



# CONTENTS

---

**FOREWORD** ..... 2

**HISTORY** ..... 2

**GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level** ..... 2

    Paper 9697/01 Paper 1 ..... 2

    Paper 9697/02 Paper 2 ..... 5

    Paper 9697/03 Paper 3 ..... 7

    Paper 9697/04 Paper 4 ..... 12

    Paper 9697/05 Paper 5 ..... 14

## FOREWORD

---

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**

# HISTORY

## GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

Paper 9697/01

Paper 1

### General comments

The overall quality of the candidates' performance was sound. Most of the scripts were relevant, clearly argued and well informed. Examiners were pleased to read some excellent scripts that showed a very high level of understanding. Candidates were required to answer a source-based question and three essay questions. The results of the source-based question and the essays were very comparable and most candidates were not disadvantaged by the requirement to tackle these different sorts of exercises.

Most candidates allocated their time sensibly so that they could complete the four answers. A few scripts contained one answer that was weaker than the others but this tended to indicate that these candidates had problems in recalling the material that was needed for a fourth answer, rather than that time was short.

Comments on individual questions are given below but some overall points of guidance might be noted. The answers that were awarded the highest marks were very exact in their relevance whereas the more moderate answers tended to be relevant but general, sometimes not focusing on the key issues that were raised by questions. These moderately successful answers sometimes contained only surveys of the topic. Higher marks were awarded to answers that were well organised. It was useful to begin with a brief, not an extended, introduction that outlined the main thrust of the argument. The sections that followed should focus on different aspects of the answer; this helped candidates to avoid narrative accounts that only told a story. Brief conclusions were included in the best answers; these summarised the argument in a cogent way. Candidates were rewarded when they focused on the particular problems that were posed in questions. Some scripts contained accounts of the background to developments that might have been omitted because they did not add significantly to the value of the answers. Candidates do not have a long time to write each answer and therefore it is important to concentrate on the particular angle of questions. This means that candidates should select what is appropriate from the material that they have learned. Good answers considered a range of explanations because the historical developments in the syllabus were not caused by one factor. Very good answers then explained why some factors were more important than others.

### Comments on specific questions

#### Question 1

*'German foreign policy was unreasonably aggressive from 1880 to 1914.' Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.*

This source-based question on The Origins of World War I was particularly about Germany's aims before the war. It asked candidates to consider whether 'German foreign policy was unreasonably aggressive from 1880 to 1914'. The most successful candidates concentrated on interpreting the four sources to assess how far they confirmed or contradicted the claim. They then offered their own argument. The highest marks were awarded to candidates who tried to organise the sources in groups, some of which agreed with the claim, whilst others disagreed. Answers could gain satisfactory, but not the highest, marks when they only considered the sources in sequence and did not compare them. Such answers were often rewarded for their explanatory comments but not for the ability to group the sources. Weaker answers tended to include much paraphrasing of the sources ('Source A says that... Source B says that...etc'); these did not deserve a high mark because they did not comment on, or interpret, the sources in order to frame an argument to answer the question.

The best answers did not accept the sources at face value but tried to assess their value to the question. For example, Source A can be accepted as a reliable account of the Triple Alliance because it is a primary document. However, it was written well before 1914 and Germany's foreign policy might have changed significantly by the outbreak of the war. In addition, treaties often hide the real motives of countries to form them. Source A would seem to indicate that Germany's foreign policy at the time was defensive rather than aggressive, but the Triple Alliance was one of the early stages by which European countries formed themselves into two hostile camps that led to war. Source E agrees that German foreign policy was not aggressive before 1914. The author blames France for being aggressive. However, some candidates did not note the information that was given about the writer. He was a German and would therefore probably have been anxious to absolve his country from blame. He was at the Versailles talks that had imposed severe peace-terms on Germany and would naturally have felt that the terms imposed on his country were unjust. The source was written with hindsight and the title of the book is a strong clue, 'The Case for the Central Powers'. Therefore, the source is useful because it shows the attitude of an important German, but it cannot be relied upon as reliable evidence of that country's foreign policy before the war.

Some answers would have been improved if they had considered the provenance of Source C. Many candidates noted that the speaker was explaining why Germany should have an active foreign policy although he claimed not to be aggressive. However, one should note that the source, as a speech, might be exaggerated because the speaker was trying to win support from other politicians. The source contains evidence of the lively reactions to the speech. The author claims to be defensive, but the tone of the speech contradicts this.

Source B was written by an important German and reveals his acceptance of war. Written at about the same time as Source A, it contradicts the idea that Germany was defensive although it does not prove that German foreign policy was seeking to be unreasonably aggressive at that stage.

Source D is the strongest evidence that German foreign policy was unreasonably aggressive before the outbreak of the world war. The War Guilt Clause clearly attributed the greatest blame for the conflict to Germany and Austria, its ally. Most, but not all candidates pointed out the bias in the source. The Commission was composed of Germany's victorious enemies after a prolonged and terrible war. Germany itself was not a part of the investigating Commission and had to agree with its conclusions.

Some answers were awarded a low mark because the candidates almost ignored the sources and wrote general accounts of the causes of the war. This was not a satisfactory way to tackle the question, which asked candidates to 'Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement'. When answering these source-based questions, candidates should only use their background knowledge to interpret the sources or to indicate how far they are incomplete. The questions are essentially exercised in using primary evidence.

