



CONTENTS

HISTORY	2
GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level	2
Paper 9697/01 Paper 1 - Modern European History 1789 - 1939	2
Paper 9697/02 Southeast Asia: From Colonies to Nations 1870-1980	5
Paper 9697/03 Paper 3 – International History 1945 - 1991	7
Paper 9697/04 The History of Tropical Africa, 1855 - 1914	11
Paper 9697/05 Paper 5 – History of USA c 1840 - 1968.....	13

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 - Modern European History 1789 - 1939

General comments

There was considerable variation between the standard of the scripts. Some candidates wrote answers that were well argued and supported by appropriate knowledge. Other scripts were general with the answers making vague and incomplete claims. Marks are not necessarily given to long answers because it is important that candidates are always relevant, that is they must answer the questions that are set. However, short answers find it difficult to combine effective and varied arguments and appropriate knowledge. It might be helpful to some candidates to have more practice in writing extended answers, especially to the essay questions. The length of the answers to the Source-based question were usually more complete.

Candidates were required to answer four questions, three essay-questions and one Source-based question. Most scripts contained four completed answers but some candidates could have used their time better because the last answer was either brief or incomplete. Some candidates did not write a fourth answer although there was no apparent problem of time because the other answers were not very long. Candidates are advised to spend about 15 minutes reading the Sources and about 35 minutes answering the question. They should spend just 40 - 45 minutes answering each of the essay questions.

Some particular comments on the Source-based question are made below but, when they read the Sources, candidates should try to work out how they link to the question. The authors, or provenance, should be noted and attempts should be made to assess the reliability of the extracts. Some candidates were confused about usefulness and reliability. Primary evidence can be useful although unreliable. For example, Source B is not a reliable account of German policy because the author claimed that the German attitude to Belgium was only defensive. However, this extract is useful in stating Germany's public, rather than private, policy. There will be differences in the views expressed and the candidates should sort out the ways in which the Sources agree and disagree with each other about the claim in the question. Some answers were awarded low marks because they only summarised the Sources. (For example, Source A says that... Source B states that...). The Sources should be used as the basis of an argument or answer to the question that is set. They are always chosen to provide a variety of views; a question will never be set when all of the four Sources either agree or disagree with each other, and an important task in this exercise is to work out the similarities and dissimilarities between them and to come to a conclusion about which is more convincing.

There were some sound answers to the essay questions. The most successful candidates avoided narratives but concentrated on explanation. Narrative means that answers only tell a story; explanation means that answers use knowledge to frame an argument. They noted the key words in the questions. For example, the key words in **Question 2** were 'most important... grievances', whilst the key words in **Question 4** were 'How similar... aims and methods'. The best answers were focused on these key words. Some questions asked 'How far...?' and the highest marks were awarded to candidates who considered the factors that were mentioned and assessed their importance when compared with other factors. For example, **Question 5** was about the relative importance of economic rivalries as a reason for imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century. Some answers only discussed the economic aspects of imperialism and did not assess their importance. Others examined the nature of economic rivalries and compared their importance with other factors such as political ambition or religious and cultural motives; these answers deserved a higher mark.

The better answers were well organised; some candidates had written brief plans, which is always a good idea. Introductions should be short and candidates should not provide too much background. For example, **Question 6** on Lenin and the establishment of a Marxist state in Russia did not require accounts of the causes of the Russian Revolution. Discussions of German and Italian nationalism before Bismarck and Cavour, for example the 1848 revolutions, were only relevant in **Question 4** when the answers linked them to the aims and methods of the two statesmen.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

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

This Source-based question on The Origins of World War I was particularly about the Belgian Crisis in 1914. Belgian neutrality was a very important aspect of diplomacy before the outbreak of the war. The general quality of the answers was satisfactory with many candidates showing that they were very capable of understanding, comparing and using primary evidence. This is an important task because all historians are so dependent on primary evidence and should not rely too much on secondary sources. Some weak answers only paraphrased, or summarised, the Sources; they contained accounts of what the Sources said and this did not contribute effectively to the argument. Some candidates accepted all of the Sources at face value - that is their reliability was affirmed rather than tested. Some weak answers did not consider the reliability of the Sources. Some candidates accepted a Source's reliability or unreliability only by looking at the author and without considering the text. For example, Davignon in Source A was probably giving an accurate version of his discussion. However, good candidates contrasted Bethmann-Hollweg's claim in Source A that Germany 'had no intention of violating Belgian neutrality', with the Schlieffen Plan which depended on an invasion of France through Belgium, making his claim unreliable. Source B is not necessarily reliable just because it was a 'Very Confidential' note from the German Ambassador. Source E blamed the German invasion of Belgium for the outbreak of the war. The more successful answers noted that this was the most important development that took Britain to war. Although one would not normally attribute much reliability to the views of a writer who might not have 'inside information' about developments, the author of Source E is correct in this case. Answers were given credit when they tried to group the Sources. Sources C, D and E contradicted the claim that 'Belgian insistence on maintaining its neutrality brought about Germany's invasion'. Source B agreed with the claim. Source A partly agreed and partly disagreed with the claim. Answers were awarded lower marks when they discussed the Sources in sequence (that is, Source A, then Source B etc.) and did not compare them. The best answers looked for agreement and disagreement from the beginning. Some answers sometimes reached the middle mark bands when a sequential discussion was followed by a conclusion that did contain a comparison; this comparison was usually too brief for a very high mark.

