



Examiners' Report **June 2022**

GCE History 9HI0 2E

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_2E_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

Candidates across the ability range continue to engage effectively with the A Level paper 2E which deals with Mao's China, 1949-76 (2E.1) and The German Democratic Republic, 1949-90 (2E.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts – cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners continue to note this year that a number of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences from the content of the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry based on both the contextual knowledge displayed and an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the sources. It is important that candidates should be clear that weight is not likely to be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the sources, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the sources. However, comments on all the things that the sources might have contained but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and most candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. Not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

Question 1

Responses to this question came from across the ability range but there were many strong answers. These were able to develop inferences from both sources and added to these with impressive contextual knowledge. Many argued the sources indicated that the status of women had indeed improved under communist rule but used them effectively to consider in what ways this may have happened and the pace of progress towards gender equality. With reference to weight, the better answers identified the likely audience for Source 1 and questioned the degree to which it was valuable as evidence to the enquiry. Comments on Source 2 were more mixed, but many considered it to be more reliable to the enquiry than Source 1 given its concession that, in some areas, the equality boasted about in Source 1 had not been achieved easily if at all by 1976.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources, a problem caused by rushed reading perhaps but one which hampered candidates' ability to engage with the enquiry. Many wrote extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources, often along stereotypical lines, without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement.

Concerning the Improvement of women's status socially in Mao's China, Source 1 states "None of this would've been possible conceivable before China's liberation in 1949. The old society gave women the lowest status. They were subjected to the domination of political and religious authorities and the authority". This suggests that modern China (1972), unlike the GMD 'old society', has achieved tangible social equality for women, successfully transforming China's previously sexist attitude towards women. This, of course, was hardly the case. Although 'de jure' women achieved equality with men, 'de facto' things were quite different. The CCP could write and enforce laws, but they could not change the traditionally sexist attitude in China, especially in rural areas far from Beijing. This source can be useful for a historian investigating women's emancipation in China, as it gives a succinct brief on a history of women's political liberation post 1949. However, the historian should bear in mind that this was produced by Chinese authorities to be published in the west, meaning it has an inherent leaning on portraying China in the most positive light; even when it

Shouldn't. As with any piece of propaganda, the historian ~~as~~ must astutely navigate any false truths if they wish to use this ~~source~~.

↓

Source 2

Source 1 states "In our area, because of the continued influence of male supremacist ideas, the highest pay for men was 10 workpoints a day. The highest a woman could get was 7½."

This suggests that though laws had changed, the CCP was unable, even by 1975, to change China's traditionally sexist attitudes on women, nor loosen their grip on rural society.

This is, of course, true. Women, especially those in rural areas, still suffered from sexism, ^{even} within the commune, where all were ^{supposedly} perceived as equal.

Although this is also a piece of CCP propaganda it ironically serves as a damning rebuttal to the previous source, when this one from 1975 discusses ^{the problem of} "male supremacist ideas" whereas the one from 1972 suggest these no longer exist.

This source is especially useful for a historian given it is a primary source from a woman in China, the subject of the investigation. The historian should remember that Chau Keh-chou is a member of the CCP producing a magazine in China where publications are vetted

and information harmful to the CCP is removed.

Concerning women's changing post economic status

Source 1 states "The broad masses of working women are politically liberated and economically independent.

There are very few areas of work where women are barred;" This would suggest women would take

places at the top-end of jobs in China, working as managers or supervisors. This wasn't the case.

Traditionally sexist attitudes meant women were

barred from swathes of work, women seldom held

managerial positions or high political office women

almost always worked in low paying jobs in manufacturing

or farming. This source is useful for a historian

as it gives an idea on what CCP intended to

achieve or, at the very least, wanted outsiders to believe

they had achieved. Again, this is a piece of CCP

propaganda created to portray China more favourably

than it really was. This inherently damages its value as

a source.

Source 2 suggests states " - our men went off to work on

a commune project - The work brigade leader said

"Watering the corn would have to wait until the

men returned" -

- This suggests women were arbitrarily barred from even the most menial of ~~tasks~~ jobs based on their gender. This, unfortunately, was often the case - women were often prevented from taking jobs in the communes to keep the subsistent to men, they were therefore paid less so they would have to eat less, meaning they would have to work less in a vicious cycle of sexism. This source is useful to a historian investigating women's economic status in China as it is written by Chou keh-eh a noted Chinese feminist who lived and worked in a commune. This being a primary source from a woman is good, but Chou keh-chau was a member of the CCP and as such may be hesitant to criticise the CCP, even when necessary.

