

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2009

GCE

## GCE History 6HI01 Option D

**ResultsPlus**  
Helping you to raise attainment  
[www.resultsplus.edexcel.com](http://www.resultsplus.edexcel.com)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit <http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2009

Publications Code US021421

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

## Contents

### *History 6HI01 Option D*

General Comments	2
Question 1	5
Question 2	5
Question 3	11
Question 4	11
Question 5	17
Question 6	23
Question 7	28
Question 8	32
Question 9	37
Question 10	37
Question 11	43
Question 12	44
Question 13	49
Question 14	49
Grade Boundaries	50

## 6HI01 - General Comments

Centres are to be warmly commended on the good preparation of their candidates for the examination. The range of knowledge deployed was quite substantial overall, and most attempted an analytical approach to the question. Answers were in the main relevant and substantial, particularly in relation to the time allowed. The main problems occurred when candidates did not read the question correctly or ignored or misunderstood the set timescale.

The quality of written communication was generally good across the whole range of scripts. Most answers were organised into coherent paragraphs and candidates made a real attempt to shape their answers into a balanced argument. Key marker words and phrases, such as 'however' and 'on the other hand' were regularly used in answer to those questions which invited a comparison. In most cases candidates did attempt a conclusion to their answers, though these were sometimes not very explicit. It was also encouraging to see many students jotting down some sort of plan before beginning their answer. Sometimes, however, these were very detailed indeed and covered two sides of the booklet; on occasions extensive planning seems to have worked to the detriment of the second answer.

Analysis was implicit in many cases. Candidates need to make sure that the points they are making are supported with sufficient historical knowledge to make the points stand up. There is a case for centres providing more guidance on the difference between choosing relevant examples and generalising. Above all, evidence has to be focused on the question, which means explaining the significance of the examples used. Although most candidates' knowledge was broadly accurate and relevant, there were many, even those who showed evidence of a sophisticated argument, who lapsed into tracts of descriptive free-standing material. In many answers, however, there were examples of very significant inaccuracies. In A12, some believed that Richard III came to the throne after defeating Edward IV in battle, while many in A13 and A14 were convinced that, since Henry Tudor had spent much of his life abroad, he was a foreigner. Several answers to D6 believed that Nicholas II was a leading opponent of the Bolshevik government, while others enrolled Martin Luther King as a member of Black Power. Some candidates in F7 were of the firm belief that the Wall St Crash occurred in 1924, and that hyper-inflation continued through the whole period of 1924-29.

Several answers were weakened by candidates' uncertainty as to the meaning of words and phrases in the question. In particular, there was a lack of understanding of key words and concepts commonly used by historians, such as 'economic', 'social' and 'political'. Many were unsure about the 'economy of mid-fourteenth century England' in A7, 'social change' in D4, 'personal dictatorship' in D8, and 'power and prestige' in D14. There were a small but significant number of candidates in E/F2 who failed to understand the concept of Bismarck's diplomacy, referring to his ability to be tactful with other politicians or his inability to maintain a calm situation.

Many candidates had been well trained to consider a range of relevant factors which contributed to a situation or outcome. It has been very pleasing to see that most candidates were able to access Level 3 which requires some attempt at analysis. However, there were several questions where such an approach was inappropriate and where considering other factors proved counter-productive. Question A14 required a focus on the significance of Spain and Scotland in strengthening Henry VII's security. Some answers dealt with these two factors, only to consider others, such as relations with Burgundy, tackling noble power and improving royal finances. Question D10 asked candidates to consider the extent to which Black Power hindered Black civil rights in the 1960s. Again, the significance of Black Power was considered, but other points were also mentioned, such as King's failures in the north and the growing alienation of white people and successive presidents. The relevance of these points was marginal. In question E/F1 candidates often penalised themselves by writing excessively long answers through assessing the positive and negative influences of the Catholic Church on Italian unity and then producing a list of other factors which hindered Italian unity when only the first part was necessary; this in turn led to less time being spent on the second question.

In questions where the focus of the question was based on relative importance many good responses were unable to achieve high Level 4 or Level 5 because of a lack of balance with reference to the given and other factors. In the majority of cases this occurred when the candidate dismissed the given factor as being unimportant and produced a list of relevant of other factors without assessing why these factors were more important than the factor given. In question E/F4 candidates often wrote a generalised statement about Republican divisions within the Spanish Civil War before giving a detailed account of the contribution of foreign intervention (which was the question set in January). A smaller number of responses referred exclusively to the given factor with little reference to other causal reasons.

One way in which centres might be able to improve candidate performance is to familiarise students with the different types of questions which can be asked in Unit 1. For example: 'How far do you agree that the Black Power movement hindered Black civil rights in the 1960s?' is a question focused entirely on the role of Black Power. However, 'How far do you agree that the Black Power movement was the most important reason for the failures of the civil rights movement in the 1960s?' is a question requiring consideration of a number of different factors, including Black Power.