Question 2

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

The question asked candidates to explain which were the most important grievances of the French Third Estate in 1789. Credit was given when answers defined the different groups that composed the Third Estate and distinguished between their grievances. For example, the priorities of the bourgeoisie were different from the complaints of the peasantry. Some answers would have been improved if they had referred to the cahiers that were produced for the Estates-General in 1789. These embodied the grievances of different groups, including the Third Estate. A few candidates took their answers too far by describing developments after 1789 but this was not a major problem.

Question 3

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

The question asked candidates to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the Industrial Revolution to the working classes. Some successful answers ranged widely, considering economic, social and political factors and they illustrated their arguments by references to developments in specific countries. Some answers would have been improved if they had avoided general descriptions of the process of industrialisation that did not focus on the consequences to the working classes. There was a tendency in limited answers to confine themselves to descriptions of social conditions.

Question 4

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

The question was based on a comparison of Bismarck and Cavour. Examiners were looking for approximately equal treatments of the two statesmen. Some good essays focused on this comparison throughout their answers and they highlighted the aspects that were in common and those that were different. For example, both Bismarck and Cavour had to take other countries into account but they dealt with them very differently. Cavour was in a weaker position than Bismarck because of the different strengths of Piedmont and Prussia. Both had to be careful about France but Bismarck could move from caution to open hostility in 1870. Some candidates gained credit when they appreciated how both statesmen adapted their ideas. At first, neither looked for the complete unification of their countries. Bismarck probably envisaged the unification of the northern German states under Prussia whilst Cavour looked for the extension of Piedmont's influence over northern Italy. Some answers gained low marks either because they were very unbalanced or because they were very descriptive, narrating first the policies of one and then the other in a way that did not compare them. Candidates should note that Cavour was not responsible for the integration of Venetia and Rome into the new Italian kingdom; these events took place after his death.

Question 5

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

Most candidates were able to record accurately the main reasons for imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century. The most frequent discriminating factor was the different degrees to which candidates provided examples to support their claims. Some limited answers were very vague, whilst the best essays showed how economic rivalries, political strategy or the other factors worked out in practice. Candidates could be selective in their examples, but they needed to provide appropriate knowledge to merit a good mark.

Question 6

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

A feature of the best answers to this question was candidates' attempts to explain what is meant by a 'Marxist state'. It was not necessary to write at length about Marxism but rather to outline the main features of such a state. There were some very interesting essays that appreciated how far Lenin and the Bolsheviks had turned Russia into a Marxist state by 1924. For example, they appreciated that the end of War Communism and the implementation of the New Economic Policy (NEP) represented a step away from Marxism because the NEP had similarities to traditional Russian practices or even to capitalism. Some answers in the middle mark bands sometimes only considered economic developments, whereas the best essays also examined the political structures of Russia and Lenin's use of censorship and force. Weak answers tended to describe developments very generally and also did not get to grips with the issue of Marxism.

Question 7

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

A few candidates wrote about both Germany and Italy whereas the question stated that they were alternatives ('in *either* Germany *or* Italy'). The most successful answers were able to explain the economic problems of their selected country, usually Germany, and showed how they led to the acceptance of a monopolistic or 'totalitarian' government. Credit was given when this term was explained accurately. Candidates did not have to agree that economic reasons were most important in bringing about the rise of a totalitarian government, and the best answers examined a number of factors, such as the political weakness of the democratic governments before Hitler's Nazis and Mussolini's Fascists.

Question 8

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

There were comparatively few satisfactory answers to this question, but some candidates did write very effective essays that compared the consequences of the First World War and at least one other war. For example, in addition to successful studies of the period from 1918, they considered the effects of Napoleon's defeat or Bismarck's victory over France in 1870. Some answers did not deserve a high mark because they discussed only the causes of the First World War, which were not relevant. The key issue was the consequences of war.

Paper 9697/02

Southeast Asia: From Colonies to Nations 1870-1980

General comments

Overall, the Examiners felt there was a modest improvement in the candidates this year. They approached **Question 1**, the compulsory sources question, with a greater understanding of the requirements of this type of question and better Centres had clearly prepared their candidates well for this question. Candidates must still realise that although factual knowledge is vital in answering essay questions, this material must be used in an analytical manner to answer the actual question set. In addition, it is vital that candidates have examples from a variety of Southeast Asian countries. That said, at the top end of the examination, essays were of an excellent quality, combining analysis, historical detail and fluent English prose, making them a pleasure to read. **Questions 2 - 6** were all very popular, but **Question 7** and **8** were rarely seen.

