

*For example ‘There is evidence both for and against the view that USSR did more to undermine the UN’s efforts to solve the Congo crisis in 1960-1. If you think the evidence supports this view then Source E helps you because it states that the USSR was hostile to the UN operation. But Source A gives a different impression because it shows the USA taking steps to remove the Congo’s Prime Minister, who was supported by the UN.’*

*L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [14-16]*

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at their face value.

*For example ‘I think it is true that the USSR did more to undermine the UN’s efforts. When you look at Source D you have to question its argument because it is not supported by Sources B and C. OR ‘I think it is true that the USA did more to undermine the work of the UN. Source A is contradictory. It suggests it is proposing action in order to prevent disastrous consequences for the UN and yet the actions posed, the so-called ‘covert actions’, on the evidence of Source D, involve assassination. Assassinating political leaders must contravene international law and thus undermine the authority of the United Nations’.*

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	3

*L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [17-21]*

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

*For example (second L4 example PLUS the following) However, some of the sources do suggest that the USSR did more to undermine the UN. Source B warns against the threat of unilateral action in the Congo, a warning which must be directed at the USSR. This warning is made in public by a new and untested President at the height of the Cold War. This is a very risky tactic, one which could easily backfire – think of the Bay of Pigs three months later – and so would not have been made unless Kennedy’s fears had sound foundations. And source C, a Western but not an American source, shows that the UN could rely on US support.*

*L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED [22-25]*

For (a) the argument must be that the evidence for agreeing/disagreeing is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse.

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it, for example, argues that the USA policy changed with the change of administration, Eisenhower’s being less sympathetic to UN efforts, Kennedy’s more. The USSR’s public position was more supportive, even though it was critical behind the scenes. These points can be argued through the different opinions/perceptions shown in the sources or by establishing different criteria for support/contradiction.

## SECTION B

### 2. ‘The Marshall Plan caused the division of Europe and thus the Cold War’. Discuss this assertion.

The Marshall Plan forced the USSR to choose between maintaining allied co-operation or bringing it to an end. The formation of the OEEC by the states of Western Europe in April 1948 to implement the Marshall Plan was followed within a year by the formation of Comecon. Thus Europe became formally divided, thereby institutionalising the Cold War. Until this time, there was always a chance that frosty relations between East and West might prove short lived. (The parallel military alliances took longer to be established, the Warsaw pact not being set up until 1955, six years after NATO.)

However it could be argued that the Marshall Plan was a symptom of the Cold War rather than its immediate cause. The Plan symbolized the wide differences of interest which were the main reasons for the outbreak of the Cold War. The two superpowers had different plans for Europe. The USA wanted a Europe of capitalist liberal democracies where the USSR’s preferred model was of one-party socialist states. Both saw the other as expansionist – at least according to the post-revisionist model. And no doubt candidates will find the opportunity to describe the traditional and revisionist models as well. Ideally, they should also evaluate them.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	3

**3. 'The Cold War became truly global only after 1962.' How far does your study of the Cold War in the period 1950-80 support this view?**

Until 1962, the argument would continue, the Cold War was confined to Europe and the north-east part of Asia (Korea and Taiwan). Part of the shock of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis was the attempt by the USSR to extend its influence into parts of the globe until then regarded as part of the American sphere. From the early 1960s – perhaps before 1962? – Cold War hostilities began to affect affairs in the rest of Asia, Africa and the Middle East. The US intervention in Vietnam from 1963, superpower tensions over Six Day War in 1967 and the Yom Kippur War in 1973, and struggles for power in southern Africa, following the collapse of the Portuguese empire in 1974, and the Horn of Africa. Central America became part of the Cold War from 1979 when the Sandinistas gained power in Nicaragua. South America, however, remained free from obvious Cold War conflicts, as did Australasia. However, throughout the post-1962, for the first time, the USSR was turning itself into a global naval power.

A full answer also requires consideration of the period before 1962, when the USA and the USSR sometimes co-operated to contain a crisis, as they did in 1956 over Suez. However, they were also at each other's throats, mainly in Europe, as shown by the crises over Hungary (1956) and Berlin (1958-61). The Congo crisis of the early 1960's shows that even before 1962 east-west tensions were appearing outside Europe; in this case the superpowers co-operated yet again, this time to stop the secession of Katanga.

**4. How seriously did the Sino-Soviet conflict weaken the Communist bloc?**

The conflict became public knowledge in the West in 1960, when China criticised the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence at a Communist conference in Moscow. During the 1960s the split continued to widen until in 1969 clashes occurred between Soviet and Chinese troops. However, there had been tensions between the party leaderships of the two states since the 1920s and certainly since 1945, when Stalin had supported Chiang Kai-shek rather than the CCP.

The rift between the two leading Communist states certainly weakened the unity of the Communist bloc. It did so in several ways. It enabled Kissinger and Nixon in 1969-73 to play one power off against the other and gain concessions from both, in terms of either arms control or trade. It diverted scarce military resources to defending their borders against each other. Finally, it enabled some minor communist states to break away from Soviet control, as in the case of Albania and Rumania. The rift also undermined the Soviet claim to be the only true interpreter of the Marxist faith. To many Third World communist leaders, China provided an attractive alternative model of a Marxist-Leninist state.