Equally, the following examples require a consideration of several relevant factors:

How far was Harald Hardrada's invasion of the north responsible for William of Normandy's success at Hastings? (A3)

To what extent were disputes over religion responsible for the Dutch revolts? (B5)

To what extent were the weaknesses of their opponents responsible for the survival of the Bolshevik government in the years 1917-24? (D6)

However, the following examples require a narrower focus on the issue raised in the question:

How far did Henry II exercise effective control over his many territories? (A5)

To what extent did Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church change in the years 1517-21? (B1)

How far did the position of Black Americans improve in the years 1945-55? (D9)

An understanding of chronology is an essential quality for historians to display and this is perhaps the area of most concern in regards to underperformance of candidates. Many seemed unaware that 1489 saw both the Yorkshire rising against Henry VII and the conclusion of the treaty of Medina del Campo (A14); or that 1521 saw the Edict of Worms issued against Luther (B1). However, it was in Options C-F that there were many startling misunderstandings of the given timescale. D3 referred to the years 1949-57, but too many went on deal with the Cultural Revolution to no effect. A remarkable number failed to notice that D6 addressed the years of the Bolshevik government between 1917 and 1924. Candidates appeared to notice 'weaknesses of their opponents' and 'Bolsheviks', and wrote exclusively on the period of the Provisional Government. For D8 several wrote about Stalin's elimination of his opponents in the years 1924-29, though the question focused on 1929-39; and many answers to D9 went beyond 1955 to consider the outcome of the Montgomery bus boycott and the events at Little Rock in 1957. In the E/F Option many candidates failed to take into consideration the time parameters set in E/F1, E/F2, E/F3 and E/F6. There were a significant and worrying number of responses to Question E/F 13 which displayed little understanding of the chronology of events in Weimar Germany in the years 1924-29. There were also many examples of a lack of chronological security when using supporting evidence within paragraph construction. Candidates often gave different supporting examples out of chronological order with no references to dates and so undermining the contextual security of their responses.

Candidates should be reminded that they are assessed on their quality of written communication. It is important that as well as writing legibly, with accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar, the style

of writing is appropriate within the context of a history examination.

The best responses were those that answered the question set and made direct reference to key words or phrases in the question with clear understanding. For example, in question E/F5 the best candidates were able to address directly the 'appointment of Mussolini as Prime Minister'; in question C5 the 'effective operation of slavery'; and in question D7 the 'essential contribution' of collectivisation to Stalin's transformation of the Russian economy.

Interestingly there was often little difference between the quality of the first and second answer, particularly with stronger candidates. Most candidates answered the questions in chronological order even if they were less sure of their first response and as a result many of the second answers were stronger than the first. Very few candidates obviously ran out of time and it is commendable that so many candidates were able to apportion appropriate time to each question.

### Question 1

**How significant was the part played by the Soviet Union in the development of the Nationalist Party (GMD) and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in the years 1921-27?**

The given factor in the question, addressing the significance of the Soviet Union for developing the GMD and CCP, was tackled well with candidates focusing on funding, advisors and support that the Bolsheviks provided to both parties. The best responses differentiated between the CCP and the GMD, acknowledging that the Soviets helped to create the CCP, but played a greater role in developing the GMD. However, few highlighted the significance of the Soviets seeming to provide more support to the GMD, in comparison to the fledgling CCP. Many commented on growing rivalries, and therefore near inevitable breakdown of the United Front and discussed the individuals involved in the parties correctly. Many answers were balanced and offered a secure assessment of the reasons behind the Soviet provisions. Some candidates strayed from the focus of the set time frame of the question, falling into a narrative of how the GMD established itself in the years after the fall of the Qing dynasty or discussed the role of the Soviets and the aid they provided to the CCP in the civil war era. There was also some confusion over Mao's role in the early years of the CCP. Candidates able to distinguish between times when the Soviets helped and also hindered showed a full awareness of the issues needing to be addressed. On the whole, subject knowledge was secure, and was applied well for the demands of the question.

### Question 2

**How far were the Nationalists responsible for their own defeat in the Civil War of 1946-49?**

On the whole this question was tackled well, with candidates aware of how to respond to a 'given factor' question. The short timeframe kept candidates focused, although a small minority strayed from the years 1946-49 to consider the position of the Communists and Nationalists before the Civil War. The majority of answers addressed Chiang's ineffective leadership well, providing valid information to support the points being made. Most also considered the strengths of the CCP under Mao and compared Chiang's military failings to Lin Biao's successes as a military commander. Most candidates thus provided a balanced answer. A few fell into a narrative of the conflict but most responses accessed high Level 3 and Level 4 to reflect the analytical skills being deployed. However, the very best responses considered the Nationalist's political failings and how these operated in conjunction with the military slant required of the question. In addition, those who discussed the growing CCP support base at a time when Chiang was alienating the masses were able to engage with Level 5 skills. Subject knowledge was, on the whole, secure and applied well to suit the demands of the question asked.

The following example was marked in mid Level 4.