Comments on specific questions**Question 1**

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

This question required the candidates to examine the hypothesis, 'the merger was wanted, both in Malaya and Singapore, for no more than short term, tactical reasons'. Candidates were required to use all the sources and to look at the whole of the hypothesis to gain the higher marks. A simple examination of the sources at face value and looking at both sides of the argument gained a Level 3 mark, and when evaluation of the sources was added this rose to a Level 5 mark. A questioning or modification of the hypothesis was needed to take the answers into Level 6. The Examiners noted that some candidates did not use all the sources and did not always evaluate them all. Also, there was a tendency to focus on the desire for merger, rather than looking at the motivations behind this. Overall, candidates clearly had a better grasp of how to approach this style of question and Centres are to be congratulated upon this.

Question 2

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

This question was very popular amongst candidates. It required candidates to consider 'to what extent did European powers seek to modernise traditional societies' and implicitly why they did or did not modernise. The Examiners wanted to see evidence from at least three countries and also a range of modernisation criteria. This might include economic modernisation, the development of infrastructure, the imposition of direct rule, education and welfare policies and possibly the introduction of western-type legal systems. Malaya, Burma, Thailand and Indonesia all provide ample subject material. As this question was so popular, it inevitably produced a wide range of responses and of varying quality.

Question 3

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

This question asked the candidates to examine the role and importance of immigrants in the economic development of Southeast Asia. This was a popular question and produced some really excellent responses. The Examiners wanted to see a discussion of the importance of Chinese and Indian immigrants and their varying roles, and also it was possible to discuss the impact of Europeans as entrepreneurs and experts. The variety of roles of Indians, from labourers in Malaya to middle men and merchants in Burma could have been examined, or the wide range of role of the Chinese in Malaya and Singapore as well as in Indonesia and Thailand. Again, a variety of countries needed to be examined.

Question 4

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

This question invited candidates to look at the extent that colonial government prepared their subjects for self-government. This was again a popular question and almost all candidates could outline the differences between differing colonial powers and their approach to their subjects. This question allowed candidates to compare Indonesia and Burma, and also the varying attitudes of Britain, the USA and France. Some candidates chose to focus on nationalist movements rather than colonial governments and this was not what was required by the question.

Question 5

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

This question was generally done well by those candidates who attempted it. It was vital to look at general and also specific regional reasons as to why the nationalist movements attracted so little support. A general point was, of course, the colonial rulers actions and other factors might be the slow development of higher education and the daily importance of subsistence rather than nationalistic aspirations. The better candidates considered the fragmentation of the nationalist groups.

Question 6

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

This question has appeared in other formats in past years and is clearly a popular topic with candidates and Centres alike. Some weaker candidates tended to focus on the harshness of Japanese rule and wrote rather descriptive essays, but many candidates had a good factual grasp of this topic and approached it in an analytical and reasoned manner. Good candidates looked at the promises that the Japanese made and the reality, the impact on the local populations and also the impact on colonial powers. The regional variations in Japanese policy needed to be examined and the differing outcomes this produced. Some candidates successfully examined why Japanese policy ultimately failed and indeed why it led to nationalist movements.

Question 7

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

This was not a popular question and the Examiners saw very few answers. Those essays, which were seen, tended to lack factual knowledge and thus could not succeed. The question called for an examination of the alternative forms of government which Southeast Asian states established. In particular, reliance on the army should have been stressed.

Question 8

How successful were Southeast Asian regional organisations - the period up to 1980?

This question was even less popular than **Question 7**. Those answers, which were seen, were generally very poor in terms of quality. This question needed an examination of SEATO and ASEAN.

Conclusion

Centres are to be congratulated on the total lack of any candidates who committed a rubric. Candidates in the vast majority of cases successfully attempted four questions as required by the examination and there was a generally pleasing level of subject knowledge. It should be reiterated that subject knowledge must be used in context and analytically to help answer the questions posed, rather than a general descriptive answer.

Paper 9697/03

Paper 3 – International History 1945 - 1991

General comments

Given the wide range and growing numbers of Centres, it is difficult to make generalisations with any great confidence. Standards of performance vary greatly, though it is pleasing to note that most candidates have a sound knowledge and understanding of the three essay questions they choose to answer. The key skill which usually distinguishes between the average and the above-average answer is essay technique. Average answers tend to take a descriptive, essentially narrative approach, perhaps using the conclusion to answer the question more directly. Evidence is put before argument. Above-average essays use a more analytical and directly relevant approach. Arguments come first, evidence second. Using an analytical approach in an essentially narrative-based subject requires time and practice to develop. It is a compliment to most candidates – and their Teachers – that they acquire these skills.

The aspect of the Question Paper which limits candidates' achievements – and which almost certainly causes them the most grief – is the compulsory source-based question. Thus most of the comments about individual questions are taken up with **Question 1**.

