

HISTORY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 25	26 - 37	38 - 48	49 - 59	60 - 69	70 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 47	48 - 59	60 - 70	71 - 100

Higher and standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The vast majority of the samples submitted in this session chose topics with a narrow focus and a clear research topic. Only a small number of candidates continued to choose subjects that could not be investigated in 2000 words, because they were too broad or vague. Some candidates still need more help in focusing on a narrow and structured topic and framing a question.

The use of referencing was good and most candidates followed a standard method for the production of their bibliographies.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A. Plan of the investigation

Most candidates scored well in this criterion. In some cases the plan was too generalized and either the methodology or the scope was not clearly stated or developed.

Criterion B. Summary of evidence

In this criterion, most candidates achieved at least satisfactory levels. More selection of the sources of evidence to be used was apparent and there were many examples of topics that had been researched very thoroughly. There were some cases, though, of evidence being utilized that was not focused upon the demands of the question being set and had poor structure.

Criterion C. Evaluation of sources

There was evidence of a growing awareness of the need to look at origins, purpose, value and limitation and their evaluation. This is an area which is improving. Fewer candidates based their attempted evaluation solely on the content of the two sources.

Criterion D. Analysis

There were some good examples of critical analysis being demonstrated and of placing the study into its broader historical context. However, few candidates attempted to discuss alternative interpretations in their section. On the positive side, more candidates are clearly differentiating between B and D in their analysis and, therefore, are developing a broader range of historical skills.

Criterion E. Conclusion

Overall this was appropriate, but some candidates introduced new material or quotations, or made judgments which were not necessarily supported by their earlier sections.

Criterion F. Sources and word limit

The main issue in this criterion was the limited use of sources by the candidates. Most sources were listed in alphabetical order, but in some instances, sources referred to in the body of the text were not included in the bibliography. There is still a heavy reliance on internet sources. The word limit had been adhered to.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Encourage students to frame the topic as a particular question with a narrow focus.
- Remind students of the limitations of the internet as a resource and, in particular, remind them to ask the same evaluation questions when using internet sources as would be applied to any historical source.
- Encourage and/or challenge candidates to examine more than a single point of view about the selected topic.

Higher and standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 25

General comments

The G2 forms sent to IBCA by the schools indicated that the November 2006 paper one was well received. 10 centres found it easier than November 2005, 28 thought it was of a similar standard and 5 found it a little more difficult. 46 schools found the paper suitable while two centres found it too easy. 48 schools found the syllabus coverage satisfactory or good, 44 found the clarity of wording satisfactory or good (four found it poor), and 48 schools found the presentation satisfactory or good. The comments that were received were also, generally speaking, highly complimentary. “An excellent question paper” (two schools), “very good questions-suited students” knowledge”, “offered students excellent opportunities to apply their knowledge and skills”, etc. There were one or two detracting comments “a pity foreign policy not yet examined as such”. It was clear that the vast majority of

centres found the Paper fair and appropriate. Stalin was the most popular choice, followed by Mao and then Czechoslovakia.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

The most frequent weakness in candidates' answers was either using an extensive description of what the sources said, rather than undertaking a comparative analysis. In some cases, where comparative analysis was attempted, the candidates' comparison or contrast was based upon differing elements which were not able to be compared and contrasted, for example where source B is a secondary source and has a different style from source A. The candidates were unable to discuss the values and limitations of primary and secondary sources in any meaningful way and it is suggested that teachers try to avoid these terms when teaching the skills of source analysis. Too many candidates are writing "because a source is primary it is intrinsically more reliable than a secondary source", which is simply not the case.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

The level of knowledge displayed was often appropriate, but the factual command of the subject was not always applied in the most effective and productive fashion. The candidates had a good contextual knowledge of the areas in question.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Questions 1(a), 5(a) and 9(a)

- 1. (a) According to Source A, why was Prokofiev unhappy in Paris?*
- 5. (a) According to Source C, why had many leading figures in the Guomindang (Kuomintang) lost faith in their own party and government by 1946–9?*
- 9. (a) According to Source A, what changes did Dubcek begin to introduce in Czechoslovakia in 1968?*

There was a tendency for candidates to "lift" extensive extracts from the sources rather than paraphrasing them in their own words. This also meant that there was little analysis or commentary on the material, resulting in frequent examiners' comments that there was little linkage to the actual question that was set.

Questions 1(b), 5(b) and 9(b)

- 1. (b) To what extent was Prokofiev's return to Moscow, as recorded in Source A, successful?*

Very few candidates linked Prokofiev's difficulties to the "terror years".

- 5 (b) What message does Source E convey about the economic situation in China in 1948?*

This was well answered by the vast majority of candidates who were readily able to identify the photograph's central message and to support their comments with an appropriate explanation.

9 (b) *What message is suggested by Source B about the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia?*

The caption and footer gave away much of the material needed to answer this question. Weaker candidates merely described the cartoon, rather than interpreting it.

Questions 2, 6 and 10

2. *Compare and contrast the views of the purges under Stalin as expressed in Sources C and D.*

6. *Compare and contrast the reasons for Communist victory in 1949 as expressed in Sources B and D.*

10. *Compare and contrast the reasons for the invasion of Czechoslovakia as expressed in Sources A and C.*

By far the greatest weakness here is that the candidates described the content of the two sources rather than comparing and contrasting them. The best way to gain marks on this type of question is to explicitly link the two sources in a running comparison and contrast. Candidates who deal with the two sources separately in an “end-on” manner do not score highly unless there is then another paragraph which actually carries out a compare/contrast analysis.

Questions 3, 7 and 11

3. *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source B and Source E for historians studying the impact of Stalin’s purges and terror on society.*

7. *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source A and Source D for historians studying Communist victory and Nationalist collapse by 1949.*

11. *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source D and Source E for historians studying the Cold War in the late 1960s.*

Too many candidates are ignoring the four parts of the rubric—origin, purpose, values and limitations—which must be applied to both of the sources. Examiners are instructed not to award maximum marks if the entire rubric is not followed. Here again, candidates tended to describe the content of the sources rather than analysing them in the context set by the rubric.

