

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

Key Messages

Ensure that there is careful and considered reflection on source evaluation and interpretation in Question 1. Do not just précis the sources.

Think very carefully about what is being asked in essay questions and answer the question as it has been set.

General Comments

Relevance, as always, was the key to success. Shortage of information was seldom the cause of underachievement, but a failure to use information correctly often was. Successful candidates did as was asked in the question. In Question 1 this meant making a genuine effort to reflect on the provenance of the sources and paying, as was asked, 'particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources, both individually and as a group.' In essay questions the key to success is reflection on what exactly is being asked and where the main focus of the response should lie. In questions with 'why' as a stem care needs to be taken to ensure that more than just a list of reasons is produced and analytical skills are demonstrated. It was good to see so many candidates with not only a good grasp of the topics, but also real understanding and a willingness to argue a case. Developed judgement supported by relevant and accurate information is key to achieving high marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The best responses tended to start with a firm answer, identifying which sources agreed with the hypothesis and those which did not, and then going into more detail in subsequent paragraphs. Some dealt with each source in turn, while others dealt with them in groups. The latter tended to be the most successful approach. The best responses were those which took care to spend time evaluating the sources. Evidence of real reflection on the provenance of the source was vital for gaining the very highest marks. A lot more than a brief comment at the end, such as 'Source D was written by a Frenchman, so it was biased' is looked for here. The majority of candidates tended to agree that France really did not want war, quoting Sources A, D and E. Many commented correctly that D was predictable in the circumstances, while E, noting the word 'defensive' had the advantage of reflection and hindsight, did not wholly endorse the hypothesis. Contextual knowledge is always valuable, and many used it successfully to provide a background of events to Source A for example.

Question 2

This proved to be a popular question with some centres. The better responses reflected on what the aims of those wishing change in 1789 actually were. A significant number of candidates thought that the essay required a list of the causes of the French Revolution, and while there could be an implicit answer in there about 'aims', stopping firmly in 1789 meant that they could not really attain highly. Some very good responses did suggest that many of those who became revolutionaries did not intend to actually be 'revolutionary' when they set out on their journeys in 1789. A good degree of knowledge was usually exhibited, but using it relevantly was the key to success.

Question 3.

This proved to be a very challenging question to those who did it. Many really wanted to write about the causes of the Industrial Revolution and got immersed in the details of various inventions. The responses considered at least two of the countries mentioned and gave a range of reasons, and then took care to argue which were the most important in the countries chosen. The requirement to 'analyse' was vital to success, as was avoiding the temptation just to list. A variety of reasons were offered, with the agricultural revolution creating surplus food and a surplus rural population enabling the factory system to develop.

Question 4.

This proved to be a popular question and was often well done. The best responses reflected on the contributions of the key Italian leaders, such as Cavour, Mazzini and Garibaldi and then compared them with the supporting efforts of the French, English and occasionally, Bismarck. The Crimean War got few mentions, but the work of Napoleon was usually well known. The very best responses delivered a developed judgment, arguing a case successfully one way or the other. There is never a 'right' answer in such essays, but some candidates who really knew the period in detail simply presented the evidence for both sides and then assumed that the reader would make up his own mind on the issue. Quality reasoning by the candidate is really vital for the highest marks.

Question 5.

This question produced a wide variety of responses. The best responses looked carefully at each region, considering motivation, course and outcome and then reached a sustained judgment. Some responses tended to be very descriptive and left the judgement out. There were a significant number of responses that were mainly concerned with listing in a generalised way the motivation for African imperialism. The absence of any detailed knowledge of events in Asia was often a stumbling block to higher marks.

Question 6.

While a popular question, a significant number of candidates wrote primarily about the causes of the 1917 revolutions, which meant inevitably, they could not attain the highest marks. The best responses looked at the strengths of the regime prior to the outbreak of war, the loyalty of the army and the legacy of some of Stolypin's better ideas. They then contrasted this with the perceived weaknesses, the growth of opposition parties, the rise of a disaffected industrial proletariat and the flaws in the leadership itself being the most quoted reasons. Reflection on the word 'stable' was the key, and there were some quality arguments seen. Some argued that the regime was inherently flawed and doomed to fail, while others argued equally successfully that it had the potential to survive if the Tsar had behaved sensibly.

Question 7.

Working out what Hitler's domestic aims were was critical for success in answering this question. There were a large number of long descriptions of what Hitler did, such as the attacks on the Jews and his building of autobahns, but only a limited number of responses actually reflected on what his aims might be and then considered 'how far' he had attained them by 1939. Some candidates spent time dealing with Hitler's foreign policy, this meant that much of the detailed knowledge demonstrated was not made relevant to the question. The key to success is writing a response to the question actually set. A variety of acceptable 'aims' were considered, ranging from creating employment, attaining absolute power to developing an economy that could support total war.

Question 8.

This question was less popular. However there were some exceptionally good responses which not only looked at the threats to peace caused by both nationalism and imperialism, but produced a reasoned judgement. Some responses lacked much in the way of detailed support, good ideas really need to be substantiated with accurate and relevant supporting detail.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

Key Messages

Ensure that there is careful and considered reflection on source evaluation and interpretation in Question 1. Do not just précis the sources.

Think very carefully about what is being asked in essay questions and answer the question as it has been set.

General Comments

Relevance, as always, was the key to success. Shortage of information was seldom the cause of underachievement, but a failure to use information correctly often was. Successful candidates did as was asked in the question. In Question 1 this meant making a genuine effort to reflect on the provenance of the sources and paying, as was asked, 'particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources, both individually and as a group.' In essay questions the key to success is reflection on what exactly is being asked and where the main focus of the response should lie. In questions with 'why' as a stem care needs to be taken to ensure that more than just a list of reasons is produced and analytical skills are demonstrated. It was good to see so many candidates with not only a good grasp of the topics, but also real understanding and a willingness to argue a case. Developed judgement supported by relevant and accurate information is key to achieving high marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1.

There were many strong answers to this question. Good responses demonstrated careful thought about what 'defensive' implied before embarking on their response. The best responses invariably started with a firm answer which gave an outline answer grouping the sources into those for and then those against the hypothesis. Good contextual knowledge was often added and there were some extremely sound evaluations of the sources which had some very creditable comments on their provenance. Many commented, for example, on the very different international backgrounds involved when Source A was written, the situation in Germany in August 1914 for Source B; there were also good comments on why Casement in Source D might be a 'hostile' commentator. There were still some less developed comments such as 'Source B was written by a German so it is biased' or, 'Source E was written in 1994 so it is not good as it is a secondary source.' It is evidence that a Source has been reflected on with care that it the key to the highest marks in this type of question.

Question 2.

The better answers rose above writing a 'causes of the French Revolution' essay. They identified the various problems that Louis had, and then considered carefully the period they were going to deal with. Simply confining it to 1789 was not always successful, and there were some excellent responses which not only considered the build up to 1789 but also continued on to the execution of the King. An interesting range of problems was identified, ranging from the usual debt/extravagance issues which pre-dated 1789, the economic background of bad harvests, and the deep social divisions to Louis' incompetence in managing events after the meeting of the Estates General. As always those who reflected on what the essay really was looking for and avoided writing a list of reasons for the outbreak of the Revolution did best.

Question 3.

A very popular question, many candidates demonstrated good knowledge about both the Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions. Some went into enormous detail on the Agricultural Revolution in England, mentioning enclosure and the new 'technology' of seed drills, but never linked it to the Industrial Revolution. Others gave impressive lists of the causes of the Industrial Revolution but made no mention of the Agricultural. Few mentioned a country other than Britain. The best responses kept a firm focus on the interconnection between the two revolutions. Usually they looked at the various causes of the Industrial Revolution in two of the countries required, and then considered how important agricultural change was to the process. Some commented that while agricultural change was vital to stimulate industrial change in Britain, there were many different factors at work in Germany, such as political impetus from above.

Question 4.