How seriously the communist bloc was weakened is much harder to assess. By 1989-91 the bloc had disintegrated and disappeared, leaving China as virtually the sole remaining communist state. That collapse was probably more a result of the weaknesses of the Soviet model of communism rather than of divisions within the bloc.

**5. Explain the effects of the collapse of the USSR in the period 1985-1991 upon the foreign policy of the USA.**

Two aspects of the collapse affected US policy towards the USSR. One was the 'new thinking' that Gorbachev revealed in Soviet foreign policy in the late 1980's, as he unilaterally cut Soviet defences and pushed hard for a new relationship with the USA. The second was the rapid disintegration of the USSR, especially in the period 1989-1991. Both developments required a response from the USA and enabled US initiatives in other areas, such as the Middle East.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	3

The US government of Reagan was right wing and thus is usually seen as cautious in its response to the initiatives of Gorbachev and Shevardnadze. (There are some historians who argue that Reagan began the policy of rapprochement in early 1984, following nuclear war scares in late 1983.) However summits at Geneva (1985) and Reykjavik (1986) established new relationships, thus resulting in the INF treaty (1987), a significant breakthrough. Reagan's successor, Bush Snr, was initially suspicious of Gorbachev but the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 caused him to accept the need to match Soviet concessions. The Malta summit (1989) led to two arms reduction treaties, CFE in 1990 and START 1 in 1991. In 1990 the two sides agreed to the reunification of Germany. The USA had eventually co-operated with the USSR in ending the Cold War. The new relationship greatly helped the USA building an international coalition to resist Iraqi aggression against Kuwait in 1990-1.

In his response to the disintegration of the USSR, Bush was cautious. He did not provide Gorbachev with the massive financial aid he requested, mainly because Gorbachev was not dismantling the command economy quickly enough. Events unfolded rapidly in 1991, which meant that the USA could do little but watch, even though its response to the attempted coup of August was not as dismissive as it might have been. Policy after the disintegration of the USSR in December 1991 is beyond the scope of the syllabus.

**6. Analyse the impact of the nuclear arms race on the Cold War during the period 1950-1980.**

The superpowers raced each other perhaps only from the later 1950s, when the USA (mistakenly) saw the Soviets overtaking them and actually pulling ahead, thereby causing a 'missile gap'. Thus the USA (a) rapidly expanded its ICBMs and (b) changed its nuclear warfare strategy to 'assured destruction' (MAD) in a second strike. For MAD to be effective, neither side had to have a surprise advantage. Thus some kind of limits on weapons was needed. Hence the controls on nuclear testing and weapons proliferation in the 1960s and on the expansion of nuclear weapons, SALT I and II and the ABM treaty, all in the 1970s. To use the analogy of a race, in the 1970s the superpowers agreed to slow the race to a virtual stop. New weapons technologies continued to be developed, causing a second-level crisis in the late 1970s and the USSR installed intermediate range SS20s in Eastern Europe. In December 1979 NATO decided to install Cruise missiles, a few weeks before the USSR invaded Afghanistan.

In the 1960s and most of the 1970s, both sides accepted limitations mainly because of their experience of the one surprise of nuclear arms, the deployment of Soviet missiles to Cuba in 1962. The crisis which followed showed how close was the risk of a nuclear conflict. This crisis could be used to distinguish between the short term and long term effects of the arms race; in the short term, it made the Cold War much more dangerous, thereafter it brought about the relaxation of tension known as détente.

**7. Why did the international economy experience serious problems in the 1970s and early 1980s?**

Because to a few developing strains were added some short-term shocks to the system. The developing strains concerned the international economic and financial system devised at the end of the Second World War. That system was based on a strong US dollar convertible into gold, a system of fixed exchange rates and on the export of US capital in aid and military expenditure, which funded the economic growth of war-torn economies. This outflow of capital strengthened these economies, which began to experience inflation, while at the same time it weakened the US dollar and economy. Expenditure on the Vietnam War and LBJ's Great Society further undermined the US economy. In the 1971 the USA ended gold convertibility, which was the first shock, and over the next two years the dollar was devalued by some 20%. Fixed exchanges rates could not be sustained; floating exchange rates became the norm. Adjusting to this new system of international finance took some time to achieve.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>3</b>

The devaluation of the dollar was one reason why OPEC quadrupled oil prices in 1973-4, which was the second shock (there were other, political reasons). Absorbing inflation on this scale caused problems for most major national economies and thus for the international economy. The term 'stagflation' was coined, IPEC compounded the difficulty when it tripled oil prices in 1979-80. Western governments, most based on the mixed economy and Keynesian economics, found great political difficulty in restoring a new economic order. Monetarism and supply side economics were the painful short-term remedies imposed by the New Right. The growth in international trade slowed down. Only in the second half of the 1980s did the international economy return to a period of stability and growth.

