

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

Key messages

- The most successful answers to **Section A** evaluated the sources, rather than paraphrasing them and reached a supported conclusion.
- The most effective responses to **Section B** contained relevant knowledge, presented balanced arguments and retained a clear focus on the question.

General comments

The most important guidance to answering **Question 1** is that candidates should avoid merely paraphrasing the sources, for example 'Source A says that...Source B says that...' More successful answers used the sources to frame an argument. How far do they agree? How far do they disagree? What is the overall conclusion? Three qualities are particularly important; relevance, explanation and knowledge. Most answers were relevant with candidates selecting appropriate material for the general topic. Good answers kept to the specified periods in answers. In **Question 2** the periods before and after Robespierre's rule were outside the scope of the question and could therefore not be rewarded. **Question 6** concerned the years from 1906 to the outbreak of war in 1914. The effects of World War I on Russia were not relevant. Better answers to **Question 8** included the period after 1870 whereas more limited responses confined themselves to the 1860s when Bismarck unified Germany.

In the majority of scripts, the standard of answers to **Question 1**, the source-based question, was higher than the standard of the essay answers. Many of the essays were rather brief. Marks are not given merely because of the length of answers but good candidates were rewarded when they used their knowledge to present balanced arguments which considered a range of issues.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were asked to use the sources to consider the hypothesis that 'Germany was more responsible than France for the hostile relations between them before World War I.' Higher credit was given when candidates grouped the sources. For example, Sources A and B agreed with the hypothesis that Germany was more responsible while Source D acquitted Germany of blame. Source C did not directly blame Germany but held that France was not warlike in 1914. Source E was more balanced and recorded the long history of resentment in France against Germany. It also showed the history of Franco-German relations with an emphasis on German aggression, but it indicates how the French were indoctrinated from an early age to be anti-German. Additional credit was given when candidates considered the provenance of the sources and used this to evaluate their reliability. Some good candidates did not accept Sources A and B as automatically reliable because they were written by diplomats, whereas weaker responses more frequently did. The more successful answers examined the sources to verify how far they were reliable. For example, in looking at Source A, they referred to the opposition in Germany to French plans for three years of military service in France. Public opinion in Germany was determined that their country would not appear second to France. Source B largely agreed with this view although it added that French public opinion also contributed to bad relations between the two countries. A few candidates gained credit when analysing Source C because they noted that the author was a German diplomat. It might be considered unusual that such a man would have declared in 1914 that France was not warlike. Sources D and E were secondary sources and there were effective comments on their status. Some candidates improved their answers by including brief references to their contextual knowledge of the sources. For example, they explained what was meant in Source A by the Germans' claim that they had lost their share in Morocco. On the other hand, a few answers were given low marks because they comprised only general accounts of the topic and paid too little

attention to the sources. The overall standard of the answers was satisfactory and there were some good responses.

Section B

Question 2

The question required candidates to make a judgement on whether Robespierre was more a success or a failure. High marks were awarded when candidates considered both sides of the argument. Most answers referred to his use of terror. The victims included not only open counter-revolutionaries but also those who were suspected because they belonged to certain social groups, although they were not personally guilty of plotting against the Revolution. Credit was given when answers explained why the use of terror was endorsed. In 1793, the Revolution was in danger from internal and external enemies and it seemed possible that it would be overturned by the counter-revolutionaries. Mass conscription was introduced to form an army against foreign threats. These dangers were defeated but candidates were rewarded when they considered how far the policies used by Robespierre represented a success or a failure. Did terror succeed in safeguarding the Revolution or did it fail because it contradicted the aspirations of the revolutionaries? Very good answers considered a wider range of issues, such as economic and religious policies. Economic hardship continued (or worsened) after the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789. Robespierre's reaction was to take action by fixing prices and reforming the currency by the introduction of assignats, or paper money. It is difficult to conclude that these measures were successful. His religious policy was extreme. The power and privileges of the Church had already been curbed but he went further and attacked Christianity itself. As an admirer of Rousseau, he introduced the Republic of Virtue, which alienated almost everybody in France. By 1795, after a short period in power, he had few allies and was executed. Effective answers ended in conclusions that weighed the factors and came to an overall judgement. Weaker answers sometimes consisted of short narratives that did not focus on the key issue.

Question 3

Candidates were asked to refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in their assessment of reasons for the importance of railways to the industrial Revolution. The majority of responses were sound and some displayed an impressive grasp of detail. They examined a range of relevant factors, whereas limited answers were often narrow in their treatment of the topic. Credit was given when candidates showed an awareness of the economic importance of railways. They enabled goods to be carried in larger quantities and over longer distances than had been possible previously. International trade grew, benefiting France and Germany especially. Some candidates were aware that railways proved a major impetus to employment. Engineering skills developed to build better railway engines, lines, bridges and tunnels. Economically and socially, large cities and towns became more important. Rising populations, that were both a cause and a result of the Industrial Revolution, needed to be fed and railways transported food to urban areas. Large-scale famine ended where railways were numerous. A contrast was apparent in non-industrialised areas that lacked railways. These often showed a relative decline.

Question 4

The best responses discussed whether Italian unification was more a victory for Piedmont's power or for nationalism and achieved balance between the two factors. Candidates were aware that Piedmont's status as the leading Italian state was apparent after the 1848 revolutions, recognising that although these failed Piedmont's position as the only state that might defeat Austria in the future was confirmed. The weaknesses of nationalism in Italy were explained in the better answers. Many candidates successfully illustrated these by referring to Mazzini's career. He was a passionate nationalist but his view that Italy should and could be united by its own efforts was misconceived. So was his support for an Italian republic in an age where major countries were ruled by monarchies. Credit was given when candidates could explain the roles of other Italian nationalist leaders such as Manin of Venice and the equivocal role played by Pope Pius IX. There were some perceptive discussions of Cavour's contribution. He modernised Piedmont and won allies, or sympathisers, among other European countries. Piedmont had no interest in the Crimean War and he was initially unconvinced of the wisdom of intervening but it won the friendship of Britain and especially France. Good answers explained Cavour's aims, which were probably more to unite the northern Italian provinces than to unify the north and south. Where moderate answers explained the narrative of developments under Cavour, better responses considered how this was linked to the key issue. Garibaldi was an interesting example of a successful nationalist, a supporter of Mazzini, who conquered the southern regions of Naples and Sicily, but who then took the realistic step of accepting the leading role of monarchist Piedmont. Credit was given when answers continued to the final stages of unification with the incorporation of Venice and

Rome. Answers that were awarded a lower mark were sometimes uncertain about the factors. They often provided quite accurate narratives of developments but were less confident about the issues involved.

Question 5

Candidates were given a choice in this question on the problems facing European imperialists - they could focus on either Africa or Asia, but not both. The most notable discriminating factor was the extent to which answers referred to particular examples in these regions. Less creditable answers often mentioned Africa or Asia in general terms whereas the better responses were more specific. Precise examples provided the factual knowledge that was necessary to gain a high mark. There were useful discussions of international rivalries, for example between Britain and France in parts of Africa. The 'man on the spot' was important in imperialism but these men could be difficult to control. The result might be that European governments could be landed with problems that they had not created. Public opinion could be a problem. Neither Disraeli nor Bismarck was initially convinced about the wisdom of intervention in Africa or Asia but changed their minds because of public pressure from their countrymen. Control could be a problem. China was too vast to be controlled effectively and imperial outposts there were different from those elsewhere in Asia. There could be trouble from indigenous peoples in Africa, for example the Zulus. There were many relevant references to diseases, especially malaria. The overall quality of answers was satisfactory.

Question 6

The main difference between sound and more moderate answers was usually that the former examined 'How strong was Nicholas II's government' while the latter opted to focus on one factor, usually the weakness of the regime. These answers were relevant but limited in scope. Nicholas II's government had much strength and few, including Lenin, predicted in 1914 that an early revolution was likely in Russia. Most people accepted the authority of the Tsar, even after the 1905 Revolution. The army was loyal and the police were efficient in curbing radical opposition. The introduction of the Dumas seemed to have taken the sting out of more moderate critics, although the Dumas had no power. The economy was growing and Russia appeared to be recovering from defeat by Japan with massive investment in the military. Russia had powerful allies in France and (probably) Britain. The weaknesses included the Tsar's personality and his preference to surround himself with reactionary advisers. Stolypin was a reformer and some candidates pointed out the lack of support for his policies from Nicholas II. His reforms had little effect before his premature death. The reality of the military situation was exposed as soon as war with the Triple Alliance broke out. Credit was given when conclusions showed whether strengths or weaknesses were more important.

Question 7

The general standard of knowledge about Mussolini's domestic policies was satisfactory. Understanding of his foreign policies was sometimes less secure. The most frequent difference between sound answers and more limited responses was the extent to which candidates linked Mussolini's policies to his aims. Some candidates organised their answers effectively by explaining his aims first, then linking them to his policies and assessing their results. Credit was given when candidates distinguished between the dictatorial nature of Mussolini's government and the extent to which he was a totalitarian ruler. Most candidates kept to the specified time period, although a few went beyond this to discuss developments such as increased anti-semitism and the obvious decline in Mussolini's independence from Hitler. Political issues were discussed and many candidates recognised that although Italy was a one-party state, opponents were not treated with the same violence that Hitler and Stalin used. There was an attempt to reform the economy but with mixed success. Mussolini realised the importance of avoiding a break with the Roman Catholic Church and was successful in this. He also maintained a relationship with the King, at least to 1939.

Question 8

This was a comparative question that allowed candidates two choices: did Bismarck's diplomacy or imperialism do more to cause tension in Europe? Credit was awarded when candidates gave approximately equal attention to each. When discussing Bismarck, some candidates narrated the developments before Germany became a fully unified country but did not discuss the effects of his policies from 1870. For example, he sought to maintain peace, largely by isolating France. However, his attempts to maintain an alliance with both Austria and Russia failed and he chose to remain close to Austria, thus alienating Russia. His ambitious series of alliances, including the Dreikaiserbund, the Dual Alliance with Austria and the Triple Alliance, did not make Europe, and thus Germany, more secure. Imperialism led to rivalries within Europe that damaged peaceful relations. The best responses compared the effects of these two developments while weaker ones generally only discussed one.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

Key messages

- The most successful answers to **Section A** evaluated the sources, rather than paraphrasing them and reached a supported conclusion.
- The most effective responses to **Section B** contained relevant knowledge, presented balanced arguments and retained a clear focus on the question.

General comments

The overall standard of work reflected good understanding and sound knowledge. Most candidates organised their time effectively to answer four questions as required. When answering **Question 1**, candidates were advised to pay attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources, both individually and as a group. This means that answers should not merely paraphrase the extracts. Higher marks were awarded when the sources were used as part of an argument. Evaluation was important. The reliability of the extracts should be assessed and linked to the validity of the hypothesis. What was the intention of the author? What was his target audience? How much did he probably know about the matters he was dealing with? Candidates can use their knowledge of the topic to supplement the sources but should do so briefly. A few candidates wrote general essays that referred very little to the extracts and their answer could not be given much credit. On the other hand, a large number of candidates used the sources effectively, integrating them in an argument and coming to clear conclusions about the hypothesis.

