

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

Key messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went further than providing summaries (such as ‘Source A says that...Source B says that...’) and used the sources to frame an argument. The most effective responses evaluated and grouped the sources according to the degree to which they supported the hypothesis.

Section B: Candidates are advised to plan their answers briefly. They should note the key instructions in the questions (such as ‘Analyse’ and ‘How far?’) and pay attention to any dates in the question.

General comments

The general standard of the scripts was satisfactory and the best responses demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding. Some scripts would have benefited from greater practice in writing essays. The skills involved include the preparation of relevant information and argument, and the presentation of an argument in a limited time. It is as important to know what to leave out as well as to decide what to include. The best essays were effectively supported by precise, relevant detail. Weaker answers tended to make only generalised comments.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were asked to consider the hypothesis, or prompt, that ‘British opinion was opposed to war with Germany in 1914.’ Moderate answers surveyed the sources in sequence whereas the more successful responses sorted them into groups. For example, it was generally agreed that Sources D and E supported the hypothesis by agreeing that Britain was opposed to war. Source C believed that British opinion had changed by August 1914. The writer of Source A was concerned that an unwillingness to go to war would preclude Britain from being regarded as a great power. This pointed to the conclusion that the hypothesis was incorrect but the most perceptive responses pointed out that the writer’s opinion was based on the conviction that he was right. Many candidates recognised that Source B showed two sides of German opinion. The German Ambassador did not believe that British policy favoured war with Germany while the Kaiser’s notes contradicted this. He believed that the British Foreign Minister was insincere in his claim that Britain was not preparing for war. Good answers did not simply paraphrase the sources but assessed their reliability and credit was given when the provenance was carefully considered. Some weaker responses accepted the value of a source only because of the status of the writer. For example, Source D was said to be reliable because it was by the British Prime Minister in a speech to Parliament. More perceptive candidates noted that the speech was justifying Britain going to war with Germany. Most credit was given when answers attempted to judge the relative reliability of the sources and supplemented this judgement with reasons. Good answers came to an overall conclusion about the validity of the hypothesis whereas weak responses lacked a judgement or concluded that it was too difficult to reach a decision.

Question 2

This question on the reasons for Robespierre and the Jacobins gaining, and then losing, power contained two parts. Candidates needed to spend approximately equal time on the rise and fall in order to gain a high mark. The general standard of answers was sound. Where answers were weaker it was usually because they described some of the most important developments during Robespierre’s government but were unclear about why the Jacobins rose and fell, apparently so quickly. The best responses were aware that by 1791 a growing number of people were losing confidence in King Louis XVI. The chronology of the main

developments was generally secure. The failure of the flight to Varennes enlarged suspicion, especially because of the connection with a foreign war. This war increased support for the Revolution and discredited the moderate reformers. At first Robespierre and the Jacobins opposed the war because of the distraction from domestic problems but 'the revolution in danger' became a popular cry in France. The Jacobins found powerful allies in the sans-culottes and emerged as winners over the Girondins. All the responses referred to the Terror but the best went beyond vague statements. A minority recognised that it could be argued that the Jacobins had successes - the war went well and food became more plentiful. However, other aspects of the economy worsened. Prosecution of the Revolution's enemies succeeded in rooting out the most dangerous people but it went too far. Nobody was out of danger, not even leading Jacobins. The revolution had attacked the claims and privileges of the Roman Catholic Church in France but the policy of de-Christianisation was too extreme. Some argued that the worst dangers to the Revolution were over by 1794 and that the Jacobins fell because their hard-line policies were no longer needed. Such responses were credited for remaining clearly focused on the question.

Question 3

The standard of responses was variable, largely because some answers were preoccupied with providing an account of the processes of industrialisation, for example the inventions that created the opportunity for industrial change. These answers were usually descriptive and lacked the necessary analysis. The most creditable answers noted that the question asked 'why?' and provided a series of reasons, making connections with the key issue. Democracy eventually meant the universal franchise but thoughtful candidates noted the preliminary steps towards this. These included the development of trade unions (which were illegal at the beginning of the nineteenth century) that allowed the working classes to put pressure on employers and governments. Although progress was slow, trade unions and workers' rights became established in industrialised countries in the second half of the nineteenth century. The working class did not benefit from the 1832 Reform Act in Britain. This gave the vote to the middle class but was a signal that the Industrial Revolution could have political effects. Credit was given to answers that could see the link between the effects of industrialisation and social reforms, such as better working conditions and changes in education and housing. There were some relevant references to the development of socialism and Marxism. A characteristic of the best answers was that they referred to two countries, usually Britain and France or Germany, whereas less effective answers often showed an understanding of general issues but were less specific in their references.

Question 4

The general standard of answers was sound. Some responses deserved credit because of accurate and relevant narrative but the highest marks were awarded to those that provided a series of reasons. Some answers concentrated mostly on Cavour, the monarchist, and Mazzini, the republican. While this was creditable, the highest marks were given when references were wider – assessments of Victor Emmanuel II and republicans such as Manin in Venice were possible. A few candidates also made relevant comment on the work of Charles Albert of Piedmont. He failed in 1848 but this did not prevent Piedmont being seen as the leading state in Italy to champion the cause of unification. There were some effective assessments of Garibaldi, the republican who surrendered his gains in the south to monarchist Piedmont. The most successful responses were convincing in their handling of the chronology whereas some moderate answers made generally valid points but were confused about specific developments, for example the date of Cavour's death.

Question 5

Most answers were commendable in their combination of argument and supporting knowledge. A frequent discriminating factor between moderate and good answers was the inclusion of examples in the latter. These provided the factual support to illustrate points. The range of imperial expansion was very wide and candidates could be selective in their references. The question stem ('how important?') meant that answers could discuss other factors besides public opinion. It could be argued that public opinion was comparatively unimportant, but acceptable essays needed to show a basic knowledge and understanding of this factor. Some very successful answers understood that governments could be reluctant to be involved in imperialism. For example, Bismarck was not sympathetic to German colonial expansion. In Britain, Gladstone and Disraeli were not convinced at first. However, Bismarck changed his mind when he saw the electoral advantages of imperialism. In Britain, Disraeli became an enthusiastic convert to the imperial cause. Governments could be pressured to give support to imperial ventures by individuals such as Rhodes in Britain and Peters in Germany. Some responses made the useful comment that the growing power of the press helped to shape and reflect public opinion.

Question 6

Most answers achieved a satisfactory balance and demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding. The best also maintained a clear focus on 1917. Some responses related events from 1905 without showing links with the 1917 Revolutions. Better candidates made effective links by contrasting the loyalty of the army in 1905 with the soldiers' disloyalty to Nicholas II in 1917. Likewise, many responses recognised that the incompetence and unpopularity of the Tsar were apparent by 1917 and made worse by the reputations of the Tsarina and Rasputin. Whereas the Tsar restored the situation after the 1905 Revolution by promising concessions in the shape of reforms, this was not possible in 1917. Some answers explained why Kerensky took the fatal decision to continue the war. The Provisional Government was unable to deal with Russia's most pressing problems, which Lenin was to identify correctly as 'Peace, Land and Bread'. Better answers were usually characterised by accurate and detailed accounts of Kerensky's fall. Weaker answers were often vague or inaccurate. For example, the Bolsheviks did not play an important part in the February Revolution. By October, they were more effective under the leadership of Lenin with the alliance between the Bolsheviks and the Soviets proving crucial. Some excellent answers made the point that the Bolsheviks' recovery was very quick and, to some extent, unexpected.

Question 7

There were many well-informed and well-structured answers. Candidates were at liberty to conclude that other factors were more important than the effects of World War I, but answers that ignored the stated factor could not merit the highest marks. Those responses which demonstrated confidence in their knowledge about the process of Hitler's rise in the 1930s were most effective. Weaker responses were often general in approach, lacking precise details. Candidates are also advised to distinguish between the economic effects of the war and the consequences for Germany of the Wall Street Crash of 1929. The 1920s, often termed the Stresemann Era, saw an economic recovery in Germany. Other factors were more long-term and continued to trouble the Weimar Republic, exposing it to Hitler and the Nazis. The terms of the concessions forced from Germany in the Versailles settlement continued to trouble the country and some of the best answers distinguished between these long and short-term problems. A few candidates recognised that, ironically, the constitution with its reliance on proportional representation made stable government impossible and assisted extreme parties, such as the Nazis. Some understood that Hitler revised his methods after the Munich Putsch in 1923 and pursued power through largely constitutional methods. Although the SA was still used, this was tolerated by those who thought they could control Hitler to bring popular support to the regime.

Question 8

The three main periods that candidates needed to discuss were the last years of Tsarist Russia, the Russian Revolution and rule of Lenin, and Stalin's Russia to 1939. Answers could be planned chronologically or thematically but all of the best essays covered the whole of the period. A minority began with the 1905 revolution and recognised that Witte's period of power helped the economy but did little to improve the condition of the poorest people. Peasants were taxed heavily and the incomes of most of them fell. Although there were some minor political reforms under the Tsar it was generally agreed that they did little to improve conditions for the lowest classes. A number of responses omitted this early section and began with a discussion of revolutionary Russia. It was noted that Lenin's slogan 'Peace, Land and Bread' showed an understanding of the problems the lower classes were facing. However living conditions continued to be harsh. Some candidates made an excellent point by contrasting these conditions with the Marxist ideal of a proletarian dictatorship. Lenin's determination to control War Communism was seen as a response to working class pressure. More perceptive responses realised that although NEP was introduced, it was only an interim measure, the army and police continuing to be used to keep order. Almost all responses contained some discussion of Stalin's policies. He used the full powers of the state to keep control of the lower classes and forced modernisation on the peasants and industrial workers. Collectivisation followed and famine was a widespread consequence. Stalin's priority was rapid industrialisation, whatever the social cost. Candidates might conclude that none of the economic policies in the three key periods did anything to improve the conditions of the lower classes. However, it was acceptable to offer an alternative argument so long as it was clearly supported.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

Key messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went further than providing summaries (such as ‘Source A says that...Source B says that...’) and used the sources to frame an argument. The most effective responses evaluated and grouped the sources according to the degree to which they supported the hypothesis.

Section B: Candidates are advised to plan their answers briefly. They should note the key instructions in the questions (such as ‘Analyse’ and ‘How far?’) and pay attention to any dates in the question.