The subject is a difficult one and thus sound efforts should be well rewarded.

**8. How far do you agree that the provision of economic aid to developing countries did more harm than good?**

In the 1950s and 1960s developed states of the First World increased the aid they provided for the newly-independent states of the so-called Third World. (The Second World of communism also provided aid but on a lesser scale and for more overt political reasons.) From the 1970s, groups in the developed world began to question the effectiveness of providing economic aid, except perhaps in the form of short-term disaster relief. In the 1980s, the amount of official aid provided began to decline.

The arguments against aid are several: it encourages dependence, not independence; it goes to the wrong people as a result of corruption, usually within recipient governments; if spend on development, it often goes on inappropriate, often grandiose projects and thus is wasted. Far better, the critics argue, to open up First World markets to goods from developing countries. However, it can be argued that economic aid can do more harm than good so long as it meets certain criteria; that it by passes national governments; that it is spent on small-scale, local projects; that these projects make a quick and obvious difference.

A general analysis of the two sides will suffice for lower pass bands. However, for the higher bands, candidates need to support the general with specific examples, ideally taken from a range of countries.

November 2003

**GCE AS AND A LEVEL**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 100**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/04**

**HISTORY**

**Paper 4 (The History of Tropical Africa, 1855 – 1914)**



<b>Page 1</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>4</b>

N.B. The notes which follow must be read in conjunction with the Generic Mark Bands for Essay questions on pages 2 and 3 of the introductory section. They should not be regarded as 'model' or 'correct' answers though they are an attempt to suggest the approach and content which would constitute a good, relevant and appropriate answer. They also attempt to identify the mark band which might best fit different types of answer. The Generic Mark Bands may, however, be the most helpful guide to the most appropriate mark for weaker answers which bear little resemblance to these notes.

**1 How and why were Dahomey and the Niger Delta states able to make the transition from the slave trade to legitimate trade quickly and successfully?**

Candidate's answers should be expected to identify the basic factors on which the speed and success of the transition depended. These included:

- The availability of suitable legitimate exports for which there was a steady demand by European traders e.g. palm oil products. Palm oil trees grew naturally in the Delta states but in the case of Dahomey had to be acquired from neighbours, usually by force.
- Adequate transport facilities to get the legitimate commodities to the coast. These, again, were more readily available in the Delta with its network of rivers which provided cheap and easy transport. In Dahomey slave labour, in the shape of 'pulla boys' provided the transport.
- Able leadership, a centralised administrative system, an efficiently organised economy and an efficient army and/or navy. These were available in Dahomey under Kings Gezo and Glele and some details should be given of the system of administration. In the Delta the widespread development of the House System (companies whose main role was the promotion and efficient organisation of trade) which emerged specifically to meet the new conditions and challenges created by the abolition of the slave trade also provided these conditions. The heads of these 'houses' were often men of humble origin, sometimes ex-slaves e.g. JaJa in Opobo and Olomu and his son Nana in Itsekiriland.

In addition to covering these basic points answers deserving a mark in the top band should also respond briefly to the words 'quickly and successfully' in the title by identifying a few states which were slower and less successful. For a mark in any of the top three bands answers should be reasonably balanced in their treatment of Dahomey and the Delta states. Serious imbalance will restrict the mark to the 11-13 band or lower.

**2 'Despite the failures of the last years of his reign Tewodros II made a vital contribution to Ethiopia's revival in the nineteenth century.' How far do you agree?**

A brief reference to the chaos of the 'Era of Princes' to show the need for a revival would form an appropriate introduction. T's. two basic aims were to reunify and modernise the country under the leadership of a powerful Emperor or 'King of Kings'. The means he adopted to achieve these aims should be outlined and their effectiveness assessed: the creation of a standing army, well trained and equipped with modern weapons; the reform of the legal system, the church, taxation and the ownership of land. He made efforts to reduce the powers of the Rases and to centralise power in his own hands. His foreign policy was over ambitious: he wished to wipe Islam off the face of the earth and to have Ethiopia recognised by European countries.

Most of his reforms alienated different elements in his own country and in some foreign countries. In the last years of his reign he faced widespread internal opposition and an invasion by a British military expedition. However, his initial success cannot be denied; and the vision of a united country under a powerful Emperor was never lost and was turned into reality by his successors who learned from his mistakes. This kind of approach and conclusion would earn a mark in one of the three top bands, depending on the accuracy of the evidence and the persuasiveness of the argument. The question, however, is open to other conclusions and these and the supporting arguments should be assessed on their merits.