Each of the essay questions contained a key issue that was addressed by the more successful candidates. Less creditable answers tended to be general essays on the topic. For example, **Question 2** asked 'How far did the people of France gain liberty and equality during the period from 1789 to 1815?' Candidates were given credit when they showed that they agreed that there were beneficial changes, explained the aspects which did not change and came to an overall conclusion about the balance. They focused on the issues of liberty and equality and avoided discussing other factors. They used their knowledge to focus on the question that was set. Most candidates tackled the questions in a well-organised manner.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates grouped the sources according to the extent to which they agreed with or contradicted the hypothesis. Sources C and E supported the claim in the question while the other sources contradicted it. Evaluations were more variable. Some answers accepted the sources at face value. A small minority paraphrased the extracts. Some applied simplistic tests to assess the sources. For example, they claimed that Sources A and B were reliable because they were official reports. Source C was accepted for the same reason. However, candidates did not consider whether all the sources could be reliable when Sources A and B contradicted C. A higher mark would have been awarded if the texts of the sources had been examined more carefully and if the statements had been scrutinised more rigorously. There were some effective comments about Source D. It was useful as an extract from a private diary, but one must question how typical the writer was of Serbians. Perhaps he was but how do we know? Some good answers were given credit for their assessments of Source E. They pointed out that France had been (indirectly) the ally of Serbia in World War I. The criticism of Serbia in the extract points to a degree of objectivity. Some creditable answers distinguished between ordinary Serbians and the Serbian government. A number of answers contained some useful, but appropriately brief, contextual knowledge to supplement their arguments, for example about the Austrian ultimatum after the Archduke's assassination in 1914 or Austria's actions in Bosnia in 1908. Overall, answers were satisfactory.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was the extent to which French people gained liberty and equality from 1789 to 1815. The most successful candidates referred to four important periods: the years immediately following the meeting of the Estates General, the rule of Robespierre and the Jacobins, the Directory and Napoleon's government. Exactly equal treatment of each was not expected and answers needed to focus on the issues of liberty and equality. These were among the main concerns of revolutionaries in 1789. Advances were seen in the early years in spite of Louis XVI's reluctance to grant concessions. Sound essays noted that there was an end to arbitrary justice. There was freedom from the burdens of unfair taxation. The franchise was widened. These changes were summarised in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The power of the Church, often seen as excessive, was curbed. The irony of the rule of Robespierre and the Jacobins was that they saw themselves as the champions of freedom but came to represent terror and government by fear. The innocent suffered alongside the guilty counter-revolutionaries. Credit was given when the impact of the Directory was assessed. It was a reversal of the extremism of the Jacobins but gained a reputation for being uncaring of the general good. Candidates came to different opinions about Napoleon. Some saw him as extending equality and safeguarding liberty while others concluded that he used these as a cover for a harsh autocracy. The standard of most of the answers was sound and there was little irrelevance.

Question 3

This question was essentially about the social impact of industrialisation and could be linked to economic and political issues. Answers were sometimes vague about the effects on particular countries and scored more highly when they included appropriate examples, for instance the effects of the 1832 Reform Act in Britain. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the middle classes in Britain had an advantage over their counterparts in France and Germany because their country was more stable. The Industrial Revolution got under way later on the continent. Some argued that the lower classes gained most because they were more numerous and their gains represented the basic necessities of life. This was allowable as long as the answers also considered the middle classes as a comparison. Some examined the fortunes of the upper classes. Most of them gained little although some were sufficiently lucky to own places that were rich in natural resources. But they did not usually lose much and their landed interests retained their value. Credit was given when answers explained the economic advantages of the middle classes. Britain was comparatively free of government intervention. Industrialisation needed those who built factories and invested in trade but it also benefited the middle classes in other ways. The number in professions, such as law or banking, grew and their larger houses reflected their greater wealth.

Question 4

The best responses were reasonably balanced between strengths and weaknesses. Less successful answers were often focused on one issue only, usually the weaknesses of Italian nationalism, while the weakest responses contained only narrative about developments in Italy and did not link this to an argument. Most candidates wrote relevant answers and a good proportion reached the highest level. There were effective appraisals of Mazzini that noted why he became a leading figure in Italy. They pointed out his determination and ability to form nationalist groups such as Young Italy. He was a leading force in the 1848-49 revolutions. Credit was given to candidates when they understood that Mazzini also represented weaknesses in the Risorgimento. In particular, his view that Italy could be united by its own efforts was unrealistic. His preference was an Italian republic, which was unpopular in a world that was ruled largely by monarchs and princes. Credit was given to answers that went beyond Mazzini and considered the work of men such as Charles Albert of Piedmont, Manin of Venice and Pope Pius IX. Some candidates referred erroneously to Cavour. His contribution to Italian unification came after the specified period. Most candidates understood the anti-nationalist role of Austria and the best were able to support their comments by referring to developments that proved this. Discussions of the 1848-49 revolutions were best when they included some details about developments and judged how they played a role in unification. Although the revolutionaries failed, showing weaknesses in the movement for unification, they were a success in that they demonstrated that the Risorgimento had considerable support. By 1849, Italy had also found a state in Piedmont that could lead the movement in the future.

Question 5

The key issue was the reasons why Britain was more successful than France and Germany in enlarging its overseas empire in the later nineteenth century. Candidates are reminded of the need to provide examples outside Europe in answers to questions on this topic. The most successful responses did so whereas

weaker answers tended to be general, even vague, in their supporting knowledge. The majority of candidates pointed to the economic advantages of Britain. It became industrialised earlier and this gave a boost to imperialism. It also had a superior navy. Political factors were important. During the period when Britain's empire expanded most, Germany was becoming unified and had other priorities. France was less stable than Britain. The defeat in 1870 by Germany resulted in a political crisis and was followed by some years of internal uncertainty. France and Germany were comparative latecomers in terms of imperial expansion. When these countries expanded, it was to regions that were less profitable as colonies, such as French settlements in Saharan Africa and Pacific islands for Germany.

Question 6

In order to achieve a high mark, candidates needed to concentrate on the specified period. It was possible to discuss developments before 1917 but the points had to be linked to the October Revolution. For example, answers could explain how the Bolsheviks came to represent a threat by 1917. On the other hand, it was difficult to make relevant accounts of the general causes of revolution, including descriptions of the 1905 Revolution and the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II. In the wider context, the Bolshevik victory in October 1917 might be described as an unexpected revolution. Many candidates structured their essays in two parts: the problems and weaknesses of the Provisional Government and the ultimate victory of Lenin's Bolsheviks. These became complementary. The position of the Provisional Government was always precarious in spite of initial widespread support. It did not have a clear constitutional mandate and postponed elections. The decision to continue fighting in the hope that Russia's fortunes might turn and to maintain financial support from the allies, backfired because it solved no problems. In fact the situation was made worse when Kerensky's regime lost the support of the soldiers. Answers were rewarded when they showed the influence of radical groups such as the soviets. (Many answers referred to these but only a few explained them). Numerous answers explained the positive reasons for the success of the Bolsheviks. Lenin was a charismatic figure. Good answers explained the reasons why 'Peace, Land and Bread' was a popular slogan. They examined the ways in which Lenin made the best of setbacks such as the July Days. They explained why the Kornilov Affair was a turning point. Lenin's decision to move in October and his success in persuading his colleagues were examined. Some explained the role of Trotsky. Most of the answers were very sound and some were excellent.

Question 7

Almost all answers contained at least a basic knowledge and understanding of the use of terror in Stalin's Russia. A discriminating factor that characterised the best responses was their ability to explain the extent and variety of the ways in which victims were chosen. They also considered the motives for the policy. The numbers are still uncertain but 20 million might be accurate and this indicates the sheer scale of terror. The range included every group in Russia: political, economic, social and military. Supporters such as leaders of the NKVD were as likely to suffer as the kulaks. Good candidates noted that terror was indiscriminate. It was so widespread that almost every family was affected, either directly or indirectly. Another feature of better answers was that they considered how far Stalin's power depended on terror. Stalin managed propaganda effectively to represent himself as the father of the nation. Not even those who were in danger in open or secret trials denounced him. Economic news was slanted so that the figures proved the success of Stalin's policies and therefore justified them. The victims of terror were portrayed as the enemies of the state, and therefore everyone in Russia, not simply as critics of Stalin. He justified terror as the only way to achieve the economic and social revolution that Russia needed. But he also moved against people who were personally his real or imagined enemies.

Question 8

The key issue was a comparison of the effects on nineteenth-century Europe of the Napoleonic Wars and the Franco-Prussian War. Whereas some answers were limited to narratives of the conflicts, good responses concentrated on their consequences. Essays that were placed in the higher mark bands were reasonably balanced between the two wars. Weaker answers often dealt with only one and lacked the comparative element. Napoleon's wars failed ultimately but succeeded in shaking the existing balance of power. They strengthened conservative opinion while, at the same time, encouraging liberal and nationalist elements in the middle classes who saw him (mistakenly) as the champion of freedom. The Franco-Prussian War had an immediate effect on the two powers involved but it had wider consequences for Europe. Germany suddenly became a leading European power. France recovered unexpectedly quickly and their rivalry was at the heart of European politics for the rest of the nineteenth century. The war also created tensions that divided other countries into rival camps.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

Key messages

- The most successful answers to **Section A** evaluated the sources, rather than paraphrasing them and reached a supported conclusion.
- The most effective responses to **Section B** contained relevant knowledge, presented balanced arguments and retained a clear focus on the question.

General comments

Overall, the standard achieved was satisfactory and some scripts deserved high marks. The most important qualities in responses included the effective use of historical knowledge to support arguments, the ability to consider different reasons for, and explanations of, developments, an awareness of the reasons for change and continuity in particular periods, and success in organising answers. The first of these qualities means that success in a history examination requires more than memory. It asks that candidates understand what the facts mean in the context of an historical development. There is never one simple explanation in response to the questions set. For example, in answering 'Why did Louis XVI convene the Estates General in 1789?' candidates need to cite factual knowledge to support their views and discard other knowledge which may be accurate but is not linked to the question. Candidates also need to be able to present different reasons and put them in order of importance. The answers should show what changed and what did not. For instance, what changed in 1789 to persuade the King that such a meeting was necessary when the Estates General had not met for more than a century? Lastly, answers should be orderly, with points made clearly. Some scripts contained plans which helped candidates to write well-structured answers. Most candidates achieved an acceptable standard and some proved themselves very adept. Combining a source-based question and three different periods for the essays meant that the candidates showed a range of understanding and the ability to express themselves. Few did not answer the required four questions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were asked to use the sources provided to consider the hypothesis that 'Germany was the "evil genius" before World War I'. 'Evil genius', a quotation from Source E, was not only a very strong denunciation of Germany's responsibility for the war. It also pinpointed Germany's role because blame was not shared with other countries. Source E claimed that the war was planned to fulfil Germany's ambitions and the dangers from Russia and France were discarded. It agreed with the view in Source A that Germany's best interests were served by pursuing aggressive policies. Schlieffen, a leading military officer at the end of the nineteenth century, criticised those in the army who favoured other policies. If the two sources are taken together, they indicate that German policies remained consistently in favour of war for a number of years before World War I broke out. Sources B, C and D disagree. Candidates were credited when they noted the direct disagreement in Source D with the view that Germany was the most culpable country. Source D put Germany at the bottom of the list of warmongers. Source E put it first. As many candidates rightly pointed out, the authors of Sources B and C can be expected to defend their countries. Some candidates wondered why Moltke's message should be sent uncoded to London. The most probable reason was that he wished that it would be leaked to other countries to persuade them of Germany's reluctance to go to war. Candidates were given credit when they examined the provenance of the sources. For example, some pointed out that America ended the war fighting against Germany. Source D was written only eight years later. This shows some revision in American opinion because the extract might be considered unexpected in its conclusions. Source D also gave a hierarchy of responsibility for the war. This gave candidates the opportunity to gain credit by agreeing or disagreeing with the hypothesis.

Section B

Question 2

The key issue was whether Napoleon Bonaparte did more to fulfil or betray the ideals of the French Revolution. Most answers were relevant and displayed creditable knowledge and understanding. Moderate answers tended to assume the ideals of the French Revolution whereas the better responses were more specific. They explained what was meant by liberty, equality and fraternity in the context of revolutionary France. Good candidates spent most of their time on Napoleon's rule. Developments from 1789 to 1799 were not needed but could be covered briefly. Napoleon came to power because of his widespread support as a soldier. Defeat in Egypt did not lessen this. In his earlier career, he was linked to the Jacobins which could have destroyed him but he survived with the reputation that he favoured liberty over the repression of the Directory. Most candidates discussed the Code and appreciated that there was a contradiction between the apparently liberal elements it contained and the autocracy that it guaranteed to Napoleon. The Concordat with the Papacy ensured both religious toleration and support for his rule by the still-powerful Church and the general populace. There were tensions between the rule of law and the secret justice that was used to curb enemies. Careers were open to talent - but only for some people. Censorship and a police system contradicted the claim that Napoleon was fully in favour of liberty. Overall, the majority of essays were creditable and some achieved a high standard.