#### Indicative content

The question is focused on the Civil War of 1946-49 and the extent to which the Nationalists brought about their own defeat. In the first phase of the war the Nationalists made a serious error in trying to take Manchuria, far from their power bases. Military leadership was poor, their armies suffered from low morale, and their ill treatment of the peasants lost them potential support. These mistakes contributed to the Nationalists' inability to hold on to Manchuria in 1947-48, which fell to the PLA thanks largely to the skilful leadership of Lin Biao. The decisive battle of Huai Hai saw many strategic errors by Chiang and his generals. 300,000 Nationalist troops surrendered as GMD resistance north of the Yangtse disintegrated. The Nationalists also made political mistakes, including their leniency towards collaborators in Nanjing, and their unpopular reliance on the USA. A major factor in the Nationalists' collapse was monetary inflation, which caused the currency to collapse and led to the stockpiling of goods. A simple outline of the course of events, possibly focused on Manchuria, is unlikely to go beyond Level 2, and progression will be based

on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who begin to offer an analysis of the failings of the Nationalists will access Level 3, although there may be extended passages of narrative. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to consider the reasons for the outcome of the Civil War, including Chiang's ineffective leadership. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the reasons for the Nationalists' collapse from a powerful position in 1946, perhaps contrasting the GMD's difficulties with the PLA's strong leadership and disciplined forces, and the CCP's promises of land reform and the promotion of women's rights.

Chosen Question Number:

- |             |                          |             |                                     |             |                          |
|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Question 1  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Question 5  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Question 6  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Question 8  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Question 9  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Question 12 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 13 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input type="checkbox"/>            |             |                          |

How far were the Nationalists responsible for their own defeat in the civil war 1946-49?

GMD failures:

- Poor tactics - poorly motivated army, Chiang commanded the battle from miles away, refused poor military positions
- Chiang didn't trust generals → spies, had many positions, had little support from China

CCP successes:

- Better motivated army, Lin Biao, peasant support, 2 million peasant helpers



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The plan flags up the twin issues of GMD failures and CCP successes and strengths.

At the beginning of the Civil War, the Nationalist army looked very strong with an army of 2.7 million and a lot of US support. However they were responsible for their defeat because of poor tactics and lack of support, which contrasted with CCP military success and support.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

An efficient introduction highlights four clear points, two for each of the GMD and CCP.

The Nationalists were defeated in the civil war because their poor military tactics meant that they could not gain a victory over the communists. The ~~army~~ Nationalist army contained poorly motivated and ill disciplined troops, which meant that they were not successful in battle. Also, Chiang ~~also~~ commanded battles from miles away, which was ineffective since he could not see what was going on in the battles. He chose poor military positions, for example at one stage his army was surrounded on all three sides, which meant <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>it</sup> ~~it~~ could be easily defeated. Chiang ignored US advice to withdraw isolated armies, and they were easily picked off by the communist armies. Chiang did not carefully use the military budget and spent most of it in the first year of the civil war trying to supply his army. This meant that later on in the war the army had very little money left to spend on reinforcements and armaments, so were defeated by the CCP. Because of the poor military tactics of the Nationalists, ~~the~~

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This paragraph considers the GMD's military tactics. Several relevant points are made, on GMD troops and on Chiang's leadership. While these might have been developed in more depth, the points are made quite effectively.

Chiang lost 500,000 of his best troops early on in the war. However, Chiang had 39 divisions of US trained troops which slowed the communist victory.

Chiang's lack of support also contributed to the failure of the GMD because it isolated the army. Chiang did not trust his generals and appointed people to spy on them, which caused a feeling of mistrust among army leaders, meaning that they could not effectively cooperate and win the war. Chiang isolated the base of his support by allowing inflation in the economy, which made the middle richer persons join the CCP. Chiang refused to delegate tasks ~~due~~ because he believed everyone else to be incompetent, and at one stage held 25 positions. This meant that tasks could not be done effectively, which led to the defeat of the GMD. However, Chiang did have the support of the USA, who provided ~~\$~~ billions <sup>of dollars</sup> in aid.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The paragraph attempts to focus on Chiang's lack of support, but drifts off into considering his refusal to delegate to his generals. There is little here on support from the mass of the Chinese people.

However, the communists were responsible for the downfall of the GMD because they fought extremely well during the civil war. While Chiang, Mao trusted his generals and allowed them to get on with their tasks by themselves. ~~Part~~ A particularly effective general was Lin Biao who

won the CCP many victories. He used guerrilla tactics at the start of the civil war, which was not an advantage to the GMD, who fought full frontal assaults. Lin Biao led a formidable army, and when his army approached Beijing, Chiang's general immediately surrendered without a fight and joined the CCP. This suggested that Chiang's generals did not support him and realised that they could not win the war. The CCP also won over the peasants and impressed them with its well motivated and disciplined troops. ~~The~~ Because of this, 2 million peasants helped the CCP army in a full frontal assault against the nationalists. This implied that the peasants saw the CCP as a more worthy ruler of China, unlike Chiang who seemed to suffer defeat after defeat. ~~The~~ However, Mao did not have the support of a superpower, unlike Chiang. Since Stalin betrayed the party by offering Manchuria to the Nationalists.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This paragraph perhaps tries to do too much. It notes that CCP forces fought well under Lin Biao, but also considers support among the peasants as well. Development of material overall is adequate rather than extensive.