**3 Who were the Creoles and what were their achievements in West Africa in the second half of the nineteenth century?**

The question requires a brief definition of the Creoles. If this is missing a mark in Band 3 will be a maximum. Their main fields of activity were: education and scholarship; the church, including mission work; administration; commerce; literature; medicine; the law. Specific examples should be given in the various fields. Where these are missing 8-10 would be the maximum mark. For a mark in one of the two top bands expect 5 or 6 bands of activity with examples. For a mark in Bands 3 or 4, expect 3 or 4 fields of activity with examples. See Tidy and Leeming, Vol.2, pages 126-127, for details.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	4

**4 How far do you accept the view that Kabaka Mutesa I consolidated Buganda's position as East Africa's strongest state?**

This question could provide different responses but most candidates will probably accept fully the view expressed in the title. Mutesa succeeded to the Kabakaship on the death of Suna who had brought Buganda to its greatest territorial extent. Mutesa neither gained nor lost any territory. Bunyoro, the old rival was still a threat and Egypt posed a new threat when General Gordon was Governor of Equatoria. Neither threat came to anything in Mutesa's reign. Economically Buganda certainly became stronger as Mutesa encouraged relations with outside traders from whom Buganda obtained cloth, firearms and new crops like maize, cassava and rice. Her military position also became stronger. The most controversial aspect of Mutesa's policies was probably the welcome he gave first to Muslims and later to Christian missionaries. This policy was not prompted by religious motives but by expectations of other benefits he hoped to gain from them. He, himself was never converted to either Islam or Christianity; but many of his subjects, some in influential positions, were. Conversions to Christianity could have led to the kabaka's absolute authority being challenged, but as long as Mutesa ruled, this did not happen. During his reign the kabaka's power actually increased at the expense of that of hereditary chiefs. Under Mwanga, his less able son, the presence and impact of these religious influences had serious consequences for the Bugandan state and the kabaka's role within it.

If the argument and evidence follows the above lines the judgement required by the question will be to accept the view in the title with the possible reservation about the potentially dangerous consequences of inviting foreign religious missions into the country. Answers to be worth a mark in one of the three top mark bands should be based on a comparison of Buganda's strength at the beginning and the end of Mutesa's reign under various headings: territorial extent; military strength; economic strength; power and ability of the kabaka to protect the country's interests.

**5 To what extent, and for what reasons, did Prempeh I of Asante fail to achieve his aims?**

Prempeh's aims:

At his accession in 1888 Prempeh's aims were to undo the results of the Asante War of 1873-74:

- to revive the Asante Confederacy
- to revive the Asante Empire
- to avoid military confrontation with the British
- to preserve the independence of his country and his own sovereignty.

Why, and to what extent did he fail?

Initially he had some temporary success in reviving the disbanded Confederacy by recapturing most of the rebel states, but the British effectively prevented them rejoining. He protested to the British retrospectively in 1889 about the inclusion of Kwano in the Gold Coast Colony in 1874. Later, in 1892-93 he reconquered the Boron states to the north west of Kumasi. In 1891 he rejected a proposal that Asante should become a British protectorate. In 1895 he sent an Asante delegation to London to ask Britain to recognise the independence of his country. The British resented Prempeh's initial refusal to accept a British Resident in Kumasi to direct Asante policy. The last straw for the British came with Prempeh's attempts to negotiate a treaty with Samori Toure which threatened the European powers' efforts to expand their African empires. In 1896 the British marched on Kumasi. Prempeh, too late for his concession to be effective, agreed to accept a British Resident. Prempeh offered no resistance to the British advance on Kumasi and the British occupied his capital. Prempeh, along with his family and counsellors, was arrested and deported.

The basic reason for Prempeh's failure, lay in the clash between Britain's and Prempeh's ambitions and attitudes. Britain regarded Asante as an aggressive and barbaric military power and was determined to prevent her gaining direct access to the coast. Unfortunately for Prempeh his accession coincided with the peak period of the European scramble for Africa and Britain's military supremacy was bound to lead to Prempeh's defeat. In the end, therefore, Prempeh failed to achieve any of his aims.

For a mark in one of the top three bands answers should adopt an analytical approach with a narrative element to summarise Prempeh's efforts to achieve his aims. A straight narrative of Prempeh's reign with little or no analysis of the reasons for his failure will struggle to reach Band 6. (8-10).



Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	4

**6 Which had the greater impact on East Africa and its peoples: the Ngoni invasions or the establishment of the Omani capital in Zanzibar?**

Answers to this question will require an analysis of the positive and negative results of both the Ngoni invasions and the establishment of the Omani capital in Zanzibar. Sultan Seyyid Said moved his capital to Zanzibar in 1840 and material from that date should be accepted. The Ngoni moved into parts of East Africa just before the death of Zwangendaba, their leader, in 1848. After that date the impact of the two events interacted with one another to bring about important changes in the political, social and economic life of the people of the East African mainland.

**The Ngoni** invaders carried with them into East Africa the various aspects - military, social and political - of the Shaka revolution in Zululand. Being a warlike people, their impact was inevitably partly destructive. Agricultural life was seriously disrupted and existing societies and small states were destroyed. They sold slaves to traders from the east coast whose highly organised caravans took them to the Zanzibar slave market along with ivory. More important was the positive impact of the Ngoni invasions. The Ngoni themselves united peoples of different cultures into larger states where earlier states had been destroyed. Several East African peoples - the Hehe, the Sangu and the Kimbu adopted Ngoni military methods in self-defense and ended as more powerful states. Mirambo of the Urambo was a successful leader of this kind who rose to prominence in Central Tanzania.

