



# CONTENTS

---

FOREWORD .....	
HISTORY .....	2
<b>GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Paper 9697/01 Paper 1 Modern European History, 1789-1939 .....	2
Paper 9697/02 Paper 2 Southeast Asia: From Colonies to Nations, 1870-1980 .....	5
Paper 9697/03 International History, 1945-1991 .....	7
Paper 9697/04 The History of Tropical Africa, 1855-1914 .....	9
Paper 9697/05 Paper 5 History of USA, c. 1840-1968 .....	12

## 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

The overall quality of the scripts was satisfactory but there was a clear variation between the standards of individual Centres. All of the Examiners read scripts that deserved very high marks whilst other candidates did not show the knowledge and understanding that were necessary. The component requires candidates to answer two different types of question. The examination paper contained a compulsory question based on the use of primary sources; candidates also had to write three essay answers from seven alternative questions. Most candidates completed the required four answers. The most successful candidates maintained high standards in each of their answers whilst scripts that reached marks in the middle or lower bands were often uneven. They contained perhaps one or two satisfactory answers and others that were weak. Few scripts contained answers in which all of the answers were unsatisfactory.

The source-based question and the essay questions test some different historical skills but they also examine some similar qualities. The first similarity is relevance, that is the ability to use knowledge that has been learned to answer the particular question that is asked. The second is argument. This is the ability to use knowledge to provide an explanation rather than to describe events or people. The essential difference between the source-based question and the essay questions is that the former is an exercise in handling primary material which is provided in the examination paper, whilst the latter is based on a topic from within the specified syllabus to test candidates' powers of recall, understanding, knowledge and extended explanation.

All of the answers carry equal marks and the most successful candidates devoted the same time to each of their answers. Within the three hours of the examination, candidates are advised to spend about 15 minutes reading the sources and about 35 minutes writing an answer. They should spend about 40 – 45 minutes answering each of the essay questions. The most successful candidates managed their time sensibly but some candidates spent too long on one question so that others, usually the last, were too short. Marks are not given simply because of the length of answers; the quality of the arguments is the most important factor but very brief answers cannot make sufficient points to achieve a satisfactory mark. It might be the case that some candidates need more practice in writing extended essays before the examination. Candidates can answer the questions in any order but Examiners reported that the candidates who answered **Question 1**, the source-based question, last, tended to do less well. This might be because they spent too little time reading the printed sources or there was too little time left to write an adequate answer after they had read the extracts.

This report repeats the advice given previously that it is a good idea to plan answers. Examiners read few scripts that contained evidence of such plans being written. Plans are not marked but they help candidates to sort out their ideas when under pressure in the examination. For example, a good answer will explain the important points first and then the less important factors, trying to make links between them and indicating why some issues are particularly important in a question. More moderate answers will often list factors without indicating why some are more important than others. Plans can also help candidates to avoid repeating themselves. It is easy to neglect structures in an examination when candidates are tempted to rush in, writing before they think.

Candidates should note the key instructions in questions. **Questions 1** and **6** asked 'How far...?' and **Question 3** contained a similar phrase 'How true..?' Good answers explained the case that could be argued in favour of a claim and also explored alternative explanations. For example, in **Question 8**, they considered the personal role of Nicholas II in causing the downfall of the tsarist government in 1917 and supplemented this by examining other causes of the Russian Revolution that were less his responsibility. Some weaker answers only considered Nicholas II. **Questions 2, 7** and **8** asked 'Why...?'. Such questions needed an analytical approach, with answers providing a series of reasons for developments, preferably in an order of priority. For example, answers to **Question 7** that narrated the events leading to Hitler's dictatorship in Germany and his policies in the 1930s were less successful than the essays that focused on reasons and used knowledge to verify the points that were being argued.

Introductions should be brief and immediately linked to the question. Candidates should not unnecessarily about the background to issues. The best introductions immediately focus on the question in questions. For example, **Question 4** was about Bismarck's aims and methods from 1862. Developments in German history to 1862 were therefore only relevant when they were linked to Bismarck's career and power.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Question 1**

*'Politicians were forced to declare war in 1914 because of the pressure of public opinion; Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence supports this statement.'*