To conclude, the Nationalists were responsible for their own defeat because Chiang was a poor leader with ineffective military tactics. He lost half a million of his best troops and ~~was~~ had spent most of his military budget early on in the civil war.

He also did not trust his generals, who could have been effective if he had allowed them, but Chiang spied on them and did not give them the equipment they required, which caused poor relations between leading officers. The communists were very effective in defeating the Nationalists since they had a strong, motivated army and peasant support, but they were successful because they took advantage of Chiang's weaknesses, for example they attracted the support of the middle class, who's support Chiang had lost. If the Nationalists hadn't been so weak an ineffective in fighting the civil war, the communists would not have been able to defeat them since the GMD had an army three times the size of the CCP's, and had ten times their artillery. Therefore the Nationalists were mostly responsible for their own defeat.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A reasonably secure conclusion. Previously made points are repeated, but there is also the comment that the CCP took advantage of GMD weaknesses, especially in gaining popular support.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer is an analytical response to the question which considers Nationalist weaknesses and CCP strengths during the Civil War. It relates well to the focus of the question and is organised around it. Communication skills are secure.

The analytical nature of the answer makes for Level 4. Some accurate factual material is deployed, though this might have been more detailed and specific. Thus a mark within mid Level 4, of 22 marks, is appropriate.

### Question 3

**How far do you agree that violence was a key feature of Communist rule in China in the years 1949-57?**

At lower levels of attainment were candidates who asserted that violence was essentially the only feature of Communist rule in the given period. Such answers were often focused on attacks on the landlords, the 'three antis' and the 'five antis' campaigns, and actions against the triads and other criminal gangs. Knowledge and understanding of these events, however, was quite sparse overall. At higher levels candidates noted the central importance of the People's Liberation Army in imposing Communist rule throughout China, especially in outlying regions, with some referring to Mao's belief that 'political power grows out of the barrel of a gun'. These answers also dealt in some detail with the Hundred Flowers Campaign of 1957, when open criticism of CCP rule became so strong that Mao was compelled to end the campaign by force. Some Level 5 answers pointed out that, while violence and terror were certainly central to these early years of Communist rule, this was partially offset by popular measures including extensive policies of social reform.

### Question 4

**How accurate is it to describe the years 1949-65 as a period of great social change in the lives of the Chinese people?**

Most candidates stuck to the time period 1949 to 1965 provided by the question. A number simply described what life was like before the revolution and then describe what life was like afterwards, without really explaining or analysing the changes. A number operated in a very generalised fashion, saying for example the change to the marriage laws benefited all and therefore all women were much freer than before; this approach treated the whole of China as a single entity, and ignored the evidence from outlying areas that social changes were strongly resisted. The range for most students was good, with some looking at Tibet, and a number showed good depth of knowledge on the reforms introduced, especially those concerned with women's rights and the development of educational and medical provisions. For a large number the opportunity to ignore or break the new laws seemed impossible, as the perception seemed to be that China was a totalitarian dictatorship with a subservient population from 1949. Weaker answers came from those who had difficulty in understanding just what 'social change' referred to. These considered, with only varying degrees of effectiveness, political change and the economic changes brought by the policies of industrialisation and agricultural reforms. While social changes are built into these developments, they did not usually form the focus of candidates' answers. Others went beyond the given period to describe in some detail the events of the Cultural Revolution.

The following example was marked in high Level 3.

#### Indicative content

The question is focused on the years between the 1949 revolution and the start of the Cultural Revolution in 1965, and on the extent to which government policies changed the lives of the Chinese people. Answers do not have to focus on a large number of social changes to access higher levels of attainment: two or three of the following are likely to be sufficient for a successful answer. Mao had long defended the rights of women, and laws were passed in the 1950s giving them more rights over marriage and divorce, and allowing them to own property. However, these policies did not change entrenched positions overnight, especially in the countryside, and very few women became involved in the economic or political life of the country. Cultural changes included the development of a form of Socialist Realism under the control of Jiang Qing. A national system of primary education reduced illiteracy, and more students were able to attend secondary school and universities. Medical provision was extended, with the party playing a role in educating the peasants on disease and health. Mao's religious policies were marked by intolerance of all religious beliefs, but persecution was especially virulent in Tibet against the lamas. Responses at Levels 1 and 2 will be

characterised by simple description of some social changes, perhaps focused on the status of women, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Level 3 answers will begin to address the nature of social change, but may include significant descriptive or narrative material. At Level 4 candidates will offer reasonable range and depth of accurate and appropriate material and will address the nature and the extent of social change in the given period. At Level 5 will be those who provide some evaluation of the level of social change, perhaps contrasting government policies with the extent to which these were ignored at various levels of society.