Question 3: it was not really relevant to comment that Source B (Mandelstam) was published before the opening of the Soviet archives. The author had experienced conditions first-hand and was writing as an eyewitness, not as an historian.

Question 7: many candidates considered the propagandist nature of Source A (Mao), but only a few candidates suggested that Source C (Jiang) might have a similar purpose.

Question 11: candidates found it hard to identify any limitations for Source D (Quitmet).

Questions 4, 8 and 12

4. *Using these sources and your own knowledge, analyse the effects of Stalin’s purges on society.*

8. *Using these sources and your own knowledge, explain why the Guomindang (Kuomintang) failed to hold on to power in China (1946–9).*

12. *Using these sources and your own knowledge, analyze the impact on the Cold War of developments in Czechoslovakia in 1968.*

There are still too many candidates who only use either the sources or their own knowledge and who do not attempt a synthesis of the two components.

Question 4: candidates were able to describe the purges and what they did, but were not able to discuss, in any detail, their effects on Soviet society.

Question 8: this was well handled by most candidates, who attempted relatively simplistic explanations of the GMD/CCP struggles.

Question 12: candidates knew quite a bit about the Prague Spring, but were unable to effectively discuss the effect that this had on the Cold War. There was a dearth of detailed knowledge on events after 1968.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Training in a variety of non-textual source material should improve candidates’ understanding of irony in cartoons or enable them to carry out a more careful interpretation of figures/tables.
- When writing compare and contrast responses, candidates should spend a few minutes of their time planning their answer. This should result in a better-structured response, which should gain higher marks.
- Candidates do not always read the questions carefully enough, and therefore miss the point of the question. A case in point here is Question 12, which some candidates read as the effect of the Cold War on Czechoslovakia.
- End-on responses do not score as highly as interfaced responses which explicitly compare and contrast the two sources.
- Candidates must not describe the content of sources if the rubric is calling for an analysis of these sources.

Higher and standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 22	23 - 26	27 - 40

General comments

Based upon the return of forms from centres (G2 Forms) and from Examiner Reports, it would appear that the great majority of respondents were satisfied that the paper was of a similar level of challenge to last year’s and that in terms of syllabus coverage, clarity of wording and presentation there was a high degree of satisfaction. It was pleasing to note that teachers considered that the paper offered a good balance of question types, sufficient scope to allow students to demonstrate in-depth knowledge and skills, accessible questions and “excellent syllabus coverage”. As centres acknowledged, the “open questions provided a good chance to use more study cases than those listed in the guide” and students were offered “excellent opportunities to apply their knowledge and skills”.

Examiners of paper two again noted that although six topic areas are offered there was a very heavy concentration on Topics 1, 3 and 5 and within these topic areas the most popular questions this session were Question 1, Question 11 and Question 21 as was the case in November 2005

interestingly. A continuing development, and source of satisfaction, is the fact that the approach to, and treatment of, “Compare and Contrast” questions has improved significantly. Candidates appear better prepared to answer such questions by carrying out running comparisons in a structured, thematic manner, rather than producing the end-on/sequential types of response which were much apparent in previous examination sessions. Indeed, essay structure in general, in terms of identification and examination of appropriate themes, as opposed to chronological narratives often indiscriminate in their choice of details and/or content has shown signs of improvement.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

As has been written in relation to candidate performance in previous examination reports, for a considerable number of candidates there remains a need to identify exactly what is being asked. As one examiner reported, candidates must “Answer the question that has been set, not the one that the candidate wishes had been set”. To reiterate what has been stated in these annual reports, “Every question/essay sets a task and the task can usually be broken into constituent parts in terms of planning a suitable response”. It remains the case that question analysis—a precise understanding of the task, the key terms in the question, the chronological limits of the question—is vital for success. A sufficient knowledge base is obviously essential, but reliance largely on the setting loose of an avalanche of facts in responses produces efforts which frequently lack relevance or focus on the key issues. Marks continue to be thrown away by failure to identify the task at the outset, or confusion, for example in questions in Topic 3 which concentrate on rise or rule or a mixture of both, in relation to single party rulers/states. Too often candidates fail to identify what aspect is being targeted.

Historiography should be used to supplement the candidate’s response: it should not be a simple regurgitation of what different historians or schools of history state to the exclusion of the provision of the candidate’s own opinion, supported by relevant historical substantiation. Cold War questions in particular any question dealing with origins or development of the conflict, still tend to be an excuse for the parroting of “Orthodox”, “Revisionist” and “Post-revisionist” views. Rarely in such cases is sufficient attention paid to the provision of accurate, relevant historical detail to effectively address the demands of the question.

Candidate performance in all essay responses could be improved significantly by taking time to plan the answer where possible organizing the response into suitable themes rather than producing narrative or descriptive accounts. Candidates might be encouraged to present their plans in their answer booklet (making sure to draw a line through them at the end), as they can be helpful to the marker. Five to ten minutes drawing up an essay plan is time well spent, despite what many candidates may think in their eagerness to address the question.

Chronology continues to provide an area of some concern. Examiners noted once more that there was not a wide use of dates in many essays. History is, of course, more than a knowledge of dates, but it was worrying to note that many candidates seemed to have a very tenuous grasp of the sequence of events in their essays. Hence treatment of cause and effect could at times be very confused and lead to very muddled responses. This reference to the lack of chronology is not new and it is something that needs to be taken on board by centres in the preparation of candidates for examination.

Levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Rubric errors were rare. The majority of candidates were able to answer two questions in the allocated time span and the twentieth century focus was observed in the vast majority of cases.

A significant number of candidates produced responses displaying high levels of historical ability – clearly-structured, coherently-expressed work which focused on the demands of the question. Such

responses reinforce the point that higher awards are given to responses which reveal evidence of planning as well as **sufficient**, relevant and accurate historical knowledge.