The key to success here was getting the focus on Prussia and not just on Bismarck. There were a large number of impressive narratives of Bismarck's life with the bulk of the time being spent on his wars. The best responses kept a firm focus on Prussia, looking both at the historical background and its social and economic strengths and its leadership in general before emphasising the work of Bismarck in particular. As always, firm focus on exactly what was being asked in the question was vital for high marks. Identification of the key reasons and then arguing which were the most important and why is the most straightforward way to gain high marks in this type of essay.

Question 5.

There were two main types of response to this question. The first type looked at the principal reasons for popular support for imperialism in more than one country, made a genuine attempt to prioritise those reasons, and then argued which was the most important and why. Some good responses commented on how and why these reasons differed between Britain and Germany for example. The other type of response was to write a long list of the reasons behind imperialism, with a real focus on Social Darwinism. Relevance, as always, was the key to success.

Question 6.

A popular question and often very well done. There were some excellent debates in many essays. Some argued that staying in the war was the key factor in the Provisional Government's failure, others felt that a great reluctance to tackle the issues of 'Bread and Land' were more important. There were some interesting ideas on the role of Lenin in it all, some arguing that if the Germans had not let him back into Russia then the story might have been very different. Rather generalised lists of causes of the Revolution could gain only limited credit. Some responses wasted a lot of time dealing with events after 1917 which gained very little credit. The question encouraged debate and it was good to see so many candidates responding so well to it.

Question 7.

There were some excellent responses to this question which demonstrated some reflection about what Marxism and Stalinism implied and considered some of the differences between the two. Most responses identified what might be seen as the key features of Marxism, then looked at what Stalin actually did between 1924 and 1939, and then contrasted the two. The consensus tended to be that while Stalin may have had Marxism in mind, things like the Purges and the cult of personality did not quite fit into that framework. Some argued that with collectivisation and industrialisation Stalin intended to move towards a Marxist 'state'.

Question 8.

This was not a popular question, but it did produce some impressive answers. The best responses considered the impact of both, such as political power as opposed to social status and economic influence, and compared them. The outstanding ones really thought about 'benefit' and did not just write about 'impact on' and the sheer diversity and originality of many of the responses was good to note. Some responses remained a little general with some interesting ideas, but there was sometimes a lack of actual examples to illustrate the points being made.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

Key Messages

Ensure that there is careful and considered reflection on source evaluation and interpretation in Question 1. Do not just précis the sources.

Think very carefully about what is being asked in essay questions and answer the question as it has been set.

General Comments

Relevance, as always, was the key to success. Shortage of information was seldom the cause of underachievement, but a failure to use information correctly often was. Successful candidates did as the question asked. In Question 1 this meant making a genuine effort to reflect on the provenance of the sources and paying, as was asked, 'particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources, both individually and as a group.' In essay questions the key to success is reflection on what exactly is being asked and where the main focus of the response should lie. In questions with 'why' as a stem, care needs to be taken to ensure that more than just a list of reasons is produced and analytical skills are demonstrated. It was good to see a number of candidates with not only a good grasp of the topics, but also real understanding and a willingness to argue a case.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The hypothesis was generally found to be straightforward and candidates were usually able to challenge and support it. Source A was usually seen to oppose it, and many who looked very carefully at C felt that this should be used to oppose the hypothesis as well. Many did not fully grasp C and just assumed that because it was written by a German, it must be supporting the hypothesis. Some dismissed it as being of no value because 'it was not a primary source as it was written after the event'. Few saw the real value of C, being written by a key participant in events in 1914 who was actually criticising the German government, his employers at the time. Very few really reflected at all on the provenance of the sources. There were hardly any comments on E for example, suggesting that the Kaiser may be wishing to justify himself having been partly responsible for the deaths of millions. Comments on Source D, for example, tended to be of the 'it was written by a British historian so it was biased' type; too few responses indicated why it might have been and even fewer suggested in which way it was biased. Again it must be stressed that for high marks, candidates need to demonstrate evidence that they have seriously reflected on the provenance of a source.

Question 2.

The better responses tended to take some care in identifying what they felt were the ideals of the French Revolution before embarking on a survey of all that Napoleon did. Some responses contained a lot of detailed military history, which at times had little relevance, although one or two did try to argue that in spreading liberalism and nationalism around Europe Napoleon was carrying out the 'ideals' of the French Revolution. Many went into great detail on things like the Code Napoleon or the Concordat without actually linking such facts to the question asked. Some responses went into great detail on factors such as censorship and the sinister Fouché on the one hand and his (occasional) egalitarianism on the other, but did not come to any actual judgement. The tendency to leave the Examiners to make up their own minds on the evidence presented does not usually help candidates to secure high marks.

Question 3.

This was a popular question which produced a few really outstanding answers. A minority of candidates looked at the impact that steam power had on the causation process and then compared it well with a variety of other factors. In some cases there were very thorough lists of causes, raw material availability and capital availability, but candidates did not always form a judgement. Some responses were very generalised in their survey of causes and only a few really looked in much detail at factors which differed from country to country. There was lots of impressive detail on the work of Newcomen and Watt, for example, but too often this detail seemed to be an end in itself and not part of a discussion of the causes of the Industrial Revolution.

Question 4.

There were some very sound answers here. Many had a good grasp of their respective roles and argued a good case each way. Again it was those who reflected on what they had written and came to a balanced judgement that did best. Some demonstrated their extensive knowledge of Garibaldi's contribution and spent a lot of time on this. Others wished to write at great length on the contribution of foreign powers such as France. While this had some relevance to the work of Cavour, it should not have been allowed to dominate the essay. Again candidates really needed to focus on the question set.

Question 5.

The word 'cause' seemed to trigger a desire to write about the causes of imperialism in Africa and not why it caused rivalries. While there were some excellent responses, which looked at the issues that arose, for example between Britain and Germany, or France and Britain, there were also a large number of lists of the broad motivation behind imperialism. These ranged from the 'Social Darwinism' idea through to the desire to appease public opinion at home. Almost every answer confined their supporting detail to Africa, few considering the Far East for example.

Question 6.

This proved to be a very popular question with a wide variety of responses. The best answers took care to identify the problems that faced Lenin in this period and then tackled the issue of assessing them. Some prioritised the problems, like dealing with the Whites and international opponents of his regime, others looked more at the scope of the problems and commented on his ability to resolve them. There were a lot of largely irrelevant responses where candidates either wrote about the causes of the Russian Revolution, why Lenin was successful in October 1917 or why the Reds won the Civil War.

Question 7

The better answers confined their coverage of the years before 1919 to a realistic minimum and placed their main focus on the years between 1929 and 1933. While a popular question it was most successfully answered by those who identified the principal reasons in the period required and argued which were the most important and why. Care must be taken in this type of essay not to just write a list of factors with no comment indicating their relative importance. Many candidates spent the bulk of their time writing about the initial weaknesses of Weimar, commenting on how much harm, for example, the electoral system did to the Republic. There were also a lot of responses which had their main focus on how Hitler established himself in power after 1933.

Question 8

There were some exceptional responses to this question. They really placed a focus on the political aims and thought about them carefully. Some candidates looked at it from a thematic point of view, dealing with the retention of power, for example, and methodology, others dealt with each individual in turn, identifying their political aims and then commenting on the differences and similarities with the others. Some responses were excellent on two of the men, but ignored the third. Some included a large amount of detail about all three, but neglected to comment on how different their political aims were. As always, those who reflected on the question carefully before they started to write achieved well.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

Key Messages

Section A

Candidates did best when they went beyond a basic face-value interpretation of the sources and developed balanced arguments which were fully focused on the hypothesis in the question.

Section B

Candidates are advised to address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory Source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates deployed their time effectively, spending an appropriate amount of time on each question, only a small minority failing to complete a fourth response.