Question 3

This question required candidates to discuss the reasons why capitalism was important to the Industrial Revolution. Most candidates understood that this was largely because industrialisation needed investment. Among other needs, larger factories had to be built. Money was necessary to construct railways to transport goods and materials. Capitalism moved from the input of small individuals to the intervention of larger banks and financial institutions. More capable candidates took the opportunity to compare Britain with France and Germany. They noted that, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the middle classes in Britain were more willing to invest than those in France and Germany. Credit was given when candidates explained why. Banks were better established in Britain, although some of them failed during economic depressions. Capitalism was also linked to imports and exports, encompassing international trade. Answers containing some specific references, for example to the Credit Mobilier in France and the Zollverein in Germany, deserved credit. Other reasons for the development of the Industrial Revolution were made relevant when they were linked to the key issue and balanced against capitalism.

Question 4

Candidates were asked to consider the extent to which German unification in 1871 was a victory for German nationalism. The most frequent difference between moderate and good answers was that the former often contained only narrative, whereas the latter were analytical in approach. Credit was given when candidates assessed Bismarck's motives. His priority was to strengthen Prussia's power and leadership in Germany. It is likely that initially he sought only the integration of the states in northern Germany. The southern states were very different, especially in their Catholicism. 1866 marked a turning point as he moved from the North German Confederation to the union of all German states. Some candidates referred to the 1848 Revolution and the failure of nationalists to unify Germany. However, the more successful responses realised that nationalism survived, especially among the Liberals. They pointed out that Bismarck supported the King against the Liberals over the budget issue but claimed that they shared the same broad views about the future of Germany. (His speech about 'blood and iron' was not about aims but methods.) He used nationalism to gain support in the three wars of unification, although he favoured a state that would be dominated by Prussian ideas and traditions. Almost all of the answers were relevant and some were argued very well.

Question 5

The words 'How beneficial?' in this question meant that candidates could examine the disadvantages as well as the advantages that resulted from imperialism. The question focused on results, rather than causes, and some candidates spent too much time explaining why European countries embarked on policies of imperial expansion. Britain, France and Germany, the three countries most involved in imperialism, gained in international status but not to an equal extent. Britain's empire was unparalleled but Germany gained comparatively little. By the end of the nineteenth century, its support for 'Weltpolitik' (world power) was weakened as many Germans believed that it had failed. There was greater support in the country for a European centred policy. France remained enthusiastic but it gained less than Britain. Its empire was large in size but smaller in terms of material gains. Some candidates claimed that empires were an outlet for the

investment of surplus capital. However, this view is not now held by many historians. Much less was invested in 'New Imperialism' regions than in other areas such as the USA. Investment in many regions did not yield the same profits. Candidates also need to be cautious about the claim that emigration from crowded European countries was a benefit because comparatively few migrated to 'New Imperial' regions which offered little chance of employment and healthier life-styles. Administrators, soldiers and missionaries were needed but these were small in number. The general quality of the answers was satisfactory with little irrelevance.

Question 6

Good candidates noted that the question was about the period after the October Revolution. Brief references to the problems that Lenin and his colleagues faced in gaining power were allowable but these were not part of the central core of the question and valid only in a short introduction. Some answers were awarded low marks because they only explained the problems that Lenin experienced before coming to power. Many answers focused on the period indicated in the question. There were sound assessments of the civil war, although a few candidates underestimated its danger to the Bolsheviks. It was relevant to discuss how Lenin achieved one-party government when the Constituent Assembly was dismissed and was replaced by the Council of People's Commissars. There were many creditable descriptions of War Communism and the New Economic Policy but some answers would have been rewarded if they had explained why these very different, even contradictory, economic policies were introduced. Some answers would have been improved if the points had been presented less as a list of problems and if their order of importance had been shown. This was part of the assessment that the question required. A more general weakness was that comparatively few candidates considered Lenin's problems of leadership. He was pre-eminent but still had to cope with strong characters such as Trotsky, Stalin and other leading Bolsheviks. The general standard of the answers was satisfactory.

Question 7

Answers to this question on whether the Weimar Republic's end was sudden and unexpected, fell into two groups. A minority were confined to accounts of Hitler's rule in Germany after the fall of the Weimar Republic. A short discussion in a conclusion would have been permissible but long accounts were largely irrelevant. The better answers showed knowledge and understanding of the Weimar regime. In hindsight, it is tempting to argue that the claim in the question was wrong and that the causes of the fall of Weimar were deep-rooted. Some candidates rightly pointed out that the Republic survived for almost 25 years (longer than Hitler's Third Reich lasted). This was in spite of considerable political, economic and social problems. The Stresemann era saw a marked recovery in the economy. Germany was recognised as a responsible and respected power by western European countries, deserving a leading role in the League of Nations. Yet underlying problems continued within Germany. Governments depended on coalitions. Powerful sections of the population remained suspicious. Candidates were rewarded when they explained why 1929 marked a turning point with the death of Stresemann and the Wall Street Crash. Political stability was under threat and Germany's economic fragility was revealed. Very good answers explained how and why Hitler and the Nazis were able to fill the vacuum. Some answers made the good point that the politicians who allowed Hitler into power did not believe that he would quickly become a dictator and end Weimar.

Question 8

The key issue was the comparative success of the French Revolution of 1789 and the Italian revolutions of 1848. This question was answered best when candidates devoted approximately equal time to each revolution. Some answers discussed only one and could not therefore reach a satisfactory standard. Better answers discussed the differences between the two movements. The French Revolution, unlike the movements in Italy, was not defeated by foreign armies. The scale of the uprising in France was larger than the more regional risings in Italy. In the short term, France's king was executed whereas Italian monarchs and princes survived. Anti-clericalism was widespread in France whereas the Papacy and the Roman Catholic Church retained the loyalty of many in Italy. However, it can be argued that, in the longer term, France came to be governed by another autocrat. Italian revolutionaries were defeated in the short term but they achieved most of their aims in the longer term. Good answers went beyond narratives of developments to discuss their significance.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

Key messages

- In **Section A** candidates should be aware that statements such as '*Source B is biased*' require supporting evidence to demonstrate the ways in which the source is biased, why it is biased and how this affects its use for interpreting the validity of the given hypothesis.
- In **Section B** the most effective responses paid close attention to the demands of the questions and presented balanced arguments which were supported by carefully selected detail.

General comments

A number of candidates sustained consistently high standards and made informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of knowledge and understanding. Many demonstrated sound knowledge in at least some of their answers. A number found it difficult to apply what they knew to address demands of the questions. Characteristic of weaker scripts was a lack of appropriate knowledge and such responses were often assertive.

In their responses to **Question 1**, most candidates identified information from the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis and constructed focused arguments. The most impressive responses were highly analytical, evaluated the sources beyond face value and cross-referenced effectively. Many candidates recognised the need to evaluate the sources, but some were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying on vague assertions regarding source reliability. The most impressive responses reflected careful reading of the sources and a little time spent planning. They understood both sides of the argument, ensuring that answers were balanced and focused on the question throughout. Candidates who read and wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis and often missed opportunities for cross-referencing. A significant number of candidates began their responses with lengthy introductions about the United Nations which had no relevance to the hypothesis and could not be credited.

The most impressive responses to the essay questions contained clear and consistent arguments which were focused on the requirements of the questions and based on a balanced analysis of factual material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a plan. A considerable proportion of candidates possessed relevant knowledge but some did not use it to its full advantage, describing events rather than answering the question. Some answers made good points but lacked balance, as in **Question 6** where a number of candidates developed arguments to show that attempts to control nuclear weapons were successful, but did not mention the counter-arguments which might be used to challenge this view.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The majority of responses were well-balanced. Sources B, C and D were seen as supporting the hypothesis. For example, Source B argued that there was a '*fundamental contradiction between traditional Communist doctrine and the principles of the UN Charter*', making it impossible for the Soviet Union to '*accept the full obligations of membership*.' Source C's assertion that the USSR joined the UN in order to wage a diplomatic war against its Cold War rivals was widely noted. Most responses recognised the relevance of Source D's claim that the USSR joined the UN to gain international prestige and as a means of combating '*anti-Soviet measures*.' Source A was seen as providing the strongest challenge to the hypothesis as Stalin demonstrated a firm commitment to a post-war international organisation as the only way of ensuring peace in the future. Similarly, many candidates noted Source E's claim that new evidence, recently released from Russian archives, confirmed that Soviet leaders were '*completely sincere*' in their support for a peacetime

'Grand Alliance', such as the UN. The most common conclusion was that Stalin's Soviet Union was not totally committed to the UN and its principles. The USSR was only prepared to join on condition that its own interests were protected, as evidenced by Stalin's insistence on the right of veto in the Security Council. Source B's assertion that '*The Soviet Union used the UN and its institution as a front*' to gain international prestige and to further its Cold War ambitions was widely accepted.

To achieve higher marks candidates needed to go beyond 'face value' interpretation of the sources and consider context, evaluate provenance and cross-refer between sources to assess the validity of the hypothesis. In some cases attempts to do this could have been more convincing. Many argued that because Source A is from a speech by Stalin it must be unreliable and biased. Better answers developed this point with an explanation of how and why. The most analytical responses placed Stalin's speech in context and confirmed its reliability by cross-referencing with the first two sentences of Source E. It was noted that Stalin made his speech in November 1944, when World War II had not yet been won. Stalin had a vested interest in maintaining the war-time Grand Alliance with Britain and the USA '*as a safeguard against a revival of the German and Japanese threats*' (Source E). Some candidates argued convincingly that Stalin was totally sincere in his commitment to the concept of a post-war international organisation in 1944. It was only later, for example at the San Francisco Conference, that the self-interest of the USSR became evident.

Many candidates claimed that Source B must be biased because it was written by an American. The best responses explained that the article was written at the height of the Cold War amid American fears of a communist plot to gain world domination. The source argues in emotive terms about the USSR's '*communist ideology*', claiming that this prevented it from conforming to the principles of the UN Charter, yet it provides no evidence to support these comments. Some candidates argued that the anti-communist tone of the article is reflected in the fact that it too readily dismisses the USSR's call for '*unflinching and consistent observance of the Charter and the implementation of its principles.*'

The majority argued that Source C is not biased because it was written by a British academic after the end of the Cold War. The most analytical recognised it as an opinionated and unbalanced assessment of Soviet motives, using emotive terms such as '*miserable achievements.*' It claims that the USSR used the UN as a tool in its Cold War rivalry with the USA and as a means of legitimising its own expansionist policies, but provides no examples to substantiate these allegations. A number of candidates showed how Source D supports Source C's claim that the USSR only joined the UN to further its own aims, but argues that this was for defensive rather than offensive reasons. Less analytical answers sometimes contained contradictory statements about Source D, arguing that it is critical of Soviet motives for joining the UN, but is unreliable because it was written by a Russian. Candidates were divided in their assessment of Source E. Some argued that the information gained from documents recently released from Russian archives would inevitably paint a positive picture of Soviet commitment to the UN. Others suggested that, since these documents were never intended for public consumption, they are likely to be an accurate account of Soviet motives.