## Question 2

*Why did the French revolution become increasingly radical during the years 1789-94?*

The question asked why the French revolution became more radical during the period 1789-94. As in **Questions 3, 4 and 6**, candidates should tackle questions that ask 'Why...?' by providing a series of reasons. The highest marks were awarded when candidates began by examining the most important reasons and then dealt with less essential issues. This was more effective than narrative accounts of events in France. Some candidates devoted too much time to explanations of the reasons why the revolution broke out in 1789. Whilst it was relevant to examine the aims and methods of the revolutionaries, it was not helpful to describe the general problems of the ancien regime in the eighteenth century. Examiners read some excellent analyses that considered a range of points. These included the growing distrust of Louis XVI and the effects both of external war and internal revolt. Opposition to the revolution was considerable in some regions. The role of Paris and other major cities could be examined and some candidates were well informed about the importance of the sans-culottes. There were some worthwhile analyses of the conflict between different factions that led to the rise of the most radical Jacobins under Robespierre.

### Question 3

*Why did Europe industrialise during the nineteenth century? (You should refer to developments in two countries in your answer.)*

The discriminating factor in many answers was the extent to which candidates could support general points about the causes of industrialisation with particular examples from at least two countries. Weak answers usually knew about the process of industrialisation but were sometimes uncertain about causes and lacked examples. On the other hand, there were some very successful essays that considered a variety of reasons and provided appropriate examples. Among the relevant reasons that candidates offered were the importance of capital that was available for investment and favourable government policies, often of non-intervention that allowed scope to industrialists at the cost to their employees. Some candidates examined the opportunities afforded by growing populations that moved to urban areas when employment was not available in rural areas. Communications improved, especially as the result of railways. This quickened the pace of change. Technological improvements helped the process.

### Question 4

*Why were the 1848-49 revolutions ultimately unsuccessful both in Germany and Italy?*

The highest marks were awarded to answers that were reasonably balanced in examining the failure of revolutions in Germany and Italy. They also went beyond sequential accounts to look at some similar and some different reasons as a form of comparison. It was permissible in a brief conclusion to look ahead by making the point that both Germany and Italy became united at a later date, but some candidates spent too much time describing the later events. The question was about developments in 1848-49 and the best answers focused on this period. Examiners read many clear and well-informed answers to this question but some answers would have been improved if they had given more weight to a study of Mazzini in Italy. As a leading figure in the unification movement, how extensive was his responsibility for the failed revolutions? Most answers on Germany included convincing assessments of the Frankfurt Parliament but some would have been improved if they had looked further at the role of Prussia.

### Question 5

*Assess the effects of imperialism on European countries during the later years of the nineteenth century.*

This question on imperialism was concerned particularly with its effects on Europe. Candidates deserved high marks when they focused on consequences rather than causes and when they supported their arguments with appropriate, if brief, examples. The geographical scope of imperialism was so wide that Examiners only expect some regional examples in answers to questions on this topic. The regions can vary. However, such examples are important to avoid vagueness. Good answers considered a variety of effects, including political, strategic, economic and socio-religious issues.

### Question 6

*Why did Nicholas II's regime survive the revolution of 1905 but not that of 1917?*

The key issue in this question was the contrast between Nicholas II's success in surviving the 1905 revolution in Russia and the fall of his regime in 1917. The highest marks were awarded to answers that were fully comparative and balanced in their study of the two revolutions and their effects on the tsarist regime. For example, they considered the important role of the army and contrasted its support for the Tsar in 1905 with its alienation from the regime in 1917. Apparent concessions helped to win support after 1905 but were unacceptable in 1917. Some candidates successfully contrasted the extent and strength of the opposition in the two stages of revolution. Moderate answers sometimes narrated developments from 1906 to 1917 but the more effective responses analysed and assessed these developments to explain why Nicholas II's policies after the earlier revolution did not save his government.

### Question 7

*How similar were the reasons for the rise of Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany?*

There were some interesting comparisons of the rise of Italian Fascism and German Nazism. Candidates were rewarded when they considered such issues as the effects of disillusion with post-war settlements, the weakness of democratic governments, and economic problems. The personal roles of Mussolini and Hitler, enhanced by propaganda, were examined. Some thoughtful candidates considered the nature of Fascism and Nazism. How similar were they? 'How similar...?' led some candidates to look at different reasons. For example, it was valid to point out that the rise of Fascism in Italy owed less to racism than Nazism in Germany. In considering economic issues, some candidates incorrectly linked the rise of Mussolini to the Wall Street Crash, which happened after he came to power, although the general economic condition of Italy after the end of the World War was relevant.

### Question 8

*How different were society and the economy in Russia from countries in western Europe before 1914?*

This question asked candidates to compare and contrast society and the economy in Russia before 1914 with those of other European countries. Although there were comparatively few answers, the general quality of the responses was pleasing. Few candidates wrote only about Russia with occasional references to conditions elsewhere. Examiners read some sound essays that were fully comparative and exact about the factors that were being discussed. Some essays gained credit by pointing out how far Russia had industrialised by 1914, although it was still behind other major European countries in a number of respects.

**Paper 9697/02**

**Paper 2**

### General comments

Candidates seemed well prepared for an examination structured differently from its predecessor in two significant respects: not only was there a source-based question but also the more traditional essay questions required answers with examples taken from three different countries.

Although the quality of candidates' responses varied widely, there was an impressive number of scripts reaching a high standard and exhibiting great skill in analysis and in the organisation of relevant information.