The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through all of the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This enabled them to display a clear and complete understanding of both sides of the argument, thereby ensuring that their responses were balanced and fully focused on the actual question throughout. Candidates who simply read and wrote about each source in turn invariably found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many candidates were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources fully in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective deployment of appropriate contextual knowledge.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent and sustained arguments which were fully focused on the requirements of the actual question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate factual material. It is no coincidence that such responses were usually preceded by a plan. Most responses relied too heavily on a narrative/descriptive approach, in which appropriate and accurate factual material was not explicitly used to address the demands of the specific question set.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates were able to produce balanced responses. Sources D and E were generally perceived as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, arguing that the right of veto was justified in view of the extra responsibilities which the permanent members had because they were the only ones with sufficient power and authority necessary to enforce decisions made the UN. Conversely, Sources B and C were seen as challenging the hypothesis, arguing that the permanent members' right of veto was unfair to all other members of the UN and, in particular, threatened the UN's ability to offer security to the smaller nations. Generally, Source A was seen as offering a balanced perspective by reporting the contrasting views of two delegates to the San Francisco Conference, Dr Evatt of Australia and Mr Gromyko of the Soviet Union.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. Many candidates were clearly

aware of the key role which the USA played in shaping the outcome of the San Francisco Conference. Candidates were able to analyse Source D in this context. They noted how the USA had pre-empted possible objections to its proposals, in particular by threatening not to become a member of the UN if veto rights were not granted. Despite Roosevelt's claim that 'the great powers would still always be answerable to world opinion', it was commonly argued that the great powers, and the USA in particular, were simply protecting their own national interests, as claimed in Source C. Similarly, many candidates were able to contrast the views of Gromyko (Source A) and the Danish writer of Source B. It was noted that while Gromyko claimed that veto rights were necessary in order to prevent war, the Danish writer argued that granting veto rights to the great powers would effectively render the UN useless in the event of any type of international conflict. This difference of opinion was explained by the fact that, as representative of the USSR, Gromyko was defending his country's national interests, while the Danish writer was clearly concerned about the future security of smaller countries such as his own.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond a basic 'face value' interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unconvincing. For example, a common assertion was that Source A must be biased because it is an extract from an Australian newspaper which would inevitably support Dr Evatt as its country's delegate to the Conference. In fact, the newspaper is simply reporting on events at the Conference, makes no attempt to explain Dr Evatt's argument beyond the rather vague assertion that 'there is no possible justification for this veto' and gives equal weight to the opposing views of the Soviet delegate. Similarly, many candidates argued that Source D is biased because it was written by an American who would inevitably defend the USA's actions at the Conference. Candidates who applied deeper analysis to this Source appreciated that it was reporting on strategies which the USA had employed to achieve its aims and objectives at a Conference held almost fifty years earlier, and that, if anything, it is implicitly critical of those strategies.

The weakest responses were characterised by a basic outline of the contents of each source in sequence, with limited understanding. For example, many candidates quoted Source E's suggestion that the permanent members of the Security Council had 'primary responsibilities', but did not explain the term or show its significance in terms of veto rights.

Section B

Question 2

This was a popular question, and most candidates were able to display sound knowledge of the Marshall Plan and the economic assistance which it offered to post-war European nations. The most impressive responses were based on a detailed analysis of Truman's possible motives for instituting the Plan, followed by a well-argued judgement regarding which might be considered the most significant. Most responses, however, while containing similar factual information, tended to lack balance. Generally, this was because candidates simply agreed with the hypothesis in the question and provided evidence to support it. The possibility that Truman might have had other motives was either ignored completely or dismissed without adequate consideration. Some candidates wrote more generally about the causes of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1949; this approach meant that there was little focus on the precise requirements of the question. The weakest responses were characterised by inadequate or inaccurate factual content, leading to an over-reliance on unsupported assertions. Some candidates were not able to differentiate effectively between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Confused chronology was not uncommon; for example, several candidates suggested that the Marshall Plan was issued in response to the Berlin Blockade.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to provide examples of the globalisation of the Cold War. Generally, this involved descriptive accounts of the Korean War, the Cuban crisis and the Vietnam War, although some responses covered a wider range, including Africa, the Middle East and Latin America. Relatively few, however, were able to focus on the precise requirements of the question. The most impressive responses were characterised by evidence to show that the Soviet Union's determination to spread its communist ideology did, indeed, play a part in globalising the Cold War, balanced with analysis of other causal factors, such as decolonisation and the USA's development of policies designed to resist the spread of communism. The majority of responses, however, lacked such analytical depth and, as a result, relied too heavily on narrative accounts of various regional conflicts followed by unsupported assertions. The weakest responses were characterised by factual inaccuracy, confused chronology and, in many cases, lack of understanding of the term 'globalisation'; many candidates, for example, wrote about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

Whereas in **Question 2** candidates tended to provide detail without balance, responses to this question were generally based on balance without detail. Virtually all candidates were able to show how both the USA and the USSR gained something from the crisis; in most cases, this was based on the agreement that the Soviet Union would remove its missiles from Cuba in exchange for the removal of American missiles from Turkey. The most impressive responses were based on detailed understanding of how and why the crisis had evolved; this facilitated focused analysis of American and Soviet motives for involvement in Cuba, thus providing criteria by which to evaluate the extent to which their respective aims had been achieved. Most responses, however, lacked such analytical depth, simply providing a narrative/descriptive account of the crisis followed by a generalised, and often assertive, conclusion regarding who gained most from the final outcome. American interests in Cuba were generally not well understood, many candidates arguing that Kennedy's 'sole aim' was the removal of Soviet weapons which posed a serious threat to the USA. As a result, the significance of Kennedy's agreement not to invade Cuba was missed. The weakest responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by inadequate or inaccurate factual content, leading to an over-reliance on unsupported assertions.

Question 5

There were relatively few high quality responses to this question. These were characterised by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reforms carried out by Gorbachev and Deng, the motives behind them and the impact of them. Some candidates argued convincingly that these reforms were in response to, rather than a cause of, the crisis of communism, while others were able to show how the different circumstances facing the two leaders led to their contrasting approaches. Most responses, however, lacked such analytical depth, relying on narrative/descriptive accounts of the reforms, seemingly based on the assumption that they were, indeed, the cause of the crisis facing the USSR and China respectively. It was clear that many candidates lacked the factual knowledge required to address this question; while most were able to write with some accuracy about Gorbachev's reforms, relatively few could provide relevant and accurate information regarding the situation in China, often leading to the assertion that Deng did not reform at all. The weakest responses were characterised by lack of understanding of the term 'crisis of communism' and confused chronology.

Question 6

The most impressive responses were based on detailed analysis of the SALT Treaties in terms of their context, aims, terms and impact. The original aims were commonly used as criteria by which to measure the extent to which the Treaties' achievements might be deemed 'substantial'. The majority of responses, however, lacked such analytical depth. Most candidates simply provided narrative/descriptive accounts of the Treaties, in varying levels of detail and accuracy, with limited, and often assertive, focus on the precise needs of the question. Some candidates wrote about the nuclear arms race in general, often referring to other attempts to control it, such as the Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Such accounts were rarely made explicitly relevant and were frequently characterised by chronological and factual confusion. It was evident that most candidates lacked the detailed knowledge and understanding of the SALT Treaties required to address this question.

Question 7

This question was attempted by a sizeable minority of candidates, usually as a fourth and final response. A few candidates were able to demonstrate good knowledge and understanding of the oil crises and their wide-ranging impact on the international economy. Fewer were able to provide balance by identifying other factors which led to problems in the international economy during the period. Those who did tended to concentrate on problems affecting the American economy, and were unable to develop the point further by showing how they impacted on the international economy generally. Most responses, however, were based on inadequate factual knowledge, and were characterised by vague and generalised assertions.

Question 8

This question was attempted by very few candidates. Most were able to show some knowledge and understanding of the Brandt Report, its context, aims and contents. Generally, there was less understanding of the extent to which the Report has been implemented and, therefore, limited analysis of its impact.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

Key Messages

Section A

Responses which go beyond a basic face-value interpretation of the sources and develop balanced arguments fully focused on the hypothesis in the question, are those which achieve the highest marks.

