

# HISTORY

---

Paper 2162/01  
Paper 1

## General comments

In the strongest scripts, candidates wrote detailed answers to four questions; these answers demonstrated knowledge and understanding the events that took place, and that information was used accurately to answer the questions.

Many weaker candidates did not answer four questions successfully. Some candidates answered fewer than four questions. This means that that these candidates cannot earn any marks for those questions. Other candidates wrote answers to topics that are generally less well-known in the history of Mauritius, but did not answer questions on topics that are generally well known. These answers were often not successful. Other candidates answered four questions on more well-known topics and were awarded some marks even if their answers were not very strong.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A*

#### **Question 1**

Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the events surrounding the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, including the ineffective intervention by the League of Nations. The reasons for the failure of the League to maintain peace were not as well explained in responses, with answers tending to focus on the failure in Manchuria. In many answers, candidates wrote in general terms about weaknesses of the League (such as its lack armed forces, the failure of Britain and France to offer full support and the absence of the USA). This information was not focussed on answering the question, and could only low marks. The answers that received higher marks addressed the question directly because they referred to the specific events of the early 1930s.

#### **Question 2**

Candidates answering this question often wrote about the reasons for Japan's defeat, but did not describe the main events of the Japanese attacks. Many answers described the reasons for the Japanese attacks but this was not the focus of the questions. Stronger answers included details of the events of 7 December 1941 and the impact of the attacks.

#### **Question 3**

There were too few responses to this question for a report to be written.

#### **Question 4**

There were too few responses to this question for a report to be written.

### *Section B*

#### **Question 5**

Most candidates answering this question wrote in detail about the work of Labourdonnais in the Ile de France, but some candidates' responses describing the work of Pierre Poivre, which could not be credited. Where candidates were able to show how Labourdonnais's work brought about stability and development, high marks were awarded for the second part of the question. The first part of the question was less well answered and some candidates did not answer this part of the question.

### Question 6

Candidates answering this question often wrote extensively about the Corsairs, but without any direct reference to the two questions set. Stronger answers linked the information to the activities of the Corsairs. Answers would have improved if they had also explained the impact on the Ile de France.

### Question 7

Responses to this question often explained of the role of the Ile de France in the Seven Years' War that was not accurate, with some candidates uncertain about the events of the period. In more successful answers, candidates explained how a major impact of the war was direct control by the French Crown and significant development of Port Louis and agriculture.

### Question 8

In most answers, candidates recounted the events of 1809/10 which resulted in the British taking control. Details of the British blockade and the decision by Decaen to surrender were frequently given to show how the take-over occurred. These answers achieved good marks, but where candidates were able to show how administrative changes and reconstruction took place in the first decade of the nineteenth century, higher reward was given.

### Question 9

This was a question where candidates were able to demonstrate significant depth of knowledge in their responses and, as a result, many scored high marks. The negotiations between the French planters and the British were generally well-explained, as was the opposition created by the attitude of Jeremie. Most candidates' answers were also improved when they explained the importance of compensation and fears of the impact on the sugar trade in opposing emancipation.

### Question 10

This question was often answered successfully by many candidates. Candidates generally had a good understanding of how slave labour was gradually replaced, both by the recruitment of workers from India under the system of indentured labour, and by the hiring of ex-slaves. The importance of the British decision to reduce duty on Mauritian sugar, and of the introduction of more effective work practices and communications, were also explained by many candidates.

### Question 11

Candidates answering this question demonstrated a good understanding of the destruction caused by cyclones. A few very strong answers also discussed epidemics, such as those of smallpox, cholera, influenza and malaria. Explanations of the significant development of Port Louis were generally explained by the population growth and British desires to bring about improvements; this contributed to some good answers. Weaker answers would have benefitted from more detailed knowledge. For example, in addition to naming different epidemics, the best answers also explained how widespread they were and the effect they had.

### Question 12

There were too few responses to this question for a report to be written.