Accurate	Inaccurate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removal of the 4 olds</li> <li>- Cultural revolution</li> <li>- Great Leap</li> <li>- Women's rights</li> <li>- education act.</li> <li>- Agriculture → Industry</li> <li>- Peoples Republic of China</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mao rule - like empire</li> <li>- happy homes</li> </ul>

It can be seen as accurate to describe 1949-65 as a period of great social change in ~~China~~ the lives of the Chinese people. However while there are a number of reasons ~~to~~ to suggest a period of great social change, some aspects of Chinese people's lives remained similar to that of pre-1949, ~~although the~~ although the ~~changes~~ <sup>great</sup> social changes outweigh the similarities dramatically.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Not a strong introduction, suggesting elements of change and continuity, but with no development.

One ~~of the first~~ <sup>by</sup> attacks made ~~during~~ <sup>by</sup> Mao ~~came~~ <sup>into</sup> power was an attack

on the four olds. This was a way of removing the imperial image of China and creating a more modern society. The aim of this was to stand out to the world as a major power, a sign that China was <sup>changing</sup> ~~change~~. This greatly effected the lives of Chinese people as it was an attack on all aspects of their lives, this showed a transaction of great social change throughout China.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The Cultural Revolution is out of the period set in the question.

A major social change which effected the lives of the Chinese people was the growing equality of women. Foot binding of wives was a long tradition in Chinese society which was abolished by the CCP, this began to show a more equal society, the basis of which Communism is built on. Women were also given rights to work which was a great difference from that of traditional Chinese culture. Another way in which

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Some understanding here of the changing status of women.

the lives of the Chinese people experienced a great period of social change in 1949-65 was the ~~best~~ care of the elderly. Chinese culture was traditionally known for the care taken of old people, it was the duty of the children to look after their parents as they aged. During this period the idea of caring for your parents was abandoned and happy homes were created in order to house and care for the elderly. The lives of elderly people also changed as since the <sup>number</sup> women at work was increasing they were relied upon to take care of the children and crops.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Relevant statements on the care of the old, with hints of their changing role linked to the changing status of women.

It could be argued that the main principle that Communist China was built on was to be equal, but in the way Mao ruled China he was similar to the bourgeois emperors of the past. As emperors enjoyed privileges only men could dream about, Mao did the same. It could



therefore be argued that a great social change between 1949-65 in the lives of the Chinese people



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Reference to Mao's status is unclear and barely relevant.

did not take place as the ruler was still ranked higher and was far better off than the people.

Perhaps the most important social change that took place between 1949-65 was the elimination of the bourgeoisie class. In 1949 land reform took place, giving taking away land from rich landowners and giving it to the peasants. This change~~s~~ began to emphasise that China ~~is~~ believed in its people, showing how everybody should be treated equally. After a series of agricultural changes including the introduction of MATs<sup>and</sup> collectives and ~~family~~ communes were created to ~~go~~ create a more equal society, families were separated and put in to work teams, ~~the~~ this was to ~~is~~ create a more equal society, this was a great change from the social ideas pre 1949.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A more detailed section on agricultural change, including the attacks on landowners and the development of the communes. This material is linked to the ideas of social equality.

to weaken. ~~and~~ An example of this is the ~~a~~ abandonment of communes ~~then~~ ~~and~~ private ~~to~~ plots of land were reinstated. This shows that although there was some social change in aspects of Chinese lives, the change began to go back to the old ways at ~~the~~ towards ~~1965~~ 1965. In conclusion, it is clear that the Chinese people were subject to <sup>great</sup> ~~major~~ social change during 1949-1965. China was beginning to modernise and move away from old traditions, and the move towards equality had begun. However some aspects of Chinese lives went back to the old ways of living, Chinese ~~people~~ peoples social lives were changed greatly, an effect which ~~is~~ is still able to see in the ever modernising peoples republic.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Concludes that some social change has taken place, but the suggestion that continuity is also apparent is not supported by any evidence.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer is shaped to some degree on the question, with an introduction, some developed points and a conclusion. However, the body of the answer is a mixture of relevant and less secure information. The Cultural Revolution is out of period, while comments on Mao's personal position are neither clear nor especially relevant. Women and the elderly, and agricultural changes, are both relevant and developed, especially the latter.

The answer cannot achieve Level 4 because of the less relevant material. A Level 3 award would reflect attempts at analysis which included material which is descriptive and some which strays out of relevance. Thus high level 3, 17 marks.

### Question 5

**How far do you agree that the economy of Tsarist Russia was transformed in the years to 1914?**

The key to this question lay in weighing up whether the extent of economic change in a specified period was sufficiently great to be called a "transformation". It might make sense therefore to start an answer with a brief comparison of the economic situation in 1914, compared to that of 1881, perhaps with regard to the two key areas of industrial and agricultural change. This would produce at least the start of a judgment. The question required not only relevant knowledge of the topic, but also the ability to narrow down the focus to economic matters, rather than including unhelpful political material as well. There were some unfocused answers at Level 2 which described the various political problems the Tsars faced, the events of 1905, the Dumas and even the First War. Many better candidates broke down their answers into an examination of the work of Witte, and then of Stolypin, with whom candidates are clearly less familiar. Witte's efforts to extend the railway network were well known, as was his focus on developing heavy industry, with occasional reference also to the need to attract foreign investment and the adoption of the gold standard. However, even well informed candidates struggled to explain the impact of these various developments, which made it difficult to assess whether there had been a "transformation". Better answers could refer to the start Witte made in unlocking Russia's enormous potential by opening up Siberia, and the possibilities for faster industrial growth that might ensue if Russia's peasants could move out of subsistence agriculture and enable the country to earn more from exported grain; also, why he had to attract foreign investment and why getting the rouble on the gold standard was useful in achieving this.