Section B

Candidates are advised to address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. It is essential that candidates pay attention to any dates in the questions.

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory Source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates deployed their time effectively, spending an appropriate amount of time on each question, only a small minority failing to complete a fourth response. Very few candidates misread or ignored the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3 and Question 4**.

The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through all of the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This enabled them to display a clear and complete understanding of both sides of the argument, thereby ensuring that their responses were balanced and fully focused on the actual question throughout. Candidates who simply read and wrote about each source in turn invariably found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many candidates were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources fully in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective deployment of appropriate contextual knowledge.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent and sustained arguments which were fully focused on the requirements of the question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate factual material. It is no coincidence that such responses were usually preceded by a plan. Many responses relied too heavily on a narrative/descriptive approach, in which appropriate and accurate factual material was not explicitly used to address the demands of the specific question set.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates were able to produce balanced responses. Sources B and D were generally perceived as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, implying that Britain played a key role in a plot to kill Hammarskjöld in order to prevent the UN from adversely affecting British interests in the Congo. Conversely, Source E was seen as providing the strongest challenge to the hypothesis, claiming that the nature of the crash pointed to pilot error or instrument failure rather than the effects of an explosion or air-born attack. Generally, Sources A and C were viewed as providing neutral and balanced assessments respectively.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. Some candidates went beyond the sources to provide contextual background knowledge to explain what Hammarskjöld was trying to achieve in the Congo and the possible threat which this posed to the interests of various parties, including Tshombe, Lumumba, Belgium, the USSR, the USA and Britain. This, for example, enabled the allegations made in the 'Ghana Times' to be analysed in the context of decolonisation and Cold War rivalry. These allegations were widely dismissed as vague and unsubstantiated, as evidenced by the use of emotive language, the contradictory assertions regarding the way in which the murder 'must have' been carried out, and the fact that they emerged so soon after the fatal crash, before investigations had taken place (as indicated in Source A). It was widely noted that none of the sources contain convincing evidence to implicate Britain in Hammarskjöld's death, merely a variety of conspiracy theories based on letters of unproven reliability (Source C) and the fact that Britain, amongst other nations, clearly had a motive for ending Hammarskjöld's involvement in the Congo (Source D). While Source E appears to end all possibility that the conspiracy theories might be true, arguing that Hammarskjöld's death was simply the result of a tragic accident, many candidates pointed out that the Rhodesian investigation was carried out under British supervision and might, therefore, have reached a flawed conclusion.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond a basic 'face value' interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unsuccessful. For example, many candidates argued that the allegations made in Source B must be true because they come from a British newspaper which might have been expected to be misleading about Britain's involvement. This rather missed the point that the source is actually quoting allegations made in an African newspaper. Similarly, many candidates argued that Source D contained convincing evidence of Britain's involvement in Hammarskjöld's death, whereas, in reality, it merely established a possible motive with no proof of guilt. There were many unsupported assertions regarding the provenance of Source D, some candidates arguing that an Irish newspaper would have no reason to be biased, while others suggested that it was inevitably biased because of on-going political problems between Britain and Ireland. Both views missed the point that Source D is actually non-committal, arguing that allegations against Britain are 'far-fetched' but that 'suspicions remain'. The weakest responses were characterised by a basic outline of the contents of each source in sequence, with limited focus on the requirements of the question.

Section B

Question 2

This was an extremely popular question, and most candidates were able to display accurate and detailed knowledge of the events which marked the early development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949. Most responses took the form of a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War, usually pursuing a chronological narrative/descriptive account of the events that led to strained relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common approach involved developing an account of the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War, outlining the views of traditional, revisionist, post-revisionist and post-post revisionist historians. As a result, most responses tended to be rather generalised with only limited explicit focus on the requirements of the actual question, usually confined to introductions and conclusions. The best responses came from candidates who were able to use their knowledge in order to address the question directly. The weakest responses were characterised by inaccurate chronology, unsupported assertions and/or a tendency to drift outside the prescribed timeframe.

Question 3

The most impressive responses were characterised by clear understanding of how and why American Cold War policies were, to a large extent, shaped by economic self-interest. Many candidates, for example, were able to demonstrate how the need to protect its economic interests in Japan and SE Asia was highly significant in the USA's decision to defend South Korea from communist attack. Balance was then established by an analysis of other factors which helped to globalise the Cold War, such as decolonisation and the Soviet Union's own need to both protect and enhance its international prestige. The majority of candidates, however, tended to ignore the 'economic interests' element of the question, writing in more general terms about the reasons why the Cold War was globalised. American policy was commonly defined as wanting to prevent the spread of communism, with no explanation regarding why this was so important. As a result, most responses took the form of narrative accounts of various regional conflicts, followed by analysis of whether the USA or the USSR should be deemed more responsible for their escalation. While these responses often contained a great deal of relevant and accurate information, they were not fully focused on the requirements of the actual question. The weakest responses were characterised by

inaccurate chronology and unsupported assertions. It was clear that some candidates lacked understanding of the term 'globalisation', some writing about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

Most responses were based on sound, and often very detailed, knowledge of the Korean War and American involvement in it. Many candidates appreciated that in order to remain fully-focused on the requirements of the question, it was necessary to achieve two things – firstly, to be able to provide a clear definition of 'containment', and, in particular, its aims and objectives; secondly, to be able to differentiate effectively between 'containment' and 'roll-back'. The majority of responses tended to address the rather more general question of whether American involvement in the Korean War should be deemed successful or unsuccessful. Some candidates adopted a narrative/descriptive approach, outlining the key events of the Korean War with no explicit reference to the actual question.

Question 5

The collapse of the Soviet Union was a popular essay choice, and, as in previous years, most candidates were able to demonstrate detailed and accurate knowledge of the reasons why it occurred. Again as in previous years, however, responses tended to follow a narrative/descriptive approach in which each causal factor was systematically explained in isolation. As a result, most responses followed a similar pattern – an account of Gorbachev's reforms, followed by a list of other factors which threatened the Soviet Union, leading to a generalised, and often assertive, conclusion about which was the main cause. The most impressive responses were based on far greater analytical depth; they were able to demonstrate how the various causal factors were inter-connected, thereby analysing Gorbachev's reforms in context rather than in isolation. This enabled candidates to demonstrate full understanding both of Gorbachev's motives and of how his reforms impacted on the integrity of the Soviet Union. There were very few really weak responses to this question; these were invariably the result of inadequate factual knowledge.

Question 6

This was a relatively popular question, and most candidates were able to display sound knowledge and understanding of the nuclear arms race and the various attempts to control it during the period from 1963 to the 1980s. This usually involved an account of the development of new and more advanced weapons and delivery systems, together with details of treaties such as the Test Ban Treaty, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the SALT Treaties. While most responses therefore contained relevant and accurate factual detail, relatively few provided an argument which was explicitly focused on the requirements of the set question. The weakest responses were characterised by unsupported assertions, factual inaccuracy and chronological confusion.

Question 7

This was a relatively popular question, and it was evident that most candidates possessed sound knowledge and understanding of the factors which led to the rapid growth of the Japanese economy after 1945. The most impressive responses were characterised by clear understanding of the role that American assistance played in revitalising Japan's economy, and the Cold War context which motivated the USA to provide it. Most responses, however, while containing similar factual detail, lacked analytical depth. They consisted largely of narrative/descriptive accounts of the reasons for Japan's economic recovery, with little attempt to analyse the relative significance of each factor or to demonstrate how they are inter-connected. In particular, most responses tended to ignore the relevance of the Cold War.

Question 8

A minority of candidates attempted this question. The most impressive responses were characterised by clear understanding of the movement's aims, using this as criteria by which to evaluate the relative significance of its achievements. Appropriate, and often very detailed, factual information was then used to provide a balanced assessment. In general, however, while most candidates were able to explain how, when and by whom the Non-Aligned Movement was formed, there seemed to be less understanding of its aims beyond the view that it was intended to prevent member countries becoming involved in Cold War issues. As a result, the majority of responses lacked explicit focus on the requirements of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

Key Messages

Section A

Responses which go beyond a basic face-value interpretation of the sources and develop balanced arguments fully focused on the hypothesis in the question, are those which achieve the highest marks.