↑

To conclude, Source 1 gives good insight on how the CCP wanted to be perceived concerning women, but due to its inherent biases as piece of propaganda it is far less useful/reliable as a source for the true status of women in China. Source 2 is far more useful, given it is a first-hand account from a Chinese woman. Biases from her CCP membership may seep into her writing, but overall it gives a fair and reliable insight on women's changing status within

the comments

combined, the sources become more useful.

As both discuss the same/similar period (1970s)

they can be easily cross referenced. Facts established

in source 1 can often be verified or disproven

by similar information in source 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response makes several reasoned inferences from both sources that are relevant to the enquiry. Contextual knowledge is added both to support and to challenge the claims made in the sources, demonstrating the candidate's understanding of the sources as pieces of evidence in an enquiry. The strengths and limitations of both sources are considered when coming to a judgement. It was given a high L4 mark.

Question 2

In this question, the better answers clearly identified the reasons behind the 1953 Rising as being a combination of the economic and the political. Most were able to develop inferences drawn from Source 3 that the discontent of the workers ranged widely but used their contextual knowledge to consider how Ulbricht's demands for greater productivity led to a fracture in SED support. In Source 4, some identified that the SED was quietly conceding that its economic policies had been a cause of the Rising though most candidates chose to examine the claims that hostile Western interference had been responsible. When considering the weight of the evidence, many discussed the extent to which the French newspaper report in Source 3 could be trusted as evidence and most identified the limitations of the SED's response in Source 4.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources, a problem caused by rushed reading perhaps but one which hampered candidates' ability to engage with the enquiry. Many wrote extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources often along stereotypical lines without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement.

Sources 3 and 4 individually are of limited use for a historian to investigate the causes of the rising of June 1953 due to the fact that although they both provide some information on the causes of the June 1953 rising, they are limited by the aims and intentions of each sources creator, as Source 3 comes from a Western newspaper while Source 4 is from the ruling party of the GDR. Source 3 is slightly more useful in this regard as it does give a somewhat accurate account of the workers' demands in the June revolt. However, Sources 3 and 4 are quite useful together as they combine to provide information about the attitudes of both the general population and the SED in the June Revolt.

~~Source 3 is of limited use~~ Although Source 3 ~~is~~ does give some indication of the true causes of the rising of June 1953, it is of limited use for investigating the causes of the rising due to the aims of its creator. Source 3 states that workers demanded 'cancellation of the 10 per cent increase in work quotas', suggesting that this was a key grievance leading to worker joining the June ~~to~~ revolt. This is supported by the fact that there were indeed increases in work norms by 10% initiated by the SED

in order to help the GDR economy catch up with that of the FRG especially in areas such as heavy industry. Moreover, the ~~source's~~ source's statement that workers also sought 'reduction by 40 per cent in the price of goods and of consumer goods' is also substantiated as due to the command economy at the time, the SED placed great emphasis on industrial production while neglecting consumer goods, which compounded with the focus on quantity over quality inherent in the system to cause great dissatisfaction among workers and the general population as consumer goods were poor quality and hard to obtain, which also led to them rising in price significantly. In spite of this, it cannot be overlooked that the source is from a French newspaper, which could be highly opposed to the ~~German~~ German state due to the heavy French losses to Germany in World War II, in addition to the fact that as the Cold War was going on, Western media would seek to portray the GDR, as an ally of the USSR, in a negative light. Therefore, while Source 3 does detail some significant causes of the June revolt, it is limited by the aims of its creator which could have caused it to intentionally highlight some grievances and minimise others.