**The establishment of the Omani capital in Zanzibar** also had negative and positive results, most, though not all, of which were economic. The trading activities of Seyyid Said and his successors to 1873 increased the volume of the slave trade and the related trade in ivory. This was partly because of the highly organised nature of the trade (caravans financed by Indians) and partly because of the establishment of clove plantations on Zanzibar and other off-shore islands which required slave labour. This disrupted still further agriculture in parts of the mainland but in the longer term led also to state building by leaders like Mirambo. Zanzibar became a gateway to the mainland not only for traders but also for missionaries and explorers (Livingstone and others). Eventually Islam and the Swahili language penetrated more deeply and spread more widely. So also did European imperialism and British influence led to the Barghash Treaty in 1873, the first major step in East Africa to the suppression of the slave trade.

Candidates may legitimately argue that a clear cut answer is impossible because the impact of the two events was so often inter-connected and difficult to separate. In any case a reasonable balance between the Ngoni and Omani influence and between negative and positive impact will be expected for a mark in the two top bands. Serious imbalance will limit the mark to Band 5 (11-13) or lower. Be generous to answers where the conclusion is compatible with the evidence presented.

**7 What do you understand by the terms 'informal empire' and 'formal empire' in Africa? When, and why, did the latter replace the former?**

This is essentially a question about how and why the European partition of Africa accelerated in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It also requires two definitions. A good introduction would emphasise the limited amount of territory under European rule in 1875 and explain why European powers were reluctant to annex African territory before this date. Most were interested in profit from trading with Africa without the responsibility and expense of administration. This was the concept of 'informal empire'. The prospects of 'profit without responsibility' were seriously diminished, if not removed, by the trend towards protectionism in international trade and the challenge to free trade posed by the activities of Leopold II in the Congo Basin after 1876. It became clear that the only way to ensure profitable trade with any part of Africa was to annex it and control its trade. In the next ten years a chain of events was set in motion which stimulated a rapid 'scramble' for African territory: the concept of formal empire' resulting from formal claims being proposed and recognised by other powers. This 'chain of events', the 'accelerators' of the scramble for Africa, included: De Brazza's treaty with Makoko (signed in 1880 but not ratified by the French Government until 1882); the British occupation of Egypt in 1882; Bismarck's annexation of 4 African colonies in 1884-85; and, in the same years, the meeting of the Berlin West African Conference 1884-1885 which laid down guidelines for the future annexation of African territory, defined 'spheres of influence' for the various powers, and established the need for 'effective occupation' before claims for annexation were made. Answers on these lines will deserve a mark in one of the two top Bands (18-20 or 21-25). Candidates who do not understand the two terms will not get beyond Band 7; and those who understand the concepts but make no mention of the accelerators are unlikely to get beyond Band 6 (8-10).

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	4

**8 Analyse the main features of post-pacification primary resistance with reference to the Ndebele-Shona Rising and the MajiMaji Rising. Compare and contrast the results of these two risings.**

**Main features** included:

- they were armed rebellions which were essentially still traditional in character, and owed little or nothing to leadership by members of a Western- educated elite
- they were protests against grievances that emerged after a period of colonial rule
- in some respects, in contrast to initial primary resistance, they were forward looking e.g. they were mass movements which bridged ethnic divides and were often led or influenced by spirit mediums and/or revolutionary figures. Candidates should identify and illustrate these features with reference to the two risings named in the title.

**Results** Candidates are required to compare and contrast the results of the two risings and this will be most effectively done by analyzing similarities and differences, point by point. For example, in both risings the Africans were defeated with heavy loss of life and without achieving their main objective of driving out the colonial power. In both risings the spirit mediums were discredited and Africans turned as never before to Christian missionaries to listen to their religious message and to acquire the skills and knowledge they possessed. The Shona did this to a greater extent than the Ndebele, but the latter fared better than the former in the peace terms they negotiated with Rhodes. Their leaders ('indunas') were recognised as salaried officials and as representatives of their people. Both British and German governments were alarmed by the risings and took steps to reduce the risk of a recurrence. The Germans did more in this respect than the British. They appointed a new reforming Governor, Rechenberg, who introduced significant changes: Africans were encouraged to grow cash crops, and forced labour was banned. Perhaps the most important lessons learned by Africans was the importance of acting together in future if freedom was to be gained; and the folly of resorting to armed resistance against colonial powers with overwhelming military superiority.

For a mark in one of the two top bands answers must (a) identify accurately most of the main features of this type of resistance and illustrate them from one or both of the two specified; and (b) identify similarities and differences in the results of the two risings. Reference to the two risings should be reasonably balanced for a mark in Band 3 (16-17) or above. Use the Generic Mark Band descriptions to differentiate between Bands 1, 2 and 3.

