

HISTORY (MAURITIUS)

Paper 2162/01
Mauritius and Modern World Affairs

General comments

Many candidates were able to answer all four of their chosen questions. Responses were generally clustered around a smaller range of questions than in previous years. There were no, or very few, responses to half of the questions set.

Candidates should be able to provide detailed knowledge, and avoid irrelevance, by focusing their responses directly on the question. This will allow for higher marks to be awarded.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This was a very popular question, and most candidates showed a good understanding of what territory was taken from Germany at Versailles and of the reasons for Germany's reluctance to sign the treaty. Some candidates could improve their responses by giving more precise information (e.g., instead of saying '*Germany lost land to France*', giving details of the land lost, such as Alsace and Lorraine). The best responses explained why the stated reason (e.g. '*the Treaty limited Germany's armed forces*') was a factor for making Germany not want to sign the treaty.

Question 2

Most candidates showed an understanding of the aims and the structure of the League, but many were not able to give details of the work of its individual agencies. While candidates showed some knowledge of the Italian invasion of Abyssinia as an historical event, few were able to provide the reasons for the League's inability to stop the invasion to gain full marks.

Question 3

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 4

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 5

This was a very popular question. While knowledge of the work of Cossigny was not always demonstrated, candidates were very good at explaining why Labourdonnais was successful as Governor of the Ile de France. His work was well known. Responses tended to be a little descriptive and could be improved further by focusing on explanation, but generally candidates performed well on this question with many receiving high marks.

Question 6

Knowledge of the effects of the Seven Years War on the Ile de France could be improved, as responses did not demonstrate strong understanding of the topic. However, there were some good responses on the work of Pierre Poivre, particularly in relation to his agricultural reforms and his improvements to the infrastructure of Port Louis.

Question 7

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 8

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 9

Candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge about the sugar industry in this period. Some weaker responses described what the candidate knew about the industry, rather than explaining how it grew in the first half of the nineteenth century and the reasons for that growth. Consequently, there was a great deal of irrelevant and unrewarded material provided. In stronger responses, candidates cited figures to demonstrate growth and explained the importance of the 1825 decision by the British to grant the Mauritius sugar industry the same terms as those applying to the Caribbean.

Question 10

Most candidates wrote well on the problems faced by Port Louis at this time. Responses frequently cited the problems created by the issue of slavery, the impact of natural disasters, and the effects of outbreaks of cholera, smallpox and malaria. Responses to the question of why the British found it difficult to make reforms showed somewhat weaker knowledge of the topic, although there were some good references to the reluctance to develop and the issues with slave owners.

Question 11

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 12

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 13

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 14

There were too few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 15

This was not a popular question, with only a small number of candidates attempting it. Responses showed that detailed knowledge about the improvements in health and education could be improved. Candidates were able to gain some marks by adopting a 'common sense' approach to the question. Unsupported, but still accurate, statements were made about the building of facilities and the government's emphasis on raising educational standards. This allowed for responses to be awarded partial marks.

Question 16

This was not a popular question, but candidates who answered it often demonstrated good understanding of the importance of tourism to the island, particularly in terms of its impact on employment and the provision of revenue for the government to support economic development. Responses about the diversification of the economy showed less depth of knowledge, though some candidates were able to describe how the economy has moved away from a dependence on sugar and is increasingly tourism-based.

HISTORY (MAURITIUS)

Paper 2162/02
International Relations and
Developments

Key messages

The purpose of this paper is to assess the ability to interpret and evaluate sources in the context of a specific historical event or development. The key to writing effective responses is to focus on the question. For example, when a question asks about the usefulness of a source, the strongest responses made a clear link to 'useful' or 'not useful' and used the content and provenance of the source to support that argument.

If a question asks whether one source makes another source surprising, it is necessary to make comparisons between the sources and then link this back to the question of surprise. The point of comparison needs to be a criterion which can be applied to both sources. The argument made about surprise needs to make sense in the context of the comparison.

The content of the sources should be used to address the questions. Short quotations are an effective way to illustrate a point in the response. It is not necessary to copy out long sections of the source, and contextual knowledge is only relevant if used to answer the question.

General comments

Some responses showed understanding of the causes and events of the Korean War. However, to be relevant, answers need to be based on the content of the sources more than knowledge of the context. It is valid to use contextual knowledge to test the claims made by a source – for example, in a question which asks whether a source is useful or reliable – but that contextual knowledge must be used to analyse the source rather than included for its own sake. Paragraphs of contextual knowledge which are not used to analyse the source in response to the question will not gain extra marks.

Many answers demonstrated good comprehension of the source material and were focused on the demands of the questions. It is important that candidates note the focus on the question before writing their answer. For example, **Question 3** required candidates to explain why President Eisenhower made a speech at a particular time. Responses needed to be based on the idea that '*Eisenhower made this speech at this time because...*' to be relevant. Some responses analysed the sources in a sensible way but did not make a clear link to the question to explain why the speech was made.

It is important to note that it will always be possible to produce a two-sided answer to **Question 5**. Effective responses to this question used quotations from the sources to show how some supported the statement and how others challenged it. Several one-sided answers were seen, while a few summarised the sources without addressing the question.