Although Source 4 does provide some information on the causes of the rising of June 1953, it is limited by the fact that it comes from the SED, who would likely

minimise the extent of some causes to make themselves look better in the view of their people and the international community. Source 4 states that the SED 'increased the pace of socialist development in the economy too much', suggesting that ~~there~~ a key reason for the revolt was the economy becoming socialist too quickly. There is some truth to this, as many workers in the GDR were truly committed to socialism so the June revolt may have been caused by an attempt to accomplish this too quickly. However, the source places a much greater emphasis on the role of 'West German business capitalists and Timbers, as puppets of American imperialism' in causing the revolt. While the West may have been supportive of the June Revolt, it was, in reality, led by the dissatisfied workers of the GDR who were not 'fascist ring leaders' as the source suggests, but rather simply dissatisfied with some of the conditions they endured. Furthermore, as the source is from the Central Committee of the SED, its creators would have intended to embellish the role of the West to portray it negatively while minimising the role of unsuccessful SED policies in causing the rising. Hence, the source is only of limited use for investigating the causes of the June revolt.

While both sources are individually of only limited use, they can be of much greater use

when viewed together. Source 4 concedes that the SED failed to 'follow the strict principle of allowing only voluntary participation in [agricultural] collectives', which ~~is~~ is further evidence to support ~~the~~ Source 4 ~~and~~ the statement that workers were disappointed with 'the price of foodstuffs', as it was indeed the mass emigration of farmers and results of forced collectivisation that led to shortages and higher prices of food. Additionally, it is highly significant that despite coming from such different origins, the sources both highlight the integral role that worker dissatisfaction over the SED and its policies in industry played in causing the rising. As ~~the~~ Source 3 is from a Western perspective and Source 4 is from that of the SED, ~~the~~ Source 3 seeks to portray the SED as negatively, as possible while Source 4 attempts to portray it as positively as possible. Therefore, since they agree on the role of the ~~the~~ SED's poor industrial policies, it is clear that this was a key factor in the June revolt, making the sources highly useful when used together.

Overall despite the information they provide on the causes of the rising, Sources 3 and 4 are optimised use individually due to their aims and how they

intended to portray the SED. However, used together, the sources become highly useful as while their aims are largely opposed, their aim of providing information remains the same, so it can be concluded that the causes they both highlight are mostly accurate and hence the sources are quite useful together for investigating the causes of the rising of June 1953.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This L5 response interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used. Contextual knowledge is used to discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material and in evaluation, there is a clear attempt to weigh the evidence to the enquiry in coming to a reasoned judgement.

Question 3

This was by far the more popular of the essay questions for Paper 2E.1, and it was often done very well. Many candidates had extensive and detailed knowledge of the two Five-Year Plans and were able to use this to consider the degree to which they were a success by several criteria. For example, while many considered the Plans simply in economic terms, others branched out to consider success by their ideological impact or the degree to which they satisfied Mao's desire for control over the population. Most concluded that the Second Five-Year Plan had been a considerable failure though many did concede that the First had achieved a degree of success.

Less strong answers tended to describe rather than analyse the Five-Year Plans. Many weak answers lacked range and depth of knowledge, and their answers were often imprecise and lacking accuracy. There was a tendency among some to over-rely on statistics of dubious provenance as indicators of success.

Mao's economic policies of the First Five-Year Plan (1953-7) and the second Five-Year Plan (1958) were bold policies intending to industrialise, boost agriculture and make China self-sufficient. Both Five-Year Plans were ~~un~~ unsuccessful in boosting agriculture and failed to make China self-sufficient, however the First Five Year plan was highly successful in industrialising the nation. It is clear that both the Plans were ^{highly} unsuccessful in achieving their intended outcomes, however the First Five-Year plan sported some successes.

^{significantly}
Five-Year
^ Both ^ Plans were highly unsuccessful in achieving their intended outcome to boost agricultural production. The First Five-Year Plan aimed to boost agriculture, as by 1955 16.9 million households were living in Agricultural Producers Cooperatives (communes) and the CCP wanted their policy to prove successful. However agriculture only grew by 2.1% due to the plan, compared to the 14% growth rate achieved from 1949, and therefore did not achieve their intended outcome.

Furthermore, the second Five-Year Plan unambiguously failed miserably in terms of boosting agriculture. The CCP announced that in 1958 grain production reached an impressive 375 million tons, only later to revise this down to 215 million later on due to exaggeration. Lysenko did not help improve agriculture, with his 'Four pests Campaign' in 1958 proving to be terrible scientific advice, but sparrowcide too led to insects eating the crops instead of the birds. Bad scientific advice and exaggerated reports meant ^{success in} agriculture 'walking on two legs' was not achieved.