The most common conclusion was that the Soviet Union was committed to the idea of an international organisation designed to ensure world peace. Elements from Sources A, D and E were used to support this view, and many used Vyshinsky's statement (Source B) as further evidence. However, as shown in Source D, the USSR was less committed to other aspects of the UN ('*economic, cultural or humanitarian issues*'), and was only prepared to join the UN provided its own interests were protected. This was seen as the reason why the USSR worked to '*consolidate as much authority as possible to the Security Council*' and insisted on the right of veto. The most impressive responses used contextual knowledge to show that the USSR was not alone in using the UN to further its own interests. The USA did the same through the structural arrangements of the UN, making it clear that American membership was dependent upon having the right of veto. As Source E states, Stalin's support for the UN was '*like Roosevelt's, self interest.*'

Section B

Question 2

Many candidates wrote impressive responses, based on a sound understanding of the ideological differences between the USA and the USSR dating back to 1917. This provided a context for coverage of the more immediate causes of the Cold War between 1945 and 1949. The most frequent conclusion was that strategic and economic factors were more significant than political ideology, but that ideological differences magnified misunderstandings and distrust between the superpowers. Some responses provided general accounts of the causes of the Cold War and could have been improved with better focus on the demands of the question. There was a variety of approaches, ranging from chronological coverage of events to evaluation of the various theories put forward by historians. Such responses were based on the

assumption that differing ideology was the cause of the Cold War, and there was little investigation of other interpretations. For example, Soviet expansionism into Eastern Europe was seen as an attempt to spread communism, while the Truman Doctrine was viewed as an attempt to prevent it. The possibility that Stalin and Truman might have had other motives (such as security and economic expansion) was ignored. The weakest responses were characterised by inaccuracies and limited understanding. A few candidates struggled to establish a chronological framework for their argument. A common misconception was that the Berlin Blockade and the building of the Berlin Wall happened at the same time.

Question 3

Some candidates produced thorough responses, balancing Soviet responsibility with other causal factors, such as the role of the USA and decolonisation. Focused arguments were supported by accurate detail covering a range of issues, such as the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War and superpower involvement in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. A number of responses, while containing much of the same information, lost sight of the question and offered a narrative of events. Such essays often concluded with an assertion regarding which superpower was responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War. The weakest responses were characterised by inadequate knowledge and generalised assertions. The most frequent conclusion was that the USSR was entirely responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War because it was determined to spread communism world-wide. This was often based on an exaggeration of Soviet involvement in the wars in Korea and Vietnam. Similarly, Khrushchev's decision to place nuclear weapons in Cuba was seen as an example of Soviet expansionism, with little attention given to the role of the USA in the build up to the crisis. A significant number of candidates, confused by the term 'globalisation' and ignoring the given timeframe, wrote at length about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

The majority of responses focused on the outcomes of the Cuban missile crisis and identified some level of success for both leaders. Kennedy's brinkmanship strategy was seen as vital in forcing the USSR to remove its missiles from Cuba, averting the possibility of nuclear war. In return, Khrushchev ensured the removal of American missiles from Turkey. Some candidates went so far as to claim that both leaders had been successful because the crisis led to a reduction in tension characterised by the 'hot line' between Moscow and Washington. Such responses, while accurate, were not always fully focused on the question. The most perceptive candidates appreciated the need to establish what the *goals* were in order to decide the degree of success. The best answers showed that American economic interests in Cuba had been damaged by Castro's revolution, and that the USA was determined to remove him. Kennedy's goals, therefore, went deeper than simply wanting to remove Soviet missiles from Cuba. This point enabled some candidates to explain the significance of Kennedy's subsequent agreement to guarantee Cuban independence. It was the American threat to Cuban sovereignty which provided Khrushchev with the opportunity to become involved, whether to protect a vulnerable communist state, to test Kennedy's resolve, or simply for prestige. Some candidates showed that although Khrushchev may have succeeded in protecting Cuba, his own prestige suffered as he was heavily criticised in the USSR and was subsequently dismissed. Weaker responses were characterised by inaccuracies or limited understanding. For example, some implied that the Bay of Pigs incident was part of the missile crisis rather than a cause. Others believed that placing Soviet missiles in Cuba and American missiles in Turkey took place at the same time.

Question 5

Many candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of the factors which led to the collapse of the USSR. The most impressive showed how the causes were inter-connected. For example, some candidates argued that Gorbachev's reforms attempted to address problems caused by poor leadership, a stagnating economy, rising nationalism and the high costs involved in the arms race. The enhancement of the American nuclear programme under Reagan, US aid to Soviet enemies in Afghanistan and improving relations between the USA and China were seen by some as imposing extra pressure on the USSR, leading Gorbachev to seek improved relations with the West. Rather than solving the USSR's problems, Gorbachev's reforms split the Communist Party and encouraged nationalism in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union. Some answers, although containing relevant material, were less focused. Such essays tended to be descriptive, discussing in varying degrees of detail the reasons why the USSR collapsed. The most common conclusion was that Gorbachev was responsible. While weaker responses tended to assert that the reforms led to the disintegration of the USSR, more effective essays explained what Gorbachev was trying to achieve and analysed the impact of his policies. Explanation of the role played by the USA was often confined to a brief account of Reagan's star wars programme. The weakest responses were characterised by a lack of accurate detail. Some responses were unbalanced, arguing either that the USA was the main reason for the USSR's collapse or that the USA played no part at all. For example, several candidates claimed that the

USA was responsible for the demolition of the Berlin Wall. Another common assertion was that the USA was responsible for the collapse of the USSR because of the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and policies of containment and roll-back.

Question 6

The best responses saw the Cuban missile crisis as a significant turning point in the arms race, and described the aims, terms and impact of the various treaties of the 1960s and 1970s. The most common conclusion was that, while these treaties had some success, they had fundamental weaknesses which made it impossible for them to control the arms race. It was only after 1980 that more effective treaties were implemented (e.g. START). Many candidates named appropriate treaties but with only limited awareness of what they were intended to achieve and the level of their success. For example, it was commonly asserted that the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 prevented all testing of nuclear weapons and, therefore, must have been a success. Similarly, a few candidates misunderstood the chronology of the treaties, and discussed them in random order, without dates. The majority of responses wrote about the START Treaties which were outside the timeframe of the question. The weakest responses often incorrectly interpreted strategies, such as MAD. The most common conclusion was that attempts to control the arms race were unsuccessful because both the USA and the USSR retained nuclear weapons.

Question 7

While some outlined the crucial role which the USA played in rebuilding the international economy in the period following World War II (through Marshall Aid and the World Bank, for example), relatively few showed how American dominance was threatened following her own economic problems in the 1970s. As a result, all but the best responses tended to be unbalanced and lacking focus on the key issue. The weakest answers were often confused about the scope of the question. Some candidates interpreted it as being about the Cold War, describing Soviet-American relations during the period with no reference to economic issues beyond an explanation of the differences between capitalism and communism.

Question 8

The majority of candidates demonstrated some understanding of the Non-Aligned Movement. The most effective analysed the movement's aims and achievements in depth. Weaker responses tended to follow a descriptive approach, with limited focus on the question. Some responses would have been improved by the inclusion of more detailed examples to support the points being made.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

Key messages

- In **Section A** candidates should be aware that statements such as '*Source B is biased*' require supporting evidence to demonstrate the ways in which the source is biased, why it is biased and how this affects its use for interpreting the validity of the given hypothesis.
- In **Section B** the most effective responses paid close attention to the demands of the questions and presented balanced arguments which were supported by carefully selected detail.

General comments

Many candidates maintained consistently high standards throughout, making informed judgements based on a solid foundation of knowledge and understanding. Most showed good knowledge in at least some of their answers, but some were unable to sustain this across the whole script. A number found it difficult to apply their knowledge so that it was closely focused on the terms the questions. Weaker scripts were characterised by a lack of knowledge, tending to consist of vague statements or unsupported assertions.

In response to **Section A: Question 1**, most candidates identified information from the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis and construct a focused argument. The most impressive responses went beyond 'face value' and interpreted the sources through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of contextual knowledge. Although some were aware of the need to apply such analytical depth, a few were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying on vague assertions regarding source reliability. The most impressive essays came from candidates who had read through the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a plan before commencing their response. They understood both sides of the argument and ensured that their essays were balanced and focused throughout. Candidates who read and wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis and often missed opportunities for cross-referencing. A significant number began their responses with lengthy introductions about the United Nations which had no relevance to the hypothesis.

The most effective responses to **Section B** contained clear and consistent arguments which were focused on the questions and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a short plan. Sometimes candidates possessed good knowledge but did not use it to its full advantage, for instance writing descriptive responses which were not focused on the question. Likewise some only considered one side of an argument and would have been improved by adopting a more balanced approach. A number of essays contained potentially relevant comments but lacked sufficient support. For example, many of the responses to **Question 7** contained vague assertions or tried to draw general conclusions from isolated (often untypical) examples.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates identified information in the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis and developed a logical, balanced response to the question. Source A was seen as providing the strongest support for the hypothesis since it shows the US President arguing in favour of an organisation which would provide a '*better world*' in which future peace is '*certain*' and where '*the eternal dignity of man is respected*.' That Truman delivered the opening speech at the San Francisco Conference was also seen as evidence of US commitment to '*ensuring a fairer and safer world*'. While some candidates dismissed Source B as having no relevance, most showed how the preamble to the UN Charter reflected the ambitious aims outlined in Source A. Conversely, Source D was seen as providing the strongest challenge to the hypothesis, since it effectively accuses the USA of using its political, '*military and economic muscle*' to ensure that it got its own

way on key issues relating to the UN Charter. In claiming that the drafters of the Charter deliberately restricted the role of the UN and insisted on the right of veto to protect the USA's interests, Source E was also seen as challenging the hypothesis. Similarly, most argued that Source C showed how the UN was created by the 'Big Five' powers, in their own interests.

In order to achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources in context, evaluate their provenance and cross-refer between them to reach an assessment of the validity of the hypothesis. It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to do this, but their attempts were not always convincing. For example, many argued that Source A is unreliable because it was spoken by the US President and therefore must be biased. The best responses explained how and why the source was biased, while weaker ones simply stated that this was the case. Similarly, while some argued that Sources D and E were more reliable because they were written by academics with access to evidence over a long time period, others dismissed them as unreliable because the authors would not know what had really happened in 1945. A large number of candidates assumed that Source C, from a Marxist magazine, must have been published in the USSR and therefore represented the official view of the Soviet government.

More perceptive responses recognised that there was not necessarily a contradiction between the USA having a '*genuine commitment to a safer world*' and a wish to protect its own interests. Many argued that Truman's determination to implement Roosevelt's vision for the UN was confirmed by Source A, and by the USA's role in establishing the UN (as shown in Source D). It was noted that Source A is clearly the speech of a politician; given the circumstances, the audience and the fact that US public opinion was heavily in favour of an international peace keeping body, he was bound to speak positively about the UN. The UN's ambitious aims, as stated in Source B, reflect the objectives established by Truman in his opening speech. As the most perceptive candidates demonstrated, Sources A and B refer to the general aims of the UN and do not consider specific details about its structure and organisation. Many noted that the language used in both sources is emotive and idealistic, dealing with issues over which it would have been impossible for any country represented to disagree.

The most impressive responses noted that, by contrast, Sources C, D and E refer to more contentious issues relating to the structure of the organisation. It was in discussions around these that national interests became a prime concern, not just for the USA but also for the other major powers. Many candidates noted that it was not just the USA which insisted on the right of veto – '*the USA and its allies made it clear*'. Similarly, Source C is critical of the UN's structure, claiming it was designed to ensure that '*the Big Five*' maintained their power. Some candidates realised that in saying this Source C is equally critical of the Soviet Union as it is of the USA.