**Question 13**

Candidates who attempted this question demonstrated an understanding about how anti-union measures hindered improvements for workers. Answers would have been improved had they included an explanation of the role of the Hooper Commission.

**Question 14**

There were too few responses to this question for a report to be written.

**Question 15**

Candidates who attempted this question demonstrated an understanding of the fact that there were differences between the parties on the shape of independence and how it should be achieved. Answers would have been improved had they included an explanation of the two Constitutional Conferences.

**Question 16**

There were too few responses to this question for a report to be written.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 2162/02  
Paper 2

## Key messages

The most successful responses made a direct attempt to address the question. For instance, where a question asked candidates why a source was published at a particular time, the best responses focused on providing a reason. Information about the message of the source or the context was only valid if they were explained as reasons for publication.

**Questions 3 and 4** required candidates to address the trustworthiness of one source and the utility of another. Few responses used contextual knowledge or cross references to other sources to test the claims made in order to assess the reliability, and therefore the utility or validity, of the information it contained.

Answers to **Question 5** sometimes demonstrated poor technique. Several candidates produced answers which were entirely one-sided. Others candidates write about the topic, summarising the sources, or wrote generally about provenance of the sources, and only answered the question at the end of their response. Better answers answered the question straight away before getting around to answering the question.

## General comments

Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the events surrounding the Disarmament Conference. Few candidates used specific details from their contextual knowledge to assess the claims made in the source. Few candidates considered the purpose or motive of the authors of the sources when they evaluated the claims made in the sources. It is important to note that sources cannot be tested using knowledge of events which have yet to occur. For instance, many candidates considered that **Source D** (from 1933) was trustworthy because of events which happened later in the 1930s. To be valid, the knowledge used must relate to events which have already happened or were ongoing at the time the source was produced.

Most answers showed sound comprehension of the source material and were focused on the demands of the question. In some cases, answers would have been more effective if they had been better planned and thought through. For example, **Question 2** required candidates to make a comparison. Many candidates wrote unfocused, lengthy responses which contained numerous attempted comparisons which were invalid. A more effective approach would be to spend some time carefully reading the sources and isolating the details or sub-messages which could be compared and supported from both sources. Some answered the question using the source(s) as required and then added a supplementary paragraph of contextual knowledge. While this was often accurate and detailed, it did not gain additional marks. This approach was particularly noticeable in answers to **Question 5**.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Question 1**

This question asked why a cartoon was published. The key issue with responses to questions like this is that there must be an element of 'this source was published at this time because...' in the answer.

Many achieved this by referring to the general context, explaining the source was published because the Disarmament Conference was taking place. Most responses used messages from the source as the reason for publication. For instance, many argued that the cartoon was published to show that the Disarmament Conference was going to fail, supporting their ideas with reference to source details. Some explained that the source was published due to the specific context of 1933. Such responses often argued that the source was

published to show that the Conference would fail because leading powers were missing, such as Japan which was no longer a member of the League. They made good use of their contextual understanding to explain this point. Others focused on reasons related to the actions of Germany following Hitler's appointment as Chancellor. It is important to note that to be valid the context must relate to 1933 or earlier. It was not acceptable to argue that the source was published to show that Hitler was going to remilitarise the Rhineland as this was not yet known. Weaker answers sometimes misinterpreted the source, often arguing that it had been published to show British support for Hitler's rise to power. Others interpreted the source in a sensible way but lacked a reason for publication. A small minority of candidates simply wrote about the context without focusing on the source.