Importantly, both Five-Year Plans failed in achieving self-sufficiency for China. Mao for years was sick and tired of China being branded the "Sick Man of Asia", and his goal was to make China a superpower. The First Five-Year Plan failed to make China self-sufficient as although industrial production was on the rise, the economy was not thriving for peasants. Farmers couldn't afford crop prices and therefore had to sell to the government at low prices, causing peasants to starve as they didn't have enough

money to live, proving China was not self-sufficient as a thriving economy meant everyone in society was well looked after. The second five-year plan aimed to "catch up ~~to~~ ^{to} Britain within fifteen ~~the~~ years", however the Sino-Soviet split saw 14,000 Soviet economic advisors flood out of China which was a factor in the failure of the Great Leap Forward. Historians estimate that around 40 million peasants died to famine, with Liu Shaogui later describing the ~~at~~ horrific event as a "man-made disaster". This undoubtedly proves that the CCP were unsuccessful in making China self-sufficient as although China was becoming more powerful, when left without Soviet aid, the worst man-made famine in history happens, which proves China could not keep its population alive by itself.

Most notably, the First Five-Year Plan was successful in industrialising, whereas the Second Five-Year Plan failed miserably. The ~~the~~ First Five-Year Plan ~~had~~ saw amazing successes in terms of industrialisation, with heavy industry output tripling and annual growth increasing to 16% per year. Industrial output exceeded its aim, increasing to 15.3%

per year, clearly proving the first Five-Year Plan industrialised very well. A singular steel centre in Anshan in 1957 attracted 35,000 workers and produced two-thirds of China's steel, proving heavy industry output was booming. Conversely, the second Five-Year Plan was unsuccessful with its industrialisation target. Mao hoped to produce 700 million tons ^{of steel} per year, however the catastrophic failure of the backyard furnaces meant steel output could not even come close to this, clearly proving the second Five-Year Plan was unsuccessful regarding its heavy industry aim. Mao could not expect peasants who were carrying out back-breaking work from dusk till dawn, who had to make 'partridge' out of mud and tree bark, and were even too tired to catch rats to eat to produce ^{successful} heavy industry output, and Mao was too confident and disregarded the terrible living conditions.

Ultimately, it is clear that although the First Five-Year Plan industrialised successfully, both plans overall were highly unsuccessful in achieving their intended outcomes. The main aim of the First Five-Year Plan was to

improve heavy industry, and was successful in this aim by tripling the output, however overall both plans failed to achieve what they set out to. Agriculture in both plans was clearly ^{highly} ~~an~~ unsuccessful, and China after both plans was not self-sufficient, ~~a~~ coming from a humanitarian approach as the people could not survive, and industry in the Second Five-Year Plan was dire. Although some aims were successful in achieving their 'intended' outcomes for the CCP, the majority weren't and no aim achieved anything for the population and the widespread impact was not felt, although Mao may not have ~~made~~ "intended" to help the people.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This essay sustains an analysis of the key issues throughout. The knowledge deployed by the candidate demonstrates a full understanding of the demands of the question, responding fully to its demands. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied throughout the essay and their relative significance is evaluated. The essay is coherent and communicated with clarity. It was given a top L5 mark.

Question 4

Though the less popular of the two essay questions, there was a range of responses to it from across the ability range. Some very good answers had an impressive knowledge of the Cultural Revolution and the roles of Zhou and Deng, especially in its latter years. They were able to assess their significance in comparison to others like Mao himself or the Gang of Four, very successfully. Weaker candidates knew little of the roles of Zhou or Deng and tended either to ignore them or claim they had little part without providing evidence. Some were far more comfortable describing the course of the Cultural Revolution from 1966. Some made dubious claims about the period based upon imprecise knowledge and understanding of the period and the issues at stake during it.

The Cultural Revolution was a major political movement by Mao to remove what he saw as the 'dangerous revisionism' within the Party. Many key players like Lin Biao, Jiang Qing, Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping all had a role in the movement.