The most common conclusion was that the USA was genuine in its desire to create an organisation designed to ensure international peace in the future and was fully supportive of the aims outlined in Source B. Many recognised that these aims were born of idealism, and once it came to more contentious issues, such as organisation and structure, the USA was determined '*that no majority of UN members could ever threaten our national interests*' (Source E). Source C makes it clear that the USA was not alone in wanting to protect its interests and, as Source D argues, '*the UN Charter was a meticulously crafted, power-orientated document, carefully moulded to conform to the global realities of 1945.*'

Section B

Question 2

The vast majority of candidates possessed good knowledge on the causes of the Cold War and the best responses were carefully focused on the question. It was generally agreed that the nature of the Cold War makes it almost impossible to identify a starting point since neither of the superpowers formally declared the opening of hostilities. Nevertheless, candidates successfully reviewed the significance of key events such as the decision to use the atomic bomb, disagreements at the post-war conferences, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech and the Berlin Blockade. Many candidates produced compelling arguments by analysing superpower motives and assessing their impact. As the first direct confrontation between the USA and the USSR, many argued that the Berlin Blockade has the best claim to mark the start of the Cold War. By contrast, a number of candidates struggled to distinguish between 'start' and 'cause'. Some wrote in great detail about the causes of the Cold War, usually focusing on the traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist viewpoints, with only a token reference to the question in the conclusion. Such responses, essentially descriptive rather than analytical, often addressed the rather different question of whether the USA or the USSR should bear primary responsibility for the onset of the Cold War. It was evident that a few candidates produced pre-prepared essays which addressed the topic rather than the question. The weakest responses were characterised by confusion over the chronology of

events and some found it difficult to distinguish between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Only the best explained the issues behind Stalin's decision to impose a blockade around Berlin.

Question 3

While it was clear that most candidates were well informed about the globalisation of the Cold War, relatively few established a clear focus on the question. A number of responses would have been improved if they had noted the 'mistaken assumption' element and concentrated on defining containment and giving examples of it in operation. Such essays often provided a narrative of the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis and the Vietnam War, together with details of US involvement in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. In each case, the motive for US involvement was seen as fear of Soviet expansionism. The best responses took the next step and analysed the extent to which this fear was justified. The most impressive showed how the USA believed that its economic interests were threatened by the spread of communism. The emergence of a communist government in China in 1949 fuelled American perceptions of a communist plot for world domination and this belief led the USA to become directly involved in global events. Some candidates debated the accuracy of this perception by analysing Soviet involvement in the Korean War and Sino-Soviet relations. The weakest responses were characterised by inadequate knowledge and often lacked balance. A common assumption was that the USSR was entirely responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War because of its determination to spread communism. This was often based on an exaggeration of Soviet involvement in events such as the Korean and Vietnam Wars. Similarly, Khrushchev's decision to place nuclear weapons in Cuba was frequently perceived as an example of Soviet expansionism. A small number of candidates were confused by the concept of 'globalisation' and ignored the given timeframe.

Question 4

The most impressive responses appreciated the need to establish what the USA's aims were and then consider the outcome of the Korean War in the light of these objectives. Many candidates showed how the USA's intentions in Korea changed. Originally excluded from Acheson's defensive perimeter, the fall of China to communism in 1949 alerted the USA to the vulnerability of its economic interests in Japan and Southeast Asia. Determination to contain the spread of communism in Southeast Asia led to the USA's initial involvement in the Korean War. It was commonly argued that, having pushed the North Koreans back beyond the 38th parallel, the USA changed its policy to roll-back. Most of these focused responses concluded that the adoption of roll-back ended in failure, but that the USA had succeeded in containing communism at the 38th parallel and in gaining the support of the United Nations. A considerable number of candidates did not establish what the USA's motives were and presented descriptive accounts of the Korean War. Although the outcomes of the war were usually discussed, they were not generally evaluated against the USA's aims. Some responses wandered away from the key issue, often considering the extent of Soviet responsibility for the war. The weakest responses, of which there were relatively few, would have been improved by the inclusion of more secure knowledge.

Question 5

Generally candidates seemed very knowledgeable on this topic, although some did not use this to its best advantage. Many responses presented descriptive accounts of the reasons for the collapse of the USSR, the nationalities issue being seen as one factor in a list of causes. As a result responses lacked focus on the question. Many wrote at length about nationalism in Eastern Europe, but relatively few demonstrated a clear understanding of the difference between satellite states and the dependent republics. Similarly, while nationalism was universally recognised as a cause of the USSR's collapse, few evaluated its impact in any depth. Those candidates who established clear links between the causal factors and evaluated the nationalist uprisings in context produced the best responses. A common argument was that the nationalist uprisings were symptomatic of the USSR's collapse, citing the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine. Weaker responses often argued that Gorbachev's reforms led to the collapse of the USSR. There was little explanation of the problems which brought about the reforms, or what they were intended to achieve. Other causes (such as the nationalist uprisings) were sometimes dismissed as being of lesser importance. Some responses strayed into irrelevance, a number of candidates writing about the Soviet Union's relationship with Eastern European states in an earlier period.

Question 6

The most effective responses provided a context for the NNPT, showing how it was a product of the nuclear panic caused by the Cuban missile crisis. Explanation of the Treaty's aims provided 'success criteria' by which its impact could be evaluated. Detailed coverage of the Treaty's three pillars was often followed by a balanced assessment of its successes and failures, together with an understanding of its significance in terms of later treaties. A number of responses would have been improved with the inclusion of more specific detail. While many candidates outlined the terms of the Treaty, some were unable to analyse its impact. This led to unbalanced and unsupported assertions. While some argued that the Treaty must have been successful because it banned the proliferation of nuclear weapons, others argued that it must have been a failure because nuclear weapons still existed. It was evident that many candidates did not fully understand the term 'proliferation'. Many responses, following a brief summary of the NNPT, drifted into irrelevance by focusing on subsequent treaties such as SALT and START. There was often an implicit assertion that these later treaties were necessary because the NNPT had failed.

Question 7

The best responses explained the vital role the USA played in rebuilding the international economy following World War II, making references to Marshall Aid, aid for Japan, the IMF, the World Bank and GATT. Balance was created by demonstrating how (and why) the USA's own economy suffered during the 1970s, together with an understanding of how American dominance of the international economy was increasingly challenged by Japan, the Asian Tigers and a resurgent Europe. Weaker responses might have been improved in a number of ways. For example, many candidates described (with appropriate supporting evidence) the key role of the USA following World War II, but did not cover the whole period outlined in the question. Such responses invariably missed the threats to American dominance of the international economy in the post-1970s period. Some responses lacked the specific knowledge required to address this question and consisted of little more than vague assertions. The weakest responses often resulted from confusion about the question. A small but significant number of candidates interpreted it as a Cold War question and described the different economic systems adopted by the USA and the USSR.

Question 8

Most candidates demonstrated some understanding of the Non-Aligned Movement and explained how, why, when and by whom it was established. Only the most effective outlined its achievements or analysed its weaknesses. As a result a significant number of responses took a descriptive approach, with little or no focus on the terms of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

Key messages

- In **Section A** candidates should be aware that statements such as '*Source B is biased*' require supporting evidence to demonstrate the ways in which the source is biased, why it is biased and how this affects its use for interpreting the validity of the given hypothesis.
- In **Section B** the most effective responses paid close attention to the demands of the questions and presented balanced arguments which were supported by carefully selected detail.

General comments

Many candidates sustained consistently high standards throughout their responses and made informed historical judgements based on a solid foundation of knowledge and understanding. Most demonstrated sound knowledge in at least some of their answers. A number found it difficult to use their information in an analytical manner to address the precise terms of the questions. A characteristic of weaker scripts was a lack of knowledge; responses often consisting of generalised statements or unsupported assertions.

In their responses to **Section A: Question 1**, most candidates identified information from the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis, and constructed a focused argument. The most impressive responses went beyond 'face value' and interpreted the sources in context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of background knowledge. A number of candidates seemed aware of the need to analyse and evaluate the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying on vague and unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability. The best answers came from candidates who read the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a plan before commencing their response. They understood both sides of the argument, ensuring that essays were balanced and focused throughout. Candidates who read and wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis and sometimes missed opportunities for cross-referencing. A number of candidates began their responses with lengthy introductions about the United Nations, unrelated to the hypothesis or sources.

The most impressive responses to Section B contained arguments which were focused on questions and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a plan. Less effective responses often contained accurate information which was not used to best advantage. For example, many of the responses to **Question 2** adopted a largely descriptive approach, explaining the causes of the Cold War but without focus on the question. Some candidates wrote otherwise analytical and well-informed responses which only addressed one aspect of an argument, limiting their marks through a lack of balance. For example, in **Question 4**, many candidates developed well-supported arguments to show how Johnson's decision led to the USA's humiliating defeat in Vietnam, but did not analyse the context in which the decision was taken in order to present a balanced assessment.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates identified information in the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis and developed logical and balanced responses to the question. Sources B and C were seen as providing the strongest support for the hypothesis. Source B argues that collective security was '*destroyed*' by Cold War rivalries and had to be '*substituted*' by a different type of peacekeeping. Similarly, Source C suggests that '*peacekeeping evolved as a second-best substitute for a non-obtainable collective security system.*' On the other hand, Source A was seen as challenging the hypothesis because it states that '*the idea of collective security was kept alive*' by peacekeeping and that this represents '*a new era of collective security.*' Many candidates argued that Source D has a balanced approach in that it claims that peacekeeping was '*another*

collective security system yet also describes peacekeeping as *'a substitute for the deficient collective security system.'* Source E was seen as supporting the hypothesis because of its opening statement that peacekeeping began *'after the failure of the collective security system.'* Many interpreted Source E's description of the legal position of peacekeeping, with reference to the UN Charter, as implying that peacekeeping was a development of collective security rather than something completely different.

The highest achieving responses went beyond 'face value' interpretation. The most analytical argued that, while each source reflected the opinions of the writer, there was no clear motive for a biased approach in any of them, with the possible exception of Source A. Many candidates assumed that Source A was biased because it contains the words of a US Permanent Representative to the UN, but some were unable to explain why this would lead to bias or provide any examples of its presence. More impressive responses contextualised the speech by considering the impact of it being made in 1993. With the Cold War recently ended and US public opinion increasingly anti-UN, the speaker might have been trying to convince an audience of senior American politicians that the UN still had a role to play in international affairs. Some candidates argued that the views of the Indian academic (Source C) might have been conditioned by the presence of a UN peacekeeping force in the disputed Kashmir region. None concluded that this undermined the reliability of the source, indeed many pointed out that Source C's credibility was enhanced as it quotes a former senior UN official, who had personal experience of the UN's procedures and actions. Candidates were aware of the need to evaluate but weaker responses were not always convincing. It was not uncommon for the same response to contain unexplained and seemingly contradictory statements, such as *'Source B is unreliable because it was written by a British historian'* and *'Source D is reliable because it was written by a Swiss academic.'*

A number of candidates drifted away from focus of the question, writing in general terms about collective security and peacekeeping and which was the more effective method. Some candidates lacked a clear understanding of these concepts. This caused misinterpretation of Source B's claim that *'collective security was sought through the hostile military blocs of NATO and the Warsaw Pact.'* More perceptive candidates drew on their contextual knowledge, and the definitions provided in Source B, to make a distinction between the two. This was essential for the argument to be convincing and balanced. Many candidates noted that Source B does not state that the UN abandoned collective security, merely that it became inoperative due to Cold War rivalries which prevented the Security Council from functioning as originally intended (a point that is also made in Sources A, C and D). Such responses recognised Source B's argument that peacekeeping was not so much a replacement for collective security but a method of addressing unforeseen problems.

The most common argument in the best responses was that there are many similarities between peacekeeping and the original concept of collective security. Both were designed to *'maintain international peace and security.'* UN peacekeeping can be seen as 'collective' in the sense that it occurs as a result of a decision taken by a group of nations acting together. Many argued convincingly that these similarities explain Source A's assertion that *'the idea of collective security was kept alive'* by the development of peacekeeping and Source D's description of peacekeeping as *'another collective security instrument.'* However, the two systems are also fundamentally different and this reflects changes within the UN itself. With the Security Council *'gridlocked'* (Source A) by Cold War rivalries, and decolonisation changing the composition of the UN and the problems it had to address, the original notion of *'collective security action'* (Source B) became unworkable. Many candidates realised that the UN General Assembly assumed greater powers. It was this which brought about the development of peacekeeping based on a *'multinational police-type force drawn from non-major powers'* (Source B).