Answers providing little more than unsupported opinion and a string of generalizations were present as always and, as always, the award given was less than satisfactory. If, as G2 responses from Centres suggested, the paper **was** accessible and appropriate in terms of level of difficulty, there should have been far fewer weak responses than there were. Candidates have to be made aware of the necessity of providing convincing substantiation in their historical writing.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war

Question 1 *Examine the part played by **each** of the following in the outbreak of the First World War: alliances; mobilization; Balkan nationalism.*

This was a very popular question which provided a very mixed response. The phrase “First World War” automatically attracted the attention of too many candidates anxious to write general responses on the origins of the conflict. This was **not** the task, which stated quite clearly that the **outbreak** was the main focus- and that three areas in particular required examination in this respect: alliances; mobilization; Balkan nationalism. There were some excellent answers, but for many the issue of mobilization was confused with the longer term arms race. Alliances were better known, though their actual operation in 1914 was not well known. Balkan nationalism for many was a case of the “spark” or “trigger” in Sarajevo in June 1914 and little else. The wider reasons for antagonism in the Balkans remained a mystery for many.

Question 2 *With reference to specific examples, account for the adoption of guerrilla warfare and assess its effectiveness.*

Candidates often tended to concentrate on descriptions of guerrilla warfare in operation in China and Vietnam, but the reasons for its adoption were less well dealt with. The political side of guerrilla activity in seeking to mobilize the population was rarely considered. The invitation to “assess its effectiveness” provided the opportunity to consider other factors in terms of explaining success of the movements. The better responses took advantage of such an opportunity.

Question 3 *In what ways, and with what success, did post-war peacemakers attempt to deal with the problems which produced the conflict? Specific reference should be made to **two** peace settlements.*

“In what ways, and with what success, did post-war peacemakers attempt to deal with the problems which produced the conflict?” (specific reference to two peace settlements required), produced a scattering of responses. Most respondents selected the Treaty of Versailles, and either one of the other Paris Peace Settlements or the conferences/discussions in 1945. While there was often good knowledge of what happened in terms of arrangements or provisions made, there was a lack of attention to the “problems which produced the conflict” section of the task.

Question 4 *Compare and contrast the reasons for, and impact of, foreign involvement in **two** of the following: Russian Civil War; Spanish Civil War; Korean War.*

This question was quite a popular choice and for the most part tackled well. Motives for external involvement and the nature, extent and impact of the foreign intervention were identified and dealt with either in a running compare/contrast structure or in end-on/sequential treatments with concluding paragraphs highlighting similarities and differences in both “reasons” and “impact”.

Question 5 *With reference to **two** wars, each chosen from a different region, explain to what extent the role and status of women was affected.*

No answers were seen by the Principal Examiner for this question.

Topic 2 Nationalist and independence movements, decolonization and challenges facing new states

Relatively few answers were seen from this section, which continues to remain very much of a “Cinderella topic” area for many centres and candidates. Of the attempts made in this section, Question 6, requiring the examination of factors which favoured the emergence and growth of independence movements in non-European colonial states in either the period 1918-39 or the period 1945-65 produced a few very impressive responses. Question 8, in the few samples which were seen, was often based on Mahatma Gandhi.

It is worth reminding Centres that in this section, when it asks for examples of leaders of non-European colonial states, neither Castro’s Cuba nor Mao’s China are appropriate examples for study and/or investigation.

Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states

Question 11 *“It was personality and not circumstances that brought rulers of single-party states to power.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

The emphasis in this very popular choice of question was **rise** to power. Candidates sometimes ignored this and wrote at length about policies/programmes which were clearly related to “in power”- thus producing work which was largely irrelevant.

The most popular choices for aspiring leaders were Hitler, Stalin, Mao and Peron. Personality was interpreted as personal ability by most, who then emphasized the various traits which produced a wave of popular support for the aspiring leader- notably the oratorical skills of the various single-party leaders- though what exactly the subjects of such oration were was rarely identified. Candidates tended to stress the role of circumstances in combination with personality in the explanation of how/why these rulers achieved power. Balanced responses were common and this question produced some of the highest awards in this November’s paper. Since the question did stress rulers (plural) more than one leader needed to be examined in order to reach the higher awards.

Question 12 *Analyse the methods used to maintain power in **two** single-party states, each chosen from a different region.*

Surprisingly this did not prove as popular a choice as expected - presumably Q11 was more attractive to candidates. Again the popular choices (examples from two different regions required) were Hitler, Stalin, Peron and Mao. The best responses tended to identify themes (force, purges, education, economic reforms/policies, scapegoatism, propaganda, cult of personality) and to carry out a running analysis of how various leaders utilized various methods to maintain power in the single-party state.

Question 13 *Examine the economic and social policies of **two** of the following: Lenin; Mussolini; Perón.*

This was not a popular question but one which produced some very sound responses in relation to the economic and social policies of Lenin, Mussolini and Peron.

Question 14 *Compare and contrast the global impact of **two** of the following: Castro; Hitler; Nasser.*

Few responses were seen to this question. Of those which were seen, Hitler and Castro were the two rulers selected. Often though, treatment of Castro consisted of little more than narratives of the Cuban

Missile Crisis. Responses tended to be underdeveloped in this question on the global impact of the leaders.

Question 15 *In what ways, and for what reasons, were culture and education controlled by rulers of single-party states?*

This question area provided some very focused and well-supported responses in relation to the reasons for (and implementation of) policies/programmes relating to culture and education in single party states. Germany 1933 onwards, the Soviet Union, and the Peoples Republic of China were the most common areas for investigation and comment.

Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states

Of the five questions available in this section no responses to Questions 18 and 19 were seen by the Principal Examiner. The most popular offering was Question 20 and the selected example for study was the League of Nations. Relatively few candidates exhibited a clear grasp of the demands of the question, or indeed a secure or satisfactory knowledge of aims (unrealistic or not) or structure. Indeed for many, structure consisted of a passing reference to the absence of the USA and little more. The determination of candidates to distort this question into a “failure of the League of Nations” response, often delivered in what seemed a learned response- was very evident and thus produced awards which were somewhat disappointing overall.