Mao Zedong was the clear mastermind of the Cultural Revolution which began when he swam the Xiangzi River in 1966 and began his attacks on the Party, urging Red Guards to 'bombard the headquarters.' But Mao had been planning his return since he was sidelined in 1962 at the 7000 Cadres Conference. He began the Socialist Education Campaign in 1963 which educated cadres to forgo glory and without questioning the teachings of Marxism. This gave Mao significant power on a local level and power amongst young people which was furthered by his publication of the Little Red Book in 1964. Mao would utilize this power alongside his ally Lin Biao to cause chaos in China by stating to Red Guards that 'to rebel is justified.' This entered the red years of the Cultural Revolution.

As the historian Dikotter argues was the most violent part of the Cultural Revolution. This movement gave Mao significant power in the Party and a god-like cult of personality developed around him which ensured he kept control of the Cultural Revolution and was its leading figure until his death in 1986.
(despite ill health)

Another major player from 1968 in the Cultural Revolution was Lin Biao who was the head of the PLA. He assumed the role after the fall of Peng Dehuai at the Lushan Conference and was a close ally of Mao. Under his leadership, the PLA became very politicised and many conventional army ranks were abolished. Every soldier was taught to be loyal to Mao and carry out the Little Red Book teachings. Lin Biao was crucial for suppressing the factionalism that emerged between Red Guard groups from late 1967 onwards. The PLA was permitted to intervene and take back control of schools, hospitals and government buildings. As Dikotter argues this in effect made China a military dictatorship from 1968-1971 as the PLA controlled all aspects of people's lives, which made Lin Biao as head of the PLA very powerful. However, Mao grew suspicious of Lin Biao

and in an event which the CCP called a failed coup, Lin Biao attempted to free the country but was killed in a plane crash over Mongolia. The death of Lin Biao signalled another slow down in the Cultural Revolution as the PLAS influence was sidelined and Lin Biao was blamed for the excesses of the Cultural Revolution and a scapegoat for Mao. Ultimately, Lin Biao was a significant player in the Cultural Revolution but he was intensely loyal to Mao and scrupulously followed his orders without question which therefore leads me to believe that whilst powerful, Lin Biao was a pawn for Mao during the Cultural Revolution.

Two other major influences on the Cultural Revolution were Zho Enlai and Deng Xiaoping. Deng Xiaoping had been purged during the Cultural Revolution in 1968 as he was labelled as a 'dangerous revisionist' and sent to work in hard labour for ~~an~~ many years. His son was also permanently paralysed by Red Guards throwing him out of a window which had a major effect on Deng. Zho Enlai survived the Cultural Revolution by being loyal to Mao and also necessary as a key member of government. He managed to save the Forbidden City from being destroyed by Red Guards as one of the last olds and in 1973 convinced Mao to bring ~~back~~ back Deng Xiaoping as he was

convicted he was 'rehabilitated' This move brought Deng back into power and gave more strength to the Pragmatists within the Party versus the ideologues like the Gang of Four. Ultimately Zhou Enlai died before the end of the Cultural Revolution but his influence on it from 1971-1976 cannot be understated as he tried to recover China alongside Deng Xiaoping.

Overall, mass influence was clearly the most significant on the Cultural Revolution with that of Lin Biao being secondary to mass control. However after the fall of Lin and Mao's ill health there was opportunities for Zhou Enlai and Deng Xiaoping to bring back rationality to China after the turmoil of the previous years. Although this was secondary to Mao.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Here, the candidate does attempt to consider different influences on the course of the Cultural Revolution after 1968, including the roles of Zhou and Deng. The answer deploys knowledge sufficient to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands, even if it could be more precisely focused in places and lacks a little depth. In coming to a judgement, valid criteria are established and applied, and overall, the evaluation is supported. It achieved a mid-L4 mark.

Question 5

The best answers to this question were able to evidence in some depth the ways in which it might be argued that the GDR was both stable and successful in the years between 1961 and 1985. Most argued that, in comparison to other Eastern Bloc countries, the GDR enjoyed a good standard of living based around full employment and well-developed social services, especially education and housing. As far as stability was concerned, many noted the lack of serious discontent after 1953 and the growing recognition of the GDR as a sovereign state. In contrast, the failing economic situation in the latter part of the period was key to many candidates as was the work of the security forces in suppressing discontent.

At the lower range of responses, there were many one-sided responses dismissing the premise in the question out of hand. Some candidates lacked sufficient knowledge of the period or strayed beyond 1985 into a consideration of the GDR's final years.