Section B

Question 2

It was clear that the vast majority of candidates possessed good knowledge of the causes of the Cold War. The best responses took a balanced approach and were focused on the requirements of the question. The most common argument was that the devastating impact of World War II on the Soviet Union led Stalin to demand high reparations and a weakened Germany, together with extended Soviet influence across Eastern Europe as a guarantee against future invasion. The USA interpreted Stalin's actions as expansionist and a threat to American economic interests which depended on the resurgence of the European (especially the German) economy. Many argued that Stalin interpreted the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan as further threats to the security of the USSR and reacted accordingly. By contrast, weaker candidates proved less able to link their knowledge to the question. Many wrote, often in great detail, about the causes of the Cold War, usually focusing on the traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist viewpoints, with only a token reference to the terms of the question in the conclusion. Such responses, essentially descriptive rather than analytical, often addressed the rather different issue of whether the USA or the USSR should bear primary

responsibility for the onset of the Cold War. The weakest responses were characterised by a lack of understanding and confusion over the chronology of events. Some found it difficult to distinguish between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan or explain the reasons for the Berlin Blockade.

Question 3

Most candidates provided appropriate examples (often in considerable detail) of superpower involvement in regional conflicts, such as the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. The strongest responses offered analysis of superpower motives for involvement rather than a narrative of events. They were characterised by a detailed and balanced analysis of the aims and objectives of both the USA and the USSR as an explanation for their involvement in each of the regional issues. This was used as evidence to support a focused conclusion. In a number of responses there was an implicit assumption that such involvement could only have been a reflection of 'expansionist ambitions'. This was particularly evident in coverage of Soviet involvement in Cuba, alternative interpretations of Khrushchev's decision to place nuclear missiles on the island rarely being considered. Some responses relied too heavily on describing events rather than answering the question. The weakest responses, of which there were relatively few, came from candidates who misunderstood of the concept of 'globalisation'. Some, ignoring the dates in the question, wrote about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

The majority of candidates addressed this question from the perspective of outcomes, arguing that the USA's failure to win the war in Vietnam demonstrated that President Johnson's decision had been a 'disastrous error'. Examples of failed military strategies and the development of public resentment against American involvement in Vietnam were quoted as evidence. As a result responses sometimes lapsed into narrative on the reasons why the USA lost the war in Vietnam, based on the assumption that Johnson had been entirely responsible for leading America into the war and for losing it. Rather than addressing the reasons why Johnson made his original decision to increase American involvement in Vietnam, such responses focused on the impact of subsequent military decisions. The most impressive responses were rather more focused on the context. When he unexpectedly assumed the office of President, it was argued, Johnson faced a difficult dilemma. The containment policies pursued in Vietnam by Eisenhower and Kennedy had failed to achieve success. American public opinion remained staunchly anti-communist and was inflamed still further by the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Johnson either had to increase American military involvement in Vietnam, in line with the policies of his predecessors, or back down entirely. Most candidates concluded that backing down would not only have severely damaged American international prestige (something which the USA could ill afford at the height of the Cold War) but also have been political suicide for Johnson himself.

Question 5

In general, this was a well answered question. Most candidates possessed accurate and detailed knowledge of China under Deng Xiaoping and used it to write a focused response. The most common conclusion was that Deng Xiaoping was certainly ruthless in ensuring both that China remained a one-party state and that he retained supreme power within the Chinese Communist Party. However, while he was opposed to any kind of political reform which might undermine the CCP's power-base, he carried out fundamental economic reforms which led to the development of market socialism in China. The quality of some responses was adversely affected by a tendency to drift away from the main focus of the question. For example, many candidates devoted too much space to a discussion about the effectiveness of reforms. Similarly, while a brief comparison between Deng and Gorbachev might have been appropriate, excessive coverage was unhelpful in sustaining a focused argument. The relatively few weak responses were usually the product of inadequate factual knowledge. For example, a small number of candidates confused Deng with Mao.

Question 6

While many described the terms of the various treaties designed to control nuclear weapons, relatively few addressed the key issue of the impact of these treaties. The most impressive responses outlined what each treaty was intended to achieve and then evaluated its success against these objectives, leading to an overall conclusion regarding the level of progress achieved by 1989. In a number of weaker responses candidates wrote about the nuclear arms race in general, with limited reference to attempts to control it. This approach led to the conclusion that no progress had been made because both the USA and the USSR retained nuclear weapons. Some wrote at length about the SALT Treaties but ignored other attempts to control the development of nuclear weapons. There were some weaknesses in knowledge. For instance some did not understand the term 'proliferation', and this prevented a valid assessment of the NNPT of 1968. Some

lacked secure chronology and this meant that essays had little sense of how attempts to control nuclear weapons developed over time. Many candidates confused strategies, such as MAD, with attempts to control nuclear weapons. The most common weakness was a lack of evaluation of the success or failure of the various treaties. In many responses there seemed to be an implicit assertion that the terms of treaties were always rigidly adhered to.

Question 7

While some candidates demonstrated the importance of free trade by describing the work of GATT and WTO, few balanced this by showing how other factors were also important in the development of the international economy between 1945 and 1980. Only the best responses mentioned the protectionist policies which led to the rapid growth of the Japanese economy and the EU. There was considerable evidence of confusion regarding the scope and requirements of the question, and weaker answers were often assertive. Some candidates simply provided a definition of free trade with no explanation of its relevance to the international economy.

Question 8

There were too few responses to this question to make general comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

Key messages

- In **Section A** the sources must be the focus of the answer. Candidates are rewarded for evaluating the sources to decide whether the hypothesis in the question is valid.
- The most effective responses to **Section B** contained relevant knowledge, presented balanced arguments and retained a clear focus on the question.

General comments

The quality of candidates' work was generally sound. Almost all candidates answered four questions, as required, and did so using some relevant knowledge and understanding. With regard to the essay questions, too many candidates still write about the topic in general rather than answering the questions set. Skills essential to doing really well are **(a)** the ability to think quickly about the question and **(b)** then to devise the framework of an answer which lists arguments on both sides of the question. This approach applies to all 'how far', 'to what extent' and 'discuss' questions. For 'why' questions, which is the same as 'account for', the approach is identifying a list of reasons, with a paragraph on each. The judgement comes in deciding which of the various factors is the most important. With regard to the compulsory source-based question, the approach is different. Each of the five sources need to be related to the question and should be evaluated for reliability.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The majority of candidates understood the concept of cultural differences and were quick to recognise that Sources A and C supported the assertion, even though they came from opposite sides of the great divide. It was also widely agreed that the two sources which challenged the hypothesis were Source B, which argued economic factors were more important, and Source D, which put political factors first. The secondary Source E, could be seen as both for and against the hypothesis and the better responses appreciated this.

The accessibility of the sources meant that most candidates identified points to argue both for and against the hypothesis. In the best answers candidates took the opportunity to show their skills of source analysis and evaluation. Many went beyond face value interpretation and achieved higher marks by commenting on the reliability of the sources. For instance, it was widely considered that Source A's critical view of the North was not to be trusted because it was published in a Southern newspaper. (There were a few candidates who thought that the 'Muscogee Herald' was a man.) The converse was true about Source C, that it was unreliable because its anti-Southern views came from a Northern newspaper. To improve their marks still further candidates need to consider how the reliability of these extracts relates to the validity of the hypothesis.

There is one trap for the unwary into which a number of candidates continue to fall. Some insist on using the sources simply as evidence in order to present a general essay on the topic in the question. The sources are not analysed, let alone evaluated. Such answers can only be rewarded in Level 1. The sources must be the focus of the answer. They should be handled in an analytical manner which looks beyond their content and considers their author's purpose, motive and intended audience in order to assess their reliability.

Section B

Question 2

Many candidates demonstrated very good knowledge of the Mexican crisis but were less confident in their discussion of the Oregon affair. A considerable number thought that the USA offered to purchase Oregon from the UK. Few realised that the Oregon territories were jointly ruled by the UK and the USA from 1818. In weaker responses knowledge of the Mexican war was not as good as it might have been. Many blurred the two wars of 1836 and 1846: the first was between Mexico and Texas, the second between Mexico and the USA. In terms of approach, the best responses consisted of a series of paragraphs, each explaining one reason why the Oregon dispute was solved peacefully and Mexico was not. They maintained a comparative approach throughout and focused on the factors which meant that the two conflicts were resolved differently. President Polk was often mentioned as being most responsible for the disputes evolving in different ways. Many candidates also considered issues such as the contrasting strength and attitude of the UK and Mexico. This was more effective (and better rewarded) than simply presenting a narrative of events. A number of candidates would have improved their responses by focusing on the reasons why the events developed as they did, rather than recounting what happened.

Question 3

The better answers debated the wider aspects of Reconstruction, such as the rebuilding of the Union, as well as considering the position of ex-slaves. A number of candidates plunged straight in and told the story of Reconstruction as they had learnt it, focusing almost entirely on the position and treatment of ex-slaves in the process. Most candidates who focused on this aspect usually agreed that the North had indeed 'lost the peace', mentioning the Jim Crow Laws as evidence. These were imposed after Reconstruction and were only relevant if the candidate showed that they were aware of this fact. In addition, the question was wider in scope. The most perceptive responses understood that the North did not fight the war solely to liberate the slaves; emancipation was not even the primary goal at the start. In addition, a small number of essays considered whether the victors could possibly be thought to have 'lost the peace'. The Republicans of the North dominated the South and imposed a series of policies which aimed to ensure liberty for all. They brought about three fundamental changes in the constitution. Weaker responses might have been improved by taking a more cautious approach to the question and considering its full implications.

Question 4

This proved to be a popular question and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding and some sound knowledge. The concept of 'the age of Reform' also gave candidates quite a wide scope; they could analyse the various reforms passed by the three presidents, Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson, or they could cover the movements that encouraged reform, including 'muckraking' journalists. Many of the best responses dealt with both of these aspects. The majority showed a good awareness of actions such as trust busting. The highest marks were reserved for those who considered the issue of 'how accurate' as stated in the question and balanced their answers. Among such essays the most commonly found argument was that big business continued to prevail. A number of candidates would have benefited from recognising that this question was concentrated on domestic policy. Those who wrote exclusively on foreign policy could be awarded only limited credit.

Question 5

The majority of candidates demonstrated secure knowledge and understanding in answering this popular question which allowed them to select the individual they thought did most to help secure civil rights in the 1960s. Responses ranged enormously, which is acceptable so long as they are based on evidence rather than assertion. It is also important to accept the limits of the question. This asked about the 1960s, which certainly ruled out W E B Du Bois but also excluded another favourite, Rosa Parks. The question also mentioned President Johnson and the most effective responses recognised that it was necessary to make some reference to his contribution before deciding whether or not he was 'most significant'. President Kennedy was a possible alternative and many preferred him to Johnson, arguing that Johnson only completed the process which Kennedy had started. Kennedy, however, had not gone far in getting Congress to approve civil rights legislation. It was Johnson, the master of the Senate, who used all his skills to get Congressional approval of civil rights laws. It was Johnson who introduced Great Society reforms, which did much to help the blacks. The obvious choice, however, was between Johnson and Martin Luther King and most candidates made some good points for and against the two leaders. In the main this question was well answered.

Question 6

There were a number of well-informed and confident responses to this question. The argument hinged on the extent to which the New Deal was a complete change of policy. To gain higher marks the case for and against needed to be explained and illustrated. In addition, economic policy was worth considering separately from social policy. Weaker responses often lapsed into describing New Deal reforms and, without clear links to the terms of the question, could only achieve limited credit. In the main candidates argued that the New Deal was a complete change of policy, both social and economic, representing a clear shift from laissez-faire to state intervention. The most effective answers were more sophisticated in their arguments and often concluded that the New Deal was a gradual change rather than a complete break with the past. For instance a number of candidates commented that the banking reforms, while bringing about important changes, were actually designed to protect the existing US economy rather than cause a revolution in finance. Likewise some cited left wing opposition and the limited nature of some legislation (usually concerning welfare or labour) as evidence that the social reforms introduced were not particularly far reaching, and certainly not a complete change.