General comments

Overall, the standard of the answers was satisfactory and there was evidence of good knowledge and understanding in the majority of scripts. For the most part candidates used their time well. There were comparatively few incomplete scripts. The most successful answers were clearly focused on the particular demands of the questions. For instance **Questions 5 and 7** asked ‘Why?’ The most effective responses provided a series of reasons and presented these in order of importance. **Questions 3, 4 and 8** involved a comparison of two factors. Most marks were awarded to the answers that were reasonably balanced between the factors. However, a requirement that is common to all questions is the issue of relevance. What does the question ask about? What is not required to answer the question? For example, **Question 2** asked about the consequences of industrialisation. It was not relevant to describe the general causes of the Industrial Revolution. **Question 7** revolved around developments in Germany in 1933. Hitler’s policies after he established himself in power could not be linked to the key issue.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were asked to use the sources to consider the judgement, or hypothesis, that ‘Austria was responsible for the Sarajevo crisis.’ The first step to be taken in organising a successful answer was to group the sources according to the extent to which they supported the hypothesis. As many candidates recognised, Source D firmly placed the blame on Austria. The Austrian Chief of Military Staff wanted a final resolution to Austria’s problems in the Balkans. Berchtold, the Austrian Foreign Minister, was willing to take a more hard line once he received the ‘blank cheque’ from Germany that guaranteed support. Many responses cross-referenced Source D with Source C which listed Austria’s grievances. They often pointed out that the assassination was the last step in a sequence of deliberately hostile actions against Austria. On the other hand, Source E named alternative guilty parties. It stated that the Archduke’s mission was to bring a fair and reasonable peace to the Balkans. Interpretations of Sources A and B depended on whether the plotters and assassins were seen as heroic freedom fighters or guilty terrorists. The next step was to assess the sources and decide how reliable they were. Weaker responses tended to accept all of the sources at face value. However, it was notable that many candidates were more analytical in their approach. They realised that while Sources A and B might be factually correct, it could be dangerous to draw conclusions from them. The only comment on the situation, at the end of Source A, accused Austria of building its empire by ‘conquest and intrigues and treachery.’ Candidates also needed to be cautious in dealing with Source C. As an official statement after the outbreak of war, it leaned heavily in Austria’s favour against Serbia. Sources D and E were modern sources and while Source D was more conventional, Source E contained an account of the Archduke’s intentions as conveyed by his daughter. Good answers questioned the reliability of an old woman’s memory of her father, seventy years after his death, especially when he was killed so controversially. The most effective responses recognised that the reliability of this source is best

judged when it is compared with other evidence of the Archduke's intentions and of the actions that were mentioned in Source E. Answers were given credit when they cross-referenced the sources. For example, Sources A and C could be contrasted. Sources D and E agreed about the role of the secret service. The final part of good answers was the overall judgement. Candidates could decide to support or amend the hypothesis. Some weaker responses omitted a conclusion or made the general point that all of the countries were responsible.

Section B

Question 2

The best answers were characteristically well organised and relevant throughout. In explaining the French Revolution, they focused on liberty, equality and fraternity, avoiding unnecessary narratives of other developments. By contrast, weaker responses tended to contain an account of the Revolution and a description of Napoleon's regime. The best answers were based on comparisons and contrasts, priority being given to making an assessment of whether Napoleon betrayed the revolution. Napoleon himself claimed to be the heir and defender of the Revolution, representing what was best in it. Some excellent essays referred to positive reforms that were introduced during the revolutionary years. There were changes to the taxation system, the Bank of France was established and the property laws were reformed. However, it was recognised that the uncertainty of the revolutionary years limited the effectiveness of these changes. Napoleon's reforms were more thorough, especially from 1799 to 1804 when he was First Consul. Knowledge of key developments such as the Napoleonic Code and the Concordat was usually sound but the most creditable answers compared and contrasted these with revolutionary developments. For example, the Concordat reversed some of the changes in religion but safeguarded most of the main ingredients. Many Church privileges were ended so that the Catholic Church became subordinate to the state. However, Napoleon's authoritarianism was undeniable and many candidates commented that as time went on he became more dictatorial. France became more of a police state, although it was more orderly and restrained than during the extremes of the Revolution under Robespierre and the Jacobins. This sort of approach was more creditworthy because it used the information in a directly relevant way.

Question 3

Candidates were at liberty to argue their response either way, although most felt the advantages of industrialisation outweighed the problems it created. The focus of all the answers needed to be on governments. Weaker essays tended to discuss the general effects of the Industrial Revolution and deserved lower marks because they showed little understanding of the consequences for governments. One advantage which was commonly cited was the improvement in communications, especially through railways. These brought communities closer together and therefore made them easier to control. Many candidates mentioned that industrialisation made countries wealthier and increased income from taxation. Foreign trade benefitted European countries' influence abroad. From the middle of the nineteenth century, industrialisation changed weapons and methods of waging war. On the other hand it was pointed out in the most balanced responses that governments were dominated by the traditional classes and could feel challenged by the introduction of new political ideas such as socialism and Marxism. There was pressure on governments to introduce social reforms and ultimately to widen the franchise.

Question 4

Many candidates used their knowledge effectively to support organised and relevant arguments. The question mentioned internal and external problems faced by Bismarck in the unification of Germany and the most effective answers dealt with both aspects. Candidates could spend more time on the problems that they judged to be more serious but the best demonstrated an understanding of both. Almost all responses related the narrative of the wars of unification but good answers went further in assessing the seriousness of the threat they posed. For example, they explained the reasons why Denmark and then Austria were problematic. There were some highly effective studies of Austria where candidates explained that it had traditionally dominated Germany. It had a strong army and some German states, especially the Catholic states in the south, saw Austria rather than Prussia as their natural ally. It was understood that having gained the victory, Bismarck opposed the Prussian leaders who wanted to impose harsh peace terms on Austria because he feared making a permanent enemy of Austria. Credit was given when candidates explained why France became a problem. The issue of the Spanish succession was important but there was more at stake. Good answers explained the link between France and the further unification of Germany after 1866. The most frequent discriminating factor was success in handling internal problems. There were some highly creditable discussions of how Bismarck dealt with the problem of the Liberals. There were also some

worthwhile commentaries on Bismarck's relations with other German states. In assessing candidates were rewarded when they examined their relative importance.

Question 5

Good answers focused on 'Why?' and were analytical throughout. Candidates were asked to refer to at least two of Britain, France and Germany in their answers. This was intended to encourage well-illustrated responses and to discourage vague accounts. The most effective answers offered reasons why imperialism caused competition which were linked to specific examples. A more common approach was to explain general, (although usually valid) reasons but not to support them. Some essays showed high quality in the variety and relevance of their examples. Because the scope of the topic is wide it was permissible to limit the response to either Africa or Asia. Some answers made the useful point that individuals could create tensions. The distances from Europe meant that they were often difficult to control. Others examined why developments caused problems between countries. Many candidates mentioned Fashoda but some were uncertain why that remote place caused tensions. The Berlin Conference (1884-85) was an opportunity to show how European countries attempted to resolve imperial tensions through diplomacy.

Question 6

Most answers deserved credit for relevance. The distinguishing feature of the best essays was their focus on the extent of Lenin's success. While it was acceptable to spend a little time explaining Lenin's role in achieving power, the focus of the question was after the October Revolution. Characteristically the better answers considered a range of issues, whereas more modest essays were often limited to economic issues. The factor to which least attention was given was government. In discussing the economy, better responses went beyond descriptions to assess Lenin's success. Most responses explained the main features of War Communism and the New Economic Policy but the more successful developed their points with sound assessments. For instance, it was recognised that War Communism was introduced because of the serious economic situation and also because Lenin and other leading Bolsheviks saw it as a truly Marxist system. The NEP was a reflection of Lenin's ability to be pragmatic as the economic and political failures of War Communism became apparent. A few excellent answers pointed out that Lenin saw the NEP as a necessary but temporary stage in the establishment of Bolshevik rule. In terms of government, Lenin quickly established a Bolshevik monopoly. He tolerated a degree of diversity in the ruling group but used the Cheka to enforce order. By the time of his death in 1924, he had achieved success in this sphere. However, some commented that he was less effective in establishing a stable succession. The rivalry between Stalin and Trotsky outlived Lenin and shaped a Russia that was very different from what Lenin envisaged.

Question 7

The most effective answers were analytical, addressed the 'why?' element of the question and considered both the collapse of Weimar and the rise of the Nazis. More moderate responses tended to be unbalanced, generally being well informed about Weimar but vague about the rise of the Nazis. Some answers were uncertain about the chronology. The highest marks were awarded to answers that focused narrowly on the key issue in terms of the problem and the period. There were longer-term issues. The Weimar Republic was unpopular with many Germans from its inception. It did not shake off the accusation that it was led by the 'November criminals' who were guilty of the 'stab in the back'. However, few traced the rise of the Nazis, especially from 1929. Some candidates referred to later developments, such as the Holocaust, as reasons why Hitler came to power. The 1920s were a period of recovery for the Weimar Republic. It was the Wall Street Crash of 1929, not the post-1918 depression that proved fatal for the stability of Weimar.

Question 8

The best responses were well argued and effectively balanced between Nicholas II and Stalin, taking a comparative line throughout. Most recognised that both rulers were autocratic, exerting strong government. A commonly cited difference was that Nicholas II gave weak leadership while Stalin's was extremely strong. The Tsar opposed change while Stalin was determined to change almost everything. Nicholas II could be forced into concessions, as in 1906 with the October Manifesto. Stalin was ruthless in resisting anything and anybody that he disliked. Both were repressive, using the army and a secret police force, but the extent of their repression almost defies comparison. Nicholas II used internal and external exile. Many answers considered that Stalin's punishments were far more extreme. Not only were individuals punished but groups, even classes. The Tsar was not interested in economic change. He gave little support to the policies of Witte and Stolypin. Stalin's economic policies sought to transform Russia. A mutually supportive alliance with the Church was replaced by the use of modern propaganda. The standard of the majority of answers was sound.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

Key messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went further than providing summaries (such as ‘Source A says that...Source B says that...’) and used the sources to frame an argument. The most effective responses evaluated and grouped the sources according to the degree to which they supported the hypothesis.

Section B: Candidates are advised to plan their answers briefly. They should note the key instructions in the questions (such as ‘Analyse’ and ‘How far?’) and pay attention to any dates in the question.