There are many interpretations as to how the GDR's ~~economy~~ sat under the SED, however most would suggest that the GDR failed to gain a stable and successful state between 1961-85.

Firstly, the GDR did not have a stable economy in the years 1961-85. The GDR lost some support from the USSR and Comecon meaning they were left with financial worries. The GDR also gained a lot of debt when it borrowed money from the FRG after Ostpolitik. Ostpolitik meant that the GDR was able to borrow money from the FRG because they both recognised each other as a state. However, this caused problems for the GDR because in return the FRG wanted to relax the borders, meaning people could visit family, although if they went on a day trip, they would have to return by midnight. This gave the people of the GDR an opportunity to see more of western life and people who had family in the west could benefit from consumer goods. However, this caused the GDR to become unstable because people did not

Support or believe in that way of life anymore.

Secondly, ~~I disagree~~ it could be argued that the SED didn't create a stable and successful state under the SED leadership between 1961-85 due to the five year plan 1981-85. The GDR relied on centralised planning, ~~however that~~ meaning everything would be planned five years in advance. However, this didn't always work because often things would be left out, such as the military, which would mean that there wouldn't be enough money left to account for unforeseen costs. The five year plan was a failure because centralised planning meant that separate planning did not occur, for example between industry, agriculture and the military. Therefore, the GDR did not create a stable and successful state in the years 1961-85 under the SED due to centralised planning failures.

Finally, the SED ~~failed to create a stable and successful state in the GDR~~ did have some successes in the GDR in order to make it a stable and successful state. Social benefits were extremely good and unemployment was low due to most of the jobs in the GDR being accessible.

The one problem with employment in the GDR was that a lot of people were over qualified for the jobs because they received a good education in the GDR system. Many jobs were in construction, industry and agriculture, meaning boys especially, could come out of school and go straight into work. There were also good social benefits for women, such as a long maternity leave and childcare. These were benefits that weren't as readily available to the west, making the East seem slightly more desirable. Therefore, the SED did succeed in creating accessible jobs and social benefits in the GDR.

In conclusion, I disagree that the GDR developed into a successful and stable state under the SED between 1961-85 due to economic failures such as relying on the FRG after Ostpolitik. Also, centralised planning caused the SED to fail because there were some unforeseen expenses that couldn't be covered, such as the military. However, the SED did succeed in creating accessible ~~and~~ employment and desirable welfare ~~and~~ benefits. Overall, it can be argued that the GDR did not develop

Into a stable and successful state under the
SED leadership.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This L3 answer shows some analysis of the key features relevant to the question. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is deployed to demonstrate some understanding of the conceptual focus, but it lacks depth. The judgement is weakly substantiated and though the answer shows some organisation, it is occasionally lacking in precision.

Question 6

This was the more popular of the essay questions for Paper 2E.2 and there were many impressive answers. The best offered a sustained analysis of the effects of both Gorbachev's October visit and the fall of the Berlin Wall on the GDR and were able to link this effectively to a consideration of how this led to the collapse of communist rule in 1990. Many, while being able to detail these events at some length, were less assured in linking them precisely to the SED's fall. Weaker responses had some knowledge of one or both events, usually the fall of the Wall, but their answers tended to lack depth and some accuracy. Some candidates interpreted the question more generally than it was framed and considered a range of other factors behind communism's collapse in the GDR, notably the economic stagnation of the 1980s. Unless this was linked effectively to Gorbachev's visit or the fall of the Berlin Wall, this was unlikely to add to their answer.

Both Gorbachev's visit to the GDR and the opening of the Berlin wall played a huge role in the collapse of the Communist rule in the GDR as it hugely undermined the SED and ~~mocked~~ ^{embarrassed} the government. Gorbachev's visit highlighted to the rest of the world the huge amount of discontent among GDR citizens with their style of leadership. On the other hand, the opening of the Berlin Wall mocked the ^{organisation of the} government ~~and~~ due to the false and incorrect announcement but also edged them even closer to the FRG. Therefore, it was the opening of the Berlin wall that was in fact more significant as it led to ~~be~~ making the divide between the two separate Germanies non-existent and therefore making

Reunification inevitable.