Question 7

The best responses recognised the differences between the two conferences and were able to draw effective comparisons, support their points with detail and make clear links to the issue of 'too conciliatory' as mentioned in the question. They recognised the significance of the different approaches of FDR and Truman. The majority of candidates wrote generally about US attitudes towards the USSR during and soon after the Second World War and might have improved their responses with more effective use of precise knowledge. Some were aware that the USA had failed to oppose Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe at the end of the war, realising that the timing of the Yalta meeting was important in this respect. In a number of the weaker answers candidates seemed unaware that the conferences involved two different US presidents.

Question 8

This question on US social and economic history from 1945 to 1968 proved to be popular. There were two broad levels of response. Some showed a fair knowledge of the topic, or at least one half of it – usually focusing on the causes of the expansion in higher education, such as government policy (e.g. the GI Bill and Truman Commission) and the economic boom of the 1950s. A number of these responses would have been improved if they had gone on to consider the second half of the question and discuss consequences. Many made a valid link between the Soviet Union launching the Sputnik in 1957 and the expansion of higher education. Others had considerably more hazy knowledge of post-war America and mentioned all that they knew, from the rise of the baby boomers – who went to higher education only in the mid and late 1960s – to the growth of 'flower power'. Those who adopted a more focused approach were more highly rewarded.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

Key messages

- In **Section A** the sources must be the focus of the answer. Candidates are rewarded for evaluating the sources to decide whether the hypothesis in the question is valid.
- The most effective responses to **Section B** contained relevant knowledge, presented balanced arguments and retained a clear focus on the question throughout.

General comments

The quality of candidates' work was generally sound. Almost all candidates answered four questions, as required, and did so using relevant knowledge. With regard to the essay questions, the best responses were well informed and carefully argued. A number of candidates continue to write about the topic in general terms, rather than answering the questions set and might improve their responses with more careful planning and selection of detail. Skills essential to doing really well are **(a)** the ability to think quickly about the question and **(b)** then to devise the framework of an answer which lists arguments on both sides of the question. This approach applies to all 'how far', 'to what extent' and 'discuss' questions. For 'why' questions, which is the same as 'account for', the approach is to identify a range of reasons (or factors), with a paragraph on each. The judgement comes in deciding which of the various factors is the most important. With regard to the compulsory source-based question, the approach is different. Each of the five sources should be related to the question and need to be evaluated for reliability. This involves considering the impact of the provenance on the reliability of the extract; what was the author's purpose, message, expertise, intended audience and how might this affect what he says? Sources can also be cross-referenced against each other or contextual knowledge to confirm whether points raised are accurate or supported. Candidates then need to decide whether, on balance, the sources support the hypothesis in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The vast majority of candidates extracted information from the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis that the Southern states' belief that they could secede was 'unreasonable'. They provided a balanced response to the question. It was generally agreed that Sources A and C supported the position taken by the Southern states, while Sources B and D opposed it. Source E provided evidence to both support and challenge the hypothesis, many candidates appreciating that it represents the viewpoints of both North and South. Virtually all candidates analysed the sources at face value. In order to achieve higher marks however, it is necessary to evaluate the sources and cross-refer between them to decide on their reliability. Here the provenance of the four contemporary sources was a great help. Many candidates recognised that the statements in Source A were likely to favour the South, given South Carolina's secession from the Union. A number of candidates were also rewarded for recognising that Source B, from a New York newspaper was likely to favour the Union. The most effective answers came to a clear conclusion about the validity of the hypothesis. A number decided that describing the position taken by the states as 'unreasonable' was open to debate, but that by 1860 the position was certainly entrenched. Often weaker responses would have been improved if they had spent some time looking at the sources in a more critical way.

There is another trap for the unwary. Some candidates use all the sources but treat them simply as evidence in a general essay on the broad topic in question. The sources are not analysed, let alone evaluated. Such answers can only be awarded limited marks. The sources must be the focus of the answer. They should be evaluated to assess their reliability and considered against the hypothesis in the question – does their reliability (or otherwise) make the hypothesis more or less valid?

Section B

Question 2

This was a popular question and many candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge and understanding of relevant events. A good proportion of responses were focused on two key factors - the weakness of the opposition, whether Mexican or Native Indian, and the strength of the USA, whether military or political. The best essays were well balanced and reached a judgement about which factors they considered to be most significant in bringing about the rapid expansion of the USA in the 1840s. Conclusions varied, but what was most important was that the decision was explained and justified in the response. A considerable number of candidates provided more descriptive answers and focused on telling the story of the war against Mexico. While the information provided was sometimes detailed and accurate, these responses contained few links to the question and were therefore only implicitly relevant. In some of the weaker answers there was confusion about the chronology of Texas breaking away from Mexico and joining the USA. Finally, the question is wider in scope than just Mexico - Oregon needed to be included.

Question 3

Answers generally displayed sound knowledge. The most effective responses analysed evidence on both sides of the argument, namely the extent to which Reconstruction rebuilt the South. In order to do this they recognised that there were several parts to Reconstruction. For instance, rebuilding Southern society, restoring the union, rebuilding the Southern economy and repairing war damage were included as issues. In some cases candidates were able to reach a differentiated judgement by concluding that some aspects were more successful than others. Weaker answers tended to be descriptive and candidates worked through the policies and efforts of Lincoln, then Johnson and then Congress. Many of these answers contained a good deal of relevant information but candidates could not be awarded higher marks as this was not linked to the question or used to address the degree of success. On a point of detail, candidates should not include Jim Crow laws as having been introduced in the Reconstruction era as they came later. Where they could be made relevant was in an assessment of whether Reconstruction succeeded or failed. Black Codes were relevant though, being introduced in the late 1860s.

Question 4

The key issue in this question on economic expansion in the later part of the nineteenth century was whether economic growth was **too** fast. The best responses showed awareness of the features that might give an indication that this was the case, pointing out that over-rapid growth usually leads to shortages of labour and wage inflation. A few responses discussed whether immigration overcame the labour problem, recognising that although cheap labour was ensured, this in turn created social problems in the rapidly-expanding industrial cities of the North and Mid-West. It was also possible to make an assessment in this question by considering whether growth was equal across the United States. While the quotation in the question might have been true for some areas, perhaps this was not the case everywhere. This aspect was generally not considered. A number of candidates who attempted this question lacked sufficiently clear knowledge to be able to describe economic growth accurately. Their responses were characterised by assertion and would have been improved by the use of precise detail to support comments.

Question 5

The period in question was 1919 to 1941, in effect the 1920s and 1930s. In order to be successful candidates needed to take careful note of the terms and key words of the question. The mention of both decades meant that the best answers drew examples from both the 1920s and the 1930s. The key words were 'merely' and 'discrimination' with 'obvious and sinister symptoms' not far behind. Better responses recognised that the question was not just about the Ku Klux Klan. Other symptoms of discrimination (e.g. against women or socialists and communists) should have been included in order to make an assessment of whether there was widespread discrimination. The majority of answers offered a descriptive account of the rise and fall of the Ku Klux Klan in the decades in question. Such information was necessary as part of a good answer; however, it was not sufficient by itself. Weaker responses were largely a result of candidates not paying sufficient attention to the question. Had they asked themselves 'what period must I focus on?' or 'what are they key words of the question?' they might have produced better focused essays. Instead, it appeared that many candidates saw the term 'Ku Klux Klan', decided to write about that and thereby produced a partial answer.

Question 6

The best responses to the question were well informed on the fortunes of the Democrats in the 1920s and wrote evaluative essays considering a range of factors which might be argued to be responsible for their lack of success. There was general recognition that the period was characterised by economic growth and that this favoured Republicanism. The three Presidents of the decade – Harding, Coolidge and Hoover – were Republican and not particularly popular. However, as a few candidates pointed out, the general benefits of the boom meant the electorate was much less likely to challenge them. A considerable proportion of essays went no further than discussing the effects of the economic situation. Only a small minority considered the ways in which the Democrats might be said to have made their own position worse. Woodrow Wilson, though president in 1920-1, was very rarely mentioned. The three Democratic candidates (James Cox in 1920, John Davies in 1924 and Al Smith in 1928) performed badly in the polls, partly as a result of the unpopularity of Wilson's policies but also because of divisions in the party. In order to achieve balance in their responses candidates needed to consider the weaknesses of the Democrats against the strengths of the Republicans and against the state of the economy. Weaker responses were generally lacking at least one of these aspects.

Question 7

The most effective responses were well supported, balanced and focused on addressing the quotation in the question, rather than providing a description of events. A relatively small number of those who built their answers around the quotation focused on the 'heroic' dimension of Wilson's failure. They recognised that heroism requires bravery and Wilson could be seen as brave to abandon his belief in diplomacy for the practice of war. Heroism might also involve fighting for ideals. Wilson could be seen in this light for managing to establish the League of Nations. There was plenty to discuss. Most candidates concentrated exclusively on Wilson's second term and the USA's intervention in the First World War, in particular the Treaty of Versailles. Wilson's first term was sometimes overlooked, even though he sent troops into Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Mexico. Weaker answers tended to describe limited aspects of Wilson's policy without a clear focus on the question.

Question 8

The best responses were from candidates who linked the changes they identified in popular music to the growth of youth culture. This could be defined to include the civil rights movement and the weakening of barriers between black and white. Most candidates accurately described some of the changes in popular music in the 1950s and 1960s, such as the rise of rock and roll. Only a few commented that this partly came about because of a change in attitudes and behaviour which reflected broader changes in society. Rock and roll cut across the racial divide and combined elements of R&B, which had been almost exclusively performed by black musicians, and also country music, which had been the preserve of white musicians. Weaker responses would have been improved if they had developed a clearer focus on the question. It did not ask for a description of the growth of popular music. Instead it asked for analysis of the ways in which popular music could be seen to offer evidence of social change.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

Key messages

- In **Section A** the sources must be the focus of the answer. Candidates are rewarded for evaluating the sources to decide whether the hypothesis in the question is valid.
- The most effective responses to **Section B** contained relevant knowledge, presented balanced arguments and retained a clear focus on the question.

General comments

The quality of candidates' work was generally sound. Almost all candidates answered four questions, as required, and did so using some relevant knowledge and understanding. With regard to the essay questions, too many candidates still write about the topic in general rather than answering the questions set. Skills essential to doing really well are **(a)** the ability to think quickly about the question and **(b)** then to devise the framework of an answer which lists arguments on both sides of the question. This approach applies to all 'how far', 'to what extent' and 'discuss' questions. For 'why' questions, which is the same as 'account for', the approach is identifying a list of reasons, with a paragraph on each. The judgement comes in deciding which of the various factors is the most important. With regard to the compulsory source-based question, the approach is different. Each of the five sources need to be related to the question and should be evaluated for reliability.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The majority of candidates understood the concept of cultural differences and were quick to recognise that Sources A and C supported the assertion, even though they came from opposite sides of the great divide. It was also widely agreed that the two sources which challenged the hypothesis were Source B, which argued economic factors were more important, and Source D, which put political factors first. The secondary Source E, could be seen as both for and against the hypothesis and the better responses appreciated this.

The accessibility of the sources meant that most candidates identified points to argue both for and against the hypothesis. In the best answers candidates took the opportunity to show their skills of source analysis and evaluation. Many went beyond face value interpretation and achieved higher marks by commenting on the reliability of the sources. For instance, it was widely considered that Source A's critical view of the North was not to be trusted because it was published in a Southern newspaper. (There were a few candidates who thought that the 'Muscogee Herald' was a man.) The converse was true about Source C, that it was unreliable because its anti-Southern views came from a Northern newspaper. To improve their marks still further candidates need to consider how the reliability of these extracts relates to the validity of the hypothesis.