In Question 17 few candidates felt bound by the need to remain within a clearly specified chronological limit (“in their first ten years of existence”).

Question 16 provided a few, essentially descriptive, responses - often of limited focus and accuracy- on the level of success of one international organization in its attempts to improve either the economic and social conditions or to encourage trade and regional cooperation.

Topic 5 The Cold War

Question 21 *Analyse the responsibility of the USA and the USSR for the outbreak and development of the Cold War, up to 1949.*

This was a very popular choice. One examiner noted that there still seems to be a pre-learned, almost Pavlovian, response of some candidates when the term “origins” appears in the same sentence/phrase as “Cold War”. There then appears a mantra which, with some variations, starts with “There are three views regarding the origins (and development) of the Cold War” followed by a trudge through the historiography of the topic area. There is too little actual historical evidence/subject knowledge being used by the candidate to substantiate arguments in such responses.

Yet, having noted the above, the overdosing on historiography in this particular topic area appeared less prevalent than was the case in previous sessions. Hopefully the message has got through that regurgitation of “schools of thought” in itself is neither regarded nor rewarded highly by examiners.

The higher awards went to answers that were able to examine the development of tensions even pre-1945 and to convincingly illustrate their claims as to levels of responsibility by reference to accurate and relevant material up to 1949.

Question 22 *Compare and contrast the economic policies and military alliances of the USSR and USA after 1947.*

Relatively few responses were seen. Of those that were seen, candidates were often producing an unbalanced coverage with knowledge of economic policies and military alliances usually limited to a narrow chronological period and/or to the USA.

Question 23 *To what extent was the movement for non-alignment a development of the Cold War?*

No responses were seen

Question 24 *In what ways, and for what reasons, did the Vietnam War affect superpower relations?*

Too often candidates chose to describe the events/course of the Vietnam War rather than to effectively apply knowledge to an examination of the impact of that conflict upon “superpower relations”.

Question 25 *Assess the importance of economic issues in ending the Cold War.*

Again, there were relatively few responses- but there were some good answers to this question.

Topic 6 The state and its relationship with religion and with minorities

The following comment (or a variation of it) has been made in relation to performance in this topic area in both November and May sessions in the past sessions. Unfortunately it still holds true for the great majority of responses in this area.

“This topic area produced very few responses, and of those that did appear the chief characteristics of the answers were sweeping generalization and inadequate historical knowledge. Generalities abounded in the majority of responses and the section continues to attract some of the weakest candidates, who seem unable to find or cope with the demands of questions in the other sections”.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Hopefully, implicit or explicit in the comments above are indications of guidance and/or tips for any future candidature, but in case there is any confusion such points are reiterated below. Suggestions for future guidance each year do appear terribly repetitive, but they are still worth repeating- **and making available to the students** in order to inform students as to what examiners are looking for in the essay questions set.

- Since every essay provides a specific task for the candidate, students need to identify the key terms in the question and plan an effective and relevant response accordingly. Question analysis means reading the entire question, breaking down the task into constituent parts or themes and then avoiding the temptation to produce an avalanche of information whose relevance to the specific demands is quite marginal.
- Five to ten minutes writing a plan of the response is time well spent and can aid in providing a coherent and focused answer. Include the plan in the answer booklet or in any class-based timed essay assignment. In this way students should see such planning as a **vital** part of the essay writing process.
- In questions relating to Topic 3, students must exercise great care in identifying whether questions are asking candidates to focus on the rise or rule of single-party leaders, or both! So many marks are lost by students who fail to identify the scope of these questions.
- Do pay attention to the regional requirements in essay questions. Students need to be aware of what constitutes a region as far as IB History is concerned. See the History guide or the front cover of Paper Two for a graphic representation of the regions according to the IBO.
- A thematic approach to essays, when appropriate, usually produces a more successful outcome. The chronological narrative tends towards descriptive writing and curtails analytical treatment of topics.

- Opinions need to be supported by relevant, accurate historical knowledge if candidates wish to achieve the higher grade bands. There is no substitute for mastery of the material and its focused deployment in the attempt to meet the demands of the task.
- Define terms which appear in the questions – not only for the sake of examiners but in order to clarify the task at the outset for the candidate.
- Historiography is not the be-all and end-all of history essay writing: it should not be a replacement for solid factual knowledge, accurate chronology, and sequencing, which must form the basis of any effective essays.

History of Africa

Higher level paper 3

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 23	24 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 40	41 - 60

General comments

This paper was taken by 40 candidates from three schools in Africa. The standard of work varied from outstanding to poor and, clearly, the paper succeeded in differentiating between the performance of the candidates. As usual, candidates' choice of questions showed that schools teaching this History paper 3 option concentrate heavily on the history of the nineteenth century. Five questions – 6,3,9,10 and 1 in order of popularity – accounted for 80% of all the questions answered. Only 10% of answers were on twentieth century questions. Ten questions were not answered by any candidate and another seven by only one or two candidates. All candidates answered three questions and there was no evidence to suggest that any of them had been short of time.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Comments are only given on the more popular questions

Question 1 *“The profits derived from the slave trade made it difficult to abolish.” Who benefited from the trade and why did it eventually end?*

There were very few good, balanced answers to this two-part question. Analyses of those who benefited were mostly incomplete, too general and/or inaccurate as were explanations of why the trade eventually ended. Some candidates thought that European industrialists benefited from cheap slave labour in their factories. In spite of the presence of the word “eventually” in the second part of the question, many answers contained no dates. A few candidates wrote, correctly, that the slave trade ended when the demand for slaves ended in America, Cuba and Brazil, but gave no indication of when this happened. There was disappointingly little attempt to assess the relative importance of the various factors, for example religious/moral and economic, which contributed to the end of the slave trade.