This source-based question on The Origins of World War I was particularly about the importance of public opinion and the outbreak of the War. Candidates were given five extracts from a variety of sources. The least successful answers only summarised the sources in sequence, perhaps with a brief conclusion that asserted that the extracts either proved or disproved the claim that 'Politicians were forced to declare war in 1914 because of the pressure of public opinion.' The best answers tried to sort the sources into groups: those which seemed to support the claim and those who seemed to contradict it. They examined the extent to which the extracts seemed reliable as evidence. Some answers assumed reliability or unreliability by looking only at the origin of a source. This led to some unfounded judgements. For example, some claimed that Source B was reliable because it was a personal telegram from Kaiser William II to Tsar Nicholas II. This is not necessarily a valid judgement. Some claimed that Sources A and C must be reliable because they were official reports. Some candidates accepted that Sources D and E must be true because they were from a British newspaper; others used the same reasoning to argue that they were both unreliable. It was more helpful when candidates also used the texts of the extracts as a basis for their assessments of reliability. Others cross-referenced the extracts with their own knowledge as a basis of assessment. For example, Source B is useful because William II recognised the pressures of public opinion on the Russian government. However, its claim that the Kaiser would use all of his influence to restrain Austria-Hungary can be denied by referring to German actions, for example the 'blank cheque' that was given to Austria-Hungary. Most candidates noted the apparent contradiction between Sources D and E but some answers did not note that they had the same provenance (The Daily News) and were published on successive days. Source D claimed that there was no war party in Britain whilst, on the next day, the newspaper printed accounts of wild enthusiasm for the war in Britain, when war had been declared. Source C was interesting because, although the extract was written by French diplomats, it was not completely hostile to Germany but noted that German public opinion was divided about the possibility of war. It recognised that the more powerful group was warlike but the more pacific people were still noteworthy. Most candidates realised that Source A should be treated cautiously because it was a report on Serbia by a hostile Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister. There was considerable anti-Austrian feeling in Serbia but Berchtold ignored the fact that his government wished to impose harsh and humiliating conditions on Serbia after the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The most successful answers included a clear conclusion that summarised their arguments and sometimes provided an alternative judgement or counter-hypothesis.

#### **Question 2**

*How far, and why, did the aims of the revolutionaries in France change during the period from 1789 to 1793?*

The most important discriminating factor was the extent to which candidates could examine the extent of change and continuity during the French Revolution from 1789 to 1793. There were some sound assessments that explained the extent of change and provided a series of valid reasons. On the other hand, some answers were weak in chronology, either ending in 1789 or continuing the argument to about 1799 with the rise of Napoleon. It might be a good idea to prepare time charts of developments during salient stages of the French Revolution. Candidates were given credit when they explained the reasons why moderate groups were less effective than the radicals such as the Jacobins. Some excellent essays considered the consequences of continued resistance from reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces within and outside France. There were good essays that were still incomplete and fell short of the highest standard because, although they included a good range of factors, they did not consider why Louis XVI was executed and a republic was inaugurated.

**Question 3**

*How true is the claim that the most important political effect of industrialisation in the nineteenth century was to encourage the demand for democracy? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)*

The key issue was the political effects of industrialisation. Some candidates spent too much time describing the causes and processes of the Industrial Revolution. These aspects were not directly relevant to the question. Such answers could not be given a high mark because relevance is a pre-requisite to achieve a satisfactory standard. On the other hand, there were some sound explanations of demands for democracy, although it can be argued that this was limited to some social classes. For example, the rising bourgeoisie demanded political concessions for themselves but were reluctant to extend these to the working classes. Some candidates were given credit when they referred to the growing appeal of marxism and socialism, political movements that emerged from industrialisation. Others pointed to the growth of trade unions as attempts to achieve democracy and greater political influence for the working classes.

**Question 4**

*How consistent were Bismarck's aims and methods from 1862 to 1871?*

The key word in this question about Bismarck was 'consistent'. Most of the answers deployed accurate knowledge about developments from 1862 to 1871. The most successful essays used this knowledge to examine how far Bismarck's aims and methods changed or remained the same. Moderate answers sometimes asserted in an introduction or conclusion that he was consistent and otherwise relied on narratives of developments that were not linked directly to an argument. These could be acceptable because they were indirectly explanatory but could not deserve a high mark. The most successful candidates examined the various stages of policy during the relevant period and linked them to consistency or inconsistency. For example, it could be argued that Bismarck was consistent because he always saw the interests of Prussia rather than Germany as a priority. More evidence of consistency might be seen in his anxiety not to isolate Prussia but to find external allies to support his policies. On the other hand, it is likely that he did not set out to unify all of Germany. His first aim was to unify the northern Protestant states around Prussia. He was probably persuaded to accept the need to incorporate the southern Catholic states after the defeat of Austria. Another inconsistency was that, in 1867, he saw Austria as a rival but he then sought Austria's friendship in the struggle against France. After using France as a friendly power in the struggle against Austria, Bismarck was to fight the final war for unification against Napoleon III.

**Question 5**

*Assess the effects of imperial expansion on Europe in the later nineteenth century*

The key issue was the effects of imperial expansion on Europe. Some candidates would have deserved higher marks if they had focused more on this key issue, writing less about the causes of imperialism which were not important. However, there were some excellent answers that considered alternative explanations. They explained some of the benefits to Europe and some of the unexpected drawbacks. Some colonies were never profitable whilst imperialism gave rise to diplomatic tensions that poisoned international relations. Previous reports have pointed out the need for answers on imperialism to include some appropriate examples. Some very good answers did support the arguments by sound examples but others would have been improved if general claims had been substantiated. The geographical scope of the topic is wide and Examiners will accept a selected range of examples, perhaps from either Africa or Asia.