~~The~~ Gorbachev's visit to ~~the~~ East Germany for the ^{50th} anniversary of the GDR embarrassed the government, especially Honecker, by highlighting just how desperate the citizens were for change. Gorbachev was a popular figure in the GDR due to his flexible ~~and~~ nature and policies which allowed room for change. During a parade Gorbachev attended, FDJ citizens shouted 'Gorby help us' as he went passed. This hugely undermines the government as it suggests that what was seen as the 'youth and pride' of the GDR were unhappy with the ~~to~~ communist rule.

The extent of the discontent can be seen through the idea that it was in fact the youth who wanted change. The youth had never experienced a capitalist country and all they knew was a communist system, and therefore

shows they were ~~with~~ desperately ~~to~~ wanted change as they were willing to adapt to a style of living completely different to ~~the~~ what they have known their whole life. On top of this, it wasn't just a small percentage of the youth, in a survey in 1988, it was shown that 83% of youth wanted reform, highlighting just how dire the situation was in the GDR at the time due to the widespread need for reform. Therefore, the visit of Gorbachev, played a role in the collapse of communist rule as it hugely undermined the government and showed a loss of fear among the ~~government~~ ^{citizens} as it ~~showed a loss of fear in the~~ because they were willing to take part in demonstrations without fear of repression, a key feature of implementing soviet rule in the GDR.

On the other hand, the opening of the Berlin wall was also played

a major role in the ~~the~~ collapse of the communist rule as it ~~showed~~ increased the influence of the FRG even more. The ~~false~~ ^{incorrect} announcement by Gunter Schabrowski, saying that the wall was open, when in reality people still needed visas ~~and~~ humiliated the government as it showed how inefficient and unorganised they were. This false announcement led to many crossing over to the FRG on November 9th but in the end the fall of the Berlin wall officially took place on November 12th. This shocked many people even Kohl, the leader of the FRG, as it was a surprising move ~~to~~ for the GDR who were adamant in creating a soviet state. However at this point reunification was inevitable due to the increased influence of the FRG. Throughout the 1980s the GDR was already growing closer to the FRG ~~show~~ due to a decrease in help from the USSR as Gorbachev ending the Brezhnev

Doctrine and stopping oil deliveries and cheaper prices of raw materials for the GDR. This led to economic crisis in the GDR and they had to take loans from the FRG as a sense of security. Therefore, the collapse of the wall made them grow even closer as the FRG began to take part in the politics of the GDR. The FRG CDU merged with the ~~CDU~~ GDR CDU and took part in the first democratic election in 1990 and won with 48% of votes beating the ~~new~~ ~~vet~~ ~~that~~ ~~was~~ ~~known~~ the SED, under their new rebrand. This meant that the FRG were essentially part of the GDR government. People were allowed to cross over to the FRG and essentially have the benefits of the capitalist life. Therefore, at this point the two Germanies were reunited just not officially.

In conclusion, at the visit of Gorbachev did play a part in

the collapse of the communist and it weakened the government. However, it only really highlighted the discontent amongst citizens and the ~~effi~~ failures of the government. Whereas, on ~~the other~~ the opening of the Berlin Wall forced the two Germanies to have even closer links to one another, showed the weakened SED as it gave citizens what they wanted and ~~big~~ allowed citizens to see and receive the benefits ^{of a capitalist economy} such as consumer goods if they went to the FRG. Therefore, the ~~fact~~ collapse of the Berlin Wall was more significant in causing the collapse of the Communist rule as it ~~made the~~ reunification inevitable as it led to the two Germanies functioning as one ^{Germany} ~~just~~ ~~to~~ even before ~~they had~~ the official reunification process took part, meaning the signing of the Treaty was just a formality.



In this essay, the candidate shows understanding of the key issues relevant to the question and deploys knowledge sufficient to meet most of its demands. In places its lacks a little depth and development, but overall, its judgement is supported. It was given a safe L4 mark.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A

- Candidates should go beyond paraphrasing the content of the sources to draw out reasoned and developed inferences
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source by looking at and explaining the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Contextual knowledge should not be used to list all the information that is missing from the sources, unless omission was the aim of the author
- Contextual knowledge should be linked to the material provided in the source
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors
- Subject-specific terminology must be used in a precise and accurate manner.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