### Question 2

Candidates were asked to compare **Sources B** and **C** to decide whether they showed that the USA had changed its mind about disarmament. Most understood that to do this they should compare the content for agreements and/or disagreements. Many responses concluded that the sources showed the US had changed its mind. The most frequently seen argument was that in **Source B** the US refused to give up its right to a fleet of battleships but in **Source C** seemed to have a more positive attitude towards the restriction of armaments. More perceptive responses went further to claim that the US had not entirely changed its mind as there was still 'disappointment' with the progress made in **Source C** which backed up the negative view seen in **Source B**. A few used their knowledge of US foreign policy to evaluate one of the sources. They argued that, following their decision not to join the League of Nations and develop an isolationist foreign policy, the US had no intention of being involved with the League's plans for disarmament and so **Source C** seemed to show a change of mind. It was also possible to consider Swanson's motives in either source to assess his purpose in giving a negative message about disarmament in **Source B** or a positive message in **Source C**. Weaker responses generally lacked valid comparisons between the sources, often claiming that the sources showed a change of mind but picking out a detail or message from one source which was not compared with information from the other.

### Question 3

This question required evaluation of **Source D** to decide if it was trustworthy. Many responses focused on the provenance of the source, arguing that it was by the German Foreign Minister and, as he was at the meeting in question and an expert in German foreign policy, it should be trusted. Others took the source content at face value and argued that the source was trustworthy as what the Minister said was true. More effective responses used their contextual knowledge to challenge or support the claims made in the source to assess whether it was reliable and hence trustworthy. The source was dated October 1933 and it was only possible to test the claims in the source using knowledge of developments in Germany by this time. Several responses argued it was a trustworthy source because Hitler developed aggressive policies, such as the introduction of conscription or the invasion of Poland. As these events had not happened, they could not be used to evaluate the source. More effective answers used their knowledge of Hitler's aims, for instance to undo the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, to show that the Minister was not entirely trustworthy and may have been making excuses to free Germany from the requirement to disarm. Others used their knowledge, or cross references to other sources, to test claims in the source about the 'highly armed states' who had refused to disarm. Few responses considered the purpose of the source to evaluate its trustworthiness.

### Question 4

Candidates were required to assess the utility of **Source E** as evidence about disarmament. Successful responses were focused on useful/not useful throughout. Some answers assessed the utility of the source by its provenance, arguing that it was bound to be useful/useless because it was from Arthur Henderson who had just been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work on the Disarmament Commission. Such answers usually took the line that it was not useful as he was bound to be biased in favour of disarmament. Most argued that it was useful based on the information it contained, for instance showing that Henderson believed disarmament could still be achieved. The most effective answers understood that the reliability of the source could be tested to prove its usefulness. These used either contextual knowledge or other sources to assess whether what Henderson said was reliable and therefore useful. For instance, **Source A** could be used to show that Henderson was being optimistic as it was clear from the cartoon that the Conference would fail. Others used **Source D** to challenge Henderson's comment that Germany might return. Weaker responses often resulted from a lack of focus on the question. It is not enough to make a claim that the source is useful and then write about the context.

### Question 5

The most effective answers used evidence from the sources to support and challenge the statement that 'The Disarmament Conference was a complete failure.' Some grouped the sources into 'support' and 'not support' sets. This approach was only effective if sources were considered individually within each section of the response. If sources are grouped and treated as a block, comment on whether they support or challenge the statement in the question can only be credited if the comment can be applied to all the sources. A large proportion of responses took a source by source approach and this was often highly effective. To be credited some evidence from the source content was required, alongside an explanation of how the detail selected linked to the issue of whether the Disarmament Conference failed. Generally, answers saw **Sources A, B** and **D** as evidence of failure, while **Sources C** and **E** offered evidence of at least a degree of success. It was possible to see both sides of the argument in **Source C**. While Swanson accepted that there were some positive developments, he also expressed disappointment that some issues were unresolved. Some responses attempted to assess the reliability of the sources. For instance, **Source E** seemed to offer strong evidence of success but was also considered an unreliable source given its purpose. A significant minority of responses were seen which offered a 'reliability paragraph', giving stock evaluation of each of the sources (such as 'it is from a Senator and therefore must be true') without considering how the purpose or context of a source impacted on its value as evidence. A small number of weaker responses wrote about the sources but made no explanatory link between their commentary on the source and the question. The least effective responses took the form of an essay on the topic with no reference to the sources.