**Question 6**

*How far did Nicholas II personally cause the downfall of the tsarist government in 1917?*

Examiners read convincing answers to this question on Nicholas II and the fall of the tsarist government in 1917. There were convincing explanations and assessments of the Tsar's role. Credit was given when the answers considered alternative explanations because the question asked 'How far..' he was personally responsible. For example, some candidates considered the long-term problems of the regime in Russia. Credit was given when the candidates explained the strength of the opposition in 1917. Some weak answers were very incomplete. For example, they discussed Nicholas II's personal shortcomings; the Tsarina and Rasputin were almost always mentioned. But they did not link Nicholas to the fall of his government, which was assumed. On the other hand, there were essays that were very well-informed about developments during the war from 1914 and linked these to the collapse of tsarism, especially with the changes of loyalty within the army.

**Question 7**

*Why was Hitler able to establish dictatorial rule in Germany in the 1930s?*

Most answers had at least an adequate knowledge and understanding of the nature of Hitler's regime in Germany. The studies of the Weimar Republic were usually satisfactory. The most successful answers delineated clearly the reasons why Hitler gained and then established dictatorial powers. For example, they analysed the salient developments in the period from 1930 to 1934. There were some excellent explanations of the Nazi one-party state.

**Question 8**

*Why, by 1900, was Russia less industrialised than Britain and Germany?*

The quality of the answers to this question was satisfactory. Most candidates wrote essays that were at least competent and Examiners also read some excellent answers. Most of the answers were relevant, explaining the lack of industrialisation in Russia. The better essays compared conditions in Russia with those in Britain and Germany but some candidates could have been more exact in their accounts of these two latter countries. Some candidates deserved high credit by explaining and assessing a series of factors such as the hostility of Russian governments to modernisation and economic change, the lack of investment, a backward agricultural sector, and poor infrastructure in roads and railways.

**Paper 9697/02****Paper 2 Southeast Asia: From Colonies to Nations, 1870-1980****General comments**

This examination session produced higher quality scripts than in previous years and in particular the answers to **Question 1**, the compulsory document question, were very much improved. Timing was rarely an issue and the general essay style had also improved with greater emphasis on analysis and less purely narrative answers. The standard of written English is to be commended as well as the essay technique which was regularly displayed in many of the Centres.

**Comments on specific questions*****Section A*****Question 1**

*'In the immediate post-war years Singapore was excluded (or kept separate) from Malaya for economic reasons; Using Sources A-E, examine how far the evidence supports this view.'*

This was the compulsory source based question. Candidates were asked to examine the proposition that Singapore was excluded from Malaya for economic reasons. The vast majority of candidates examined this question in detail and also realised that the different sources would give different perspectives on this topic. It was pleasing to see that candidates also treated the sources as evidence rather than just sources of information and were happy to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. The approach to this type of question has markedly improved in recent years and both Centres and candidates are to be congratulated on this.

**Section B****Question 2**

*How far did traditional forms of political authority survive the impact of European colonisation in South Asia up to 1941?*

This essay was asking candidates to evaluate the continuance of traditional forms of political authority following European colonisation. Candidates were expected to examine at least two countries and also to explain the differing European approaches. However, it is important to stress that candidates who addressed the issue of "how far" scored more highly. This was genuine analysis and some candidates were tempted to slip into a rather descriptive approach. This is to be avoided. This was a popular question and candidates had clearly prepared well for it.

**Question 3**

*To what extent had Southeast Asia become linked to the world economy by 1941?*

This question was popular and tended to produce strong responses. Country-centred examples were of a good quality and many candidates had a very good grasp of the material. Candidates were expected to have a knowledge of, and to address cash crops, capital enterprise, the penetration of large Western companies into Southeast Asia, the draining of wealth from the region and also some knowledge of the types of product which were developed and exploited by Western capital.

**Question 4**

*Account for the rise of plural societies in Southeast Asia in the period c. 1870-1918.*

This was again a popular question. Candidates were expected to be able to define and account for the growth of plural societies. They should and often did examine the roles of immigration, migration, economic development and the colonial notions of race. Better candidates were able to explain and describe the creation of plural societies as products of colonisation and capitalism.

**Question 5**

*How far can the growth of nationalism in Southeast Asia in the period c. 1918-1941 be seen as a reaction to colonial rule?*

This question required the candidates to examine the growth of nationalism and the reasons behind it. Candidates were allowed to examine the interaction between nationalism and colonialism. Attention needed to be paid to the impact of World War One, the economic impact of colonial rule, the religious opposition to colonial rule, the causes of anti-colonial rebellions and an awareness of the differing degrees of anti-colonialism among the states of Southeast Asia. Better candidates also looked at the growth of anti colonial ideologies such as communism in the region.

**Question 6**

*Why did the Second World War deal a 'mortal blow' to European imperialism in Southeast Asia? [You must **not** use examples drawn from Singapore to support your answer.]*

This question was looking at the impact of the Second World War on European imperialism in Southeast Asia. Some candidates were confused by the term "mortal blow". This question required the candidates to examine the impact of Japanese occupation on imperialism and nationalism. Issues that needed to be addressed were the growth of Japanese nationalism, the decline in the reputation of Western imperialism, the ideological pressure to which imperialism was subjected during the war years and finally the destruction of the myth of European invincibility. This question was generally answered well.