**9 'Paradoxically the spread of colonial rule in Africa helped the spread of Islam rather more than that of Christianity.' How valid is this claim?**

Candidates should be credited for responding to the presence of the word 'paradoxically' in the quotation of the title and explaining its significance. The best candidates may well argue that the claim is not valid in every part of Africa. Note also that the quotation does **not** claim that the spread of Christianity was not helped by colonial rule.

The most rapid spread of both Islam and Christianity was probably in the 25 years before 1914. In certain areas e.g. Sierra Leone, Yorubaland, the Niger Delta, Buganda and Malawi the spread of Christianity was greater than that of Islam. In general, however, the claim is valid and candidates should be expected to explain why this was the case. The explanation lies partly in the reluctance of the colonial powers, especially Britain and France, to allow Christian missionaries to work in areas where Islam was already firmly established and in which it continued to make further gains. If candidates identify areas where 'exceptions prove the rule', an explanation should again be expected. Two general points worth mentioning are that, in many parts of Africa, Islam had been established for centuries before the arrival of European rule; and that the stability brought by colonial rule created a climate favourable to the spread of both religions. Finally, however, once colonial rule began, Islam benefited from having no connection with the imposition of alien rule. For a mark in Band 1 or 2 expect candidates to show awareness of the complexities of the question and to be able to illustrate and explain these.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>4</b>

**10 Compare and contrast the British system of Indirect Rule and the French system of Association as practised in West Africa.**

Many candidates may be too ready to claim that the two systems were 'the same' or 'similar'. General statements of this kind will deserve very little credit. The differences between the two systems are more numerous and more important than the similarities. The question is made more difficult by the fact that neither system was the same in all the West African territories of the two powers. Beyond the fact that in both systems Britain and France made some use of African personnel in administering their colonies and that in all cases there was a British or French official in a higher, supervisory position, there are few other general comparisons that can be safely made.

It is easier to identify contrasts. The British preferred to use traditional chiefs when these were available, rather than members of the educated elite. Lugard's contemptuous description of the latter as 'trousered blacks' reflects this preference. The French, in contrast, used traditional rulers only in the last resort and, even then, in positions low down the hierarchy. They also made it clear that traditional rulers, when used, exercised their powers only as appointees of the French authorities and not by virtue of their role in traditional society. In territories where traditional chiefs existed the British used them and the institutional framework within which they worked. Where they did not exist the British tried to 'create' or 'invent' them as in the case of 'warrant chiefs' in Iboland. In this situation it could be argued that the two systems became similar.

Candidates who are not aware of the basic differences between the two systems will hardly deserve to reach Band 6 (8-10). Candidates whose answers contain more contrasts than comparisons, as in the notes above, and also are clearly aware that neither Indirect Rule nor Association were monolithic systems that existed throughout French and British West Africa will deserve a mark in either Band 1 or Band 2.

November 2003

**GCE AS AND A LEVEL**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 100**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/05**

**HISTORY**

**Paper 5 (The History of the USA, c.1840-1968)**



Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	5

## SECTION A

Part  
Mark

**'The secession crisis of 1860-1 only led to civil war because of President Buchanan's weakness and indecision.'** Using Sources A-E, discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

### Question 1

#### Source based question

*Level 1 Writes about the hypothesis — no use of sources.*

These answers will be about secession but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Included at this level are answers which use information taken from the sources, but only to produce an account of secession, rather than testing the hypothesis.

(1-5)

*Level 2 Uses information taken from the sources to challenge OR support the hypothesis.*

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context, for example Yes, Source B shows Buchanan was indecisive, he knows secession is unlawful but says he can do nothing about it or No, some southerners were prepared to compromise; in Source C, Crittenden, a Senator from Kentucky seeks common ground.

(6-8)

*Level 3 Uses information taken from sources to challenge AND support the hypothesis.*

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and disconfirm it. However, sources are still used only at face value, for example there is evidence both for and against the view that it was Buchanan's weakness and the intransigence of north and south which caused the Civil War. One can see this in Buchanans address in Source D where he simply refuses to take action, in the dogmatism of Source A from Georgia, and Source E where it says Lincoln would not compromise on the extension of slavery. However, on the other hand, Sources C, D and E all give examples of willingness to compromise on certain issues.

(9-13)

*Level 4 By interpreting/evaluating sources in context, finds evidence to challenge OR support the hypothesis.*

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context i.e. not simply accepting them at face value, for example, how typical of opinion in Georgia was this convention in one county in source A. The decision for Georgia to secede was only carried narrowly OR, could not Buchanan's stance in A be interpreted as trying to calm and moderate passions, not simply indecision. He alone gives some sense of awareness of the sheer horror of civil war in human terms.

How relevant to Crittenden's position in C is the fact that he was Senator for Kentucky, a border state where fighting would take place. Significantly, the Kentucky legislature voted for neutrality in the conflict.