Comparatively few candidates seemed able to see the link between what Stolypin was later trying to achieve for agriculture and what Witte had already begun in his "Great Spurt" for industry. If Stolypin could free the peasants from the control of the mir, then more labour would be available for the growing industrial centres and more peasants could re-locate to Siberia. There did seem to be a lack of awareness of the problems Finance Ministers were up against in modernising Russia – the restrictions on the peasantry imposed by the mir, and the lack of a business-minded middle class which meant that in Russia innovation had to be imposed, and investment supplied, from above, rather than the impetus coming from ambitious people below, as in the west.

Well informed candidates could list the various details of economic reforms, but far fewer were able to explain what the government was trying to achieve. Candidates who did this stood more chance of reaching a meaningful judgment on the extent of change by 1914. There were few candidates who posed the question of whether "transformation" would have been on the cards in the future given a longer period of peace, which is what Lenin feared.

As this was a question about economic change, focused answers did require some selection of knowledge. The dreadful working conditions that resulted from rapid industrial growth and the discontent caused by defeat at the hands of the Japanese were unlikely to add anything of value to an answer on their own. They had to be made relevant in some way to economic change. While most candidates correctly observed that the 1904-05 war was economically damaging (the loss of Port Arthur, the financial cost, the effect on investors and damage to the economy caused by strikes etc in 1905), few mentioned that it was caused by Russia's desire for economic gain in the east – perhaps a damaging offshoot of Witte's apparent success.

Finally, it is worth stressing the need to respect the time frame of questions on this paper. While, as a breadth study, answers will be required to range over a number of factors, straying beyond the dates specified in the question should not be seen as a way of making the range sufficiently broad – there will be enough within the given dates. Accounts of the emancipation of the serfs before 1881, which appeared very frequently, and the war after 1914 were of no value in themselves.

The following example was marked in low Level 4

#### Indicative content

The question is focused on the development of the Russian economy from c1890 to 1914, and the impact of the economic reforms of the period. In 1881 there were only small pockets of industrial development in the Ukraine and around Moscow and St Petersburg, and capital for further industrialisation was limited. Major changes occurred while Witte was Minister of Finance between 1892 and 1903. He acquired state capital through tariffs and foreign loans, using much of the funds available to finance a transport revolution based on railways. At the same time, government policy promoted the coal industry in the Ukraine and oil in the Caucasus. The overall effect of Witte's policies was a significant rise in the production of raw materials and grain, and sustained economic growth. However, priority was given to heavy industry, with Witte ignoring light industries such as machine tools, and failing to tackle agricultural problems. Answers may consider Stolypin's agricultural reforms, including the Land Bank and voluntary resettlement, and may note the darker side of industrialisation, including overcrowding in towns, poor working conditions and weak unions, but these are not essential for accessing any level. Responses at Levels 1 and 2 will be characterised by simple description of some of Witte's innovations, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. At Level 3 will be answers which begin to address the extent of change over the period, but which may include significant descriptive or narrative material. At Level 4 candidates will offer reasonable range and depth of accurate and appropriate material and will address the extent of change over the period. At Level 5 will be those who can offer some evaluation of the extent of change, perhaps referring to the limited and regional industrial development, and to the fact that even in 1914 80% of the population still worked on the land.

5) How far do you agree that the economy of Tsarist Russia was transformed in the years to 1914?

In 1881 Russia was described often as a "backwards country". The majority of its population were peasants, working on small farm holdings which

produced few crops. The small upper class held all the wealth and power, there was not much of a middle class. What industry there was was outdated in the rest of the developed world. To become a powerful nation, as the Tsar and upper ruling classes wished, dramatic change was needed throughout the Empire.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Places 1881-1914 in context by describing the state of the economy in 1881 and noting the need for dramatic change if Russia was to be confirmed as a great power.

Throughout the period 1881-1892 very ~~few~~ few changes were made, they did not know how to bring about the necessary change without the expertise or the willingness and cooperation of the vast Russian peasantry, who knew little of national affairs.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Not a strong paragraph, though it does suggest that little was achieved before the appointment of Witte.

In 1892 Sergei Witte was appointed chief finance minister, his view was that economic change would

be brought on through industrial growth. His first step was improving communications across the vast Russian Empire. In 11 years, Witte more than doubled the stretch of railways in operation throughout Russia. This did more than just improve communications, it created a need for growth in the steel, coal and oil industries. This project was expensive, and Witte gained the money by taxing the peasants more with general taxes, and taxes on everyday essential items. This made him unpopular among the peasantry.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Secure development on Witte which explains his ambitions and describes several of his achievements. Aware of the process of change.