**Question 7**

*Why did the military assume a leading political role in some independent Southeast Asian states after 1945, but not others?*

This question was not popular and those candidates who attempted it generally did so poorly. It required candidates to examine and assess the different paths pursued by the states of Southeast Asia following the end of the Second World War. They should have looked at the factors which sometimes allowed the military to gain power but also why some states did not succumb to military takeovers.

**Question 8**

*How successful were Southeast Asian states in achieving economic self-sufficiency in the period 1945-1991?*

Very few candidates attempted this question. Those that did invariably produced poor quality answers. Candidates were required to look at attempts at economic self-sufficiency and schemes such as import substitution, protectionism, and financial incentivisation. It was also necessary to examine the continuing dependency of certain Southeast Asian economies on the external economic environment. This meant examining globalisation and the influence of western capital.

**Paper 9697/03**

**International History, 1945-1991**

**General comments**

The question paper seemed accessible to the full ability range, with even weaker candidates finding no difficulty in selecting three questions to answer from **Section B**, and the source-based question being set on a central aspect of the work of the UNO. There were, of course, significant differences in the quality between the best and the worst answers. The work of weaker candidates suffered from two main faults: on the source-based question, all the sources would be taken at face value, with no attempt made to evaluate their content, and in the essays the writing would constantly lapse into unfocused description, often of marginal relevance to the actual questions asked. There were also problems that the weaker candidates experienced on specific questions; these are analysed later in this report. However, it would be wrong to give a misleadingly negative impression of the general level of work produced. Many essay answers were detailed, fluent, knowledgeable and consistently analytical. Most candidates demonstrated that they knew they were expected to evaluate the sources in **Section A**, even if they were not always able to do this on many of them. In short, whilst it remains true that only a modest number of candidates reached the highest standards, it is also the case that the great majority achieved a respectable level of attainment.

**Comments on specific questions****Section A****Question 1**

*How far do Sources A-E support the view that, during the Cold War, the permanent members' veto powers were a serious obstacle to Security Council action?*

The sources provided a pretty even balance of views about the impact of the veto on the work of the Security Council. The issue for candidates was how to go about evaluating these views. There are still many who think that this evaluation can be carried out solely on the basis of the provenance of the sources. For such candidates, **Source C** would be more credible because it was produced by someone in the UN Secretariat, or **Source E** would be reliable because it was written by two academics. This is not enough. The provenance can be an important aid to evaluation, but only when used to assist in the analysis of the source content. Thus, **Source D** is not reliable because it is American; however, its reliability is enhanced by the fact that it is written by an American, and yet he is making critical points about the US use of the veto. This kind of analysis which makes use of the provenance in relation to the specific claims made in the source will not always work, simply because the provenance may not be of particular relevance to those claims. This is one of the reasons why cross-reference of content between sources is allowed as evaluation, and is the route into the higher levels which is always available to candidates, even though no really sound conclusions can be made on the simple comparison of content alone. What is demanded in cross-reference, however, is some clarity about what exactly is being checked – bland generalisations about Source X supporting Source Y are not enough.

Assuming they could comprehend the sources, and infer their standpoint in relation to the hypothesis (which was not universally the case), the main problem for candidates seemed to be that they found it difficult to accept the idea that there were positive features to the veto. Their evaluation tended therefore to be one sided, with the inevitable limitation of marks this brought. It seemed sometimes as if candidates that they were evaluating both sides of the hypothesis by taking two sources (e.g. **C** and **D**) one of which *at face value* supported the hypothesis, and one which did not. They would then cross-reference, e.g. to **Source A**, and conclude that **D** was reliable because what it says about the US use of the veto is backed up by the statistics in **Source A**, whilst **C** was unreliable because it says the Council got round the effects of the veto, but **Source A** shows that this was not the case because use of the veto increased in the 1970s. Here, both cross-references support the hypothesis, which is not evaluating both sides. Because relatively few candidates successfully evaluated the hypothesis, even fewer could have access to the top level of the mark scheme.

## Section B

### Question 2

*How far do you agree that, in the years 1945-9, the USSR's policy towards Europe was more one of 'national security' than that of the USA?*

This was an extremely popular question, answered by almost all candidates. Material on the early years of the Cold War was generally well known. Candidates were also well aware of the different historical interpretations of the period, and most appreciated that the question, in effect, was asking whether they agreed with the revisionist school. The best answers were those that looked at the policies both of the USSR and the USA, and explained how national security considerations were relevant to both sides, albeit in different ways at different times, but that both powers were also guided by other considerations. Many candidates were able to do this.