Comments on specific questions**Question 1**

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

Level 3 = 13: this was the level and mark awarded to too many answers to **Question 1**. Level 3 is the highest level which candidates can reach by simply accepting the content of the sources at face value. Many candidates did no more than provide 'face value analysis' of each source plus some comments on the reliability of the source. The following summarises such comments

Source C was written by an Irishman. Ireland is a neutral country. Therefore the author of Source C does not identify with either the USA or the USSR. Therefore the Source is a reliable one.

Such assertions receive no credit. Candidates should be discouraged from commenting on the source alone. They should be encouraged to focus on the content of the sources, which they should analyse and evaluate. The following advice addressed to candidates is an attempt to make the requirements of the three higher levels as clear as possible.

To reach Level 4, you must evaluate the sources, *as a result of which* (for the sake of this explanation) you identify at least one source which supports the hypothesis. You can evaluate sources in several ways. The most common is to check the arguments of one source against either other sources or your own knowledge. A typical line of argument is to reason that the argument of Source X against the question is not supported by the information provided by Source Y (or by what you know about the topic), and thus X supports the hypothesis.

To reach Level 5, you must also identify at least one source which contradicts the hypothesis. Again, you must identify this argument as a result of evaluating the sources.

To reach Level 6, having evaluated and identified sources for and against the hypothesis, you must state your conclusion on the outcome of your evaluation. You have a choice of approaches at this level. Firstly, you might conclude that the evaluated sources in favour of the question are more convincing than those against. You must then explain the reasons why you prefer one set of sources over another. Secondly, you might decide that the evaluated sources would better fit a slightly different question. In other words, you alter the wording of the question to better fit the combination of four or five evaluated sources on the Question Paper.

Thus the key to reaching these higher levels is evaluation. So many candidates spend most of their time describing, explaining and occasionally analysing the several sources. It is quite common for candidates to take a whole side to explain just one source. To do so is to waste valuable time. Candidates should be encouraged to summarise quickly – a sentence or two will do – the main points of a source as it relates to the question. The greater part of their limited time can then be spent evaluating each source, before finally writing a conclusion based on this evaluation.

A couple of examples of effective evaluation follow. The first is based on contextual knowledge and provenance.

Source D challenges the hypothesis as it shows that the US had authorised an assassination on Lumumba and this had been 'frustrated by the UN troops'. It also suggests that the United States had undermined the efforts of the UN by publicly criticising it and that the policy of the US towards the Congo was shaped by its paranoia of communism and cold war concerns rather than the interests of the country itself. This is supported by contextual knowledge because the Congo crisis took place from 1960-61 which was the peak of the cold war, which had revived after a brief respite from 1956-58. The United States was also prone to being paranoid about the threat of a monolithic communist power and had undertaken extreme actions in Korea to oppose a global communist threat that was never really existent. Thus the source can be said to be reliable in asserting that the United States had implicitly undermined the UN through its covert actions. This is lent credibility by the provenance of the source. The author, being a UN representative in the Congo during the time of the crisis, would have a first-hand knowledge of the incidents that occurred. Furthermore, the fact that it is published in an American journal suggests that it is only for a limited audience who would be reading it for intellectual referential purposes. Thus it is not likely that the author wrote this for propaganda purposes but rather to reflect the truth of the situation.

The evaluation of this extract, by both context and cross-reference, is good enough to offset a confused assertion about the provenance of the source.

Source B supports the hypothesis at face value, being a statement of US support for the UN peacekeeping in the Congo. Kennedy is implying that the USSR's desire to intervene unilaterally should be condemned. The USSR did indeed attempt to airlift troops and equipment into the Congo unilaterally. In reality, however, the US was also keen to intervene in the Congo, to pre-empt any spreading of communism there, but unlike the USSR it chose to do so by supporting UN intervention. The keen US support for the UN mission is supported by Source C and is evidence that, unlike the USSR, the US could work within the UN to achieve its geopolitical goals. The provenance lends credibility, being President Kennedy's public speech, but the date of February 1961 shows that there could have been a sudden policy change, after Lumumba's murder in January. The source is thus credible and supports the hypothesis.

If this shift of emphasis from explanation to evaluation comes about, then Examiners look forward to writing Level 5 = 21 in the majority of cases and Level 6 = 25 for a rare minority.

Finally, as **Question 1** is compulsory, it is worth saying something about the choice of topics for the question. The question-setter faces two major constraints. The first is the Syllabus, which identifies four main areas of study of the United Nations. This means that questions need to be set on less central topics, such as international terrorism, as well as the more familiar international peacekeeping. The second is the need to set a question which allows candidates to evaluate. Thus the set of sources need to relate to each other, which often means choosing a topic which is confined in scope or time. Though candidates will sometimes be faced with unfamiliar subjects, they should be reassured that the sources should provide enough opportunities for evaluation.

Question 2

'The Marshall Plan caused the division of Europe and thus the Cold War.' Discuss.