Section B

Candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory Source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates deployed their time effectively, spending an appropriate amount of time on each question, only a small minority failing to complete a fourth response. Very few candidates misread or ignored the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3 and Question 4**.

The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of responses. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through all of the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This enabled them to display a clear and complete understanding of both sides of the argument, thereby ensuring that their responses were balanced and fully focused on the actual question throughout. Candidates who simply read and wrote about each source in turn invariably found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many candidates were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources fully in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective deployment of appropriate contextual knowledge.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent and sustained arguments which were fully focused on the requirements of the actual question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate factual material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were usually preceded by a plan. Most responses relied too heavily on a narrative/descriptive approach, in which appropriate and accurate factual material was not explicitly used to address the demands of the specific question set.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates were able to produce balanced responses. Sources A, C and E were generally perceived as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, suggesting that Hammar skjold acted 'even-handedly' in his attempts to prevent the crisis escalating into a civil war enflamed by Cold War rivalries. Conversely, Sources B and D were seen as being highly critical of Hammar skjold, claiming that he failed to implement the UN Security Council Resolution, actively supported the coup by which Kassavubu deposed Lumumba and allowed the UN to fully support the foreign policy interests of the USA.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. It was widely noted, for

example, that Sources B and C reveal clear differences in the ways in which Lumumba and Hammaraskjold interpreted the UN Security Council Resolution. While Lumumba expected the UN to assist him in defeating the rebel government in Katanga, Hammaraskjold argued that the UN's role was to preserve peace in the Congo rather than to support one of the factions in what was, effectively, a civil war. While noting that Source C was Hammaraskjold speaking in defence of his own actions and, therefore, inevitably biased, many candidates used contextual knowledge to argue that his interpretation of the Resolution was more reliable than that of Lumumba as expressed in his equally biased letter (B). In support of this argument, many candidates noted the significance of Lumumba's statement that 'in its intervention in the Congo, the UN is not to act as a neutral organisation but rather is to place all its resources at the disposal of my government'. Source A was generally considered to offer the most reliable and balanced account of UN involvement in the Congo crisis. Written by an historian with no obvious motive for bias and with access to research material, it was perceived as critical to some extent of Hammaraskjold's failures, while understanding the complex problems which he faced in the Congo.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond a basic 'face value' interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unsuccessful. Many candidates, for example, simply dismissed the contents of Source E on the grounds that it must be biased because it was written by the man who had been Hammaraskjold's deputy at the time of the Congo crisis. This establishes a motive for bias, but it was necessary to test the reliability of his statements by cross-referencing against other sources before making such an assumption/assertion. Similarly, many candidates argued that Source D must be biased because it was written by an historian whose country, Belgium, had a vested interest in the Congo crisis. This rather missed the point that the Source is actually critical of Belgian actions in Katanga Province. While some candidates argued that Sources B and C were the most reliable because they were written at the time of the crisis, others suggested that A, D and E were more reliable because they were written with the advantage of hindsight. Both views are simply vague assertions if not accompanied by detailed analysis of source contents and provenance.

The weakest responses simply provided a basic outline of the content of each source in sequence, with little or no attempt to address the hypothesis in the question.

Section B

Question 2

A majority of candidates attempted this question. The most impressive responses were based on full understanding of the assistance offered to European nations by the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, the context in which they were initiated and their implications for American-Soviet relations. Many candidates were able to identify and analyse a wide range of Truman's possible motives, often using historiography to support their arguments in an explicitly relevant way. This analysis was often followed by a well-argued judgement regarding the most likely reason(s) why Truman adopted policies which were clearly detrimental to relations between the USA and the USSR. Many responses, while fully focused on the question, lacked balance because they only considered one possible motive, invariably the view that Truman initiated the policies as a way of containing communism. A relatively large number of candidates wrote about the causes of the Cold War in general, often addressing the rather different question of whether the USA or the USSR was responsible for initiating it. While such responses generally contained accurate and, often, detailed factual information, this was not used effectively to focus on the issue of Truman's motives for adopting the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The weakest responses were characterised by inadequate or inaccurate factual content, leading to an over-reliance on unsupported assertions. Some candidates were not able to differentiate effectively between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

Question 3

The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed analysis of Soviet motives for becoming involved in what were essentially regional conflicts, providing evidence from a wide range of examples (such as SE Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America). Balance was created by analysing other factors which could also be seen as responsible for globalising the Cold War, such as decolonisation and the USA's implementation of anti-communist policies (containment, roll-back, NSC-68 etc.). Some candidates adopted a similar approach, but their analysis was weakened and their judgement distorted by providing only a very limited range of examples; for example, based solely on coverage of the Korean and Vietnam Wars. Many candidates argued that the Cold War was not globalised because of the Soviet Union's determination to increase its international influence. Some responses appeared to be addressing the rather different question of whether the USSR or the USA should be seen as primarily responsible for globalising the Cold War. The weakest responses were characterised by unsupported (and often inaccurate) assertions. A few candidates

clearly lacked understanding of the term 'globalisation', writing at length about events which took place in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

In much the same way as **Question 2**, this question required a detailed analysis of motivation. The most effective responses were characterised by analysis of a wide range of possible motives which may have led Khrushchev to take the 'gamble' of placing nuclear weapons in Cuba. This usually involved demonstrating full understanding of the Cuban Missile Crisis in its wider Cold War context, with focused reference to issues such as disputes over Berlin and the nuclear arms race. Some candidates argued effectively that Khrushchev's decision was a classic example of brinkmanship and that, as such, he was not really risking nuclear war at all. Many responses lacked balance because they only considered one possible motive, usually the view that Khrushchev intended to use the Cuban missiles as a bargaining tool to achieve the removal of American missiles from Turkey. A large number of responses suffered from lack of focus on the precise requirements of the question. Many candidates, for example, wrote narrative accounts of the crisis, while others seemed to be answering the rather different question of whether Kennedy or Khrushchev gained most from its outcome. The weakest responses were based on limited understanding of the background to the crisis and, in particular, the reasons for American interest in Cuba.

Question 5

This was a popular question, and virtually all candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge of the various factors which contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union. The vast majority of responses, however, tended to be lists of causal factors with very little analysis or understanding of how they inter-connected. As a result, pressure imposed by the USA (usually perceived as meaning Reagan's strong stance against the 'Evil Empire') was dealt with in isolation, followed by similar coverage of other factors, such as the Soviet Union's economic problems. Candidates were able to write at length about Gorbachev's reforms, but relatively few were able to analyse them in context; as a result, there was little explanation of why he reformed and still less analysis of the impact of his reforms beyond the assertion that they led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. This, in turn, led to over-simplifications, such as the common assertion that Gorbachev's repeal of the Brezhnev Doctrine was responsible for the growth of nationalism in Eastern Europe.

Question 6

Only a relatively small number of candidates addressed this question, invariably as a fourth and final response. With very few exceptions, it was clear that candidates lacked the detailed and specific factual knowledge required in order to develop an argument which was both fully focused and adequately supported. Most responses were characterised by vague and generalised accounts of the nuclear arms race and/or the attempts to control it through various treaties. As a result, there was little reference to the actual question and, in most cases, a tendency to drift well outside the established timeframe.