In general, candidates performed less well in **Question 1**, the source-based question, than in the essay questions. This variation may be accounted for by the different intellectual skills called for in this question, compared with the more familiar techniques of analysis and organisation needed for **Section B** of the Paper.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

*'With David Marshall as leader of the Singaporean delegation, the 1956 constitutional talks never had any real chance of success.' Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.*

Candidates generally were aware of the need to consider both sides of the argument if their answer was to be awarded a mark in the higher mark bands. As a consequence, few candidates contented themselves with presenting one side of the case. Again most candidates were familiar with the context in which David Marshall's political drama was played out and displayed an extensive amount of background knowledge. Evaluation of the Sources sometimes focused too closely on Source A and B and the expressed contempt of the British authorities for the Chief Minister. However, many candidates emphasised the likelihood of bias in Lee Kuan Yew's account (Source E); some examined Lennox-Boyd's use of the term 'psychopathic' (Source D) or the hint that he gives that Marshall may have been the victim of a plot by Lee and

his supporters. Again, good candidates picked up Lennox-Boyd's generally hostile assessment of the delegation's leaders, particularly the description of Lim Chin Siong as 'almost sinister' and spoke in support of him. Given the tone of the Colonial Secretary's comments, no alternative leader from the delegation would have been successful. Source C gave candidates some difficulty. It was sometimes read as if it came from the British Parliament and this was an offer to Singapore. Occasionally it was ignored entirely or dismissed as irrelevant. The best candidates saw that this resolution represented the will of the Legislative Assembly and could be seen as the basis of the Singapore delegation's proposals to the British. One interpretation of Marshall's refusal of Lennox-Boyd's offer might be - as Source B suggests - that he was 'too much of a gentleman' to abandon what, as a barrister, he would see as his brief or too unsuited to the 'hurly-burly of politics' to do a deal with the Colonial Secretary.

## Section B

### Question 2

*During the period 1870-1914, how effectively did the imperial powers tighten their grip on Southeast Asia?*

This was very widely attempted with excellent analysis of the differing ways in which the tightening grip of the colonial powers was exercised, with a wealth of detail from various South East Asian societies. Malaya, Burma and Indonesia were widely cited as case studies, although many candidates drew on the colonial experience of the French in Vietnam to illustrate their argument.

### Question 3

*'On any reasonable assessment, colonial rule in Southeast Asia was beneficial for the local people.' How far do you think this is true of the period 1870-1914?*

This was a very popular question and usually well-done. Answers ranged from a limited assessment of economic benefits produced by efficient administration and communications, to sophisticated analyses which considered the importance of a common language and clearly defined political boundaries. Again, there was often a reference to the splitting of local communities which this could produce. Most candidates saw the development of education and social services as amongst the major benefits and the best candidates wrote eloquently of the replacement of arbitrary rule by legal codes, while partially regretting the decline of the traditional patron-client relationship. It was rare to find answers which commented on the end of local wars and feuds as amongst the benefits colonial rule brought. Some candidates wandered beyond the period and wrote at length on the impact of the Great Depression on South East Asian societies who had been involuntarily forced into the world economy.

### Question 4

*How do you explain the widely-differing nationalist responses to colonialism in the inter-war years, 1919-41?*

This was not as widely-attempted as **Question 2** or **Question 3**. However it produced a range of very good answers, which offered a categorisation of the different nationalist movements with evidence taken from societies as diverse as Malaya, Vietnam, Burma or Indonesia. Many candidates produced an analysis which considered the different bases in, say, religion or politics, and then considered the significance of the regime - its relative toleration or repressiveness - in triggering nationalist movements.

### Question 5

*'Almost everywhere in Southeast Asia, although the Japanese invaders were welcomed with open arms, they subsequently failed to win the hearts and minds of the people.' How far do you agree with this statement?*

A minority of candidates answered this question. The level was always satisfactory - probably because the subject is so familiar - but responses did not reach the level of sophistication often displayed in **Question 2** or **Question 3**. Some candidates fell back on stereotypical material on the Japanese occupation of Malaya and Indonesia although there was also excellent analysis of Japan in Burma, in Vietnam and in the Philippines.



### Question 6

*To what extent would you agree that the colonial powers were reluctant decolonisers?*

This usually produced answers which reached a high level, with very good material on the imperial record of the Americans in the Philippines, the British in Burma and very full accounts of the evidence of Dutch reluctance in withdrawing from Indonesia. Again, good candidates were very well briefed on the complex situation in Dutch-Indonesian relations, and commented on the apparent double standards of the Americans in exerting pressure on the Dutch in Indonesia and offering support to the French in Vietnam.

### Question 7

*How successful were the independent Southeast Asian states in reducing the social and economic inequalities inherited from colonialism?*

Too few answers to make any useful assessment.

### Question 8

*Since the end of the Second World War in 1945, which has been the more important influence on Southeast Asia: the threat of communist subversion or superpower rivalry?*

Too few answers to make any useful assessment.

Paper 9697/03

Paper 3

### General comments

This is the fourth examination of this syllabus. The number of Centres entering candidates has more than doubled in the past twelve months. The number of candidates taking the examination has grown even more rapidly. Examiners' experiences of candidates' responses to four Examination Papers enables some important general points to be made. Most importantly they all relate to the compulsory source-based question.

The key message about **Question 1**, developed at greater length in the next section, is the importance of passage evaluation. What exactly does that mean?

Evaluation is more than commenting on the passages. Some candidates do, for example, cross reference a source with another source or against their own knowledge. They conclude their comparison with an assertion that Source B supports Source A. Such an approach is not source evaluation. It is only the start of the process of evaluation. Candidates should then use this comparison to decide on the value of the source and the support it does (or does not) provide for the argument. To achieve the highest marks for **Question 1**, candidates must question the source, testing its argument in one of the four ways specified in earlier reports.

Evaluation is certainly much more than commenting on the authors of the passages. Making such comments is a very common approach. It seems that, for many candidates, author evaluation is an automatic default position. With the question in this examination, many asserted that the arguments of the two authors who had worked at or in the UN (Sources B and C) were convincing because they had inside knowledge. Why should that necessarily be so? The opposite case – that their arguments are unconvincing because they are likely to have strong opinions one way or the other – could just as easily be argued. This chain of reasoning is not strong enough to carry any weight. It is not to be encouraged.

Thus the key messages about **Question 1** are essentially twofold: concentrate on the passages, not the provenance; evaluate the passages, do not just comment on them.