Every candidate attempted this question on the origins of the Cold War. Their approach was uniform: explain how the Marshall Plan resulted in the formal division of Europe (though one or two disagreed) and then explain the importance of other factors. The latter usually followed a standard sequence: ideology, the postwar political vacuum in Europe, Germany, Poland and changes in leadership. Thus many candidates produced almost a standard answer, which although solid and substantial, did not really argue a point with great vigour.

The best candidates did argue. They noted the significance of 'thus' in the question and debated the argument that the division of Europe was a consequence of the Cold War and not its cause. The weakest answers came from those who quickly turned the question around into a description of the three schools of history – traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist.

Question 3

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

This question usually did stir candidates into arguing quite vigorously for and against the assertion. Responses varied considerably. In this respect, it was more enjoyable to mark than **Question 2**, where responses were so uniform. The best answers came from those who defined 'truly global'. Even if this definition was a little unorthodox, it did not matter too much so long as candidates then applied their criteria to various Cold War conflicts. Some argued that 'truly global' meant that the Cold War had to be fought on every continent, others that the USA and the USSR must be directly involved in a conflict. On this last definition, many concluded that the Cuban Missile Crisis was the only truly global conflict of the Cold War.

1962 was obviously another key term in the question. Less convincing answers were those which considered conflicts in Vietnam or the Middle East without considering whether the conflicts were different after 1962 than before. Most considered whether the Korean War was 'truly global'. They usually decided it was not on the grounds that the main opponent of the US/UN forces was China and not the USSR. The apparently monolithic nature of Communism in 1950 was overlooked.

Question 4

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

Of the two globalisation questions, this was the less popular. It was also less well answered. Candidates tended to write a narrative answer, describing and explaining Sino-Soviet relations from around 1950 onwards. Such answers covered the causes and main events of the Sino-Soviet conflict as well as the consequences of the conflict for the Communist bloc. They were not as focused as they need to be to reach Bands 1 and 2.

The other limitation of many answers was that they concentrated on explaining *how* the bloc was weakened rather than *how seriously* it was weakened. The difference is slight but significant. A full assessment of how seriously the bloc was divided requires some analysis of the nature of the bloc in the first place. It might have been the case that communism was less unified than might be suggested by the term 'bloc' and therefore the conflict did not result in a serious rift.

Question 5

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

Most of the minority who chose this question misinterpreted it. They reversed the relationship, considering how and how far American foreign policy caused the collapse of the Soviet Union. Even those who did address the question wrote in very general terms about how US foreign policy changed in the 1980s. One significant gap was an almost total failure to mention the foreign policy of George H W Bush; an otherwise capable candidate argued that the only change in US policy came with the change in presidency from Reagan to Clinton. Bush's years as president, from 1988 to 1991-2, were the years when the collapse of the USSR gathered pace.

And on a point of detail, many candidates exaggerate the percentage of Soviet GDP spent on defence. Some placed it as high as 75%. Though accurate statistics are hard to come by, a more realistic figure is around 15%. As to changes in defence expenditure, Philip Hanson in *The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Economy* (2003), argues that defence procurement grew in real terms until the mid-1970s and fell back on the arrival of Gorbachev, who had plans to expand defence spending once more.

Question 6

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

Most answers to this question were sound and a minority most impressive. Candidates analysed with some care the interrelationship between nuclear arms race and the Cold War. Some made some unusual connections, such as the Chinese decision to 'go nuclear' in the late 1950s, which affected the Cold War in the 1960s. A few were so keen to write about SDI in the 1980s that they ignored the end date of 1980; by doing so they penalised themselves. But, overall, the quality of the answers was higher than had been expected for a relatively technical subject.

Question 7

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

The relevant points which most candidates explained included: the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in 1971-2; the oil price shocks of 1974 and 1979; the 'new protectionism' of the 1970s; the growth of eurodollars and petrodollars; the Third World debt crisis of 1982; the trade and business cycle; the falling productivity of Western economies as workers became 'soft'. Thus the standard of many answers was very high.

However, no one managed to combine all of these factors. No one mentioned the impact of the introduction of monetarism in the USA and the UK in the early 1980s, which forced interest rates even higher. Too many spent too long on marginal points. Some explained why the USA went off the gold-dollar standard in 1971. Even more wrote a great deal on the reasons why less developed countries were badly treated in the 1970s and 1980s. The developing countries contributed relatively little to the development of the international economy.

Question 8

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

This attracted a number of candidates, few of who defined exactly what they meant by economic aid. Some wrote only on the IMF and the World Bank, which is too narrow an approach. Others cast their net too wide by including commercial bank loans as a form of aid. Some went even further by considering the work of multi-national corporations, which is definitely not a form of aid. Graham Evans in the *Penguin Dictionary of International Relations* (1998) defines aid as 'transfers of goods and services on a concessionary basis' which 'covers both grants and loans, both bilateral and multilateral, both government and private. It excludes commercial transactions where the donor makes no concessions'. The various types of aid identified in this definition provide one framework for answering the question.