General comments

The majority of scripts reached a satisfactory standard and demonstrated relevant knowledge and understanding. It was notable that a number of candidates had planned their answers. The plans are not assessed and the most effective were precise, helping candidates to produce elegant and well organised essays. Some candidates found them especially useful in answering **Question 1**. The majority of candidates used their time effectively. In individual answers, the best responses were relevant with most time spent explaining the more important points. Less important points were explained briefly. Good answers made links between different factors and the best responses organised points into hierarchies of importance. It was creditable when the answers focused directly on the question. Less commendable scripts occasionally wasted time with unnecessarily long introductions that were of limited value.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were asked to use five sources to consider the judgement, or hypothesis, that ‘Russia was the aggressor in 1914.’ Success depended on the candidates’ ability to interpret sources, analyse them individually and compare them as a group. The best answers assessed the reliability of the sources and come to a conclusion that was justified in the answer. Whereas weaker answers tended to paraphrase or copy out sections of the sources, more effective responses used them as the basis of an argument. For example, using Source A at face value led some to the conclusion that it would be almost impossible to stand by peacefully if Austria took action against Serbia – the peace party in the Russian government would be swept aside by public opinion and the consequence would be war. More analytical responses recognised that Russia’s options were narrowed by its long-term policies in the Balkans, which made it the ally of Serbia and therefore of Slav nationalism. However, the source shows that although there was a peace party in the Russian government it did not have a decisive influence. If war broke out, it would not be limited to Russia and Austria but would probably spread to the other members of the rival alliances. This sort of answer would deserve more credit because it shows the candidate thinking more carefully about the source. In assessing the reliability of the sources, better responses did not accept them as reliable simply because of their provenance. Source A was a communication to Austria from a leading German official. While Austria and Germany were close allies, Bethmann Hollweg recognised the problem facing Russia. This adds to the credibility of the extract. Sources B and C could be compared. The writer of Source B showed Russia to be anxious to secure peace while Source C was Germany’s declaration of war on Russia and alleged that Russia was responsible for the hostilities. Some good candidates used their own knowledge to assess these sources. A similar approach was used by successful candidates when assessing Sources D and E. For example, sound answers noted that both extracts saw Russia as an aggressor, but Source D blamed Russia as the only aggressor while Source E shared out the responsibility with Serbia and France. Good answers then provided a brief conclusion to show how far the hypothesis was valid.

Section B

Question 2

The majority of answers were relevant and maintained a clear focus on the question. If answers were weaker, it tended to be because they discussed the causes of the French Revolution in general rather than analysing the failure of attempts, for instance by Turgot, Necker and Calonne, to reform the ancien regime. Many answers realised that none of the attempted solutions worked and provided detail to support their points. It was recognised that Turgot's advice was rejected by a king who was persuaded by the war party that saw the opportunity for revenge against Britain. Necker did not have the confidence of the Queen, Marie Antoinette. Groups that were otherwise peaceful resisted Calonne's call to reduce expenditure and reform the taxation system. A large number of responses considered that the major problem was Louis XVI, an absolute monarch in theory but in practice too weak to push through change. In some cases candidates overstated this factor and did not balance their answer by considering other issues which prevented reform. For instance, the legislative and administrative systems were complex and mostly obstructive. The *parlements* were fierce in defence of their traditional rights. Tax farmers were an important group that could not simply be abolished. The traditional and apparently unchangeable power of the aristocracy and Church were both mentioned in many essays. The Assembly of Notables met in 1787, apparently in recognition of the need for reform, but failed. Many concluded that the weakness of Louis XVI was the only reason why reforms failed. More balanced responses argued that although there were other factors at work he was undoubtedly a key element because ultimately everything depended on him.

Question 3

The best answers showed an awareness of the limits, as well as the extent, of industrialisation in society. They also drew on examples from two of Britain, France and Germany. Less creditable answers tended to spend too much time describing the process of the Industrial Revolution, although some achieved a reasonable focus on the outcomes of industrialisation. Discussions of urbanisation and the development of machines were only partly relevant and credit was given when responses explained how far these features had spread by the middle of the nineteenth century and the extent to which they changed society. For example, machines gave employment to some people and deprived others of a living. Some of the more perceptive answers dealt with continuity as well as change, recognising, for example, that although the British census of 1851 showed that more people were living in industrial towns, a sizeable minority were still living in pre-industrial villages. It was generally recognised that progress was slower in France and Germany. Some of the better responses considered a wider range of issues and noted that social relationships changed with the Industrial Revolution. Semi-skilled jobs performed by individuals before industrialisation disappeared to be replaced by the mass unskilled labour that was necessary to operate machines. Some candidates made the good point that life for the upper class changed little during the middle of the century and pointed out that this was true of Britain, France and Germany.

Question 4

Many answers provided a relevant narrative of the wars of unification. The highest marks were awarded to those that contained convincing accounts of the different but complementary roles of the foreign powers. For example, Austria was Prussia's ally in the war against Denmark (1864) but was an enemy soon afterwards in 1866. There were some good accounts of the reasons for this change. There was also a significant development in relations with France between 1866 and 1870. Again, credit was given when the reasons were explained. Some candidates examined whether Bismarck's aims changed from 1866, when the North German Confederation was set up, to 1871, when the complete unification of Germany took place. There were some well-informed studies of the relations between foreign states and German states other than Prussia. Bismarck could not assume that these would support Prussia. Good responses explained why he preferred to deal leniently with Austria but harshly with France.

Question 5

Candidates were required to assess the importance of economic issues, alongside other factors, in explaining 'New Imperialism'. Almost all of the answers deserved credit for relevance. The discriminating characteristic was success in providing examples. The ability to explain different factors was important and some listed reasons without explaining them or assessing their importance. Most accepted that economic issues were important but some essays did not support their positive arguments with examples. Others illustrated their answers, providing evidence of regions that were believed to be profitable. The best answers understood that this is a controversial matter because many historians believe that New Imperialism yielded few profits and that more money was invested in non-imperial regions. For example, France's acquisitions

included extensive but unprofitable regions in Africa. Germany made few financial gains from the Far East. The question invited candidates to compare economic and other reasons for imperial expansion. Some answers included strategic reasons and, again, the best provided illustrations of specific regions. For example, strategic interests were important to Germany and France. Germany wanted to assert itself as a world power while France saw imperial expansion as recompense for its defeat in 1871. Many candidates referred to Social Darwinism as an important factor but relatively few provided specific examples to support this point.

Question 6

The best answers established clear links between World War I and the two revolutions in Russia in 1917 and were effectively balanced. Weaker answers could generally have been better focused. For example, while it could be relevant to explain the development of the Tsar's problems from before 1914, there was no need to explain the general causes of the February Revolution at length. Nor was it necessary to give extensive attention to the rise of communism before 1917. Most of the best answers maintained quite a narrow focus and made clear links between other factors and the war. Many recognised that by the beginning of 1917, Russia was divided at all levels between those who wanted more effort to win the war and those who advocated peace with Germany. A large proportion of responses commented that Nicholas II's decision to lead the army personally was a failure militarily and politically. The human cost of the war disillusioned the soldiers, resulting in many desertions. Meanwhile the problem of supplying the army dislocated communications and supplies for the civilian population. The outcome was the abdication of Nicholas II. Good candidates were rewarded when they explained why Russians were split in their opinions about continuing or ending the war. Kerensky's decision was controversial even among his ministers in the Provisional Government. Most responses considered war as a crucial element in the October Revolution because it politicised the army. The slogan 'Peace, Land and Bread' was mentioned in many answers but the most creditable explained the reasons why it was important and made links between the demands.

Question 7

The key issue was the importance of Stalin's propaganda. Most answers were relevant and displayed at least a basic knowledge and understanding of the topic. The most frequent characteristics that took answers to a high mark band were the range of the discussion and candidates' ability to assess whether propaganda was 'Stalin's most important method'. Some disagreed and saw terror as more important. This was a valid argument but the best essays understood the link between terror and propaganda. Those who suffered under the terror regime were attacked as enemies of Russia. Propaganda justified the power that Stalin enjoyed. Credit was given when candidates noted how propaganda exaggerated the economic achievements and turned failure into success, such as by manipulating statistics. More moderate answers tended to lose focus on the key issue and provide general accounts. The weakest answers were unclear as to the meaning of 'propaganda'.

Question 8

The best answers showed a good understanding and knowledge of the period as a whole, whereas more limited responses usually only covered part of the timeframe. Some excellent essays distinguished between the positive and the negative effects of the Revolution. For example, it encouraged Liberalism and nationalism. To some these were gains but to others they were problems. The Revolution unleashed twenty years of war from 1792 to 1815 but this was followed by generally peaceful international policies until the middle of the century. Less successful answers tended to contain narratives and the least successful comprised accounts of developments in France which neglected the wider impact on Europe. Some essays included developments that were not linked to the key issue. For example, there were references to the Industrial Revolution. By contrast, the best answers noted that the question asked 'Why..?' and were organised around a series of reasons.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

Key messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went beyond face-value interpretation of the sources and grouped them into those which supported or challenged the hypothesis or prompt. This enabled them to develop focused and balanced arguments.

Section B: The most effective responses addressed the question rather than the topic, noted any dates or key terms, maintained a balanced approach and ensured that arguments were appropriately supported.

General comments

The majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most used their time well and only a small minority did not complete a fourth response. Very few misread or ignored the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3 and Question 4**.

The overall standard was satisfactory, although the quality of scripts varied considerably. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) were based on careful reading of the sources and a structured plan. This meant that responses showed a clear understanding of both sides of the argument, and maintained balance and focus throughout. Candidates who read and wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis. Many went beyond face value and interpreted the sources in context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the use of appropriate knowledge. Weaker responses were less convincing in this respect, relying almost exclusively on vague and unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent arguments which were focused on the requirements of the question and on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. It is no coincidence that many such responses were preceded by a short plan. Some responses relied too heavily on a descriptive approach and the accurate material which they contained was not used to address the specific demands of the question. Weaker scripts tended to lack appropriate knowledge and were often based on vague statements or unsupported assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates produced balanced arguments to consider whether the Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter. Source C was usually seen as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, Source B as providing the greatest challenge to it. Interpretation of the remaining three sources was rather more inconsistent, with a tendency to focus on the motives behind the Uniting for Peace Resolution rather than on the extent to which it could be considered inconsistent with the UN Charter.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond face value interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were sometimes unconvincing. For example, many argued that, because it is a statement by a Soviet Representative to the UN, Source C is inevitably biased. To make this point effectively, it was necessary to show how and why the source is biased. It was noticeable that a significant number of those who considered Source C to be unreliable due to bias did not level the same accusation at Source B. In some cases, attempts to evaluate the provenance of sources led to

contradictions; for example, it was not uncommon for responses to argue that Source D was a hypothesis, but then claim that the source is unreliable because it was written by an American.