Question 7

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

Question 8

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

Key Messages

- For the source-based question, candidates need to *analyse* the sources in order to show how far they support the given hypothesis. This means taking the sources at face value. For higher marks, candidates should *evaluate* the sources, using the source itself, other sources or their own knowledge to decide how reliable the source is.
- For the essay questions, candidates need to develop a balanced argument which answers the question set. That argument should be structured into a series of key points with a paragraph per point. Each point needs explaining, illustrating with relevant and detailed historical evidence and finally each point needs relating to the question. A conclusion is absolutely essential. It must summarise the main points and answer the question directly.
- Candidates can improve responses by including some precise, detailed examples to support their arguments. Many essays in particular involve no more than general historical explanation, often without any reference to specific dates. History is about change and continuity over time. The more specific, both evidence and the candidate's awareness of time, the higher the marks which can be awarded.
- In order to prepare for the examination, candidates are advised to practise writing answers against the clock.

General Comments

- As candidates become more familiar with source-based question, there is a tendency to use rather formulaic approaches to source analysis and evaluation. Candidates consider each source for reliability and validity. There is no need to distinguish the two. Reliability is the focus of source evaluation on this paper.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Source-Based Question

Question 1

The sources included a cartoon of four Southern states following South Carolina in chasing 'the secession humbug' and heading towards the edge of the cliff as they did so. This cartoon gave rise to a range of different interpretations. Some argued that the four states following South Carolina were actually pushing a presumably reluctant South Carolina towards the cliff edge. Others showed they had not fully read the provenance when they stated that the breakaway donkey following a gentler path represented the border states. In terms of origins of the cartoon, some maintained it came from Georgia. The cartoon portrays the secessionist states in such a negative light that it must come from the North.

There is enough in the cartoon to identify its source and evaluate its reliability, even before contextual knowledge is brought into play. The same point applies to Source B as well; lack of specific information about the source should not prevent evaluation. Source B could be evaluated by cross-reference to both the cartoon and to Source E. Many thought the latter to be Robert Toombs' autobiography rather than his biography; at this level candidates are expected to know the difference between the two and its relevance for source evaluation. Source D, from President Grant's memoirs – which can be defined as an autobiography of part of the writer's life – was written at the end of his life as he was dying. In terms of the hypothesis,

elements of all sources could be used for and against. The keyword in the hypothesis is 'fully'. Some candidates used it effectively to construct their argument, others ignored it completely.

Question 2

This was popular and reasonably well answered. Most candidates knew something about the topic. Many, however, interpreted the question too generally. They took it to read 'Describe the factors which caused the destruction of the way of life of *Indians* in the *nineteenth century*'. Thus they ignored three key factors in the question. They described rather than assessed. They considered all Indians, not just the Plains Indians. They covered the whole of the nineteenth century rather than the second half. By doing so, they limited the marks they could receive. The more focused the answer, the better candidates could achieve.

Question 3

This was also a popular choice, those who chose the question knew something about Reconstruction and how far it helped ex-slaves. Most candidates provided arguments and evidence on both sides of the argument. The better answers knew something about the changing nature of Reconstruction within the 10-15 years before its abandonment in 1877. Some went beyond the Reconstruction era to describe the Jim Crow policies of the late 19th century, which was appropriate as long as it was linked with Reconstruction. To mention *Plessy vs. Ferguson* in 1896 was to go too far.

Question 4

A minority of those who attempted this question misinterpreted 'trade unions' to be trade associations rather than labour unions. As there were few formal trade associations at the time, these candidates found it hard to write anything of relevance, even in terms of their redefinition of trade unions. The majority who did define their terms correctly understood that the question allowed the inclusion of other factors which contributed to US economic growth, such as the contribution of the big names of US industry such as Rockefeller and Carnegie. The question required some details of the work of various labour unions, especially in the Progressive era of the early twentieth century, but those efforts were not the exclusive focus of the question.

Question 5

This question covered a less popular aspect of race relations. Most candidates interpreted it as focusing on military events during the two wars, about which they knew only a little. They neglected the home front. They overlooked the post-war impact of the two wars. Most important of all, they made few comparisons between the two wars and their impact. Answers became a description of the impacts of the two wars rather than a comparison of those impacts. 'Compare and contrast' requires candidates to consider the similarities and differences between the two wars. This approach was taken by a minority of candidates, who did not always provide the detailed examples needed to substantiate their comparisons.

Question 6

This was a straightforward question which some candidates turned into one solely on the New Deal. The domestic policies of the FDR presidency were certainly part of the answer. However, they were not the whole answer. The Great Depression was essentially economic and thus assessment of the development of the US economy was needed before the New Deal was explained. The same applied to American society. Did the Great Depression divide or unite the American people? Many candidates wrote too generally about both economy and society. In addition, candidates were asked to evaluate and not just describe the effects of the Great Depression. To do so means candidates have to attempt to make some kind of historical judgement about the relative importance of the various developments they explain and illustrate. Few candidates went beyond describing, which limited the marks they could be awarded.

Question 7

This was a popular question. Some candidates only covered the few years leading to American intervention in the Second World War, from 1937 to 1941. A few more mentioned the America decision not to join the League of Nations in 1919. The long period in between usually received little, if any, coverage. Candidates also tended to focus on US relations with Europe. Relations with China and Japan were infrequently mentioned, those with Central and South America hardly at all. Some candidates even turned the question into an essay on domestic affairs, writing about the inward-looking 'roaring' twenties and the depressed 1930s rather than foreign policy. There were some candidates who made a useful distinction between economic and diplomatic isolationism.

Question 8

Almost everyone who answered this question disagreed strongly with the assertion. They argued that American life was revolutionised in the 1960s. They usually quoted the experiences of college students, women and African Americans in support of their argument. Often they used examples which came from the 1950s rather than the 1960s. This is a question where some knowledge of historical dates is vital. Elvis Presley rose to fame in the 1950s. The so-called 'British invasion' of groups such as the Beatles did not occur until 1964-5. For women, change was only just starting in the mid to late 1960s. The National Organisation for Women (NOW) was formed in 1966. Again, dates are important. With regard to African-Americans, many candidates concentrated on the methods used by the civil rights movement, often from the 1950s, when they should have focused on the outcomes of the movement for the lives of African Americans. In addition, the counter argument – that changes in lifestyles in the 1960s were NOT revolutionary – needed considering. In the late 1960s, political leaders used the phrase 'the silent majority' to make a clear contrast with the 'noisy minority'. Even President Nixon gave the term his seal of approval in 1969. The vast majority of white middle aged working and middle class Americans experienced no great change in their lifestyles in the 1960s – except when affected by the behaviour and beliefs of their children.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

Key Messages

- For the source-based question, candidates need to *analyse* the sources in order to show how far they support the given hypothesis. This means taking the sources at face value. For higher marks, candidates should *evaluate* the sources, using the source itself, other sources or their own knowledge to decide how reliable the source is.
- For the essay questions, candidates need to develop a balanced argument which answers the question set. That argument should be structured into a series of key points with a paragraph per point. Each point needs explaining, illustrating with relevant and detailed historical evidence and finally each point needs relating to the question. A conclusion is absolutely essential. It must summarise the main points and answer the question directly.
- Candidates can improve responses by including some precise, detailed examples to support their arguments. Many essays in particular involve no more than general historical explanation, often without any reference to specific dates. History is about change and continuity over time. The more specific, both evidence and the candidate's awareness of time, the higher the marks which can be awarded.
- In order to prepare for the examination, candidates are advised to practise writing answers against the clock.

General Comments

- As candidates become more familiar with source-based question, there is a tendency to use rather formulaic approaches to source analysis and evaluation. Candidates consider each source for reliability and validity. There is no need to distinguish the two. Reliability is the focus of source evaluation on this paper.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Source-Based Question

Question 1

The sources included a cartoon on the topic which used the nursery rhyme about Little Bo-Peep to make its point. The cartoon clearly supported the hypothesis. Contextual knowledge would suggest that the cartoon is fairly reliable: some Europeans were hoping to exploit the disunion of the USA and 'Old Buck' did turn his back on a major political and constitutional problem caused by secession. Source D undermines the latter point but then Source D is most unreliable. Source E explains why Buchanan had little choice but Source E is unreliable.