Question 3 *How important were the contributions of Yohannes IV and Menelik II to the reunification and stability of Ethiopia?*

Most answers to this question were at least satisfactory. The main weakness was a lack of balance in several answers between the treatment of the two rulers, with much more attention given to Menelik

than to Yohannes. There were some good, brief introductions to set the scene at the death of Tewodros II and emphasise the lack of unity and stability facing his successors.

The best answers showed how both rulers had learned from the mistakes of Tewodros in various ways; how both had restored good relations with the “rases”, with the church and with the peasants. The pact of 1878 between the two did much to restore stability when Yohannes recognised Menelik as his successor to the imperial throne and, in the meantime, as King Shewa. A few of the best answers noted the importance of Menelik’s work in expanding the territory under his control whilst King of Shewa and later as Emperor of Ethiopia. Both attached great importance to rebuilding a strong and well-equipped standing army to defend Ethiopia’s independence – a prerequisite for stability. Whilst this task was seen as Yohannes’ most important contribution to Ethiopia’s stability and reunification, Menelik’s victory over the Italians at Adowa in 1896 was seen as the prelude to his important work in laying the foundations for the modernisation of Ethiopia. In their conclusions, the best candidates made an attempt to assess the relative importance of the two rulers’ contribution.

Question 6 *Why did Samori Toure succeed in establishing the Mandinka Empire, but fail to prevent French conquest?*

This was the most popular question and, again, was usually answered at least satisfactorily. The main general factors which enabled Samori to build his empire were well explained; but there were few details of the main steps in the build-up of the empire. The commonest weakness was the serious absence of dates, which made it difficult to establish clear chronology and time frame in many answers. Another weakness was a failure to include a brief description of the efficient administrative system which Samori created to rule his empire – an important factor in his success. Amongst the best answers were a few which attached great importance to some of the rare misjudgments which Samori made as being amongst the main reasons for his failure to prevent its conquest by the French. These included his decision to attack Sikasso, and his attempt to convert his non-Muslim subjects to Islam by force, a move which led to the Great Revolt in 1888. Both came at a critical time when the French, having defeated the Tukolor Empire, were ready to attack Samori. In addition, at a later stage, his use of a “scorched earth” policy to slow down the French advance against him also imposed a severe strain on the loyalty of some of his troops and led to his capture and defeat. In general, this question produced some good answers and a few that were very good.

Question 8 *To what extent was the Boer Trek the result of British policies in the Cape?*

Although this was not a popular question, one candidate’s answer was probably the best one from any candidates taking this paper. It contained an accurate and comprehensive analysis of the legislation passed by the British government at the Cape in the twenty years or so before the Great Trek. The Boers found much of this legislation unacceptable because it undermined their racist policies before the arrival of the British, and the master-servant relationship between them and the indigenous peoples in Cape Colony. The candidate, having examined the other contributory reasons for the Great Trek, concluded that its most important cause was the Boers’ determination to escape from British rule and the policies which threatened to destroy their domination of the non-white people.

Question 9 *With reference to specific examples, analyse the reasons why most African states failed to resist European conquest.*

The basic reasons why most African states failed to resist European conquest were well known and adequately explained in general terms by most candidates. They included the political and technological backwardness of most African peoples and their leaders, especially their failure to unite against European encroachment on their territories, and their inferior weaponry, tactics and strategy. In contrast, the European powers were able to adopt the divide and rule approach, exploiting existing rivalries between tribes and creating new ones. European explorers and missionaries supplied their armies with the intelligence reports they needed to defeat African tribes and states. The differences in the quality of answers was found largely in the specific examples candidates used to illustrate the general points.

Finally, only a few candidates pointed out that there were exceptions to the general rule that “most African states failed to resist European conquest”. The Ethiopians under Yohannes IV and Menelik II, by managing to build up standing armies equipped with modern weapons and using appropriate strategies and tactics, inflicted humiliating defeats on Italian invaders; the Zulus won a one-off victory over the British at Isandhlwana; and Samori Toure resisted the French for many years before being defeated. The mark scheme restricted the award of marks in the top band to answers which mentioned these exceptions.

Question 10 *“An uprising born out of despair and desperation, futile in its objectives and disastrous in its results.” To what extent do you agree with this judgement on the Maji Maji uprising. (15 answers)*

A few candidates wrote excellent answers which were well documented, well organised and well argued. By examining its causes, its course and its results these candidates argued that, though there was some truth in all three of the judgments in the title, all three went too far. The rising was provoked by the oppressive policies and behaviour of the German colonial regime and its Arab and Swahili agents. In so far as its main objective was to expel the Germans and to regain their independence, its objective was possibly futile. However, they were given the courage to rise against their oppressors in the hope that their objective could be achieved by their spiritual leaders’ false promises about the properties of “maji maji” (magic water). After a few uprisings during which many Germans and their agents were slaughtered, reinforcements were brought in and revenge and reprisals were brutal. Scorched-earth tactics wiped out villages and their inhabitants and destroyed crops. 75,000 Africans died in the fighting and in the famine that followed. However, the shock that the Rising had administered to the Germans and the fear that similar risings might occur in the future caused them to review their earlier policies which had caused the Rising. Under a new reforming Governor, von Rechenburg, forced labour was abandoned, support was given to the export of African cash crops, schools and health facilities were provided for Africans, and the later inspired a generation of modern African nationalists.

Question 14 *With reference to specific examples, compare and contrast the British system of indirect rule and the French system of association.*

This question was an unfortunate choice for the few candidates who attempted it. Most had very little accurate knowledge of the system of indirect rule but almost none of the system of association. All had difficulty in providing suitable specific examples. One candidate used Sierra Leone as an example of a colony where association was in use, thinking it was a French territory. There were no satisfactory answers.