Witte's next step was to take out large foreign loans such as with the French in order to buy in the machinery to start off Russian factories. These loans were paid off by requisitioning grain from the peasants and exporting it. This again was an unpopular move. Despite ~~the~~<sup>his</sup> unpopularity, there is

no doubt that Witte made ~~big~~ huge changes and improvements to Russian industry and through it, the economy. By bringing in foreign investment he was making the country already more powerful.

Witte's plan was to win back the peasants' favour when the economy was well enough that the money would flow in and make the majority better off. In 1902 however, ~~there were~~ poor harvests, combined with an international slump marked an end to 'the great spurt', and an end to Witte's ~~own~~ career.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Further development on Witte's reforms, focused on foreign loans and the reasons for these. Notes the impact on the peasantry, and concludes with the suggestion that Witte's reforms had ended in failure.

Witte's successor, Stolypin, had a plan of reform in the countryside. He decided to work with the peasants to bring about economic change. He encouraged the kulaks, enterprising peasants with animals and hired labourers, to sell their produce on the markets and to consolidate smaller holdings by buying up the land

of poorer, less ~~enterpr~~ efficient peasants. while ~~the~~ this did help the flow of money in the Russian economy it also created a growing class of alienated poor peasants and in 1911, Stolypin was ~~assassinated~~ assassinated. Despite the fact that not everyone was content, there is no doubt that the work of Witte and Stolypin brought dramatic changes to the Russian economy at least in the short term.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Stolypin's reforms are considered, though in much less detail than Witte's. However, the answer does make clear that both Witte and Stolypin did have some significant achievements to their credit.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer displays some Level 3 and Level 4 qualities. It relates well to the focus of the question and deals with the work of the two principal ministers who made for change in the given period. There is a good range of detailed information here, all relevant to the question, and there are some attempts to assess the nature and significance of change. However, it is only in the conclusion that the candidate notes that there were 'dramatic changes to the Russian economy'. Overall, therefore, a low Level 4 award of 20 marks.



## Question 6

**To what extent were the weaknesses of their opponents responsible for the survival of the Bolshevik government in the years 1917-24?**

It is possible that, in preparing for the examination, candidates attempted a question set in January on whether the Provisional Government was responsible for its own downfall. Examiners reported that a substantial number of candidates misread Question 6 and wrote almost exclusively on the weaknesses of the Provisional Government in dealing with the growing threat posed by the Bolshevik party. Others even went back to the Tsarist era, with some claiming that Nicholas II was one of the leading opponents of the Bolshevik government. Such answers were very ineffective and were rarely rose beyond Level 2 performance.

Candidates who did address the question correctly often limited their answer to a study of the weaknesses of the military opponents of the Bolshevik government, thus framing their response exclusively on the period of the Civil War and foreign intervention. A number produced a narrative of events without a specific focus on the question. Others wrote at length in general terms about the weaknesses of the White forces and their allies, referring to poor communications, disorganisation and disunity without backing up these points with specific evidence. There was usually, however, a clear awareness of the role of Trotsky in recruiting and organising the Red Army, and in providing strong and effective leadership throughout the Civil War. Lenin's role in the military campaigns was less well known.

Stronger answers explored political as well as military opposition. Candidates considered the implications of the election and subsequent dissolution of the Constituent Assembly, the destruction of political opposition, and the attacks on the middle classes and other domestic opponents in the months after November 1917.

The best answers deployed a range of relevant factors on the question, setting the weaknesses of its opponents against the strengths and growing resilience of the Bolshevik government itself. The ban on factions and the establishment of central control by Lenin were considered, and many noted the importance of Brest Litovsk in ending a war which had already contributed to the downfall of both the Tsar and the Provisional Government. Many also covered the whole of the given period by noting that, for Lenin, political survival ranked higher than ideological purity. This explained his readiness to end War Communism in the light of growing internal opposition, notably by the Kronstadt mutineers, replacing this policy with the less oppressive New Economic Policy. Thus the key to success in Levels 4 and 5 was a broad understanding of both political and military opposition, coupled with an awareness of Bolshevik strengths epitomised by both Lenin and Trotsky.

The following example was marked in low Level 4.