It is understandable that a new type of source-based question will cause problems of technique. The relative unfamiliarity of the topic and the absence of accessible resources, especially on some central topics, only compounds the difficulty. Candidates should be reminded that even unfamiliar sources must relate to the question in some way or other. This means that their arguments can always be put against each other. The surprising point about this year's **Question 1** was how few candidates evaluated sources against their own knowledge.

Essay questions, a very traditional form of assessment, are not really a problem. Candidates knew or did not know the topic. (Most knew something.) Candidates could or could not apply their knowledge to answer the question set. (Many could analyse and evaluate.) And the quality of most candidates' English was good enough to cause no problems of understanding (with one or two scripts, handwriting was a real problem, however). Once candidates gain the skills of source evaluation required to answer **Question 1**, virtually all of them achieve high standards.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

*Source-based question on the Changing Position of the UN Secretary-General*

*'The UN Secretary-General has never possessed any independent power.' How far do sources A-E support this view of the position of the Secretary General in the period 1945-1991?*

There is a lot to say about how best to answer source-based questions. The main point to make is that candidates have to evaluate the sources and not their authors. Far too many spent all their time commenting on the latter. Examples of such an approach include:

*Boyd (Source A) appears to be trustworthy, his reportage being largely objective and showing no clear bias towards the US despite his British heritage.*

*Source A is written by a journalist in his book, which can be trusted as its content is not controversial and it has the benefit of hindsight*

*E is rather believable as the author actually uses quotes instead of merely his own views.*

Such insubstantial comments about the authors were then used to draw a conclusion about the passage. Thus: the author is (un)reliable, therefore the passage is (un)reliable and (depending upon the candidate's interpretation of the passage) supports or disproves the hypothesis. This was a very common approach. It still takes the passages at face value and thus is limited to Level 3 at best.

Perhaps the simplest route to the higher levels comes from the candidate who wrote

*Sources B and E seem to be supporting the hypothesis. However we must not be fooled into taking the sources at face value.*

This then leads into an examination of the content of the sources, of which the following is an example (from a different script).

*Source E is a source that clearly echoes the sentiments of B. Again, the Secretary-Generals are criticised and again Dag Hammarskjöld is mentioned as the exception. The comments on the Secretary-Generals are certainly not entirely true and, in fact, are too harsh. 'U Thant was invisible' may be a comment made due to his refusal to talk much during meetings. However, outside meetings, he did carry out certain initiatives. His courage was revealed in his passionate criticism of the USA's invasion of Vietnam, which shows that he did not (**sic**) have independence. Also, he took the initiative to carry out talks to resolve the Cuban missile crisis issue. This shows that he did exercise his powers and was independent. The source is thus not very reliable. (**Evaluation of a source which argues the case for the hypothesis, using contextual knowledge. Thus Level 4**) It clearly does not look at instances where the three successors of Hammarskjöld did possess any independent power. Like Source B, Source E is too harsh and cannot be used to access (**sic**) whether the hypothesis is true.*



Note that the focus is entirely on the content of the source. As candidates so often focus on the author of a passage, there is perhaps a good case, in training candidates to evaluate a source, to remove any mention of who wrote it. Once they were able to evaluate content, then authorship could be included. It cannot be excluded because occasionally it helps evaluate the content, as with the case with Source C in the examination.

There are certain common approaches which certainly should be discouraged. These include:

- Commenting on the title of a book  
One candidate maintained that the evil mentioned in the book title in Source E 'presumably' referred to the UN.
- Commenting on the profession of the author  
The writings of a university professor are not in themselves reliable. Conversely, neither is a journalist's report necessarily unreliable. (Rather surprising were those who saw journalists as academic and thus reliable.) Each source needs to be judged on its merits, on what it states.
- Criticising a source for what it leaves out.  
By definition, the sources must be short extracts from a longer work. They should be evaluated for what they say, not what they do not say. (Thus the penultimate sentence of the extract above adds nothing to the argument.)  
To take a specific, rather unusual example of the dangers of this approach, some gave a critical evaluation of Source E because its author refers to but does not name an historian of the United Nations. In his book William Shawcross does name the historian he quotes. In setting the question, Examiners removed the name in the belief that to do so would help candidates. The argument was that giving a specific name would be a distraction, especially as the name – Rosemary Righter – would have meant little, if anything, to candidates.
- Arguing that the most recent sources are the most reliable.  
The belief is that hindsight and access to earlier histories makes the latest source the most accurate and useful. Many thought Source E the most useful of the five sources for this reason alone. Again, the content of the source needs examining and evaluating, as does the candidate in the extract above.

To reiterate the key point: to achieve Levels 4 and 5, candidates must evaluate – give a value to – the content of the passages in relation to a given hypothesis. The difference between source analysis which concludes

*Thus the source supports/rejects the hypothesis*

and

*Thus the source is reliable/unreliable and does/does not support the hypothesis*

is slight but most significant. The latter shows evidence of evaluation and, assuming it is soundly based, results in Level 4 and Level 5 marks.

So what is needed to reach Level 6? The conclusion is the crucial evidence. It needs to be more than just a summary of analyses of individual sources. It needs to reflect on the relative merits of the sources as evidence both for and against the assertion. Until then, sources have been evaluated one by one. The conclusion is where the set of passages are evaluated as a whole. How useful are they? A passage might have been evaluated positively as a reliable source and yet it might not be very useful in helping to support the assertion, especially when considered against other passages.

Once this collective evaluation has been carried out, candidates might then modify the quotation to ensure it more accurately reflects what the sources are actually saying. Too many candidates were too quick to modify the quote without basing their alteration on a reasoned evaluation of the sources.