### Question 3

*'More a series of separate regional conflicts than a single global war.' How far do you agree with this view of the Cold War in the period 1950-80?*

Strangely, the quote in the question seemed to give many candidates problems. It was intended to make candidates analyse the varying nature of regional conflicts in the Cold War period, but what many tried to do was determine *whether or not* they were Cold War conflicts. Since to a greater or lesser degree all were, this path led to confusion and lack of clarity. Alternatively, some candidates focused on whether or not the conflicts were *regional*, which also was a distraction. The best answers understood and illustrated the important differences, e.g. between Korea, Cuba and the Arab-Israeli conflict, but also accommodated the overarching ideological conflict between the superpowers as a common element between them all.

### Question 4

*Analyse the view that US military intervention in Vietnam was 'more a necessity than a tragic error'.*

This question attracted many candidates and it was often impressively answered. It was a rare answer that did not at least attempt to explain both 'necessity' and 'tragic error', though this was sometimes secondary to extended (and unnecessary) narrative, including much consideration of the period prior to the US military intervention (not strictly required by the question). The best candidates were able to reach a reasoned judgment on whether there was *more* necessity than error, with some even arguing that the US's position, despite all the errors made, would have been damaged far more by non-intervention than it was by unsuccessful intervention. Such arguments were based on a wider appreciation of the Cold War context than Vietnam alone.

### Question 5

*Which of the various policies followed by the Chinese government in the 1980s was most responsible for the crisis of Chinese communism in 1989?*

This question produced a very wide range of responses. It was often misunderstood, and at worst this led to answers that focused on the wrong period entirely – the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. Other candidates looked at the 1980s but simply lacked the detailed knowledge of Deng's reforms that was necessary for a successful answer. However, some of the best answers were superbly detailed and persuasive, linking together the economic changes and their impact on Chinese society, with the inevitable political consequences of these changes.



**Question 6**

*'That so few states had nuclear weapons by 1991 is evidence of the success of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968.'* Discuss.

Although not particularly popular, this was answered by a significant number, and for many of these it was not answered well. This was a question about nuclear *proliferation*, yet answers were often on nuclear arms control. Whilst there is some overlap between the two, there are distinct and separate points to be made about the problem of proliferation, and no answers which looked solely at arms control could be successful. Nonetheless, there were also many candidates who were well informed about the 1968 Treaty, and who could assess its impact. The best answers, of course, were able to analyse the extent to which the situation in 1991 had been brought about by the Treaty, or whether other factors were more significant.

**Question 7**

*How important to the growth of the international economy in the period 1945-91 were the policies of the World Bank and the IMF?*

This was not often attempted. On this paper there are always some candidates with an exceptional command of economic topics, and these could provide convincing and detailed analyses of the impact of the World Bank and the IMF. However, there are also some weaker candidates who are drawn in to the more economics-based questions, in the vain hope that they can base their answers on vague generalisations.

**Question 8**

*Account for the changing fortunes of OPEC from its formation in 1960 until 1991.*

Again, this was very much a minority choice, but for those candidates who were prepared to answer on this topic, the question was straightforward and gave rise to a number of high-quality answers.

**Paper 9697/04**

**The History of Tropical Africa, 1855-1914**

**General comments**

This paper was taken by one hundred and twenty five candidates. The overall standard was disappointingly low. It was difficult to believe that the weakest candidates had made any serious study of the syllabus for the examination. Most of the answers from these candidates showed little accurate knowledge of the period studied and limited understanding of the questions attempted.

The most frequently answered questions, in order of popularity, were **Questions 4, 2, 3, 10** and **1**. All these were answered by over half the candidates.

**Comments on answers to individual questions****Question 1**

*Assess the relative importance of the factors that contributed to the decline of the slave trade in either West or East Africa.*

A serious weakness in many answers was that candidates failed to make any attempt to assess the relative importance of the factors which they had correctly identified. Several candidates made no distinction between the slave trade and slavery, and some answered with reference to both West and East Africa. A significant number of those whose answers were based on West Africa clearly believed that European powers took slaves back to Europe to work in their factories or on their '*plantations*'. Only a few avoided these faults and weaknesses and wrote very good answers.

**Question 2**

*Analyse the means by which Samori Toure built the Mandinka Empire and identify its main features.*

This, the second most popular question, was generally answered at least satisfactorily. The two parts of the most answers were reasonably balanced and general points were adequately supported with specific examples. Most candidates wrote their answers in two separate parts; but in some of the best answers the two parts were successfully merged.

**Question 3**

*Compare and contrast the work of Tewodros II and Johannis IV as rulers of Ethiopia.*

This was another popular question which was answered satisfactorily by the majority of candidates. The best approach was that of candidates who dealt with the similarities and differences point by point with adequate specific knowledge to support general claims. Weak candidates showed little accurate, specific knowledge of Tewodros' reforms and of Johannis' military successes against foreign threats to Ethiopia's independence. A few candidates wasted time on the work of Menelik II.