There is one trap for the unwary into which a number of candidates continue to fall. Some insist on using the sources simply as evidence in order to present a general essay on the topic in the question. The sources are not analysed, let alone evaluated. Such answers can only be rewarded in Level 1. The sources must be the focus of the answer. They should be handled in an analytical manner which looks beyond their content and considers their author's purpose, motive and intended audience in order to assess their reliability.

Section B

Question 2

Many candidates demonstrated very good knowledge of the Mexican crisis but were less confident in their discussion of the Oregon affair. A considerable number thought that the USA offered to purchase Oregon from the UK. Few realised that the Oregon territories were jointly ruled by the UK and the USA from 1818. In weaker responses knowledge of the Mexican war was not as good as it might have been. Many blurred the two wars of 1836 and 1846: the first was between Mexico and Texas, the second between Mexico and the USA. In terms of approach, the best responses consisted of a series of paragraphs, each explaining one reason why the Oregon dispute was solved peacefully and Mexico was not. They maintained a comparative approach throughout and focused on the factors which meant that the two conflicts were resolved differently. President Polk was often mentioned as being most responsible for the disputes evolving in different ways. Many candidates also considered issues such as the contrasting strength and attitude of the UK and Mexico. This was more effective (and better rewarded) than simply presenting a narrative of events. A number of candidates would have improved their responses by focusing on the reasons why the events developed as they did, rather than recounting what happened.

Question 3

The better answers debated the wider aspects of Reconstruction, such as the rebuilding of the Union, as well as considering the position of ex-slaves. A number of candidates plunged straight in and told the story of Reconstruction as they had learnt it, focusing almost entirely on the position and treatment of ex-slaves in the process. Most candidates who focused on this aspect usually agreed that the North had indeed 'lost the peace', mentioning the Jim Crow Laws as evidence. These were imposed after Reconstruction and were only relevant if the candidate showed that they were aware of this fact. In addition, the question was wider in scope. The most perceptive responses understood that the North did not fight the war solely to liberate the slaves; emancipation was not even the primary goal at the start. In addition, a small number of essays considered whether the victors could possibly be thought to have 'lost the peace'. The Republicans of the North dominated the South and imposed a series of policies which aimed to ensure liberty for all. They brought about three fundamental changes in the constitution. Weaker responses might have been improved by taking a more cautious approach to the question and considering its full implications.

Question 4

This proved to be a popular question and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding and some sound knowledge. The concept of 'the age of Reform' also gave candidates quite a wide scope; they could analyse the various reforms passed by the three presidents, Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson, or they could cover the movements that encouraged reform, including 'muckraking' journalists. Many of the best responses dealt with both of these aspects. The majority showed a good awareness of actions such as trust busting. The highest marks were reserved for those who considered the issue of 'how accurate' as stated in the question and balanced their answers. Among such essays the most commonly found argument was that big business continued to prevail. A number of candidates would have benefited from recognising that this question was concentrated on domestic policy. Those who wrote exclusively on foreign policy could be awarded only limited credit.

Question 5

The majority of candidates demonstrated secure knowledge and understanding in answering this popular question which allowed them to select the individual they thought did most to help secure civil rights in the 1960s. Responses ranged enormously, which is acceptable so long as they are based on evidence rather than assertion. It is also important to accept the limits of the question. This asked about the 1960s, which certainly ruled out W E B Du Bois but also excluded another favourite, Rosa Parks. The question also mentioned President Johnson and the most effective responses recognised that it was necessary to make some reference to his contribution before deciding whether or not he was 'most significant'. President Kennedy was a possible alternative and many preferred him to Johnson, arguing that Johnson only completed the process which Kennedy had started. Kennedy, however, had not gone far in getting Congress to approve civil rights legislation. It was Johnson, the master of the Senate, who used all his skills to get Congressional approval of civil rights laws. It was Johnson who introduced Great Society reforms, which did much to help the blacks. The obvious choice, however, was between Johnson and Martin Luther King and most candidates made some good points for and against the two leaders. In the main this question was well answered.

Question 6

There were a number of well-informed and confident responses to this question. The argument hinged on the extent to which the New Deal was a complete change of policy. To gain higher marks the case for and against needed to be explained and illustrated. In addition, economic policy was worth considering separately from social policy. Weaker responses often lapsed into describing New Deal reforms and, without clear links to the terms of the question, could only achieve limited credit. In the main candidates argued that the New Deal was a complete change of policy, both social and economic, representing a clear shift from *laissez-faire* to state intervention. The most effective answers were more sophisticated in their arguments and often concluded that the New Deal was a gradual change rather than a complete break with the past. For instance a number of candidates commented that the banking reforms, while bringing about important changes, were actually designed to protect the existing US economy rather than cause a revolution in finance. Likewise some cited left wing opposition and the limited nature of some legislation (usually concerning welfare or labour) as evidence that the social reforms introduced were not particularly far reaching, and certainly not a complete change.

Question 7

The best responses recognised the differences between the two conferences and were able to draw effective comparisons, support their points with detail and make clear links to the issue of 'too conciliatory' as mentioned in the question. They recognised the significance of the different approaches of FDR and Truman. The majority of candidates wrote generally about US attitudes towards the USSR during and soon after the Second World War and might have improved their responses with more effective use of precise knowledge. Some were aware that the USA had failed to oppose Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe at the end of the war, realising that the timing of the Yalta meeting was important in this respect. In a number of the weaker answers candidates seemed unaware that the conferences involved two different US presidents.

Question 8

This question on US social and economic history from 1945 to 1968 proved to be popular. There were two broad levels of response. Some showed a fair knowledge of the topic, or at least one half of it – usually focusing on the causes of the expansion in higher education, such as government policy (e.g. the G I Bill and Truman Commission) and the economic boom of the 1950s. A number of these responses would have been improved if they had gone on to consider the second half of the question and discuss consequences. Many made a valid link between the Soviet Union launching the Sputnik in 1957 and the expansion of higher education. Others had considerably more hazy knowledge of post-war America and mentioned all that they knew, from the rise of the baby boomers – who went to higher education only in the mid and late 1960s – to the growth of 'flower power'. Those who adopted a more focused approach were more highly rewarded.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/06

Paper 6

Key messages

- In **Section A** the most effective responses showed an evaluative approach to the sources.
- The most highly rewarded essays in **Section B** used detailed examples to support the points being made.

General comments

Most candidates answered the required four questions fully. There were some well written papers which achieved a consistently high standard throughout, demonstrating good knowledge and sound understanding.

In answering **Section A, Question 1** those who interpreted or evaluated the sources, both individually and as a group, produced the most effective responses. Perhaps comments on the group as a whole were best placed in a concluding paragraph. A number of candidates spent too much time quoting from the sources and might have strengthened their responses by devoting more attention to evaluation. Final paragraphs that only summarised the contents of answers could not gain further credit and this was equally true of some responses to **Section B**. In both sections key words from the questions should be emphasised in answers. The best essays showed a clear focus on the question throughout. The majority made good use of the time available and planned their responses effectively.

When looking beyond the content of sources in **Question 1**, more analytical responses commented that Source A was taken directly from the report of a committee meeting in Britain whose members may have had little experience of the situation in the British West Indies. Eye witness accounts (such as Source B), and the content of other sources supported Source A and it was necessary to make cross-references to demonstrate this. Such observations enhance the candidate's ability to interpret the group of sources as a whole.

Answering **Question 5** about how members of the plantocracy reacted to the development of the peasantry, some candidates wrote generally about peasantries, without much reference to the point of view of the planters. With questions in **Section B** the use of examples from around the Caribbean area is always advantageous. On this paper only **Questions 7** and **8** were specific to particular places. Sometimes no reference was made to a specific territory or country and this lack of precise examples weakened responses.

Section A

Question 1

This question on the 'labour crises after emancipation' was answered, as instructed, by all candidates. There were some outstanding answers that stood out above any shortcomings mentioned below. All made use of the content of the sources and many candidates picked out the fact that Source D contained points on both sides of the discussion. Occasionally the quotations used were too long or too frequent for the purposes of a sound answer. In a few instances candidates misread a source. In the case of Source C a few dismissed it as irrelevant, considering it to be about social customs rather than plantation labour. As the most perceptive candidates realised, the final sentence of the source gives emphasis to the reduction of female labourers because they had been 'taken from the field and the estate'. It was rare to see detailed reference to the authors of a source when assessing reliability or potential bias, although a few mentioned the strong tone taken in Source E.

Section B

Question 2

There were some excellent answers which were wide-ranging in their approach. Most candidates showed good knowledge and dealt effectively with humanitarian campaigning, resistance of the enslaved and economic factors. Some might improve their responses if they had offered more detailed examples and explanations. Political developments were generally given less prominence and this lack of discussion about political circumstances in Britain, France and also Spain in Cuba, meant that a number of answers lacked a proper emphasis on the element in the question dealing with 'different European states'.

Question 3

A number of candidates recognised that this question required consideration of provision for a peaceful transition from slavery to freedom. They were aware that it was seen as necessary to train freed people so that they could become responsible free citizens. Answers also showed good knowledge of how schemes to guarantee captive labour for a period of years after emancipation were brought about and how these favoured the planters. The best responses drew comparisons between different schemes and used detailed examples to illustrate their answers. Some candidates read the question as asking about the failings of apprenticeship and other transitional schemes and therefore struggled to make their knowledge and examples relevant.

Question 4

Some excellent answers were presented and the best were characterised by careful consideration of the 'to what extent' element of the question. Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge and explained that, once fully free, opportunities existed to express freedom, to stay on estates as paid workers or to move to new areas or occupations, even combining estate work with peasant-style farming. The varying opportunities to break free from planter control, according to different labour-to-land ratios, were noted giving the answers a Caribbean wide dimension. A few responses took a descriptive approach and overlooked the requirement to make a judgement.

Question 5

As with **Question 4**, there were many good answers to this question, exploring in this case the planter/peasant relationship. Many of these concentrated on antagonism and coercive measures. The opportunities to create peasantries in the larger territories, in comparison with high density population areas, were emphasised. Few answers covered the more cooperative approaches which could exist, for example with the creation of peasant holdings close to an estate to secure some labour on the plantations. Illustrations from British and French colonies were often given. A few answers dealt briefly with the use of immigrant labour to fill the gaps in the work force and provide wage competition. Some answers concentrated on the 'development of the peasantry' rather than on the reactions of the plantocracy and these responses tended to lack balance as a result.

Question 6

Many candidates used a good range of geographical illustrations, including Trinidad, British Guiana and Cuba to exemplify their answers. Some confined their responses to consideration of the Indians and the British West Indies. The need for new sources of labour and the general success of Indian and Chinese labour was often quoted but details of the economic impact were only explored in a minority of responses. Other factors contributing to the success of sugar plantations in Trinidad, British Guiana and Cuba were occasionally included to illustrate the nature of the impact of imported labour. A number of answers seemed to be based on the simple theme that the immigrants came and sugar prospered. These responses could have been improved by taking a more analytical approach. A few answers began with material that was appropriate to the theme but then developed into a more general description of immigrant life and its associated problems.

Question 7

The majority of candidates made some mention of the aspirations of parents in supporting education and the controversy about the sort of education which should be provided. Specific details of the educational provision were seen relatively rarely and a number of weaker answers would have been improved with more precise use of supporting detail. The date 1835 was given in the question to trigger references to the Negro Education Grant but the larger proportion of answers overlooked this.

Question 8

Candidates who chose to write about this topic showed awareness of major developments, the effect of events in France, the slave rebellion, the emergence of Toussaint and the disastrous impact of French intervention. The actual events leading to Dessalines declaring himself to be the emperor were very rarely covered and a number of answers would have been improved by more careful consideration of this aspect.