Few responses achieved the higher levels of evaluation of the sources through consideration of their purpose or by cross-referencing. In a question about the usefulness of a source (**Question 4**), it is possible to use contextual knowledge to test the claims a source makes to decide if it is reliable and therefore useful. It is also possible to consider the purpose of the speaker or writer to assess whether the source has an ulterior motive and how this might affect the usefulness of the source.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates were given a cartoon showing the United Nations and Korea and asked to explain the message of the cartoon. Many answers identified at least one valid sub-message of the source, such as, *'the source shows that the United Nations is powerful'* or *'the source shows that Korea is being divided.'* The most effective answers focused on the main message of the source that the UN's involvement in Korea would make the situation worse. Many responses commented that the cartoon showed that Korea was being harmed by UN intervention. The best responses made effective use of source details to support the answer, by suggesting that the UN was much bigger than Korea so it might be bullying Korea. Other responses pointed out that Korea was in pain or shouting for help, so UN intervention was damaging. Few candidates misinterpreted the source, although a small minority wrote about the context with limited reference to the cartoon.

Question 2

This question asked whether candidates were surprised by Source C having read Source B. Source B was a written source and Source C was a cartoon. There were many effective responses, which were based on valid comparisons between the sources and made valid links to the question of whether the comparison made the source surprising or not. It was possible to find agreements and disagreements in detail and message between the sources. Most importantly, responses needed to ensure the details matched and the comparison supported the argument about surprise.

Many candidates argued that they were surprised because the sources disagreed. For example, answers were seen along these lines: *'I am surprised by Source C, because Source B is positive about how well the UN are doing in Korea, but Source C is not. In Source B, the soldiers are heroic and superior to the enemy. The writer is confident the UN will win. However, this is different from the image shown in Source C, where peace is out of reach and there are mounting casualties and expenses.'* Fewer candidates argued that they were not surprised based on the argument that Source B showed *'the UN might be in trouble as it was outnumbered, and this agrees with Source C where the UN soldier is definitely in trouble.'* Either argument was valid. A small number of responses considered the purpose of one of the sources, generally arguing that Source B did not make Source C surprising, because it was a message from the commander of the UN and US forces and *'therefore he was bound to be positive when sending a message to the troops'*. It was rare to see candidates use the different dates of the sources, and their understanding of the context, to explain why the sources were different and therefore not surprising. Source C was published over a year after Source B. By July 1952, it was clear the war had reached a stalemate. Weaker responses sometimes lacked valid comparisons, and a minority of answers compared the sources without making a link to the issue of surprise.

Question 3

This question asked why US President Eisenhower made a speech in July 1953. In general, the question was answered well, with many responses providing a reason for publication. Some referred to the general context, explaining that the speech was made because the armistice in Korea was about to be signed. Some responses took this idea a step further and argued, *'This speech was made at this time to tell the American people that the Korean War was at an end'*, using the message of the source as a reason. Others focused more specifically on what Eisenhower wanted to tell people about the UN. For example, responses suggested that *'Eisenhower made this speech at this time because he wanted people to know that the United Nations, supported by the United States and other nations had been successful in Korea.'* The best responses understood the purpose behind the source and argued that *'Eisenhower made the speech to justify US and UN involvement in Korea and show that it had been the right decision to get involved. This would make it more likely that the American people would support the policy of the US government during the Cold War.'* Some weaker responses interpreted the source in a sensible way but lacked a reason for the speech. The weakest responses copied sections of the source text or wrote only about the context.

Question 4

This question asked how useful Source E was as evidence about the outcome of the Korean War. It was critical that answers addressed utility with a statement such as *'this source is useful because...'* Many responses argued that the source was useful, because it gave information about the end of the Korean War. For example, the source was useful because it said that the armistice was *'a great victory of the heroic Korean people.'* Other responses were focused on the provenance, arguing that the source was not useful, because it was by the leader of the Soviet Union and might show bias in favour of North Korea, a fellow

communist state. A small number of candidates used their contextual knowledge to develop this idea, adding that the Soviet Union had supported North Korea in the war and would want to show a positive outcome. Several of the best responses considered whether the source was reliable, using cross-reference to another source to support or challenge what the leader of the USSR said. For example, there was a clear contradiction between Sources E and D, and some argued this meant Source E was not reliable and therefore not useful. Weaker responses often interpreted the source in a sensible way but lacked a clear argument about its usefulness.

Question 5

The most effective answers used evidence from the sources to support and challenge the statement that 'The United Nations mission in Korea was successful.' Some responses grouped the sources into 'support' and 'challenge' sets. This approach only works if each source is considered individually within the support or challenge argument. If sources are grouped together, the argument that they support or challenge the statement must be valid for all the sources in the group. Other responses took an equally valid source-by-source approach, in which each source is tested against the hypothesis. As well as identifying whether the source supports or challenges the statement, it is necessary to use the source content to explain how that source supports or challenges the statement.

Sources B and D provided evidence of the UN being successful. In Source B, the commander described the soldiers as having '*professional skill, determination, courage*' and these were all positive characteristics which suggest the UN would prevail. Some responses also used Source B to support the hypothesis, by pointing out that it referred to the superior firepower of the UN. Likewise, Source D suggested that the UN mission was successful. Responses often quoted Eisenhower's comment that the UN had met the '*challenge of aggression*' with '*deeds of decisive purpose*'.

On the other side of the argument, Sources A, C and E challenged the statement. Responses argued that Source A showed that the UN made things worse for the Korean people and this was hardly a sign of success. The soldier in Source C was on the '*rocky road to nowhere*', and other problems such as '*rising costs*', '*mounting casualties*' and '*world apathy*' implied the UN was not successful. Lastly, Source E claimed that North Korea, not the UN, was victorious in the Korea War.

Some weaker responses only addressed one side of the argument. The weakest responses discussed the sources but made no explanatory link to the question, or they wrote broadly about the Korean War with no reference to the sources.