**Question 4**

*How and why did the interest of European powers in Africa change between 1875 and 1900?*

This was the most popular question attempted, with varying success, by two-thirds of the candidates. The question required candidates to show how and why informal empire changed into formal empire and how a limited interest in trade with Africa developed into a full blown 'scramble' for African colonial possessions within the specified period. General factors like the replacement of free trade by protectionism, the spread of industrialisation in many parts of western Europe and the growth of influences fuelled by the work of traders, explorers and missionaries, led to an interlinked chain of events from Leopold II's activities in the Congo Basin after 1875, via the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, to the summoning of the Berlin West Africa Conference in 1884-1885 which triggered the 'scramble for Africa', which continued until the end of the nineteenth century. The best candidates mentioned most of these general factors along with details of the 'chain of events' from 1875 to 1885, followed by examples of the widespread acquisition of new possessions by the various European powers between 1886 and 1900. Many weaker candidates concentrated on a few general factors without mentioning any of the specific events which started the 'scramble'. Finally, far too many answers ended in 1885 without giving any examples to illustrate the rush for colonies all over the continent after the Berlin Conference ended in 1885.

**Question 5**

*Account for the emergence and growth of independent African churches in either Malawi or West Africa and assess the importance of the development.*

Very few candidates who attempted this question had sufficient detailed knowledge to do justice to its demands. Good answers were based on Malawi and identified the main leaders of the movement and the two basic causes of its emergence. The movement was not only a protest against the style of management of the mission-led Christian churches (the slow speed of Africanisation within the churches), but also against many aspects of colonial rule (taxation policies; forced labour; alienation of African land). There was little attempt in any of the answers to assess the importance of the movement.

**Question 6**

*What were the similarities and the differences between (a) the causes, and (b) the results, of the Hehe and the Maji Maji Risings in German East Africa?*

The most satisfactory answers dealt, point by point, with first the causes of the risings and then the results. Most candidates showed far more knowledge about causes than about results and, as a result, many essays were unbalanced. In particular, only a very few had any detailed knowledge about the concessions made by the Germans under Governor Rechenberg in their administration of the territory after the Maji Maji Rising.

**Question 7**

*Analyse the economic and social results of the building of railways in either Central Africa or East Africa.*

The choice between the two regions was fairly even. The commonest weakness was the failure of all two candidates, whose answers were based on East Africa, to provide an accurate description of the railway network as a base for analysing the results of the building of railways. Specific knowledge of the economic and social results was also thin in the answers on both the regions. Comments like *'both exports and imports were greatly increased'* were of little value without some references to the products and commodities involved. Although two of the answers on East Africa did mention the Central line in German East Africa in addition to the Uganda Railway, neither candidate demonstrated any detailed knowledge about its route or its economic and social impact.

**Question 8**

*With reference to any two chartered trading companies show how and why these played an important part in the establishment of colonial Empires in Africa.*

Four chartered companies were named by the small number of candidates who attempted this question. These were the British South Africa Company, the Imperial British East Africa Company, the Royal Niger Company and the German East Africa Company. Almost no accurate dates or other details of the origins and activities of any of these companies was given in any of the answers to this question. In particular, several candidates who had chosen the German East Africa Company as one of their two chartered companies overestimated the length of time during which it exercised power in the region. There was no mention of the fact that all these companies came into being in the years after the Berlin West Africa Conference which had triggered the 'scramble' for Africa. Nor was there any reference to how they had filled an important holding role in the early days after the conference in meeting the need for establishing 'effective control' in a region before making a claim to annex the territory.

This was a question that few of those who attempted it should have chosen to answer.

**Question 9**

*Why and with what results, did Lobengula resist the British but Lewanika seek their protection?*

This question was, on the whole, answered satisfactorily. It was good to note that almost all candidates emphasised that Lobengula had tried hard for many years to avoid confrontation with the British and only resorted to armed resistance reluctantly, and as a last resort, to avoid losing his independence. The main weakness in many answers was that too little attention was given to the various agreements made by the two leaders with the British and to the results of these. The best answers here were, however, very good.

**Question 10**

*In French colonial territories, what were the differences between the administrative systems of 'assimilation' and 'association'? When and why did the French move from one to the other?*

Candidates invariably have difficulties with questions on French colonial administrative systems, particularly when 'association' is involved. The majority of candidates stated that *'association is similar to the British system of indirect rule'*. In fact, the differences between the two are far more important and more numerous than the similarities. Most answers in this examination were also weak in explaining why the French moved from 'assimilation' to 'association'. This was a popular choice but, for many candidates, an unwise one.

**Paper 9697/05****Paper 5 History of USA, c. 1840-1968****General comments**

The November paper this year was sat by one hundred and eighteen candidates. The standard of some Centres was very high and those who prepared the candidates deserve congratulations. Some candidates were able to attain the highest level for **Question 1** (22-25 marks) which required demonstrating why evidence to challenge or support the hypothesis was to be better/preferred or reconciled the evidence to show that neither was to be preferred. Essay answers from these Centres were again of high standard or very good.

Candidates from other Centres demonstrated a wider range of ability. Common faults were repetition and summaries of the five sources in **Question 1** and in the case of the essays, weak relevance and over reliance on description rather than analysis or explanation.

**Comments on specific questions****Question 1**

*'The sectional conflict which led to the Civil War was about the clash of competing economic interests and not the rights and wrongs of slavery.'* Using Sources A – E, discuss how far the evidence supports this explanation of the causes of the Civil War.