## Section B

### Question 2

*How far has the historical debate about the origins of the Cold War changed since the collapse of the USSR in 1991?*

The Origins of the Cold War is a popular topic and so many answered this question. Its particular focus caused problems for many, however. Virtually all candidates knew of the long-running historical debate and were able to identify and explain the three main historical schools: traditional (or orthodox), revisionist and post-revisionist. Very few knew how the debate had changed since 1991. Thus many ignored the date and just described the three schools. Even here, candidates often provided a simplistic analysis, seeing the traditional view as American, the revisionist as Soviet and post-revisionism as a welcome and sensible mixture of the two and, by implication, almost the end of the debate.

Others – the majority – asserted that the post-revisionist school had emerged since 1991. In this they were mistaken. Post-revisionist theories were developed in the 1980s. A small number of candidates were aware of this. They talked about the emergence in the 1990s of what they called a post-post revisionist school. Its arguments were similar to those of the traditional school in that the outbreak of the Cold War was seen as being primarily the responsibility of Stalinist authoritarianism. For Teachers who wish to know more about these developments, the main source is *We Now Know* by John Lewis Gaddis (1997), a post-post-revisionist who has abandoned his post-revisionist past.

There was another approach, unanticipated by the Examiners, argued by a few. Ignoring the matter of resources, they considered how the causes of the collapse of the USSR might help understanding of the causes of the Cold War. Thus, for example, they reflected on the Soviet Union's loss of control over Eastern Europe in 1989 and its importance in bringing about the collapse of the USSR. This, they argued, showed how important Eastern Europe was to the USSR in the 1980s and, by implication, in the 1940s. This meant that the revisionists' explanation for the outbreak of the Cold War was strengthened. Though rather convoluted, as well as being hard to prove, the argument was accepted as a valid attempt to answer the question.

The important general point is that those who really tried to answer the question and made some valid points in doing so received more credit than those who simply repeated received information about the three schools of Cold War history. Candidates should be encouraged to answer the question actually set.

### Question 3

*'The globalisation of the Cold War in the 1950s and 1960s is clear evidence that both the USA and the USSR had expansionist ambitions.' Discuss.*

This was also popular. It was usually well answered; candidates analysed the policies of the USA and the USSR for evidence of expansionism. Though some strayed beyond the 1960s to the 1970s and 1980s, most kept to the 1950s and 1960s. Most based their answers on analysis of the main regional conflicts of the era: the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Middle East.

Knowledge of these various conflicts was usually sound and often up-to-date, e.g. the Korean War. The one crisis about which misconceptions were common was the Middle East. Two assertions in particular stood out. Firstly, that the USA intervened in the 1950s and 1960s in order to secure supplies of oil. If so, why did it intervene on the side of Israel, much hated by the Arab states who controlled the oil? And until c1970, the USA was a net exporter of oil. The second common assertion was that the USSR intervened in order to gain access to a 'warm water port'. In the age of ICBMs, the USSR would gain little from such a port. Also, which port did the Russians have their eye on? The reality was that the Cold War provided to superpower intervention its own momentum; each had to establish its influence in order to negate its opponent's efforts.

Establishing influence could be interpreted as expansionist. The very best answers did attempt to define the term, as in the following case:

*Expansionist ambitions must fully be defined. In the context of the ideological conflict of the Cold War, such ambitions were probably that of establishing influence or a position of power in the country more than just establishing territorial hegemony over the area.*

This makes a useful distinction between influence or power and hegemony. It would have been even better had it separated influence and power and force. Sometimes the use of military force marks the loss of political power over a client state. The more structured and more reasoned the answer, the higher the mark it is likely to receive. Such an approach will always outscore a series of narratives which occasionally answer the question.

#### Question 4

*Analyse the impact of the Cuban Revolution on American policy towards Cuba in the period to 1962.*

A fair number of candidates chose this question on the globalisation of the Cold War. They usually knew the detailed events of these three years. Almost inevitably, answers consisted of a narrative of events. A few, otherwise detailed, stopped short of the Cuban Missile Crisis. The mention of 1962 in the question shows that candidates were expected to consider the superpower confrontation of October of that year. After all, even though the crisis was a question of US-USSR relations, it still greatly concerned the island of Cuba.

The key difference was between those who did actually analyse the changing American policy and those who preferred just to describe American – and Cuban and Soviet – policy between 1959 and 1962. Analysis means explaining as well as describing. It means highlighting important ‘turning points’. It can mean compare and contrasting different facets of the subject matter. The question is more demanding than it might appear.

#### Question 5

*Compare and contrast the crisis experienced by China in the late 1980s with that experienced by the USSR under Gorbachev.*

This is a demanding question. For a start, and just as a start, candidates need to know and understand the key developments of complex crises in two states. Then they must compare and contrast those developments. It is pleasing to report that many candidates made a very good attempt doing so. Those who simply provided separate accounts of the two crises with a brief comparison at the start and at the finish were relatively rare.

In terms of content, a common confusion was to blur the difference between the states of Eastern Europe and the Union-Republics of the USSR. Some candidates certainly referred to Poland as a Soviet Republic. It is important to distinguish clearly between the two. The collapse of the USSR's East European empire was certainly an important part of the Soviet crisis of the late 1980s, especially because it stimulated national groups within the USSR to demand independence. However, it is a mistake to compare Tiananmen Square and the fall of the Berlin Wall as contrasting examples of the two crises. (If there is an event in the USSR specific to 1989 which can be offered alongside Tiananmen Square as a significant stage in the crisis, it is probably the ‘Baltic Way’ of 23 August 1989. On the 50th anniversary of the secret Nazi-Soviet agreement that the USSR should occupy the Baltic states, several million Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians protested against Soviet occupation by forming a human chain which stretched for 400 miles, linking their three capitals. This marked an important stage in nationalist resistance to Soviet rule.)