The most impressive answers contained detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and use of contextual knowledge. For example, many noted that statements in Sources B and C were made on the same day that the Resolution was adopted and therefore constituted part of the debate which took place in the UN General Assembly. The contrasting views expressed by the American and Soviet representatives were seen as a reflection of the 'early Cold War division between East and West' as outlined in Source E. Some candidates contextualised the debate by reference to the Soviet boycott of the Security Council and the USA's determination to gain UN support for its involvement in the Korean War. The weakest responses generally offered a basic outline of the contents of each source, with little or no attempt to address the hypothesis.

Section B

Question 2

This was a popular question, and most responses contained accurate and detailed knowledge of the events which marked the early development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949. Most offered a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War, usually giving a chronological account of events which led to strained relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common approach involved developing an account of the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War, outlining the views of various groups of historians. As a result, many responses were generalised with only limited focus on the question, usually confined to the conclusion. The best responses came from candidates who were able to use their knowledge in order to address the question directly and in a balanced way. The weakest responses were characterised by inaccurate chronology, unsupported assertions or a tendency to drift outside the prescribed timeframe.

Question 3

The quality of responses to this question varied enormously. The most impressive were based on a focused and balanced analysis of the actions of both the USSR and the USA, most commonly leading to the conclusion that they should share responsibility for causing the deterioration in relations which led to the Second Cold War. It was clear that a number of candidates lacked the depth of knowledge required to address this question effectively. As a result, many responses were significantly unbalanced, the most frequent argument being that the USSR was entirely responsible for ending détente because of its invasion of Afghanistan. The weakest responses often showed evidence of confusion about the requirements of the question. This led some candidates to write generally about why relations between the USA and the USSR were poor throughout the period from 1945 to 1991, with no attempt to focus on the 1970s. It was evident that a significant number of candidates had limited understanding of the term 'détente'.

Question 4

Most responses displayed sound knowledge of the Korean War and American involvement in it. The most effective answers identified dilemmas in American policy, such as the fact that Korea was not included in Acheson's 'defence perimeter' speech, the contrast between containment and roll-back and the debate over whether to use nuclear weapons. Such discussion encouraged focused analysis of the way in which the USA conducted the war. A considerable proportion of responses, while containing much of the same factual information, did not address the question. Many candidates adopted a narrative approach, in which the USA's decision to push the North Koreans back beyond the 38th parallel was noted but not identified as a deviation from the policy of containment. A small number of candidates drifted into irrelevance by explaining how American actions in Korea were subsequently replicated in Vietnam.

Question 5

The best responses compared and contrasted the impact of the 'crisis of communism' on the USSR and the People's Republic of China, providing sound contextual evidence to explain why the former collapsed and the latter survived. Less effective responses tended to be unbalanced because, while candidates analysed the effects of the crisis on the USSR, they lacked sufficient knowledge to describe its impact on China. For example, many displayed sound knowledge regarding Gorbachev's reforms in the USSR, but incorrectly interpreted Mao's Great Leap Forward as the strategy which China adopted to avert the crisis. It was evident that a significant proportion misunderstood the term 'crisis of communism'. As a result, some responses

focused on the wrong time period, most commonly describing deteriorating relations between the USA and Mao.

Question 6

Most candidates displayed at least some relevant knowledge regarding the nuclear arms race, although relatively few assessed its impact on the conduct of the Cold War. Most responses offered a descriptive account of the build-up of nuclear arms after 1949, often in impressive, though unfocused, detail. Many candidates, ignoring the timeframe established in the question, wrote about events which took place after 1963, such as the development of SDI and the series of treaties signed in an attempt to control the arms race. While issues such as the Cuban missile crisis and the development of MAD were commonly referred to, their significance in terms of wider Cold War issues was rarely identified. Questions on the nuclear arms race are invariably popular with candidates, but tend to produce relatively few high quality responses. A number of candidates would have improved their performance if they had appreciated the importance of focusing on the question rather than writing more generally about the topic.

Question 7

Most of the candidates who addressed this question displayed good knowledge and understanding of a range of factors which led to Japan's 'economic miracle' after World War II. The best responses came from candidates who provided clear evidence of Japan's post-war political stability and recognised how it facilitated economic recovery, while also analysing the relative significance of other causal factors. Some responses took a more descriptive approach and would have been improved by closer attention to the question. Many such responses seemed rather disjointed, each causal factor described in isolation and in no explicitly logical order. The weakest answers relied too heavily on unsupported assertions; for example, the statement that '*Japan's recovery was dependent on the USA*' requires explanation of what the USA did and how this assisted the revival of Japan's economy.

Question 8

Responses to this question, which was attempted by a sizeable minority of candidates, varied enormously in quality. The best essays were characterised by well-argued and fully focused arguments, effectively supported by appropriate factual material. Weaker responses were generally based on inadequate factual knowledge, leading to the presence of vague and unsupported assertions. A number of candidates assumed that this was a question about the Cold War and wrote about the impact of superpower involvement in various countries. It was evident that some candidates misunderstood the term 'Third World'.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

Key messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went beyond face-value interpretation of the sources and grouped them into those which supported or challenged the hypothesis. This enabled them to develop focused and balanced arguments.

Section B: The most effective responses addressed the question rather than the topic, noted any dates or key terms, maintained a balanced approach and ensured that arguments were appropriately supported.

General comments

The majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most used their time effectively, only a small minority failing to complete a fourth response. Very few candidates misread the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3 and Question 4**.

The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was some variation in the quality of scripts. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from those who had read through the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This meant that responses showed a clear understanding of both sides of the argument, and were balanced and focused throughout. Those candidates who wrote about each source in turn found it more difficult to remain focused on the hypothesis. Many answers went beyond 'face value' and interpreted the sources through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of contextual knowledge. Some candidates were aware of the need to apply such analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying on vague assertions regarding source reliability.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** developed consistent arguments which were focused on the question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate material. It is no coincidence that many such responses were preceded by a short plan. A number relied too heavily on a descriptive approach, in which the accurate material which they contained was not used to address the specific demands of the question. Weaker scripts tended to lack appropriate factual knowledge, so that responses consisted largely of general statements or unsupported assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates produced balanced arguments about whether the People's Republic of China was wrongly denied membership of the United Nations. Source B was invariably seen as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, Source C as providing the greatest challenge to it. Interpretation of the remaining three sources was less consistent. For example, many candidates argued inaccurately that Source A supported the view that the PRC was wrongly denied membership of the UN because Mao's government had '*effective control over practically the whole of the Chinese territory and is the legal government of the country*', an argument which the writer rejects. Similarly, it was commonly suggested that Source D supported the hypothesis because of its opening statement that '*it would be desirable*' to bring '*mainland China back into effective relations with the rest of the world*'; the significance of the writer's scepticism about the PRC's sincerity in seeking UN membership was often missed. Most candidates recognised Source E as offering a balanced assessment because it described the contrasting views of the British and American governments;

many perceptive candidates noted that the last two lines of the source indicated that the source was somewhat critical of the USA's motives in rejecting UN membership for the PRC.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond face value interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unconvincing. For example, many candidates argued that Source B is biased because it is an article by a Chinese academic, Source B is inevitably biased. In order to make this point effectively, it was necessary to show how and why the source is biased. In some cases, attempts to evaluate the provenance of sources led to contradictions; for example, it was not uncommon for candidates to argue that Source E supported the hypothesis, but then claim that the source is unreliable because it was written by an American.

The most impressive responses contained detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and good use of contextual knowledge. For example, many noted the anti-communist rhetoric in Source A, particularly the emotive language used in explaining how the government of Chiang Kai-shek was overthrown '*by force and violence...by the ruthless tyranny of Mao Zedong.*' This was commonly contrasted with Source B's assessment that Chiang Kai-shek's regime had been corrupt, an opinion which is also reflected in the last line of Source E. Similarly, many candidates used contextual knowledge in order to challenge the allegations about the PRC made in Source C, in particular the claim that China launched an '*invasion of Korea to fight the very forces of the UN.*'

The weakest responses generally provided an outline of the contents of each source in sequence, with little attempt to address the hypothesis in the question. It was clear that a number of candidates lacked the contextual knowledge and understanding required to differentiate between the China of Chiang Kai-shek and that of Mao Zedong.

Section B

Question 2

This was a popular question, and most responses contained accurate and detailed knowledge of the events which marked the early development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949. Most responses took the form of a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War, usually pursuing a chronological account of events which led to strained relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common approach involved describing the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War, outlining the views of various groups of historians. As a result of this some responses were rather general, with only limited focus on the demands of the question, usually confined to conclusions. The best responses came from candidates who used their knowledge in order to address the question directly, demonstrating how the USSR's need for physical security led to the creation of a 'buffer zone' in Eastern Europe, while the USA's need for economic security led to the Marshall Plan and a determination to contain communism. A common argument was that, in order to ensure their own security, both the USSR and the USA carried out policies which could be interpreted as expansionist. The weakest responses were characterised by poor chronology, unsupported assertions and, in a few cases, drifted outside the prescribed timeframe.

Question 3

Most responses demonstrated good knowledge of the USA's involvement in regional conflicts which marked the globalisation of the Cold War. A number of responses offered detailed accounts of American involvement in various issues, most notably the Korean War, the Vietnam War and the Cuban crisis, but also the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. Such responses, while containing sound factual detail, were often based on the assumption that the hypothesis was accurate so there was little attempt to challenge it by considering other interpretations. The best responses made a genuine effort to explain why the USA felt so threatened by communism and to analyse the extent to which this fear was either understandable or excessive. The weakest responses were characterised by inadequate factual content, leading to the presence of too many unsupported assertions. A very small number of candidates lacked understanding of the term 'globalisation' and wrote about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

This was a popular question and many answers were focused, balanced and analytical. They contained detailed analysis of American, Soviet and Cuban motives, together with clear understanding of the impact of their respective actions, leading to a supported judgement regarding the extent of American responsibility for causing the crisis. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of focus or balance. A number of

candidates wrote knowledgeable accounts of the crisis and its outcomes, rather than focusing on the US. Some provided a valid and well-argued account of American responsibility for causing the crisis, but responses have been improved if they had balanced this by analysing the extent to which the Soviet Union might also be held responsible.