Of the four written sources, on initial analysis, two support the hypothesis, two oppose it. Although one source, C, does not mention Buchanan by name, the last sentence is clearly critical of him, if in an indirect way. The two sources challenging the hypothesis, Sources D and E, are both of limited reliability because one is from Buchanan's memoir. Although the preface is anonymous, many believe that it was written by Buchanan. Source E refers to the unique political position retiring US presidents hold between the election of their successor in November of one year and their standing down from the presidency in the spring of next year (as it was in the 19th century). The period is better known as the lame duck period. Hence Davis's reference to 'the feeble power he possessed in the closing months' of Buchanan's presidency. Many took 'feeble power' to refer to Buchanan's weak leadership when in fact it refers to his lack of authority, which

meant he could not be strong even if he had wanted to. Source B, perhaps the most measured of the sources, would appear more reliable than the other more partisan sources.

Most candidates were able to analyse the content of the sources to argue for and against the hypothesis. Far fewer, however, could evaluate their reliability in order to reach a more balanced judgement.

Question 2

This was not a popular question choice. Those who answered it wrote too generally about the treatment of Native Americans in the nineteenth century; many mentioned the Trail of Tears, which occurred in the 1830s and thus was irrelevant. Many also described the tactic of deliberately infecting blankets given to Native Americans with the smallpox virus, still a matter of great historical debate. What is indisputable, however, is that this tactic was used in the eighteenth century, if at all. The use of smallpox vaccination was common, even among Native Americans, by the mid-nineteenth century. The key word in the question was 'deliberate', which some used to write a balanced and focused analysis. More detailed evidence of the position of the Plains Indians in the late nineteenth century would have strengthened such arguments, however.

Question 3

The dates in the question indicate that Grant's military and political careers should have been considered. Some candidates took for granted the fact that Grant was a great military leader and went straight on to assessing his Presidency. With more time, such answers were often impressive in their coverage of Grant's term at the White House. Most answers, however, gave an essentially negative assessment of Grant's political career, concentrating on the several scandals during his time in power as well as his lack of political experience. There is a counter-argument which the best answers provided, namely that Grant was quite successful in carrying through Reconstruction in the South, at least in the short term. That the focus of political life turned away from the South to economic problems from 1873 onwards caused Grant new problems that the US Presidency of the time just could not cope with.

Question 4

Many candidates who chose this question did so because they knew the main points of the topic. Answers usually focused on the work of the great industrialists – or robber barons – of the time, which was covered rather too generally and almost always too uncritically. Most knew that they had to mention other factors and the preferred choice was technological innovations such as electricity and the Bessemer steel-making process. Usually overlooked were the creation of a single mass market, the large-scale immigration from eastern Europe and the high tariff policy to protect American industry.

Question 5

This was not a popular question. The few who did attempt it usually knew enough about the topic to write a reasonable answer to the question. The impact of the First World War, the Great Migration from South to North and the effect of the Great Depression and the New Deal were all covered to a greater or lesser extent. Most candidates drew a valid contrast between the changing position of African Americans in the North and the unchanging position of those in the South.

Question 6

Few candidates chose this question. Those who did tended to agree with the assertion. They could use various aspects of the Roaring Twenties to show how most Americans enjoyed themselves. They could also show how the problems of an economy based on personal debt were put to one side, until the Great Crash arrived and it was too late to address those problems. Candidates found challenging the hypothesis much harder. There were two main ways in which it could be done. One was to argue that economic problems were sometimes addressed; this applies to the question of war debts following the Great War. With the Dawes Plan, especially the US government at least addressed a serious problem of international finance. The other was to question whether all Americans enjoyed themselves. Some groups did not, for example farmers and African Americans living in the South.

Question 7

Few candidates attempted to answer this question. Many demonstrated little knowledge beyond policies towards the First World War, both in taking the USA into the war in 1917 and in trying to influence the post-war settlement in 1918-20. The foreign policy of Wilson's first term, from 1913 to 1917 was almost entirely overlooked. His intervention in the affairs of several Caribbean and Central American states, especially in the ongoing Mexican Revolution needed analysis to provide a full answer to the question, as did his policy of non-intervention in the First World War from 1914 to 1917. The overall assessment of most answers saw Wilson's diplomacy as more a failure than a success.

Question 8

Many answers to this question reinterpreted the question to mean 'write all you know about the women's movement of the 1960s'. Such a generalised approach merited little credit. Those who did focus more on the causes of the emergence of the movement in the 1960s sometimes resorted to unconvincing generalisations about social change. Three features included in virtually all answers, general or specific, were the publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, the introduction of the contraceptive pill and the formation of National Organisation for Women (NOW). Stronger answers went on to explain and, where possible, illustrate the social and economic obstacles which women faced in the 1950s and 1960s, such as their limited economic opportunities.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

Key Messages

- For the source-based question, candidates need to *analyse* the sources in order to show how far they support the given hypothesis. This means taking the sources at face value. For higher marks, candidates should *evaluate* the sources, using the source itself, other sources or their own knowledge to decide how reliable the source is.
- For the essay questions, candidates need to develop a balanced argument which answers the question set. That argument should be structured into a series of key points with a paragraph per point. Each point needs explaining, illustrating with relevant and detailed historical evidence and finally each point needs relating to the question. A conclusion is absolutely essential. It must summarise the main points and answer the question directly.
- Candidates can improve responses by including some precise, detailed examples to support their arguments. Many essays in particular involve no more than general historical explanation, often without any reference to specific dates. History is about change and continuity over time. The more specific, both evidence and the candidate's awareness of time, the higher the marks which can be awarded.
- In order to prepare for the examination, candidates are advised to practise writing answers against the clock.

General Comments

- As candidates become more familiar with source-based question, there is a tendency to use rather formulaic approaches to source analysis and evaluation. Candidates consider each source for reliability and validity. There is no need to distinguish the two. Reliability is the focus of source evaluation on this paper.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Source-Based Question

Question 1

The sources included a cartoon on the topic, the two national figures named in the cartoon provide two of the four accompanying written sources. Source B, from Senator Daniel Webster, shows him to support the new Fugitive Slave Act, to see it as constitutional. Source D, from William Lloyd Garrison shows how vehemently opposed he is to the new law. The cartoon shows both in an unfavourable light, Webster providing support for a slave catcher, Garrison threatening to shoot in order to defend a slave woman. Thus it could be argued that the cartoon's message is even-handed, aiming to show how deeply divided the two sections were over the Fugitive Slave Act. A contrary analysis is that the overall message of the cartoon is more anti-slavery than anti-abolitionist. This is illustrated by the wording of the two flags which fly over the temple of liberty. It would be very hard to interpret the cartoon as being pro-slavery.

Of the four written sources, on initial analysis, two support the hypothesis, two oppose it. Sources B and C opposed the hypothesis. Source B is a bit of a surprise, given that Webster represents the Northern state of Massachusetts. Few candidates made use of this point. Source C is also something of a surprise in that the religious arguments were usually on the side of abolition; here you have a cleric arguing the opposite. Both points help question the reliability of these pro-slavery sources. Sources D and E support the hypothesis; Source D in describing Garrison's burning of copies of the Fugitive Slave Act and the US constitution is

shocking to 21st century eyes. Source E expresses a view which is hard to challenge and impossible to prove or disprove.

In responding to this question, most candidates could explain what the sources were saying on the surface but few went beyond this analysis to consider how reliable that surface information might be. Most attempts at evaluation rarely went beyond the general. Thus candidates asserted that a source written some time after the event under examination was more reliable because its author had more information and could be more objective. Such assertions are too general – and can be very mistaken. Evaluation of source content needs to be detailed in order to be convincing.

Question 2

Candidates showed sound knowledge and understanding. Most candidates mentioned the opening of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 but few mentioned that this line was the first of five coast-to-coast railroads built by the turn of the century. Many candidates explained or described rather than assessed the impact of the railroads. The latter could be done in one of several ways. One would be to consider the balance between the gains and losses of railroad growth. Another would be to consider the different forms that the impact of the railroads took, e.g. economic, social and cultural. Having done so, candidates should then have considered which impact was the greatest, providing some detailed evidence to support their case. To reach higher marks, candidates must make a reasoned historical judgement.