Some answers were imbalanced, and in different ways. Some wrote a lot on Gorbachev and not much on Deng Xiao-ping. Some wrote too much about economic reforms and little about the essentially political crisis, in China especially. But the best were excellent, thorough, structured and genuinely comparative.

#### Question 6

*Account for the evolution of American nuclear deterrence strategy from massive retaliation (1954) to assured destruction (1964) and flexible response (agreed by NATO in 1967).*

This was both more popular and better answered than had been expected. There were certainly candidates who missed the point, preferring to write about the more familiar subject of arms control. However, better prepared candidates did have a reasonably sound knowledge of the three deterrence strategies. Perhaps not surprisingly, flexible response was the least well known.

The question followed the sequence of strategies as specified in the syllabus, adding dates in order to give candidates some further assistance. In reality, it is better to see flexible response as coming between massive retaliation and assured destruction. The strategy was an attempt by the incoming Kennedy administration to provide an alternative to the ‘overkill’ of massive retaliation. It involved the use of ‘conventional’ as well as nuclear forces. The theory was that once a political crisis became a military conflict, the American response to Soviet military moves would be proportionate. America's NATO allies were not too happy about this and for two reasons: costs (they would have to expand their conventional forces) and vulnerability (They worried that they might be abandoned by the USA). Thus it was some five years before they reluctantly approved flexible response.

### Question 7

*Assess the contribution of the US to the development of the international economy in the period 1945-1970.*

Many candidates were familiar with the contribution of America to the development of the international economy in the thirty five years from 1945 and thus wrote sound and relevant assessments. So well-prepared candidates were especially impressive on economic and monetary matters.

However, most answers failed to provide a full assessment, for one of two reasons. Firstly, many answers were stronger on 1945-55 than on the 1970s, when American economic weakness limited America's positive economic contribution. Such answers thus failed to provide a balanced assessment of America's role over time. The second limitation was to concentrate wholly on the USA, failing to mention other factors which also helped the development of the international economy, such as developments in technology and transport.

### Question 8

*How far do you agree that, in the vast majority of cases, decolonisation gave the appearance but not the reality of independence?*

Most of those who attempted this question started by explaining the effects of decolonisation before turning, often quite quickly, to the problems of developing countries and of North-South relations. In covering this latter topic, candidates often considered the situation of South American states, states which had gained their independence more than 150 years ago.

Candidates should have analysed the recent history of states which gained their independence in the twenty years or so following the Second World War. And rather than being based on a sequence of generalisations, this analysis should have been based on a series of references to the specific experiences of, say, the Belgian Congo and Malaysia, Kenya and Singapore. Some essays did take the latter approach, for which they were well rewarded. Most did not. They were suitably rewarded.

**Paper 9697/04**

**Paper 4**

### General comments

This Paper was taken by 56 candidates, mainly from schools in Africa. Most Schools entered small numbers of candidates. With some exceptions, the amount of accurate and relevant knowledge shown and the general standard of the work submitted was disappointingly low.

The most popular questions were **5, 6, 3** and **10**, all of which were attempted by over half the candidates. **Questions 2, 4** and **9** were chosen by one third of the candidates. Least popular were **Questions 1, 8** and **7**.

### Comments on specific questions

#### Question 1

*Explain the development of the House System and analyse its importance in the states of the Niger Delta.*

Few candidates attempted this, and fewer still understood the close links between the development of the system and the changing patterns of trade after the abolition of the slave trade by Britain and other European powers. Candidates' knowledge of leaders like Jaja of Opobo and Nana of Itsekireland was generally thin, as was analysis of the importance of the system and its impact in the states of the Niger Delta.

#### Question 2

*Why was Dahomey one of Africa's most efficient states in the pre-colonial period?*

This was a fairly popular question which only a few candidates answered well. Answers should have been focused on the factors which made Dahomey an efficient state in the reigns of Kings Gezo (last years) and Glele. Only a few candidates had sufficient knowledge of these to do this adequately. Most answers showed little knowledge of the working of the country's well organised administrative system and the functions of its leading officials; of the very efficient planned economy; or of the contribution of the army to the efficient running of the state.

### Question 3

*Assess the contributions of Johannes IV and Menelik II to the unity, modernisation and preservation of the independence of Ethiopia.*

This was one of the most popular questions. It produced perhaps the largest proportion of satisfactory answers, along with a handful of good ones. Some candidates failed to achieve a fair balance between the contributions of the two rulers. Few gave Johannes enough credit for his work in beating off threats to the independence of Ethiopia; or for his skill in negotiating a pact with Menelik which neutralised the latter's potentially dangerous ambitions. Equally few recognised fully Menelik's contributions to the expansion of Ethiopia, and to the process of modernisation in the country after he had defeated the Italians at Adowa.

### Question 4

*Explain how the building of railways played a crucial part in the economic development of either Central Africa or East Africa.*

This was a fairly popular question. More answers were based on East Africa than on Central Africa. A major weakness in answers on both regions was the failure of candidates to give a brief description of the railway network in the region of their choice. Without this it was difficult to give a meaningful answer to the main part of the question. In East Africa not a single candidate mentioned the Central Line in German East Africa though all mentioned the Uganda Railway. In Central Africa descriptions of the railway network, when given, were very vague and incomplete. In answers on East Africa a few candidates spent more time describing the problems encountered in building the railway than in explaining how it contributed to economic development.

### Question 5

*Why did the European partition of Africa develop into a 'scramble' between 1875 and 1900?*

This was the most popular question. The best answers were those which showed a real understanding of the key role played by the well-known 'accelerators' - Leopold II's activities in the Congo Basin; the De Brazza-Makoko Treaty; the British occupation of Egypt; the Berlin West Africa Conference and its decisions - in the transition from partition to scramble. Unfortunately very few answers referred to all of these and wove them into a meaningful 'chain of events' which culminated in the 'scramble' in the years following the Berlin West Africa Conference. Fewer still illustrated the early years of the scramble with examples of the annexation of colonies between the end of the Conference in 1885 and 1900. Answers which mentioned none of the 'accelerators' and merely listed, in general terms, the various motives - economic, strategic, humanitarian, political - which led European powers to annex African territory, struggled to reach 8-10 marks.