Despite various limitations, many answers were impressive in their balance and range of specific examples. It is the latter which is the key to a sound answer. Making the general case for and against aid without supporting arguments by specific examples from several states of the Third World, is to provide a less than convincing answer.

Paper 9697/04**The History of Tropical Africa, 1855 - 1914****General comments**

The Paper was taken by 73 candidates. The general standard of performance was low. All the questions on the Paper were answered. The most popular choices were **Questions 10, 2, 3 and 8**, all of which were answered by half to two-thirds of the candidates. The least popular were **Questions 5 and 7**. Several candidates were handicapped by poor English which, at times, made their answers unintelligible. A large proportion of the candidates wasted time by writing out the titles of questions. All that is required is the question number. A few candidates wrote a summarised version of the titles. This is a dangerous practice since the summaries used often change the meaning of the question, and answers may become largely irrelevant.

Comments on specific questions**Question 1**

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

This was a fairly popular question. Good answers needed to be fairly evenly balanced. Some were not and gave far more time to Dahomey than to the Niger Delta states. The best answers mentioned good, effective leadership; availability of legitimate products, especially palm oil, and reasonably easy transport facilities to take products to the ports for export, as the key factors making for quick transition. The weakest answers spent time on irrelevant material relating to the abolition of the slave trade.

Question 2

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

This was a very popular choice and, overall, the best answered question. Good answers identified and explained the reasons for the failures in the last years of Tewodros' reign, but argued that his 'vision' served as a model for his successors who also learned from his mistakes and, between them, achieved what had been his aims. Most candidates had enough accurate and relevant knowledge to support a satisfactory, or better, answer.

Question 3

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

This was another very popular question but was not always well answered. A definition was required and was usually adequately provided. Nearly half of the candidates, however, thought wrongly that the Creoles were, from the beginning, opposed to British colonial rule. For most of the nineteenth century, until c.1990, the Creoles played a vital role in many aspects of the development of British West Africa. For a really good mark here, candidates needed to be able to identify at least four fields in which the Creoles made significant achievements - education and scholarship; the church including mission work; the law; trade; administration; medicine; journalism and literature. Names of some individual achievers in these fields were also expected.

Question 4

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

This fairly popular question, answered by about one third of the candidates, revealed that most of those who attempted it possessed little accurate specific knowledge of the policies and achievements of Mutesa I and about the state of the country he had inherited in 1844. It was not true that Mutesa expanded Buganda territorially, as many claimed; or that he himself was converted either to Islam or to Christianity. It is true, however, as the better candidates pointed out, that his decisions to invite first Muslim and then Christian missions into the country exposed Buganda after his death to foreign influences that led to loss of sovereignty under his less able son, Mwanga.

Question 5

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

This was the least popular question. The few answers marked showed that the candidates who attempted it made an unwise choice. Only one candidate knew enough about Prempeh and his aims and policies to support a sound answer. He pointed out that Prempeh became ruler of Asante at the height of the European scramble for Africa. This was the worst moment for an Asantehene whose aim was to restore his empire to its former greatness, to begin the attempt.

Question 6

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

This was the fairly popular choice of just under one third of the candidates. The majority, most of them in the introductory paragraph, stated that Seyyid Said's decision to move his capital to Zanzibar had the greater impact. Unfortunately most candidates went on to examine the claims of the Omani impact but wrote nothing at all about that of the Ngoni invasions. The remainder, quite properly, considered the claims of both the Ngoni and the Omani impact before reaching a conclusion. The amount of accurate knowledge shown was very limited.

Question 7

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

This was the second least popular choice which was just as well since only a small proportion of the candidates chose to answer the question had a correct understanding of 'informal empire'.

Question 8

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

This was another of the four most popular questions. The majority of candidates interpreted 'features' to mean 'causes'. One 'feature' was certainly that all risings of this type were protests against the oppressive nature of the early years of colonial rule; but this did not mean that answers should include lengthy analyses of the many grievances arising from colonial rule. The other major features were that they were all armed rebellions, essentially traditional in character; they were all influenced and encouraged by spirit mediums and all bridged ethnic divides without really succeeding in mounting effective, united opposition against the colonial powers.

Most answers to this question were rather better in comparing and contrasting the results of the two risings than analysing their main features, but few candidates were able to give full coverage to the considerable concessions which the Maji-Maji Rising won from the German administration under Governor Rechenberg.

Question 9

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

This was a fairly popular question, answered by just under half of the candidates. Surprisingly, not a single candidate had any comment to make on the use of the word 'paradoxically' in the title. Nevertheless, many of them challenged the validity of the quotation, using as part of their argument the fact that Christian missions paved the way for colonial rule, whereas what the quotation claims is that the spread of colonial rule helped the spread of Islam, not of Christianity. Taking the country as a whole the claim is actually valid, partly because the two main colonial powers forbade Christian missions to enter areas where Islam was firmly established before the beginning of colonial rule. Much of what candidates wrote about the spread of Islam and Christianity actually happened before the spread of colonial rule began and was therefore irrelevant.