(14-16)

*Levels 5 By interpreting/evaluating sources in context, finds evidence to challenge AND support the hypothesis*

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, Level 4 plus All sources take place in an historical context which should be brought out by the responses to evaluate the extent to which evidence confirms or disconfirms the hypothesis, for example, it could be argued that all factors mentioned in the hypothesis did not cause the Civil War, but that this was an 'inevitable conflict' or brought about by factors not mentioned.

(17-21)

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

*Level 6 As Level 5 Plus EITHER (a) Explains why evidence to challenge/support is better/prepared OR (b) reconciles/explains problems in the evidence to show that neither challenge nor support is to be preferred.*

For (a) the argument has to be that the evidence for challenging/supporting is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse.

For (b), include all Level 5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it, for example many factors other than those stated in the hypothesis were present and generalisations as to the cause of the war are impossible. (22-25)

## **SECTION B**

### **Essay Questions**

These will be marked using the criteria adopted in the generic marking bands scheme published by Cambridge International Examinations.

#### **Question 2**

***How influential a factor was the doctrine of Manifest Destiny in the huge territorial expansion of the United States in the 1840s?***

Good answers should focus clearly on the reasons for Manifest Destiny, and a narrative account, however skilful will merit 17 at best. The basic tenets of, and background to the doctrine, need spelling out; that Providence had intended the United States to control the North American land mass (including Canada). Whereas Britain was powerful enough to deter aggression, the Mexican state and the Native American tribes and nations were too weak to resist American incursions. Better candidates will draw attention to the role of better communications in the form of railroads, and the lure of cheap and limitless land in the West provided a means for new and future immigrants to better themselves. One would hope for discussion of whether the idealistic element of the doctrine was merely a cloak for less lofty motives of greed, racism and exploitation coupled with aggressive nationalist expansion. High quality answers will score (21-25 marks). These will be consistently analytical, well structured and have good quality supporting material. Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical, mostly relevant but with some unevenness in quality of argument and material. Basic pass answers (11-13) will be mostly narrative in style, with variable relevance and patchy quality of factual material.

#### **Question 3**

***Assess the respective strengths and weaknesses of Presidential and Congressional Reconstruction policies.***

A good structure is the key factor here. There were two Presidential Reconstruction plans, that of Lincoln and that of Johnson, but Lincoln's plan was an aspiration only, cut short by his murder. Congressional Reconstruction was the much more radical and aggressive policy favoured by the Republican leaders in Congress. Had Lincoln lived his great prestige might have forced down Congress. He regarded Reconstruction as an executive not legislative function and his emphasis was on magnanimity towards the former rebels, with only 10% of the electorates of states being required to take an oath of loyalty to the Union and accept the abolition of slavery before benefiting from an amnesty and having the rights to form a state government. The Wade-Davis Bill (which suffered a veto by Lincoln) was much harsher, and on his death there was deadlock. In essence, Johnson's plans were too sympathetic to rebels once too indifferent to the plight of freedmen; his personality and background also made clashes with Congress inevitable. On the other hand the much harsher Congressional plans were too harsh on the rebels and too indifferent to the position of the 'poor white' majority of the South. Johnson's policy failed because his generosity was treated as weakness by the unrepentant southern leaders. However, the Radicals, at first a minority in Congress, were actuated by a combination of idealism, political expediency and hatred of the planters of the South. The strength of the congressional position was a determination to address the need to improve the life of the freed men, its weakness a failure to address the question of land reform. High quality answers (21-25) will be consistently relevant and analytical/explanatory, with good quality material and well structured. Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical, and mostly relevant with good material but with some unevenness. Bare pass answers (11-13) will be mostly descriptive and while the narrative will be adequate, relevance will be variable.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	5

#### Question 4

***How successful were attempts to deal with the plight of farmers in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century?***

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion "hardly at all". The basic problem was one of an international crisis of over production with new virgin lands in Australia, Canada, Argentina and Russia which inevitably led to dramatically falling prices of produce, hence farmers' incomes. But there were other local reasons for complaint. Railroads, essential for transporting produce, charged extortionate rates to farmers; interest rates were usurious, being often in the range 15 to 25%. Nearly everything the farmers bought came from manufacturing monopolies who could charge what they liked; finally they claimed that as consumers they paid the bill for the protective tariff which kept out cheaper imports. The remedy was political action through first, The Grange movement, active from 1867 to 1884, and later The People's Party. Though successful at state level, and in 1896 persuading Bryan to campaign on a largely Populist platform, little was achieved and 'free silver' was largely an irrelevance. Federal administration under the control of conservative Republicans or the equally conservative Grover Cleveland from 1868 to 1900, did little or nothing to address or alleviate farmer's concerns.