History of the Americas

Higher level paper 3

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 23	24 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 40	41 - 60

General comments

This session, the Americas paper produced some excellent answers which revealed knowledge of the topics and historical skills. There was concentration of answers on both Latin American and US history with focus on the 20th century. No questions about Canada were recorded. The most popular

questions were 11, 12, 13, 15, and 22. Within the centres there was a variation of performances, from very good to poor, although the general performance was rather good. All the students answered the required three questions.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

The question that seemed to be difficult for the students was question 9. The majority of the answers made reference to international policies and very few to domestic issues. The very few responses to the early part of the syllabus generally produced poor answers, as seems often the case. Questions on social and cultural history were not answered, indicating a lack of interest in or preparation for these topics. Probably the most significant weakness observed in this session was the candidates' failure to address the demands of two-part questions.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

As mentioned above, some candidates produced analytical, factual and relevant answers, which showed good preparation and relevant knowledge. This was particularly evident in Questions 11 and 15. As in previous sessions, the use of relevant historiography is increasing and candidates were aware of different interpretations and views. Overall, many of the responses to some demanding questions showed well-prepared candidates displaying impressive levels of knowledge, skills and understanding. Questions that required the candidates' own views and assessment were very well treated.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Comments are only given on the more popular questions.

Question 1 *"The Catholic Church played a dominant role in the colonization of both French and Spanish America." With reference to **either** French **or** Spanish America, to what extent do you agree with this statement?*

There were very few answers for this question with very poor results.

Question 5 *For what reasons did non-slaveholders in the Americas support the institution of slavery?*

Several students answered this question with some very good results. Good answers discussed some legal, religious, and political arguments and supported their answers with relevant knowledge and facts. The answers were focused on the United States.

Question 6 *"Territorial expansion was the main cause of the US Civil War." To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

This was a popular question. Many candidates challenged the statement and offered some different alternatives to the "main" cause of the US Civil War. The main weakness in the answers was that some candidates that disagreed with the statement did not provide a relevant argument to support their disagreement.

Question 8 *Why were large numbers of immigrants attracted to any **one** country of the Americas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries?*

Although this was not a popular question, some centres had clearly prepared the students for this topic. Some very good answers selected Argentina and provided insightful and relevant answers.

Question 9 *How successful was the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt between 1901 and 1909?*

Several candidates addressed the question, with rather limited results. Candidates focused on Roosevelt's international policies (with regard to Latin America) and neglected the domestic policies.

Question 11 *For what reasons, and with what effect on Cuba, did the United States enter the Spanish-America War in 1898?*

This was a very popular question. Some candidates produced well-balanced and factual arguments. However, many concentrated on only one part of the question without addressing both of the demands and therefore lost marks.

Question 12 *“Madero has unleashed a tiger; now let us see if he can control it.” (Porfirio Diaz, 1911). Assess the accuracy of Diaz's statement in predicting the course of the Mexican Revolution up to 1920.*

By far the most popular question, this produced some excellent results. Candidates, overall, tended to agree with the statement and demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the topic. Interestingly enough, very few of the answers did not observe the timeframe of 1920.

Question 13 *Explain how **one** country of the region changed its policy on the role the government should play in the economy as a result of the Great Depression.*

This was also a very popular question. The selected countries were the United States, Argentina and Chile. Answers varied, but in general the performance was good. Some candidates showed relevant and factual knowledge about the topic and high-quality analysis. However, others neglected to discuss the “change” and therefore did not score very good marks.

Question 15 *How did **either** Getulio Vargas of Brazil or Juan Perón of Argentina gain and retain the support of the urban workers?*

Many candidates selected this question. The majority choose Perón although Vargas was the choice of some centres. The answers were rather disappointing. With regard to Perón, many candidates were unable to make the distinction between “gain” and “retain” and answers tended to be narrative. Vargas, however, was addressed very well, with candidates making the clear distinction demanded by the question.

Question 17 *How did the Cold War change relations between the United States and **either** Latin America **or** Canada between 1945–53?*

There were very few responses, all related to Latin America. The overall answers were good in terms of knowledge and relevance.

Question 18 *With reference to at least **two** countries in the region, analyse the major causes of revolutionary movements in Latin America after the Second World War.*

Only very few students chose this question. Those who selected Castro provided acceptable responses.

Question 20 *Compare and contrast the Vietnam War policies of Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon.*

This was not a very popular choice. The few answers addressing the topic were not very satisfactory in terms of either comparative approach or relevant knowledge.

Question 21 *In what ways, and for what reasons, was there a shift in the focus and activities of US civil rights organizations by the mid-1960s?*

The students that selected this question did not seem to follow the demands of the question. Several ignored the time frame and others did not address the “shift of focus and activities”.

Question 22 *“By 1962 Castro’s domestic policy had successfully transformed Cuba.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

As usual, Castro attracted many responses and some excellent answers were seen. Candidates tended to answer in a balanced, analytical way. Solid knowledge was observed and historiography was used in a relevant manner.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

The recommendations for teachers areas follows.

- Candidates should be trained in answering two-part questions. This limitation was one of the reasons why many students lost marks
- Candidates should be advised to examine the key words, consider what the question is asking, and then decide whether they know enough to answer it effectively.
- Candidates should be encouraged to strive to provide well-supported answers to the questions asked and avoid use of sweeping generalizations and “pre-prepared” answers.
- Average and weak candidates should be advised to answer and plan answers carefully.

History of East and South East Asia and Oceania

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 23	24 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 40	41 - 60

General comments

The G2 reports from the schools indicated that the paper was comparable with that of last year. Three centres found it a little more difficult, five that it was of a similar standard and one centre found it a little easier. Eight centres found the level of difficulty to be appropriate and all the centres found the syllabus coverage, clarity of wording and presentation of the paper to be satisfactory or good. As usual, 98% of candidates answered questions focused entirely on Chinese and Japanese History. Unfortunately several candidates answered question 1, which specifically identifies the focus to be on South East Asia, with material based entirely on China and Japan. This Subject Report has repeatedly commented on this simple geographical failing but teachers do not seem to pass this on to their students, with disastrous consequences. One candidate answered Questions 1 and 18 using China. This is tantamount to a candidate choosing Turkey as a Scandinavian country in the European Regional Option. The examiners have no choice but to mark geographical errors such as these extremely severely. Another issue is the tendency for candidates to write reams of accurate background information (sometimes as much as 10 pages) without ever answering the specific demands of the question.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

- Many candidates seemed to have prepared answers to questions and then found it difficult to adapt this material in response to the specific set questions.
- There was a lack of specific, in-depth, detailed knowledge. Candidates often wrote in sweeping generalities.
- Candidates seem to have been instructed by their teachers to sprinkle historians' names and quotations throughout their essays, so as to indicate that they have an understanding of historiography. This tactic is not successful.
- The general questions, namely 24 and 25, were usually handled poorly by the candidates, who should be instructed to avoid these questions.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

- Many candidates displayed a detailed and comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter.
- In this session candidates structured their thematic responses better than in previous years.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Comments are only given on the more popular questions.