Question 10

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

This was the most popular question, answered by more than half the candidates, but the least well answered. Too many candidates claimed that the two systems were similar whereas, in fact, there were more differences than similarities between them. Above all they were different in their attitudes towards, and their use of the educated African elite. Many also confused association and assimilation. Others wrote about Indirect Rule as if it operated in the same way in all British colonies. Instead of answering the question in this Paper, a few candidates answered questions about colonial administrative systems that have appeared in previous Papers, for example, 'Why, and when, did the British switch to a policy of Indirect Rule and the French to a policy of Association'? Some answers would have gained more marks if this had been the question in this year's Paper. This emphasises the importance of reading questions carefully and making sure that the key words and phrases have been identified and understood correctly.

Paper 9697/05

Paper 5 – History of USA c 1840 - 1968

General comments

The performance of the forty-eight candidates who entered varied considerably – between the exceptionally good, on the one hand, and quite weak, on the other. Of the stronger candidates, their essay answers, in particular, were relevant, well organised, and contained high quality material used in an analytical/explanatory way. Of the weaker candidates, certain weaknesses were evident which resulted in lower outcomes. The compulsory source-based question was not answered well. To simply repeat and recycle the words of the sources with a few general remarks at the end of the response can at best only result in Level 3 (9 - 13 marks) and this is what most candidates did. To achieve the higher bands it is essential to use the sources as evidence i.e. to interpret and evaluate them in their historical context. For example, in Source A no candidates explained how representative this convention was of opinion in Georgia, but we do know that when a state-wide convention voted for secession there was a significant pro-union dissenting minority. In Source C, only two candidates made the point that Senator Crittenden was from a slave border state, where it was certain that heavy fighting would take place if civil war occurred, hence there was a compelling argument for compromise to avert conflict. The major weakness of the essay answers was that a large number of candidates simply ignored the key phrases, such as 'how influential' in **Question 2**; 'assess' in **Question 3**; 'how successful' in **Question 4**; 'analyse' in **Question 5**. Straight narrative answers, even with good material, can only score Band 4 (14 - 15 marks). Only a small number of candidates engaged in analytical/explanatory answers which clearly focused on the demands of the question. Lack of relevance was too often a problem, with many candidates seemingly writing down a prepared answer on topics learnt, which ignored the terms of the question set.

Comments on specific questions**Question 1**

Source Based question – 'The Secession crises of 1860-61 only led to civil war because of Buchanan's weakness and indecision.' Using Sources A-E discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

As this is a different type of question and is compulsory, it is best to answer it first. To leave it to the end as some candidates did, is to risk running into time problems. Most candidates simply went through the sources in sequence. A few adopted the better approach of going critically through the evidence favouring the assertion (for example, Sources B and E), then the evidence against (for example, Sources A, C and D), and then coming to a conclusion. Few candidates focused on the word 'only' in the question. This is a strong expression and it could well be argued that while Buchanan's policy of passive inaction may have made matters worse, there were other fundamental factors, which had little to do with him. The Southern states demanded the right to extend slavery into new Territories, while Lincoln and the Republican Party refused to concede this; as far as they were concerned the Mississippi Compromise was finished; nor were they prepared to make new compromises.

Question 2

How influential a factor was the doctrine of Manifest Destiny in the huge territorial expansion of the United States in the 1860s?

A popular question but few defined Manifest Destiny, and while most candidates discussed some aspects of the expansion, (railroads, displacement of Indian nations, war with Mexico, gold in California, mass migration and the lure of cheap, plentiful land), these were rarely put together in a coherent way. The question posed was usually evaded. While it is easy to decry it a cloak for less edifying factors such as racism, greed etc, Americans did seem to believe that by occupying the whole American land mass (except for Canada) they were carrying out God's purposes in extending freedom and democracy.

Question 3

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

A very popular question but few attained the higher bands. The key here was a good structure. The struggle between the Executive and Legislative is ever present in the US system and Lincoln's almost dictatorial powers during war meant that a reaction in peace time by Congress asserting itself was almost inevitable. Lincoln's assertion that Reconstruction was entirely an Executive function would have been difficult to sustain, even had he lived. Johnson, a Southerner and ex Democrat with few political skills, stood little chance of prevailing over Congress. The main strength of Presidential plans was that they aimed to rapidly bring back the seceding states into full membership of the Union and to restore full states rights, thus healing the wounds caused by Civil War. Their main weakness was that apart from the abolition of slavery and the 14th Amendment, little in practice was to be done to improve the lives of the former slaves. The Congressional strategy was quite different, being to punish the seceding states and to have direct rule from Washington in five military districts while rapidly protecting and promoting the political and civil rights of the former slaves now called freedmen. Better responses pointed that by ignoring the land reform question (i.e. breaking up the large plantations) and doing nothing for the poor whites who had never owned slaves, they were ensuring that any reforms would be short lived once power was returned to the States, as happened in 1877, as whites formed the majority in nine of the eleven seceding states.