#### Question 5

***Analyse the factors which led to the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.***

Will probably be a popular question. It might be helpful to distinguish between the background factors and the immediate reasons. World War II had a radicalising effect on Black Americans and Unlike the 1920s there was no Ku Klux Klan to suppress this. From 1950 onwards, television enlarged the horizons and aspirations of Southern Blacks and in 1952 there was the unanimous Brown decision of the Supreme Court, outlawing segregation in schools. Key factors were the activism and shrewdness of Martin Luther King's leadership of the mass non-violent protest movement in the South. A key point was King's conscious cultivation of sympathetic elements in the Democratic Party at a time when it was possibly less favourable to civil rights than the Republicans. Immediate factors should stress the political development after the election of JFK, in which King played a significant part. While Kennedy's actual contributions to the cause were minimal, compared to his brother Bobby as Attorney General, it was Johnson who flung his considerable skill and energies, derived from his time as majority Senate leader, into pushing through a reluctant Senate a full bodied Civil Rights Act. Students may wish to summarise and evaluate the Act which is arguably part of the question. High quality answers (21-25) will be consistently analytical/explanatory, fully relevant, well structured with good factual material. Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical/explanatory, but the structure and quality of material will be more uneven. The impression will be of a good solid answer. Bare pass answers (11-13) will be mostly narrative/descriptive, relevance may be variable and the factual material basic.

#### Question 6

***'The revolt of small town and rural America against the cities'. Discuss this assessment of the 1920s.***

The 1920s exhibited two quite contradictory tendencies. First, the technological advances in motor cars, planes, electrical industries; then the jazz age and a new school of American writers and an era of social and sexual emancipation. However, simultaneously there was a sharp reaction against internationalism, Wilsonian earnestness and idealism. This manifested itself in the Republican ascendancy at all levels of government except for some large cities. Also the Ku Klux Klan was revived with a spate of lynchings which went unpunished. Prohibition was voted in by suburban, rural and small town voters, and there was a revival of nativism. Clearly there is more than the quote implies in 1920s, and at best it embodies a partial truth only.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – NOVEMBER 2003	9697	5

### Question 7

***Assess relations between the United States and Europe, 1919-1941.***

The key here is to assess or evaluate, not simply describe. The best answers will try to ascertain what principles underlay US foreign policy. Terminal and commencement dates should be observed, and relevance may be a problem as the answer is confined to relations with Europe, hence Japanese actions and US reactions are NOT relevant. In 1920 the US Senate rejected the Versailles Treaty and hence the League of Nations and this marked the start of a twelve year period of isolationism. In 1921 the US made a separate peace with Germany. However, though the US was isolationist it was not uninvolved, and was surprisingly active in world affairs, being an observer at the League, on League committees; it took the initiative in the Washington Conference leading to a Five Power Naval Treaty (including Japan) – it had, however, no enforcement machinery, the only sanction being moral restraint. In 1928 the US took the lead in the Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war and signed by sixty-two countries. It too had no means of enforcement and has been described as a monument to illusion. Good answers should also deal with the strange treatment of Allied War Debts and Reparations, which had a strongly negative impact on US public opinion. 1933 marked a sea change, with a new President and Hitler's accession to power in Germany. From 1933 to 1939 FDR's policy was dictated by public opinion in the US which was increasingly pacifist. It was only after the dramatic German success of 1940 and his re-election for an unprecedented third term that FDR adopted a much more pro-Ally policy, though short of entering war. Good answers should trace the complex steps by which the USA in the two years shifted from strict neutrality to an undeclared naval war with Germany in 1941.

### Question 8

***Analyse the reasons for the dramatic change in social attitudes and lifestyles that occurred in America in the 1960s.***

These were centred mainly, though not entirely, on university and college campuses and most answers will focus on this aspect, one suspects. The magnitude should not be exaggerated. The decade that started with JFK as President ended with Richard Nixon. Whereas the 1950s had been conformist and apolitical, the 1960s saw a wide range of behaviour and attitudes which many, 'the silent majority', found shocking. Some were political, as protests against the seemingly endless war in Vietnam grew geometrically and acquired more militant and confrontational forms. All male students were in principle eligible for the draft, though the better connected found ways of circumventing this (including the last two Presidents of the US!). There was also a concerted protest at the structure, ethos, and role of universities in which nothing was unchallenged. They had grown in size dramatically (University of California having over 100, 000 students). Inevitably they were more bureaucratic, had close links with government and commerce, and were organised on hierarchical lines with many outmoded regulations in halls of residence. The 'sexual revolution' was not confined to the USA though it seemed initially more confined to Anglo-Saxon cultures. The students of the 1960s onwards were 'baby boomers', brought up on the maxims of Dr Spock, and relatively free of disciplinary and traditional constraints. Pre-marital sex and cohabitation seemed to become more common, certainly more in the open. Long hair, unkempt clothes, experimenting with drugs, rejection of all middle class values, and rock music became the norm. These changes were not universal, but were largely confined to the younger generation, who had never known war, unemployment or economic hardship (campuses were predominantly middle class). Though anarchism as a philosophy had very little explicit support, its underlying premise – that all external restraints were unjustified, seemed behind much 60s behaviour. High class answers (22-25) will be consistently analytical and relevantly well structured with very good quality material. Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical, mostly well structured, and mostly relevant but with some unevenness in quality of material. The impression will be that of a good solid answer. Bare pass answers will be largely descriptive, material may be basic, and relevance may stray.