### Question 6

*Explain the response of two of the following to the encroachments of Europeans on their territory: Mkwawa of the Hehe; Mwanga, Kabaka of Buganda; Lobengula, King of the Ndebele; Lewanika, King of the Lozi.*

The most popular choices were Lobengula and Lewanika though all four rulers were included in the answers to this second most popular question. Several of the candidates who wrote on Lobengula showed clearly that, for many years, he attempted to meet some of the demands of the European concession seekers who visited his court and avoided the error of labelling him a 'resister' from the start of his reign. Several of the weakest answers were those on Mwanga. Some candidates confused him with his father, Mutesa, whilst others found his many changes in attitude too complicated to follow and describe accurately.

### Question 7

*What were Concessionary Trading Companies? With reference to such companies in two countries, explain what role they played in Tropical Africa before 1914.*

This question attracted very few responses.



### Question 8

*'Africans often expressed their opposition to European rule through religious means.'* With reference to at least three examples involving different religions, show how far you agree with this claim.

A few candidates attempted this. Not very many of these gave three examples of religion being used as a means of expressing opposition to European rule. Traditional religion was not always included in spite of the frequent role of traditional spiritual leaders in rebellions. The opposition of Independent African Christian Churches was also missing from some answers. There was also considerable confusion and inaccuracy over how long Islam had been established in East Africa. In spite of these weaknesses, however, there were examples of very good, full and well documented answers to this question.

### Question 9

*Explain the spread of either Islam or Christianity in East Africa between 1875 and 1914.*

This was a fairly popular choice with answers evenly divided between Islam and Christianity. On Islam, several candidates seemed unaware of the length of time for which Islam had been established in the region, a fact which had an important bearing on its spread in the specified period in this question. On Christianity, most candidates emphasised that its spread owed much to the social changes it brought with it in the fields of education and health. Some candidates unfortunately misread the question and wrote about the spread of both religions, whilst material from West Africa formed the basis of another response.

### Question 10

*'Convenience and self interest rather than principle led Britain to adopt a system of indirect rule in most of her African colonies.'* How far do you agree?

Disappointingly this popular question was often not well done. This was in some cases the result of strained and inappropriate definitions of 'principle', which led some candidates to challenge the claim in the quotation in the title. Understandably such answers were not entirely successful. Some candidates, whilst agreeing with the quotation, failed to produce convincing answers to support their arguments. This arose partly from the fact that very few candidates pointed out at the beginning of the answer, what system of administration had preceded indirect rule in British colonies in West Africa, i.e. a form of assimilation. By failing to do this, candidates deprived themselves of material to argue for 'convenience and self-interest', since indirect rule was much less costly to operate than assimilation. Some of the best candidates argued that though Britain adopted indirect rule mainly for reasons of 'convenience and self-interest', there were also elements of 'principle' behind the switch.

**Paper 9697/05**

**Paper 5**

### General comments

The cohort of candidates was only 25 out of a nominal entry of 30, making comparisons with the very large entry in June 2002, impossible. It is however estimated that the structure and level of difficulty of the Paper was the same as June 2002.

Candidates did not have any problems in complying with the rubric, though it was disturbing that some candidates failed to answer a third essay question as required. Though the choice of questions is restricted to three out of the seven set, the seven topic specifications are detailed and candidates should ensure they have revised a *minimum* of five so as to give them a degree of choice of questions. It goes without saying that candidates should never attempt an answer to a question they have not revised.

It was pleasing to see that the compulsory source based question was tackled with skill and knowledge; there were very few weak answers and some were very good. However the essay questions attracted a weaker response. Detailed, factual knowledge was too often lacking, and there was a strong tendency to favour a descriptive and generalised approach rather than the analytical and explanatory one required for Bands 1 to 3. Relevance was too often poor.



## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

*'The slavery issue undoubtedly caused the American Civil War.'* Use sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

This question should always be answered first so as to give candidates a good launching pad for the rest of the Paper. The hypothesis posed tended to an either/or response but the two best answers considered the possibility of a third option, that the slavery question was only *partially* responsible for the Civil War. It was pleasing to see that most candidates got beyond the common practice of simply reproducing large extracts from the sources with little explanation or interpretation. Most candidates progressed to Level 3 (using the sources as information to confirm or disconfirm the hypothesis) and some went further to Levels 4 and 5 (interpreting and evaluating them in their historical context and to get beyond simply accepting them at face value). Some responses pointed out that in Source A, Lincoln was fighting a fierce election campaign for the United States Senate against a formidable opponent, who was the incumbent, which he lost. Others pointed out that Source B was highly biased and represented an extreme view; no one pointed out that South Carolina was the most secession minded of all the slave states and had threatened to secede in 1830! Some responses correctly elicited the reasons for the soft-line taken by President-elect Lincoln in Source C in private correspondence, as contrasted with Source A. Nearly all responses drew the contrast between Sources D and E in their interpretations of causes of the conflict.

### **Section B**

#### **Question 2**

*Assess the main factors involved in taming the 'Wild West' between 1865 and 1896.*

All candidates answered this question. A small number of responses went outside the dates laid down. The great majority of responses dealt predominantly, at times exclusively, with the driving out of Native American tribes or nations from their ancestral lands; while important, this approach was at the expense of other key factors, such as the discovery of minerals and the great boom in cattle ranching. Some did not even discuss the importance of communications, in particular the transcontinental railroads (five different routes by 1896), and also the telegraph. No candidate mentioned Turner's 'Frontier Thesis', and only a few discussed the more intangible continuing progress of 'manifest destiny', the belief first put forward in the 1840's that America had a 'right' and 'duty' to settle the whole North American land mass. What one did get too often were vague generalities.