Question 5

Many responses showed accurate knowledge of the reasons why the USSR had collapsed by 1991. Causal factors, including Gorbachev's reforms (glasnost, perestroika and the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine) were commonly outlined but with limited analysis. This approach tended to lead to essays having insufficient focus on the first part of the question. Gorbachev's reforms were seen in isolation, with little attempt to explain what he was trying to achieve. The best responses saw Gorbachev's attempted reforms in context and explained how and why he tried to address the multitude of problems facing the USSR, why the reforms failed and what their impact actually was. This more analytical approach enabled some candidates to show clear understanding of the ways in which the factors which led to the collapse of the USSR were interconnected. The weakest responses simply described Gorbachev's reforms with no reference to their relative significance regarding the collapse of the USSR.

Question 6

The quality of responses to this popular question varied enormously. Many candidates produced fully focused and well-supported arguments, based on impressive knowledge and understanding of the key issues. A considerable proportion of responses did not achieve this high standard. Some candidates wrote generally, in varying degrees of detail and accuracy, about the nuclear arms race without specific focus on the 1970s. This often took the form of a narrative account of the various treaties which were agreed in an effort to control the development of nuclear weapons. It was clear that some of those who did concentrate on the 1970s lacked sufficient knowledge and understanding to address the question, relying almost exclusively on unsupported comments. It was particularly true in this instance that candidates need to appreciate the importance of focusing on the specific requirements of the question rather than writing in more general terms about the topic.

Question 7

Most of the candidates who addressed this question displayed appropriate knowledge and understanding of at least some of the factors which led to Japan's 'economic miracle' after World War II. The best responses were characterised by an explicit attempt to assess the relative significance of each factor and to explain how they interrelated. Less effective responses were usually based on a more descriptive approach and offered limited analysis. Many such responses seemed rather disjointed, each causal factor described in isolation and in no explicitly logical order. The weakest answers relied too heavily on unsupported assertions; for example, the statement that '*Japan's recovery was dependent on the USA*' requires explanation of what the USA actually did and how this assisted the revival of Japan's economy.

Question 8

This question was attempted by a sizeable minority of candidates. The most impressive responses contained sound, and often very detailed, knowledge of the problems which faced Africa in the period from 1960 to 1991. This was used to provide a focused assessment of the relative significance of political instability, arguments being supported by appropriate examples and factual evidence. Many of the weaker responses lacked accurate knowledge, and relied too heavily on vague assertions. This was particularly evident when the question was attempted as a final response. A surprising proportion of candidates based their responses on the assumption that Africa constitutes a single country.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

Key messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went beyond face-value interpretation of the sources and grouped them into those which supported or challenged the hypothesis or prompt. This enabled them to develop focused and balanced arguments.

Section B: The most effective responses addressed the question rather than the topic, noted any dates or key terms, maintained a balanced approach and ensured that arguments were appropriately supported.

General comments

The majority of candidates attempted the compulsory source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates used their time effectively and only a small minority did not complete a fourth response. Few misread or ignored the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

The overall standard was satisfactory, although the quality of the scripts varied considerably. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who read through the sources carefully and developed a structured plan. This encouraged a complete understanding of both sides of the argument, ensuring that their responses were balanced and focused on the question throughout. Candidates who read and wrote about each source in turn found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many candidates went beyond 'face value' and interpreted the sources in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective use of contextual knowledge. Some showed awareness of the need to apply analytical depth to their evaluation, but were less convincing, relying almost exclusively on vague assertions regarding source reliability.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained consistent and sustained arguments which were focused on the demands of the question and were based on a balanced analysis of relevant material. It is no coincidence that many such responses were preceded by a plan. Less effective responses tended to rely too heavily on narrative and the accurate material which they contained was not used to address the demands of the question. The weakest scripts often lacked appropriate factual knowledge, so that responses tended to consist largely of generalised statements and assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates produced balanced responses which considered both sides of the hypothesis that the Soviet Union's decision to boycott UN Security Council meetings was a major error. Sources A and E were generally seen as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, Sources B and D as providing the greatest challenge to it. Interpretation of Source C was rather more inconsistent, a sizeable minority of candidates dismissing it as having no relevance to the question.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond face value interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unconvincing. For example, many candidates argued that, because it came from a letter written by Stalin, Source B is inevitably biased. In order to make this point effectively, it was necessary to show how and why the source is biased.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on a careful evaluation, cross-referencing and effective use of contextual knowledge. For example, many candidates noting Source D's claim that the boycott was not an error but a deliberate policy to involve the US in the Korean conflict, argued convincingly that the writer was using Stalin's letter (Source B) as his key evidence. While the writer of Source D believes the explanation which Stalin gave in his letter, the writer of Source E does not, implying that Stalin was making excuses for a decision which had 'backfired' (Source A). Many candidates argued that it was their different interpretation of Stalin's motives which led to contradictions between Sources D and E, such as D's claim that the USSR 'actually desired American intervention in the Korean War' and E's view that the USSR 'preferred no American military intervention'. A small number of candidates noted that Stalin's decision to boycott the Security Council had led to criticism, both from 'his top aides' (Source E) and the President of Czechoslovakia, which explains why Stalin felt the need to justify his actions in a letter. In general, the better responses saw Source C as supporting the hypothesis; Stalin's assumption that the Security Council would be unable to make decisions in the absence of the USSR proved to be inaccurate, while the boycott itself was 'a violation of the Soviet Union's obligations' under the UN Charter.

The weakest responses were based on providing an outline of the content of each source, with little or no attempt to address the hypothesis in the question. It was clear that many candidates lacked contextual knowledge and understanding of the UN's involvement in the build-up to the Korean War.

Section B

Question 2

This was an extremely popular question, and most candidates displayed accurate and detailed knowledge of the events which marked the early development of the Cold War to 1949. Most responses offered a general assessment of the causes of the Cold War, usually pursuing a chronological account of events which led to strained relations between the USA and the USSR. Another common approach involved developing an account of the historical debate surrounding the causes of the Cold War, outlining the views of different groups of historians. As a result responses tended to be rather general with only limited focus on the requirements of the question, usually confined to conclusions. The best responses came from candidates who used their knowledge in order to address the question directly by analysing American motives for adopting strong anti-Soviet policies in the post-war period. In many cases weaker responses would have been improved by more secure chronology.

Question 3

Most responses contained appropriate knowledge, covering issues such as the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War and superpower involvement in the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. The best answers presented a balanced argument and were focused throughout. A number of responses would have been improved if candidates had used their knowledge to analyse motives for superpower involvement in regional conflicts, rather than describing what happened. As a result, some answers were restricted to a narrative account of a series of regional conflicts and the ways in which tensions were intensified by Cold War rivalry. The weakest responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by inadequate factual content or arguments which were based on general assertions. A small number of candidates drifted into irrelevance by writing about events in Europe prior to 1950.

Question 4

Some candidates produced highly impressive essays, offering balanced arguments which were focused on the question. Most responses, while containing much of the same factual information, fell into one of two categories. Firstly, those which outlined the reasons for the American defeat in the Vietnam War; the view that the USSR was in any way responsible for this defeat was often dismissed without sufficient consideration. Secondly, those produced by candidates who took the opportunity to write an account of the Vietnam War and the USA's involvement in it, with no explicit attempt to analyse the reasons why the USA was defeated. It was evident that virtually all candidates possessed sound knowledge of the USA's involvement in the Vietnam War; it was the ability to apply this knowledge to the question which led to variation in the quality of responses.

Question 5

Many candidates displayed sound knowledge and understanding of the factors which led to deterioration in relations between the Soviet Union and China. Some answers were based on a descriptive approach in which the causal factors were discussed in isolation with only limited analysis of their relative significance and the ways in which they inter-connected. In general, there seemed to be a tacit and unchallenged acceptance that China's determination to play a leading role in the world communist movement was the main underlying cause of the split. The most impressive responses came from candidates who applied their knowledge to develop more focused and balanced arguments.

Question 6

It was evident that many candidates possessed impressive knowledge and understanding of the context, aims, terms and impact of the SALT Treaties. The majority of responses contained accurate and detailed accounts of the terms of the SALT Treaties, but did so in a descriptive way with no attempt to analyse the impact and significance of the Treaties. Conversely, some attempted to focus on the significance of the Treaties, but provided limited factual evidence to support their arguments. Weaker responses lacked sufficient knowledge and understanding of the SALT Treaties. Confusion between the terms of the SALT Treaties and those of other attempts to control nuclear weapons (such as the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968) was not uncommon. The weakest essays were often based on a general description of the arms race. Candidates should appreciate the importance of focusing on the terms of the question rather than writing more generally about the topic.

Question 7

This question was attempted by only a minority of candidates. The most effective responses made a genuine attempt to develop well-focused arguments. A considerable proportion of responses were based on an assessment of the factors which facilitated Japan's economic recovery after 1945 rather than focusing on the impact which this recovery had on the wider international economy.

Question 8

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

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

Key messages

- In order to prepare for the examination, it is helpful for candidates to practise writing answers against the clock and to rely on their memory rather than notes.
- A considerable proportion of candidates used formulaic approaches to source analysis and evaluation. While developing a standardised approach can be helpful it can also limit some responses, particularly when the approach taken is over-complex.

General comments

For the source-based question in **Section A**, there is no need to paraphrase the content of a written source or to describe the content of a visual source. Instead, candidates need to *analyse* the sources in order to show how far they support the given hypothesis. For higher marks, responses should *evaluate* the sources beyond face value, using the source, its provenance and other sources or their own knowledge to do so.

For the essay questions in **Section B**, responses should develop a balanced argument which answers the question set. The argument should be structured into a series of key points with a paragraph per point. Each point should be (a) explained, (b) illustrated with relevant and detailed historical evidence and (c) directly related to the question. A conclusion is essential to achieve the higher mark bands. It should reach a judgement in response to the question and be consistent with the argument advanced in the essay.