The standard this year was much higher than usual. However, too many responses relied on going through the sources in sequence, summarising them, with the occasional comment and then a summative concluding paragraph answering the question, often by simply repeating the words of the hypothesis. Such an approach is safe but will only attain at best Level 3 (9-13). To attain the higher levels it is necessary to evaluate/interpret the sources in their historical context, for example, in C, Lincoln was trying to persuade the crucial border states such as Kentucky to remain to the Union. In D, Stephens was writing three years after the defeat of the Confederacy. It is worth noting too that his relations with Jefferson Davis were very poor. It is highly desirable that candidates have plenty of practice in answering source-based questions from past papers. Centres are also advised to obtain the booklet 'Documents on Sectional Conflict in the United States' published by Cambridge, which gives guidance on how best to answer this compulsory source-based question.

**Question 2**

*Why was it that the 1850 Compromise had started to unravel by 1856?*

This was moderately well handled. The best set the scene by describing the context and contents of the Compromise. Like the 1820 Compromise it assumed parity between the slave and free states, but California's admission gave a free state majority in the Senate even though its Senator was pro-slavery. On balance, the Compromise favoured the North and it was only the promise of a much more easily enforceable Fugitive Slave Act that secured its rather reluctant acceptance in the South. The 1850s were a time of great expansion, of plans for transcontinental railroads and large scale immigration, nearly all of which went to the North. Douglas' ingenious 'solution' to the problem of slavery expansion, 'popular sovereignty' resulted in the Kansas-Nebraska Act discussed by most candidates. This led to internal bloodshed and strife in Kansas, and to the formation of the first national party opposed to slavery expansion, the Republican Party which had a minority of abolitionists. In 1856 it did not even put up candidates in any of the thirteen slave states. Many candidates went beyond 1856, usually as part of a narrative approach. The best candidates pointed out the importance of the growth of abolitionist sentiment in these six years which made enforcement of the fugitive laws in Northern cities almost impossible, which prompted in turn allegations of bad faith by the South. Curiously, no one mentioned the impact of Harriet Beecher Stowe's famous book 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' published in 1852 in book form and which recorded the amazing sales of 300 000 by the end of that year.

**Question 3**

*'The victory of the Union in the Civil War was inevitable'. How far do you agree with this view?*

A very popular question. While there were some excellent answers, and most candidates had very good factual material, answers often suffered from two common weaknesses. First, too often the answers were stating reasons for the Union's victory, not discussing the extent to which it was inevitable. Secondly, and more seriously, many answers simply provided a summary of events from 1861 to 1865.

'Inevitability' is very much the verdict of hindsight and certainly the North had very great advantages (which nearly all candidates summarised cogently). However, at the outset European opinion was that the Confederacy would win its bid for independence. It merely had to wage a defensive war. Its population had local knowledge and were fighting for their homes. The South had internal communications and at the outset, superior generals. The South had simply to hold on, to prevent the North from conquering and holding hostile territory, and whether the Union population had the tenacity and commitment to fight a long war merely to force the Southern population into continuing in a Union they wished to leave, was questionable. As late as August 1864 the Confederacy's dogged endurance in carrying on fighting produced acute war weariness in the North and the distinct possibility of a Democratic Presidential victory to be followed by an armistice and peace negotiations.

**Question 4**

*Evaluate the effectiveness of Progressivism on the United States politically, socially, and economically from 1901-1916.*

Few responses, none of any real merit. Some had no clear idea of what Progressivism was, and the terms of the question were generally ignored, with little attempt to measure 'effectiveness' or to distinguish between 'politically, socially and economically'. Some answers went beyond the terminal date of 1916. Very few details were given of what Progressives actually achieved in conservation – quite a lot, in trust-busting and tackling the excesses of the large corporations – very little. It did however, achieve a great deal in local government reform in cities, especially in the field of housing. Primaries and direct elections of Mayors and US Senators made surprisingly little difference. None made the point that Progressivism was a softer, easier reform programme compared with the rapid increase in this period of socialism among the working class votes, hence it was particularly appealing to a wide band of middle class voters. In the Presidential election of 1912 all three leading candidates (Taft, Roosevelt, and Wilson) were Progressives! None made the point that Progressivism has been described as Populism made respectable.

**Question 5**

*Account for the dramatic rise and fall of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s.*

A very popular question. This question lent itself to a simple structure, i.e. reasons for rise and then fall. The Klan's appeal was to groups of declining status who felt under threat and is best seen as the last in a whole series of nativist, negative movements such as the Know-Nothings, or the Ant-Masons. The trigger leading up to its revival was the seminal film by D.W. Griffith 'Birth of a Nation' glorifying the earlier Klan. It should be seen as part of the sharp reaction and disillusionment with internationalism, Progressivism and Wilsonian idealism. Though the range of the Klan's rage was directed against a wider set of targets – Catholics, Jews, 'Reds' and foreigners – than its predecessor, unlike the former Klan, it was not confined to the South, but spread to the Mid-West in particular. Few made the point that the Klan's rapid rise was part of the general revolt of the small towns and rural areas against the large cities; other examples being Prohibition, a revival of religious fundamentalism, and much tighter restrictions on immigration. The Klan's decline was generally correctly stated. It had no positive programme; its appalling violence against African-Americans in particular, and lynchings, produced in time reactions of disgust; organised opposition to the Klan and discrimination in employment made Klan membership a handicap rather than a business advantage. Finally there were a number of serious sexual and corruption scandals involving leading Klan members. Some answers made the interesting point that the Klan's activities had become increasingly social in nature by the late 1920s.