#### **Question 3**

*'He was completely unfitted for the office of President.'* To what extent is this a fair judgement on Grant during his two Presidential terms?

Few candidates answered this question and none got beyond Band 3. The rest had no grasp of what Grant was doing in his two terms and none mentioned the sustained attempt to deny him a second term. None of the candidates pointed out that Grant saw his role as purely ceremonial and above politics and that he was only too happy to allow Congress to be the dynamic force in politics. Some referred to corruption scandals but no details were provided and no comments were made on the extent to which Grant was involved.

#### **Question 4**

*Assess the impact of immigration on American social and economic life in the period from 1865 to the First World War.*

A popular question with disappointing responses. Answers were highly generalised with surprisingly little specific information, for example, How many? Where from? Over what period? For what reasons? And with what impact in which institutions?

Answers should have focused on the effects on the booming United States economy in this period of providing cheap, plentiful and motivated labour. They also needed to discuss the dramatic change in the ethnic, religious and political life in the cities which resulted in the rise of 'city bosses', corruption and crime. It also needed noting that all the aforementioned added to the poor housing and poor health associated with mass immigration, and led to the Progressive movement from 1900 onwards.

### Question 5

*Evaluate the leadership role of Martin Luther King in the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s.*

A very popular question though responses were too uncritical, with much fulsome praise (often justified), little, if any, evaluation as required. No answer traced King's background and career with any precision. The all emphasised his doctrine of non-violent protest, often in the face of extreme provocation (dogs, clubs, whips, beatings). Candidates should have gone on to discuss his excellent tactical sense in cultivating public opinion in the North and West of the United States, and cultivating close links with the Democratic Party there. Answers should have made the link between his tactics and the triumphant victory of civil rights legislation in Congress, started by John F. Kennedy and carried on by Johnson. No mention was made of the historic Brown judgement of the Supreme Court and the energising boost it gave to the civil rights movement, who could now say they had the law on their side. The best responses contrasted the rival Black leadership and their philosophies which went to the very limit of peaceful protest, such as Cleaver and the Black Panthers, or justified violence and rejected common citizenship such as Malcolm X and the Black Muslims. No one made the point that these performed a useful role in King's campaign in that he could argue that if his 'non violent' protests were either ignored or crushed, then younger African-Americans would increasingly turn to them.

### Question 6

*How far were the 1920s in the United States a period of prosperity and optimism?*

Answers were descriptive and tended to avoid the question. The 1920s saw a reaction against Progressivism, internationalism and Wilson's high mindedness. There was Republican dominance of all levels of the political system - Presidency, Congress, Supreme Court and the States (outside big cities and the Democratic South). The South was in fact the most reactionary and backward looking party of the United States, with the Ku Klux Klan dominant and a strong hold of extreme fundamentalism, for example, the 'monkey trial' in Tennessee.

There was a sustained boom fuelled largely by the dramatic expansion of the new mass automobile industry, and later the more artificial and fragile stock market boom. The prosperity was uneven, with large sections of society missing out (blacks, farmers, the old textile industries of the North East). It was also based on very shaky foundations, with the Wall Street Crash at the end of the period. Few answers dealt with optimism. This was present with the breaking of many social and sexual taboos, emancipation of women, and the belief, enunciated by Hoover in 1929, that poverty would be abolished.

It was also, however, the decade of Red Scares, nativism, a vast increase in lynchings, the Ku Klux Klan, isolationism, and suspicion of those who were not WASPs (White Anglo Saxon Protestants). Hence answers should have struck a balance sheet on both aspects of the question, but this did not happen.

### Question 7

*Analyse the reasons why the United States was unable to sustain its policy of neutrality in World War II.*

There were only a few answers, none addressing the question with any conviction. None traced the evolution of United States policy from 1933 onwards, when both Franklin D. Roosevelt and Adolf Hitler assumed office (curiously, both men left office through death in the same year, 1945). This started the drift to war, but this was by no means inevitable. Had France responded to the illegal German reoccupation of the Rhineland, Hitler could well have fallen from power.

The League of Nations had shown itself to be a broken reed by its failure to take any effective action against the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. FDR's dilemma was that the mood of the nation was overwhelmingly against any involvement in 'Europe's wars', and that Congress reflected this. His hands were tied by the Neutrality Act passed just one week before the Rhineland occupation in 1936. Though FDR tried to act as a peacekeeper, once war began, neutrality became more difficult to sustain after 1940 - unless the United States was prepared to see the whole Eastern seaboard of the Atlantic dominated by Germany and her allies. Hence the 'Ships for Bases' deal and the stretching of neutrality to its limits. However, the United States was still officially neutral when Japan declared war on the United States by the bombing of Pearl Harbour in December 1941. No one noted that Germany declared war on the United States at this point, not vice versa. A German declaration of neutrality would have made it impossible to get a declaration of war against it through Congress, at least at that time.

### Question 8

*'In the 1950s and 1960s religion permeated every aspect of American life but how far there was a religious revival remains uncertain.'* Assess the accuracy of this contention.

Not very many answers, none of them grasping the point of the question. While there was a boom in church membership of all denominations, and a great number of revival movements, such as Billy Graham's, they had, in practice, little impact on the secular and materialist culture of the American way of life. It could be unfairly characterised as the worship of God on Sundays and of Mammon for the remaining six days of the week. This was the last time that the United States could be called a completely Christian country (leaving aside the 2% Jewish population - very small but influential). Unbelief was both unfashionable and dangerous to express publicly, even for teachers in schools.