For both types of question, responses can be improved by the inclusion of some precise, detailed examples to support their arguments. A number of scripts contained essays which involved no more than general historical explanation, often without any reference to specific dates. History is about change and continuity over time. The more specific the evidence and the more secure the chronology, the higher the marks which can be awarded. The best answers are full of such details.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Source A was a cartoon contemporary with and commenting on events in Kansas in the mid-1850s. Almost all candidates analysed the cartoon, which clearly supports the assertion, and made appropriate comments about its meaning. In doing this, some took too long to describe what was happening in the cartoon, for which they could only receive limited credit. Fewer responses evaluated the source effectively. The most commonly seen approach was to make general statements along the following lines: '*Source A is a cartoon. Cartoons are subjective and one-sided. Therefore Source A is biased and not to be trusted*'. This is too general to be considered as historical evaluation which must be more soundly based and more detailed. There were several ways in which the best responses addressed this. A small proportion of candidates considered the fact that the source was drawn in 1856 which was presidential election year. The cartoon portrays 'the Democratic platform' in a very critical way, presumably in an attempt to influence voters. Thus it is definitely one-sided and unreliable. A greater number of responses used cross-reference to evaluate Source A. It was recognised that Sources D and E blame the Democrats, although neither mentions the four leaders in the cartoon by name. Even Senator Sumner, the most radical of abolitionists speaking in 1856, does not do so. Thus the cartoon's anti-Democratic stance is not specifically supported by other sources. Some used contextual knowledge of Stephen Douglas and James Buchanan to assess the source. It was known that Senator Douglas supported the concept of popular sovereignty, which meant that voters in the

Territories would decide whether to accept slavery or not, rather than have it imposed on them. This undermines the cartoon's view of Douglas. In 1858 President Buchanan supported the Lecompton constitution for Kansas. This supports the cartoon's view of Buchanan.

Candidates often found Sources B and C easier to evaluate, usually by reference to their authors, Douglas and Davis. Source D proved somewhat harder as, at first glance, it seemed to be a Northern abolitionist advocating violence. However, he did so only in response to violence by border ruffians from the South. Most responses seemed to find Source E the most challenging. Many seized on the line '*slavery might be introduced quietly and surely, without arousing a conflict*' and used it to argue that the Democrats of the South did not cause trouble in Kansas. A more careful reading of the source shows that the statement was Sumner's summary of Southern hopes, not its actions. Those hopes were dashed by the 'populous North', which 'poured into the land'. This then caused the South to use force to get its way. This was the crime against Kansas which Sumner was referring to. This shows just how important it is to read the source very carefully in order to ensure its proper meaning is understood.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that some candidates have become over-elaborate in their attempts at evaluation. They distinguish between relevance, reliability and validity of sources. They do not need to and some wasted valuable time in doing so. Reliability is the key. The less reliable a source, the less value it has in relation to the particular hypothesis.

Section B

Question 2

This was a popular question and reasonably well answered, with the majority of candidates displaying relevant knowledge. Many, however, interpreted the question too generally. They took it to read '*Describe the factors which caused the destruction of the way of life of Indians in the nineteenth century*'. Thus they ignored three key limitations of the question. They tended to describe rather than assess and considered all Indians, not just the Plains Indians. A number attempted to cover the whole of the nineteenth century rather than the second half. By doing so, they limited the marks they could achieve. The best responses paid closer attention to the wording of the question, were focused throughout and were rewarded for relevance.

Question 3

Responses to this question were characterised by good knowledge of Reconstruction and the extent to which it helped ex-slaves. Most candidates provided arguments and evidence on both sides of the argument and achieved a degree of balance. The better answers knew something about the changing nature of Reconstruction within the 10 to 15 years before its abandonment in 1877. Some went beyond the Reconstruction era to describe the Jim Crow policies of the late nineteenth century, which was acceptable so long as comments made clear links with Reconstruction. Discussion of the *Plessy vs Ferguson* judgement in 1896 was to go too far beyond the parameters of the question. It was notable that a number of responses confused the black codes and Jim Crow laws, the former coming in the 1860s and the latter from the 1880s.

Question 4

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

Question 5

The majority of responses demonstrated some knowledge on the topic of race relations. Most interpreted this question as focusing on military events during the two wars, about which they knew only a little. A considerable proportion of responses neglected to discuss the home front and overlooked the post-war impact in each case. The best responses made comparisons between the two wars and their impact. Weaker answers tended to describe the impacts of the two wars rather than establishing a comparison. 'Compare and contrast' requires candidates to consider the similarities and differences. The most effective

responses took this approach although, in some instances, better use of detailed examples strengthened arguments and led to the award of higher marks.

Question 6

A significant proportion of candidates turned this into a question on the New Deal. The domestic policies of the FDR presidency were certainly part of the answer. However, they were not the whole answer. The Great Depression was essentially economic and thus assessment of the development of the US economy was needed before the New Deal was explained. The same applied to American society. Did the Great Depression divide or unite the American people? The majority of responses consisted of a general discussion about both economy and society. The best responses recognised that they should evaluate, rather than simply describe, the effects of the Great Depression. This involved making an attempt to form an historical judgement about the relative importance of the various developments. A minority of candidates achieved the higher levels by taking this approach.

Question 7

There were some knowledgeable responses to this question although a number were weakened by two limitations. Firstly, they covered the few years leading to American intervention in the Second World War, from 1937 to 1941, rather than the entire time period in the question. A few responses mentioned the American decision not to join the League of Nations in 1919. The period from the early 1920s to the late 1930s usually received little coverage. Secondly, most answers focused on US relations with Europe. Relations with China and Japan were infrequently mentioned, those with Central and South America hardly at all. A minority of responses attempted to turn the question into an essay on domestic affairs, writing about the inward-looking 'roaring' twenties and the depressed 1930s rather than foreign policy. There were some perceptive responses which made a useful distinction between economic and diplomatic isolationism, but these were unusual in their approach.

Question 8

Almost everyone who answered this question disagreed strongly with the assertion. They argued that American life was revolutionised in the 1960s. They usually quoted the experiences of college students, women and African Americans in support of their argument. Some knowledge of historical dates is vital and some responses used examples which came from the 1950s rather than the 1960s. For instance, Elvis Presley rose to notoriety in 1956. The so-called 'British invasion' of groups such as the Beatles did not occur until the mid-1960s. Likewise, the position of women only really started to change in the mid to late 1960s. The National Organisation for Women (NOW) was formed in 1966. With regard to African-Americans, many candidates concentrated on the methods used by the civil rights movement, often from the 1950s, when they might have focused more effectively on the outcomes of the movement for the lives of African Americans. The most effective responses also considered the counter argument – that changes in lifestyles in the 1960s were not revolutionary. By the late 1960s, political leaders were using the phrase 'the silent majority' to make a clear contrast with the noisy minorities of college students and African Americans. Even President Nixon gave the term his seal of approval in 1969. A number of responses concluded that the vast majority of white, middle-aged, working and middle class Americans experienced no great change in their lifestyles in the 1960s – except possibly when affected by the behaviour and beliefs of their children.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

Key messages

- In order to prepare for the examination, it is helpful for candidates to practise writing answers against the clock and to rely on their memory rather than notes.
- A considerable proportion of candidates used formulaic approaches to source analysis and evaluation. While developing a standardised approach can be helpful it can also limit some responses, particularly when the approach taken is over-complex.

General comments

For the source-based question in **Section A**, there is no need to paraphrase the content of a written source or to describe the content of a visual source. Instead, candidates need to *analyse* the sources in order to show how far they support the given hypothesis. For higher marks, responses should *evaluate* the sources beyond face value, using the source, its provenance and other sources or their own knowledge to do so.

For the essay questions in **Section B**, responses should develop a balanced argument which answers the question set. The argument should be structured into a series of key points with a paragraph per point. Each point should be (a) explained, (b) illustrated with relevant and detailed historical evidence and (c) directly related to the question. A conclusion is essential to achieve the higher mark bands. It should reach a judgement in response to the question and be consistent with the argument advanced in the essay.

For both types of question, responses can be improved by the inclusion of some precise, detailed examples to support their arguments. A number of scripts contained essays which involved no more than general historical explanation, often without any reference to specific dates. History is about change and continuity over time. The more specific the evidence and the more secure the chronology, the higher the marks which can be awarded. The best answers are full of such details.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Source A was a contemporary cartoon which commented on events in Kansas in the mid-1850s. All candidates analysed the cartoon, sometimes with unexpected results, but generally to good effect. Weaker responses often contained general comments along the following lines: '*Source A is a cartoon. Cartoons are subjective and one-sided. Therefore Source A is biased and not to be trusted*'. Such comments are too general to be historical and the best answers contained more soundly based and detailed evaluation. There were several ways in which this was achieved. It was possible to consider the provenance of the source. It was drawn in 1856 and a few candidates pointed out that this was presidential election year. The cartoon portrays the Democratic leadership as border ruffians, presumably in an attempt to influence voters against the Democratic party and therefore it was evaluated as being one-sided and unreliable. Other candidates cross-referenced to the pro-Democratic Sources C and D to challenge the view of the cartoon. Source C in particular contradicts the cartoon when it states '*we repudiate all sectional parties which seek to ... incite treason and armed resistance in the Territories*'. However it was pointed out that this assertion came from the Democratic party itself and in election year. Therefore it cannot be trusted to give an accurate account of Democratic views and is no more reliable than Source A. A number of candidates used their contextual knowledge of James Buchanan and Stephen Douglas. In 1858 President Buchanan supported the pro-slavery Lecompton Constitution for Kansas and, to some extent, this supports the cartoon's view of

Buchanan. Senator Douglas supported the concept of popular sovereignty, which meant that the Territories would decide whether to accept slavery or not, rather than have it imposed on them. This undermines the cartoon's view of Douglas. Some candidates cast their net wider, considering Source C to be propaganda designed to discredit the Democrats by referring to both Democrat and Republican actions to support their view of the cartoon. Such methods of evaluation were equally valid and led to some perceptive and thoughtful responses.

In general candidates found Sources B and C easier to evaluate, simply because one came from the Republican party, the other from the Democratic party. Source D proved to be a challenge for some as it made no specific mention of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. However, this omission suggests that the Act did little long-term harm to the Democrats, who had won the 1856 presidential election. Source E suggests the same. It describes how the Kansas-Nebraska Act had completed the division of the Whigs and helped create a Republican party which was not particularly successful, either in 1855 or in 1856. This is a perspective that might not be expected from a prominent abolitionist, especially after the Civil War had been won and slavery abolished. Thus some candidates decided that the argument of Source E was more reliable than that of the other sources – especially if the narrative was halted in 1856. If contextual information up to 1860 was considered then some of the information in Source E, showing the steady rise of the Republicans, could also be supported.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that some responses became mired in over-elaborate attempts at evaluation. It is not necessary to distinguish between relevance, reliability and validity of sources and it is costly in terms of time for candidates to apply this approach. Reliability is the key issue and this can be judged in a number of ways, as outlined above. The less reliable a source, the less value it has in relation to the particular hypothesis. The most effective responses ended with a clear conclusion about whether the hypothesis was supported by the sources.