**Question 6**

*Why was opposition to the New Deal so fierce?*

A very popular question. Far too many ignored the question and put far too much emphasis on general descriptions of the New Deal, with little concrete material on its opponents. A key point often overlooked was that the New Deal, in spite of all the furore and excitement, was not particularly effective. In 1938 unemployment levels, GDP and stock prices were still at their 1933 levels. Many responses also did not point out that there was no unifying factor behind the New Deal other than FDR's activism, 'can-do' attitude, and his willingness to at least consider (and sometimes to enact) any proposals, however unorthodox. Once the first shock of extreme crisis when it seemed that the whole US system was at risk had passed, the most consistent line of opposition was fiscal irresponsibility, the huge cost of relief programmes, vast budget deficits and FDR's seeming disregard of the 'American Way'. Among the ranks of the Liberty League were the previous Democratic Presidential candidates, Al Smith and John Davis. A second line of attack was radical; the New Deal did not go far enough in distributing wealth and income from the well off to the vast number of unemployed and low income earners. A variety of bizarre, unorthodox schemes were propounded, of which the most formidable and coherent was Huey Long's in 1936, which was cut short by his assassination.

Most candidates mentioned the Supreme Court's hostility to all forms of radical reform, and FDR's devious and ruthless plan to stack the Court, which provided a pretext for Southern Democrats to desert the President and ally with the Republicans. By 1938 the claim was being put forward in all seriousness that FDR had aspirations to be a dictator. Certainly he could and did ride roughshod over opposition in the Court and Congress. However, a free press continued and in the 1936 Presidential election every single newspaper in the country was against FDR except for one small local paper in New England. Nevertheless as many candidates pointed out, FDR won the biggest ever Presidential majority ever recorded (46 out of the 48 states), a sure sign that though opposition was fierce, FDR still had the people behind him after his first term.

The most intense and therefore the fiercest opposition came from the rich (at most 5% of the population), who regarded FDR as a traitor to his class and were terrified that the New Deal might take a more radical turn, always a possibility.

**Question 7**

*To what extent were FDR's policies towards the "aggressor states" between 1933 and 1941 weak and ineffective?*

A very popular question with some excellent answers. Virtually all correctly identified the 'aggressor states' as Japan, Germany and Italy. In 1933 Japan had already invaded Manchuria and Germany and Italy were clearly embarked on policies of expansion and disregard for the League. More than any other leader, FDR was constrained by public opinion with biennial elections for Congress, an independent legislature and not least an independent guardian of the Constitution in the shape of the Supreme Court. FDR was little interested in foreign affairs and in 1933 can best be described as a moderate isolationist. The key factor which most answers grasped was that as the drift to war became clear after 1935, anti-war sentiment in the US grew, resulting in a series of Neutrality Acts which sought to prevent the President from committing the US to involvement in a European conflict. Most candidates did not fully tackle the 'weak and ineffective' parts of the question. Only in 1937 did FDR turn serious attention to foreign affairs and his famous 'quarantine' speech in that year provided a hostile reaction in America. It can be argued that from 1933 until 1940 (the fall of France), FDR's policies were hesitant, and never went beyond rhetoric to concrete and specific measures to deter aggressor states. However, once it became clear that only Britain stood between Germany and Italy's dominance of the whole Atlantic seaboard and the Mediterranean, FDR's policy switched to one of all out help to Britain, short of war. The concept of neutrality was stretched to the limit, until Germany and Italy resolved the matter by declaring war on the US, following Pearl Harbour. Most candidates answered the question correctly but by a circuitous route.

**Question 8**

*How far is it true to say that there was an 'urban crisis' in America in 1968?*

Only a very small number of candidates answered this question and only a very few of those answered adequately. The most common error was to completely misinterpret the question as being exclusively about the plight of urban Afro-Americans. While this was an important part of the urban problem in 1968 it was by no means the main one. US cities appeared to be dying due to a combination of corrupt, inefficient local administrations with payrolls swollen by decades of rewarding party followers with municipal jobs. Migration into cities of groups suffering from poverty, unemployment and low educational skills put intolerable strain on budgets. The flight of businesses and middle class whites from inner cities to the suburbs further eroded revenues, leaving abandoned and decaying buildings. High crime levels added to the general neglect. Measures to deal with this crisis fall largely outside the period except for Johnson's well meaning but ineffective War on Poverty.