Question 1 *Analyse the reasons for, and the impact of, European interest in South East Asia from the late eighteenth century to 1860.*

As indicated above, no candidate who chose this question chose a South East Asian country as an example.

Question 2 *Explain why the Macartney, Amherst and Napier Missions to China failed.*

This was a very popular question among some centres and was generally well handled. Among weaker candidates there was a tendency towards anecdotal comments rather than real analysis.

Question 3 *To what extent did the emergence of "Dutch Learning" (rangaku) and of "National Learning" (kokugaku) contribute to the decline of the Tokugawa shogunate (Bakafu) in Japan?*

Better candidates were able to define the two terms and write critical, analytical accounts of their relationship to the decline of the Bakafu. Other candidates did not seem to know the difference between these two schools of learning. There was a tendency among some candidates to try to adapt material relating to the fall of the Bakafu without mentioning Dutch Learning and National Learning.

Question 7 *Compare and contrast the self-strengthening movements of China (1861–94) and Japan (1868–94).*

This was quite a popular choice, but was not done particularly well. Candidates were more knowledgeable about Meiji reforms and China was often dealt with in a very general way. Only the best candidates were able to identify the Chinese reformers and give specific details about Chinese reforms.

Question 8 *“The ‘Hundred Days Reforms’ (1898) in China had no chance of success.” How far do you agree with this statement?*

This question was poorly handled by most candidates. There was considerable confusion between the Self Strengthening Movement (1861-1894) and the 100 Days of Reform (1898). Only the better candidates included mention of Emperor Guangxu and the importance of Kang Youwei’s role in the Reform Movement.

Question 9 *“During the Meiji period, Japan changed its clothes but not its soul.” Is this a fair assessment of the modernization and westernization which took place over that period?*

Although this was quite a popular choice, responses varied in quality. Some candidates interpreted the question too literally and there were many descriptive answers on the Meiji reforms, which largely ignored the quotation. There were some excellent, analytical and thoughtful responses, which thematically analysed the changes that occurred in Japanese society. The very best candidates questioned the extent to which Japan really changed by the end of the century.

Question 16 *“The achievements of the Nationalist Government of China between 1928 and 1937 have been greatly under-estimated.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

This was another popular choice. Most candidates concentrated on the Nationalist government’s corruption and military failures. Only the better candidates could actually identify and analyse the domestic policies which occurred during the “Nanjing Decade”.

Question 17 *Evaluate the contribution of the Long March (1934–6) to the final victory of the Communist Party.*

Also a very popular choice, this was well handled by the majority of candidates who were able to deal with the question in a thematic manner. All candidates were able to make links to the final victory in general terms. There was a tendency for some candidates to repeat their response to Question 16 here and largely ignore the contribution of the Long March or only deal with it in a scant manner.

Question 19 *Assess Mao Zedong’s (Mao Tse-tung’s) contribution to China’s development after 1949.*

This was the most popular question on the paper and, to the amazement of the examiners was one that was handled extremely poorly by the majority of candidates. The question required candidates to **assess** Mao’s contribution, and to include the importance of other leaders (Zhou Enlai for example). Candidates merely catalogued Mao’s policies in great detail and made absolutely no attempt at any evaluation of Mao’s contribution. It was implicitly assumed that, as Mao was the leader of China at this time, his contribution to China’s development was obvious-which it is not.

Question 20 *To what extent did the allied occupation transform Japanese society between 1945 and 1952?*

This question was generally well done. Most candidates knew quite a lot of detail about the political, social and economic changes effected during the allied occupation of Japan and could discuss them at some length.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- There were a great many responses where candidates wrote fluently and well, but they did not include enough specific factual evidence to support their answer. Where this applied to entire centres, it seemed that the teachers might not be expecting enough precise detail from their students.

- There is still a tendency for candidates to ignore the key words or phrases in a question and to write too much background information in their responses that is not directly relevant to the question. This can be remedied by teachers insisting that their students practice writing essays under examination conditions.
- Candidates are mixing up Pinyin and Wade-Giles spellings in their responses. Teachers should insist that one system be used consistently.
- There were very few cases in this session of candidates running into difficulty with time. This is a pleasing development indicating that teachers have taken note of some of the comments made in previous Subject Reports.

History of Europe (including Russia/USSR)

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 23	24 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 40	41 - 60

General comments

The standard for this component was very pleasing. There were few very weak scripts and many good to excellent ones. More candidates this session focused on the set question rather than writing all they knew about the person or event named in the question, although less able candidates continued to do so. As usual, however, there will be those who are disappointed with their result, probably due to choosing an unsuitable question. There were a handful who misinterpreted a question, but these were few. Social and economic questions still produce very general, or political answers, and one candidate, obviously writing in a second language, confused domestic and foreign policies.

The candidature for the November session is very small compared with the May session, so there were several questions on the paper for which no or very few answers were seen. It was probably a paper which produced a large percentage of candidates answering a small number of questions (see section C below).

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Candidates who have studied the nineteenth century as well as the twentieth century often score better than those who have only studied the twentieth century. This could be because the latter rely too much on the material they have studied for Paper Two, which is focused on world rather than European history, hence there is not always the depth that is required for Paper Three, which is the higher level paper.