Section B

Question 2

This question was popular and reasonably well answered. Most responses contained relevant knowledge about some forms of federal government support, usually legislative, such as the 1862 Homestead Act and the 1887 Dawes-Severalty Act. Fewer candidates mentioned the help given by the US army in fighting the many Indian wars between 1860 and 1890. Technological innovation was interpreted as covering a range of developments from the 1860s, including the transcontinental railroad to barbed wire and the reaper-binder machine to harvest grain. Candidates who included the concept of manifest destiny could receive little credit for doing so unless they related it directly to the question. Those who achieved this linked the concept to government encouragement, if not outright support, for expansion.

Question 3

There were many well informed responses. Most of those who chose this question realised that the focus was not why the North won the civil war but why it took them four years to do so. Relevant factors which were discussed in many responses included the initial differences of leadership between North and South: Lincoln lacked military experience and effective generals while Davis had both experience and better generals. Many responses commented that the military campaigns of 1861 and 1862 illustrated these differences all too clearly. In addition, the South kept going in 1863-64 in the belief that a prolonged war would divide the North, especially in the 1864 elections, and cause it to sue for peace. Only from the autumn of 1864 and the re-election of Lincoln was it clear that a total Northern victory was just a matter of time. The most effective responses maintained a clear focus throughout and discussed a range of issues.

Question 4

Some of those who chose this question were confused about the period which is described as 'the Progressive era'. A considerable proportion concentrated almost entirely on the 1920s; presumably the area which they were most familiar with. Among those who recognised that the era covered almost the entire period from 1890 to 1920 were some who faltered because they had limited knowledge of the wide range of economic, social and political reforms that required consideration. The best responses covered the whole of the time frame (although not necessarily in the same depth throughout) and analysed the degree of success of the major reforms, such as the anti-trust laws. It was not necessary, or desirable, to list all of the legislation. A more effective approach was to select examples which illustrated the argument most clearly and this was seen in the best responses.

Question 5

This proved to be a popular question although a substantial proportion of responses overlooked its precise terms and wrote more generally about the topic of race relations. Most candidates knew why the civil rights movement made real progress from the 1950s but that was not the focus of this question. The majority of responses contained relevant information about the divided leadership of the early civil rights movement between Booker T Washington and W E B Du Bois. Fewer responses knew of developments from the start of the First World War until the end of the Second. The efforts of A Philip Randolph in the 1930s and 1940s received relatively little attention, for example. Some mentioned the continued dominance of US politics and government by the white majority, but few focused on the predominance in the US Senate of the 'solid South' of white Democrats. Many answers seemed keen to move on to the 1950s and 1960s as quickly as possible. For this coverage however, they could receive little credit.

Question 6

Most responses were well informed about the key opposition groups and individuals, from the Supreme Court to Huey Long. They generally described in some detail why such people opposed the New Deal. To measure the effectiveness of the opposition required some assessment of their impact upon New Deal policies. Many responses made creditable comments in this respect. For example, Dr Francis Townsend was linked with the Social Security Act, while the failure of FDR's court packing plans showed how little the federal government could do to block the opposition of the US Supreme Court. Overall, this question was well answered.

Question 7

The majority of responses drew general contrasts about the attitude of the USA to the League of Nations and the UN. It was universally recognised that the USA stayed out of the League but joined the UN. Some responses pointed out that Roosevelt was successful in mobilising US support behind the UN whereas Wilson failed to gain US support for the League. A number of responses made a valid distinction between the two wars, the First World War being more of a European affair, the Second World War more global, and used this to explain the apparent success of Roosevelt and failure of Wilson. Only a minority of candidates pointed out that talks to form the UN were held in the USA where the UN itself was to be based. By contrast the League was founded in Europe and thus could be seen to distance itself from the USA.

Question 8

Some candidates perceived this question as an opportunity to write about the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Such discussion was relevant if linked to the question. However, for higher marks a broad definition of 'social change' was required. Most of those who focused on a wider definition of US society tended to agree with the quotation, using the changing status of women and the more dissenting attitudes of college students to do so. Some brought into their arguments changes in technology such as the space race and the emergence of computers. Both required very careful handling in order to be relevant to the question. The best essays also considered the counter-argument; the 1950s and 1960s was a period of limited social change for some sections of society and in certain regions of the USA.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

Key messages

- In order to prepare for the examination, it is helpful for candidates to practise writing answers against the clock and to rely on their memory rather than notes.
- A considerable proportion of candidates used formulaic approaches to source analysis and evaluation. While developing a standardised approach can be helpful it can also limit some responses, particularly when the approach taken is over-complex.

General comments

For the source-based question in **Section A**, there is no need to paraphrase the content of a written source or to describe the content of a visual source. Instead, candidates need to *analyse* the sources in order to show how far they support the given hypothesis. For higher marks, responses should *evaluate* the sources beyond face value, using the source, its provenance and other sources or their own knowledge to do so.

For the essay questions in **Section B**, responses should develop a balanced argument which answers the question set. The argument should be structured into a series of key points with a paragraph per point. Each point should be (a) explained, (b) illustrated with relevant and detailed historical evidence and (c) directly related to the question. A conclusion is essential to achieve the higher mark bands. It should reach a judgement in response to the question and be consistent with the argument advanced in the essay.

For both types of question, responses can be improved by the inclusion of some precise, detailed examples to support their arguments. A number of scripts contained essays which involved no more than general historical explanation, often without any reference to specific dates. History is about change and continuity over time. The more specific the evidence and the more secure the chronology, the higher the marks which can be awarded. The best answers are full of such details.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Source A was a cartoon contemporary with and commenting on events in Kansas in the mid-1850s. Some candidates interpreted the cartoon in unusual ways. A few saw the flagpole as the dividing line between images and message on either side. The right-hand side, these candidates explained, illustrated events in the South, the left-hand side events in the North. Some saw the two slaves chained to the flagpole as Mexicans, presumably because of the reference to the Gulf of Mexico in the text above. In all probability – and many candidates pointed this out – the fight to the left of the cartoon almost certainly represents Preston Brooks' assault on Charles Sumner in Congress in May 1856. The allusion was clear to candidates who possessed sound contextual knowledge. Some missed the irony or satire of the cartoon, as shown by the contrast between the reference to modern democracy on the flag of the Democratic candidates and the question asked by the slaves on the ground. The cartoon is anti-Democratic. It portrays Democratic policy in Kansas-Nebraska and elsewhere as unsuccessful. A number of responses made the point that the cartoon makes no explicit reference to Kansas-Nebraska. However, the burning house on the left-hand side is almost certainly a reference to the sacking of Lawrence, Kansas, by border ruffians, also in May 1856. The majority of candidates analysed the source correctly although some took far too long to describe what was happening in the cartoon, for which they received only limited credit.

Fewer responses concentrated on evaluating Source A convincingly. Less effective attempts generally comprised statements along the following lines: 'Source A is a cartoon. Cartoons are biased and one-sided. Therefore Source A is biased and not to be trusted'. This is too general to be considered a historical evaluation which must be more soundly based and more detailed. The most effective responses showed that there were several ways to evaluate the source. Some pointed out that although we do not know much about the cartoon, we know it was drawn in 1856 which was presidential election year. The cartoon portrays 'the Democratic platform' in a very critical way, presumably in an attempt to influence voters. Thus it is definitely one-sided and unreliable. A more common approach was to cross-refer to other sources. Source B makes no specific mention of the Democrat party, which caused some candidates to dismiss it as irrelevant. However, it is linked with squatter sovereignty, the more common and critical term for the Democrats' popular sovereignty, which gave the citizens of a Territory the right to decide whether it was free or slave. Source B clearly shows that the South, which means Southern Democrats, are in danger of losing Kansas to the North. Though no violence is mentioned Source B supports Source A in showing the failure of Democratic policy towards Kansas. Conversely, Source E shows that the Democratic policy of popular sovereignty has been successful in that 'everything of a practical nature has been decided'. There is some difference of opinion regarding the admission of a Territory – presumably Kansas – into the USA but 'this, happily is of little practical importance'. Thus Source E undermines Source A and supports the hypothesis. Coming from a newly-installed Democratic president, however, its reliability is very doubtful. Others used contextual information to assess the cartoon, explaining the sacking of Lawrence and that Senator Sumner was badly beaten up. This knowledge confirms the reliability of Source A; despite being a cartoon, it portrays events that actually happened.

Source D could be used both for and against the assertion and is worth studying in more detail. It is a report of a speech by Lincoln and not the speech itself. In relation to the hypothesis, as some candidates noted, it argues both for and against. In the first half Lincoln explains how slavery was spreading, in other words that the Democrats were succeeding. In the second half he shows how the Democratic party was dividing over the issue of slavery expansion. In this respect, it could be argued that Democratic policies towards Kansas, if they divided the party, were not succeeding. This shows how important it is to read the source very carefully in order to ensure its proper meaning is understood. There were differences of opinion over Source C which shows how repressive Democratic policies were. Was that tyranny a sign of weakness and failure or strength and success? The point could be argued either way so long as it was supported by references to other sources or contextual knowledge.

It is worth mentioning that some candidates employed over-elaborate attempts at evaluation. They attempted to distinguish between relevance, reliability and validity of sources. In doing so they wasted valuable time. Reliability is the key. The less reliable a source, the less value it has in relation to the particular hypothesis. The most effective responses ended with a clear conclusion about whether the hypothesis was supported by the sources.

Section B

Question 2

There are two words in this question which determine its focus and they are 'myth of'. If they are ignored then the question becomes a very different one. Many candidates chose to overlook these words and thus wrote an essay which was marginal to the question. A myth is a simplified, distorted view of complex events, usually with heroes and villains. The best responses recognised that the myth of the Wild West started to grow as the West was being conquered in the second half of the nineteenth century and it continued to grow in the twentieth century. Buffalo Bill's Wild West show began as early as 1883 and lasted until 1906. Dime novels, from the mid-19th century, and the first films, shown in nickelodeons, helped establish the myth. The growth of an urban working class in the cities of the East provided a market for these simplified accounts of life in the West.