Question 4

How successful were attempts to deal with the problems of farmers in the late 19th century?

Very few candidates attempted this question.

Question 5

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

A very popular question with some really well thought out answers. Some responses spent too long on the formation of the N.A.A.C.P and Booker T. Washington's credo contrasted with W. E. B. Du Bois. Few dwelt on the post World War Two mood. Even during war Roosevelt had outlawed segregation in Federal work places and contractors and war service had raised the horizons for the hundreds of thousands of Afro-American veterans. The US claim to stand for freedom against the Russians in the Cold War meant that segregation as soon as one crossed the Potomac River into Virginia became increasingly embarrassing, particularly when newly independent African states sent diplomatic missions to Washington. Nearly all candidates highlighted the crucial importance of the Brown judgement of the Supreme Court, though no one mentioned it was unanimous, and few that enforcement was left in the hands of the States except for the vague injunction to proceed with 'all deliberate speed'. All candidates highlighted the crucial role of Dr Martin Luther King, though too much time and space was spent on narrating the specifics of his campaigns, and too little on his sophisticated tactics of building alliances with the Democratic Party so as to drive a wedge between the "liberal" North and the segregationist South. Also, King's tactic of non violence enabled him to occupy the moral high ground, and media coverage, increasingly important, favoured his cause. All this bore fruit when L. B. Johnson used his skills to drive through the Act. Too few discussed the role of the more aggressive and militant black groups such as Malcolm X's Nation of Islam and the Black Panthers. It is debatable whether these advanced progress for black emancipation.

Question 6

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

A popular question but few candidates mounted a discussion as to the relative strengths of the backward-looking, isolationist, fundamentalist elements, strongest in the rural and small town areas and the dynamic, hedonistic lifestyle associated with the phrase the 'Roaring Twenties', associated with the large cities. There was a sharp reaction against Wilson's high minded internationalism and progressivism and this combined with prosperity (though this was unevenly spread) ensured Republican dominance at all levels of politics except for the mayoralties of some big cities. Many candidates discussed the notorious Monkey Trial in Tennessee but this was no more typical of the era than the world reported by Scott Fitzgerald in 'The Great Gatsby'. As in other questions, only a few candidates evaluated and analysed as opposed to writing straight, descriptive, narrative answers. Nearly all candidates highlighted the importance of the automobile revolution associated with Henry Ford and the impact of the exciting new film industry.

Question 7

Assess relations between the United States and Europe from 1919 to 1941.

1919 marked the rejection of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations by the US Senate and the onset of a period of self styled isolationism until December 1941, when Japan attacked Pearl Harbour and Germany declared war on the United States.

This was a popular question, but isolationism tended to be defined in a simplistic way. In fact the US was highly involved in the 1920s and 1930s in a number of diplomatic initiatives including the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Washington Naval Conference. The US also had observer status at the League of Nations and played an active role in League committees. Many answers dealt with the thorny question of Allied war debts and German reparations, which had a negative impact on US public opinion which was strongly opposed to any US involvement in European conflicts. From 1933 to 1939, Roosevelt's policy was dictated by US public opinion which was increasingly pacifist. The latter found expression in the Neutrality Act which tied Roosevelt's hands. Only after his unprecedented third term election victory and the dramatic German successes of 1940 did the US adopt a more pro-ally policy. Few answers dealt with the steps by which strict neutrality in 1939 led to an undeclared naval war with Germany in 1941.

Question 9

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

Few candidates attempted this question, and answers were pedestrian. None made the point that the often outrageous forms of protest (burning the flag, waving the Viet Cong flag, public nudity, sit-ins of buildings) were confined largely to college and university campuses and served to alienate as much as to enlist support for the causes adopted. The decade that started with the election of Kennedy, ended with Richard Nixon as President. Answers made a few basic points but did not explain or analyse. None pointed out that similar forms of protest occurred in Europe as well, without the catalyst of the Vietnam War. Responses overlooked the essentially middle class nature of the unrest which precipitated these changes. Students of the 1960s were 'baby-boomers' who had never known world war, mass unemployment or (in most cases) poverty. University education had become a mass industry with some campuses the size of cities (University of California had a total of over 100, 000 students plus faculty, administrators, support staff). Answers did not mention the draft for the war in Vietnam, avoidance of which became an important radicalising influence. Sexual experimentation was encouraged by the marketing of the contraceptive pill. It is worthy of note that the disaffected operated outside the confines of the party system and the notorious scenes at the Democratic Convention of 1968 did much to weaken the standing of Vice-President Humphrey in the subsequent election, which he narrowly lost to Richard Nixon. Protest and radicalism had started to become fashionable in the 1950s civil rights struggles and simply took new forms of expression and new targets for hostility in the 1960s. Also present was a strong element of generational conflict between young people and their elders, with the latter seeming to lack confidence in handling sharp attacks on their values, lifestyles and power.