Areas which are studied carefully and in depth include Napoleon, Italian and German unification, and Alexander II. Russian history in the twentieth century is also popular, but often the depth and detail is too limited. Twentieth century German history is generally well known, as are both World Wars.

The improvement in tackling comparative questions continues, and Question 19, which required the comparison of the domestic policies of Hitler and Stalin, produced some of the most successful answers on the paper.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Comments are only given on the more popular questions.

Question 1 *To what extent did the outbreak of war in April 1792 change the nature and the course of the French Revolution?*

This question on the effect of the outbreak of war in 1792 on the French Revolution was neither popular nor well done. Candidates did not know enough about the war or its impact.

Question 2 *“The success of Napoleon’s domestic policies in France between 1802 and 1815 has been greatly exaggerated.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

This question on Napoleon’s domestic policies between 1802 and 1815 produced evidence of reasonable knowledge of his policies, and varying responses as to whether their success has been exaggerated.

Question 3 *Why were revolutionary activities so widespread in Europe between 1848 and 1849?*

The question on European revolutionary activities in 1848 and 1849, was not popular but some satisfactory wide-ranging answers were seen.

Question 5 *Compare and contrast the contributions of Mazzini and Garibaldi to Italian unification.*

Most candidates were able to compare and contrast Mazzini and Garibaldi quite well, in a comparative structure. Not surprisingly Mazzini attracted more material and praise.

Question 6 *“The unification of Germany by 1871 was the result of Bismarck’s foresight and careful planning.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

This question on Bismarck and German unification was one of the most popular and successful on the paper. The best candidates debated and analysed the quotation, with many showing familiarity with views and interpretations; some agreed, others disagreed with the quotation. Weak candidates accepted the quotation at face value and described Bismarck’s wars.

Question 8 *To what extent did Alexander II’s reforms cause more problems than they solved?*

This proved to be another very popular and well-known subject. Most candidates described and analysed Alexander’s reforms, but only the more able ones focused exactly on, and fully addressed, “caused more problems than they solved.”

Question 11 *How important was the Paris Commune (1871) for France and for Europe?*

It appears that candidates did not have sufficient knowledge on the Paris Commune to answer this question satisfactorily.

Question 13 *Compare and contrast the causes and consequences of the 1905 and February/March 1917 Russian Revolutions.*

This was one of the three most popular twentieth century questions on the paper. Some candidates found it difficult to maintain a structure that had four elements, to compare the causes, and contrast the causes, then to compare the consequences and contrast the consequences, of the 1905 and February/ March 1917, Russian Revolutions, but the vast majority of candidates had reasonable knowledge for all four sections, and some very good responses were written. The consensus was that the causes were on the whole more similar, but the consequences very different.

Question 14 *Analyse the factors which led to the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary during the First World War.*

This question on the defeat of Germany and her allies was quite popular, and in general, quite well argued, but more depth and detail was necessary for answers to reach the top bands.

Question 15 *How important was Trotsky's role in the establishment and development of the Soviet state between 1917 and 1929?*

Few answers on Trotsky contained enough specific detail and analysis to get beyond the satisfactory band.

Question 16 *Assess the effects of **two** of the Paris Peace Settlements.*

Answers to this question on the Paris Peace Settlements tended to give the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and to a lesser extent St. Germain, and criticise them, rather than assessing their effects.

Question 17 *Analyse the effect of the Wall Street Crash on **two** European countries (excluding Germany) between 1929 and 1935.*

The effect of the Wall Street crash had few takers possibly because Germany was excluded.

Question 18 *Analyse the reasons for the collapse of the Weimar Republic and the establishment of a Nazi dictatorship in the period 1929 to 1934.*

This was the second very popular twentieth century question: the vast majority of candidates were able to analyse reasons for both the collapse of the Weimar Republic, and the establishment of the Nazi that is, Hitler's dictatorship. Some excellent answers showing evidence of wide reading were seen.

Question 19 *Compare and contrast the domestic policies of Hitler and Stalin up to the outbreak of the Second World War.*

This was the third very successful and popular question for the twentieth century, although time limitation probably prevented some candidates from comparing and contrasting a full range of the domestic policies of Hitler and Stalin. At least one candidate did not understand "domestic", and wrote about their foreign policies.

Question 20 *Why did internal tensions in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s lead to a civil war in 1936?*

The internal tensions in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s tended to be described rather than explained or analysed.

Question 21 *Analyse the importance of **one** of the following to the eventual outcome of the Second World War in Europe: war in the air; war at sea; war on land.*

A few analytical answers of the war in the air were seen, but again descriptive accounts predominated.

Question 22 *Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev.*

Some reasonable knowledge of the similarities and differences of the foreign policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev was shown.

Question 23 *"The history of European cooperation between 1957 and 1975 was harmonious and successful." To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

No candidate recognised European cooperation as "harmonious and successful," between 1957 and 1975. Instead, the problems of the Cold War in Europe were discussed.

Question 24 *Analyse the reasons for the decline and fall of **one** communist regime in eastern Europe (excluding the USSR).*

The fall of the communist regime in Poland was chosen by a few candidates, but answers were mainly narrative.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- The advice to think and plan before writing has been given in many reports, and as noted above, more candidates appear to have followed it this session. Teachers must be thanked for successfully promoting it. Examiners rarely see evidence of plans, as the policy of schools seems to be to advise that plans are written on scrap paper, handed in and destroyed. This is a pity. It is always welcomed when plans are written and included with the answers. Examiners do read them, and often additional credit is given.
- Mastering focus and structure nearly always produces good answers, so continue to stress this, and give candidates frequent practise to enable them to master this skill.
- Historiography is no substitute for specific factual details; indeed it is “name dropping” without these details, and earns no credit.
- The majority of candidates did reveal some breadth and depth of historical knowledge, as well as a feeling for the subject. This is due to interesting, dedicated history teachers, so thank you, and continue to foster this love of history.