Question 3

Most candidates handled this question well. Responses tended to fall into two categories. The first came from candidates who were not so well informed about the policies of the European great powers but understood that the cotton trade with the UK was important to the war, especially in its early years. They quickly moved on to consider other reasons why the civil war was won by the North. The second came from those who were more secure in their knowledge and who knew of the Trent Affair and how the UK was divided over whether or not to intervene. These responses agreed that the decision of Britain and France in 1862-63 not to intervene on the side of the South was important to the outcome of the war.

Question 4

This question was generally well answered and most responses displayed good knowledge. Almost all essays made detailed reference to Ford's production line revolution and were able to explain its effect on the production of Ford motor cars. There was also good coverage of its impact on other manufacturing processes, both in peacetime and in war. Finally, many responses were well balanced showing that they were aware that Ford's methods, though revolutionary, did not bring about a complete transformation of American industry.

Question 5

There were many impressive responses to this question. The majority recognised that the success of mainstream civil rights groups concerned the South, where the Jim Crow era was finally brought to an end. The position of African Americans in the ghettos of Northern cities was not the principle concern of the main civil rights movement and this contrast was personified by the two African American leaders of the period: the moderate Martin Luther King was from the South, the radical Malcolm X grew up in various cities of the North. Candidates knew that while moderate civil rights groups had ended the segregation of white and black they had not ended the racism upon which segregation was based. Some perceptive responses argued that the success of moderate groups helped to cause the rise of black militancy – remedying one problem simply revealed a more fundamental one.

Question 6

The most effective answers focused solely on 1929 and 1939, providing economic, social and political data from the two years in order to establish a careful comparison. A significant minority of responses lacked the knowledge and the confidence to take this approach. Thus they tended to focus on explaining how the USA came to be in the state it was at the end of the two decades. One focus of the question was 1929 but too many wrote too much on the economic boom of the 1920s. The other focus was 1939 but many wrote a lot about the New Deal policies of the 1930s. Only occasionally did candidates make explicit reference to examples of unity or disunity, which is what the question required. Those who produced the best answers had clearly thought carefully about the argument they were constructing and were selective in their approach to the detail they included.

Question 7

Some of those who attempted this question wrote hurried accounts of how the USA became involved in the two world wars, which was to miss the point of the question. Some responses drew clear points of contrast between the two wars. Firstly, many commented on the belated contribution in the First World War compared with the earlier and greater commitment in the Second World War. Secondly, the massive economic contribution in 1941-45, including lend-lease before the war, was compared with a significant but lesser contribution in 1917-18. Finally, a few responses considered the idea that the USA provided the political leadership of the Allied war strategy in the Second World War in a way that neither the USSR nor the UK could.

Question 8

There were too few answers to make general comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/06

Paper 6

Key messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they grouped the sources into those which supported or challenged the hypothesis or prompt. This enabled them to develop focused and balanced arguments. The best responses also commented on the reliability of the sources.

Section B: The most effective responses were focused on the question rather than the topic. Points were supported with relevant examples.

General comments

Good work which demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding was produced by many candidates. It may be that some spent too long on **Question 1** and so produced shorter answers to their other questions. In particular some essays lacked focus on the specific wording of the questions and were short of suitably detailed territorial examples as illustrations of the general points being made.

Thorough work was produced in answers to **Question 1**. All the sources were considered and many showed understanding of the background of the topic and the context of the sources. The majority of responses did not comment on the reliability of sources. For example, the writer of Source D seemed to be uncritically enthusiastic about the outcomes of emancipation. The reasons behind his approach might have been questioned or considered in order to achieve the higher mark levels.

In answering **Section B**, most candidates completed the required three questions. Sometimes answers were short but they were usually fully relevant. Occasionally a candidate misread a question or focused on the topic rather than the question. In some scripts this happened with **Question 5**. The question was about peasantries and their effects on plantation economies. Some wrote about the emergence, development and results of the formation of peasantries rather than the interrelation of peasantry and plantation. There were times when candidates did not include in their answers specific consideration of the first few words of the question; 'how important,' 'to what extent' or 'assess the effectiveness.' Thoughts about these key phrases enhance the resulting answers. There were some responses which made hardly any detailed reference to different territories. The experiences in Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados and Cuba were very different. Broad generalisations did not cover their varied situations. Many answers would have been improved had these extra dimensions been added to the knowledge, selection and presentation of the material.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Candidates were asked to consider whether Sources A–E supported the statement that 'In the 1830s, ex-slaves had no more than a promise of future freedom.' A significant proportion of candidates took the sources one by one, in alphabetical order, and might have improved their responses if they had grouped the sources into those which supported the hypothesis and those which challenged it. All responses recognised that Source A stated that 'the entire abolition of slavery' should take place, then went on to apply conditions to what that would mean. It would be 'subject to the restriction of labouring for their present owners.' Source B referred to apprenticeship and the right to purchase freedom. This suggested that only those willing and able to pay could be freed. Many responses pointed out that both sources seemed to agree that freedom for all would come sometime in the future. Source C caused some difficulty in interpretation. It concerned Antigua. The suggestion in the first paragraph that 'unrestricted freeing of slaves should happen almost

immediately', seemed to contradict Sources A and B. The second paragraph reveals the reasons for this. The nature of the island was such that labourers would have utter dependence on the proprietor for the means of procuring food, because of the frequent droughts and the absence of unoccupied lands; they would in practice be no more free than they had been. The best responses recognised that this was the message of the source.

Sources D and E seem to suggest that once the apprenticeship was over a wider definition of freedom became possible. Though Source D was written in 1861 it refers to events in the 1830s and ends on a note of triumph as the event marks the 'commencement not only on liberty but of an independent peasantry in the island of Jamaica.' Source E contains the view about former slaves as being 'independent of labour on the plantations', the gaining of 'proper wages' for their work, and being able to settle wages 'more at the will of the labourer than at that of his employer.' Signs of a broader freedom are detected and it would have been useful for candidates to consider what motive lay behind the Governor's words.

Many candidates worked their way carefully through the sources, making comments about the context and meanings of the various pieces based on their own knowledge. There was very limited discussion of the meaning of 'freedom'. Candidates could have argued that despite their differences, all the sources suggest a limited view of freedom. Many candidates simply concluded their essays by repeating points previously made, rather than offering a discussion of whether challenge or support for the hypothesis was preferred.

Section B

Question 2

Most candidates opted for a multi-causal approach, dealing with economic arguments, humanitarian campaigns and the actions of the slaves themselves. Some took account of the events in Britain and France which helped to trigger the emancipation measures at specific times. Answers were often written in general terms, especially on economic issues. Specific consideration of British, French and Spanish emancipations helped to expand the explanations in some of the most effective answers. Candidates rarely attempted to explain the relative importance of each factor. A few suggested that, taken together, these factors illustrated what happened. The majority mentioned that over the years different historians have emphasised one of the causes as the most important, but did not go on to develop this discussion by relating it to their own argument.

Question 3

Two elements occurred in many answers. It was widely recognised that a common theme behind each Act was the desire to preserve the labour forces for plantations. Most candidates also referred to the fact that schemes did not work out as expected by those who designed them and some ended prematurely.

Candidates usually discussed the situation in individual territories, one at a time. Some displayed impressive knowledge in this respect. The element of comparison was not strong and a thematic approach would have improved some responses. Themes could have been developed around issues such as the length of time before full freedom was granted, the level of compensation to slave owners, the treatment of children and opportunities for manumission. The emphasis in many answers was on describing what happened rather than establishing the similarities and differences between areas.

Question 4

Candidates usually made a good range of points about the attitudes of former slave owners and freed people. Stress was laid on the fact that owners were anxious to retain labour and often acted towards freed people as they had done during slave times. Coercive tactics received most attention in responses, conciliatory treatment was less fully explained. The situations in different territories received least attention (e.g. Barbados compared to Trinidad) and inclusion of comparative details such as this would have improved weaker responses.

Most answers were strong on the aims and ideas of the emancipated slaves and also their reactions to former slave owners who did not seem to adapt to changed circumstances. As above, some answers did not work out how situations dictated by geography were significant. Metayage was mentioned regularly. It was usually dealt with in one or two sentences rather than more fully in a whole paragraph. Some responses recognised that to many owners it was a temporary expedient, involving less control and a situation to be exploited selfishly.

Question 5

This question was chosen by many candidates and was often very well done. A few read the question being directly about the development of peasantries and wrote answers which went beyond plantations, alternative life opportunities and social and institutional developments. However, most responses contained much material which was relevant. To deal adequately with the extent to which plantation economies were affected candidates should have looked at territorial differences, as well as issues related to the labour 'crisis'. The already ailing sugar industry in Jamaica suffered much from labour problems, and other conditions, and declined further. Many commented on the extension of peasantries, seeing it as one more difficulty. Trinidad, with a comparatively small labour force and also affected by the peasantry, experimented with immigration schemes until, by the 1850s, Indian immigration contributed to an upturn in fortunes. This issue could be used to address the extent to which peasantries affected the sugar economy.

Question 6

There were some excellent answers to this question. Most responses defined the problems by reference to British Caribbean territories. Issues such as the impact of Emancipation and the Sugar Duties Act, competition from other producers of both cane and beet sugar and more local problems such as a shortage of capital, poor estate management and lack of innovation were discussed. The introduction of more machinery, amalgamation of estates, better management (Barbados and Trinidad), use of the Encumbered Estates Act and immigrant labour were commonly explained as efforts to deal with the problems. Weaker answers were often very generalised, giving the impression that all areas faced the same issues and dealt with them in the same ways. It appeared that some responses lost sight of the need to assess the effectiveness of the planters' efforts. Whatever the success in some areas, none approached that of Cuba which was generally omitted from responses.

Question 7

The majority of answers tended to be short in length and lacking in detail. In some responses the starting date of 1850 was ignored. Candidates who were confident in their knowledge linked the start date with the influx of Indian immigrant labour and the failure of estate owners and managers to take the necessary steps needed to avoid high mortality rates. Then the various government steps to improve the situation were outlined. Such attention to the starting point for the essay tended to lead to more effective responses.

Question 8

There were fewer responses to this question. The problems of Jamaica in the early 1860s were the background to events at Stony Gut and Morant Bay. One outcome was the Jamaica Act (1866) which imposed crown colony government on the island. J P Grant became Governor. He achieved many changes and these were discussed to some degree in most responses. To balance this argument some responses recognised that there were downsides, for instance the Governor's rule was autocratic and most senior government officials were from Britain.