Question 3

This was not a popular choice, those who had studied the impeachment of President Johnson, however, were able to provide good answers. Candidates were usually stronger on the causes rather than the consequences of Congress's use of impeachment against Johnson. The narrow failure to gain the necessary two-thirds supermajority in the Senate meant that though Johnson remained President for another ten months his authority was impaired. The balance of constitutional power shifted towards Congress, a factor which Grant had to take into account when he became president.

Question 4

This question was popular; many were able to demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the rise and fall of the Populist movement. Most answers were descriptive rather than analytical. The main issue was identifying how and how far the movement was significant. What did its emergence and decline signify about the USA of the later nineteenth century? It was a sign of the 'great depression' of the time, of the declining importance of agriculture in an increasingly industrial society and in some of the reforms the movement proposed helped give rise to the Progressive movement of the early twentieth century.

Question 5

This question was popular but not always well answered. Many candidates felt that they needed to describe the battle for civil rights from start to finish. They did not have to do so. Then question was about the end of the battle. The focus should have been on the later 1960s. In addition, the question asked about ethnic minorities in general and not just African Americans. Native Americans and – although in terms of the US census not strictly an ethnic minority – Hispanics or Latinos should have been included as well. The efforts of AIM, founded in 1968, and the work of Cesar Chavez in the 1960s on behalf of Hispanic farm workers in California also needed consideration.

Question 6

'Compare and contrast' questions require candidates to consider the similarities and differences of two historical topics. However, this question did not require candidates to compare and contrast the First and Second New Deals. Answers had to focus on aims and effect. Aims are not the same as causes, a confusion which caused a number of answers to lack sharp focus. Impact could cover many aspects of American life, from the more obvious economic and political consequences to developments in society and culture and ideas, which are harder to substantiate. Most candidates concentrated more on the content of the two New Deals, on the various reforms which were introduced by the Roosevelt administration in the 1930s. In doing so, they sometimes limited the amount of marks which they could achieve.

Question 7

This was not a popular question choice. Those who attempted it usually demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding of the topic and question. Coverage tended to be restricted, however. The Spanish American war of 1898 and entry into the First World War in 1917 were the two aspects of the period which were described most. The period in between was rarely considered. A few mentioned the building of the Panama Canal during the presidency of Teddy Roosevelt but the dollar diplomacy of the Taft administration and the foreign policies of the first Wilson administration were rarely considered.

Question 8

Those who answered this question showed a general awareness of the point of the quotation but lacked the detailed knowledge of American society with which to support their assertions. Most answers focused mainly on the impact of the civil rights movement of the time. The other main point of consideration was the emergence of youth culture of the 1960s. Some also remembered to include what has become known as second-wave feminism. As usual, however, most answers described these changes rather than analysing the extent of these changes. The 'silent majority' identified by Richard Nixon in a famous speech of 1969 was rarely mentioned.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/06

Paper 6

Many candidates made good responses to the four questions which they answered. In the case of **Question 1** candidates covered all the sources in some detail. Only a few gave detailed conclusions, e.g. to modify the hypothesis. On most of the essay questions candidates were well informed. Some made their points in general terms, without much detailed evidence.

In **Question 1** candidates usually did well, interpreting and evaluating sources and dealing with challenge and support of the hypothesis. On **Section B, Questions 4, 5 and 6** were chosen most often. In those cases, most candidates showed clear understanding of the question and provided arguments and factual knowledge in their answers. In some cases appropriate material was used without the extra quality provided by making clear links with the wording of the question. Answers to **Questions 2 and 3** were shorter and lacked the range of material and ideas compared with the answers to other questions.

Comments on specific questions.

Question 1

The five sources include three extracts from official sources, material from a recent history and part of the resolution from a town meeting. They were written at different times and represent the situations in different colonies. Two are about Trinidad. Sources A and B were written soon after full freedom was attained. They reveal the apprehensiveness at the change; some felt that emancipation could be disastrous to the sugar industry. Source C records that in Trinidad Indian immigration was making a difference. Source D summarises the success of Barbados as action was taken to improve the situation there. Source E, Jamaica 1865, records the feelings of a public meeting. It seems that the situation described is without hope.

Some candidates dismissed Source D in a few words without any analysis. Some reported that it was only a secondary source. Another view could be that it was researched by a historian (subject to peer reviews); it records details; it gives a range of detail which a contemporary might not be aware of. Source E, apart from its message, is different from the rest of the sources. The other sources are official, possibly linked with the feelings of planters. This one is based on a different group of people, with pressing concerns, possibly exaggerating their worries and grievances.

Candidates covered all the sources in their answers. Many approached the sources in alphabetical order, though some grouped them. A, B and E represented one side of the discussion, though the difference of dates was not noted. C and D represented the other. Some found one or more to be 'neutral'. Few candidates used background knowledge of the period, except for references to 1838 as the end of Apprenticeship. To recognise the 1840s as a period of apprehension (A and B) and the 1850s as a time of recovery (C and D) would have added quality to answers, using general knowledge to lend weight to quotations from the sources. In the case of Source E, to see that this was a different type of source, arising from the feelings among the general population, even recognising the significance of the 'Underhill Letter' could have added weight to comments.

Candidates did appreciate the fact that there were two sides to the answers. Conclusions tended to line them up, A B and E on one side and C and D on the other. Emphasis on the special circumstances in Jamaica in relation to rain did not appear in many answers. Most answers fulfilled some of the qualities in interpreting and evaluating the sources in context.

Question 2

A few candidates wrote only about anti-slave reformers, usually in Britain and France. Fuller answers mentioned economic motivations, the actions of slaves themselves, political events in Europe and so on. Many answers were done in general terms, even without reference to particular countries. None took a

historiographical form. A direct approach, assessing the importance of different factors was used. Most answers were descriptive.

Question 3

In this question too, responses were dominated by description. The workings of apprenticeship in the British Caribbean were described by most, without reference to the reasons for the Scheme's premature end. Some did not mention the Dutch. A few wrote about the Danes instead.

Question 4

Candidates answered this question in various ways. At one level answers were generalised descriptions, without specific reference to dates or regional variations. The major theme was that freed people wanted to be free of the conditions and locations associated with slavery. This meant leaving the plantations and exploring different ways of earning a living. Some responses went on to consider the efforts of planters to retain labour on the estates. More complex answers took up the theme of the impact of high and low densities of population. This helped to deal with the extent to which lives could be changed. Barbados and Jamaica presented different possibilities. Only a few candidates gave detailed examples about free villages, planters' willingness to sell land, and so on.

Question 5

One theme which came into almost every answer was that of the proportion of population to land. High density areas posed greater difficulties. Barbados was the major example. Candidates often gave the impression that it was the natural, and easy, option to leave an estate and begin a self-supporting small-holding. Some responses described the lives of peasants and the advantages to be gained. In fact for many the establishment of peasantries was not easy, even where there was land available. Government action and the costliness of purchasing land caused difficulties. Still there was much uncultivated land and it was virtually impossible to stop the development of peasantry. Over the rest of the century even in Barbados the number of freeholders increased. Although candidates made good points, really full answers were few.

Question 6

Candidates could concentrate on the early years after 1838 or go beyond that. In addition to the range of dates, the geographical variations could and should be considered. Some candidates wrote generalised accounts, in these, Barbados did not have a problem but most other Caribbean colonies did. Some description would follow e.g. contesting Guadeloupe and Martinique. Taking large British colonies such as Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana, few looked at details or made comments or emphasis. Jamaica did have a problem but shortage of labour was not the only cause, Trinidad and British Guiana as 'new' sugar colonies had a smaller labour force. Efforts were made to recruit labour but without major success until Indian immigration developed in the second half of the century. Many other areas also received Indian or Asian labour. Candidates usually introduced the subject of Indian labour but did not detail the results.

For **Question 7** and **8**, there were too few answers to make general comments.