### Indicative content

The question is focused on Bolshevik rule until Lenin's death in 1924, and on the failure of their many opponents to overthrow the government. The dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918 outwitted the Bolsheviks' main opponents, the SRs, who became a significant White force in the Civil War after the failure of their attempted coup in Moscow in 1918. While the government's opponents in the Civil War appeared impressive in numbers, they lacked unity in their military strategy and differed in their political aims. They were scattered around Bolshevik held territory and, as the Civil War developed, it became clear that the leadership of Denikin, Kolchak and Yudenich was uninspiring. Foreign intervention also appeared menacing. After Brest Litovsk Britain, France and the USA occupied some Russian ports, and the Japanese took Vladivostok. They were soon joined by other forces from eastern Europe. However, these armies had no interest in a long campaign after the defeat of Imperial Germany, and withdrew in 1919-20. A simple outline of some events is unlikely to go beyond Level 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who begin to offer a causal analysis of the failure of the Bolsheviks'

enemies will access Level 3, although there may be significant narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the weaknesses of the Whites, interventionist forces and the SRs, and the significance of these in explaining Bolshevik success. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the conflicts of these years, perhaps with some consideration of Bolshevik strengths, including the political leadership of Lenin and Trotsky's military brilliance.

To what extent were the weaknesses of their opponents responsible for the survival of the Bolshevik government in the years 1917-24?

### Plan

- ① weaknesses → civil war - no unity
- ② whereas Bolsheviks had unity government = Bolshevik party
- ③ way Bols acted → red terror
- ④ C.A → satisfying the people
- ⑤ went successful with WC ~~success~~

The weak opposition that faced the Bolshevik government between 1917-24 was key in its survival. During the civil war the white opposing army had no unity ~~as~~ which meant that they were unable to defeat the reds. The Bolsheviks were unsuccessful with their policy of War Communism yet opposition was not strong enough to defeat them. However, the Bolsheviks survived because their leadership <sup>had</sup> ~~was~~ successful aspects. The Bolshevik party was very unified believing in democratic centralism ~~and they also introduced red terror~~ to ~~establish~~ their position. The weakness of the opposition did help the Bolshevik

government survive but ~~that~~ it was the actions of the Bolsheviks themselves that ensured their power.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The opening paragraph notes that both the weaknesses of their opponents and Bolshevik strengths helped maintain the new government in power.

In the Civil War the White opposing army was divided both physically and politically. The different armies were spread across most of Russia making their forces weaker as they were split up. The split meant the separate armies were not big enough to defeat the united red army. The Whites were also divided on their racial ideas which meant that the Whites acted as separate armies rather than one which caused the Reds to win each battle against each separate army one by one. This meant that, due to the weak opposition, the Bolsheviks could defeat them and continue running Russia.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Some good analysis on the political and military divisions among the White forces, though there might have been more development on political divisions.

Although the opponents of the Bolsheviks had no unity making them weak. The Bolshevik government had a great deal of unity. There was a policy of 'democratic centralism' in which

you were free to discuss your opinion but when the decision was made you had to stick to it. This allowed the Bolsheviks to dominate at every level both in the government and during the civil war. The Bolsheviks were ~~also~~ always in minority but voting as one meant that they achieved exactly what they wanted allowing them to survive in government due to their actions.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Compares the divisions of their opponents with Bolshevik unity, though the point at the end of the paragraph is not correct.

Another way that the Bolsheviks acted to help their survival in government was to introduce reforms and attempt to give the people what they wanted. The Bolsheviks had seen how the Provisional Government had ~~changed~~ failed due to its lack of reforms so it introduced land redistribution for peasants and created a lot of radical ideas that showed the peasants and workers that the Bolsheviks were actively working to improve life for them.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Demonstrates that one way in which Bolshevik survival was ensured was the popularity of some of their early reforms, especially among the peasants.

It is true that the reforms made during the period of war communism were unsuccessful

~~and there~~ but for the majority of its running there was no opposition due to the fact that there was little or no opposition, any there was, was weak. By the end of War Communism there were some peasant uprisings in the Tambov region and the Kronstadt mutiny which showed opposition however, this was the first signs of uprising showing that there <sup>was a</sup> lack of opposition ~~its weakness~~, <sup>for the majority which</sup> allowed the Bolsheviks to survive in government.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A reasonable point made on opposition to War Communism which could have been taken further with reference to the introduction of the NEP.

The unity of the Bolsheviks and the reforms they introduced helped the Bolsheviks to survive in government from 1917-24. This was the main reason the Bolsheviks survived. Although their survival was helped by the weakness of its opponents. The lack of unity in the Whites and few peasant and sailor uprisings meant the Bolsheviks could deal with the opposition effectively and survive in government from 1917-24.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer is shaped on the question, and communication skills are secure. The candidate deals with the political and military divisions among the Whites, but does not set against this the military successes of the Bolsheviks, especially the importance of Trotsky's leadership. However, there is an appreciation of the political unity exercised by the Bolsheviks, a point which could have been made more convincingly with mention of Lenin's leadership. Overall, an analytical answer relating to the question and aware of some of the key issues raised by the question, though lacking balance in places. Low Level 4, 20 marks.

### Question 7

**How far do you agree that the collectivisation of agriculture made an essential contribution to Stalin's transformation of the Russian economy?**

Question 7 was linked to the third bullet point in the specification and to the clarification of content (page 156). The relevant section reads 'Students should understand the reasons for the decision to promote collectivisation and its effects not just on rural areas but its connection to industrialisation and urbanisation.'

Weaker answers considered collectivisation as a free-standing point only. Candidates described the state of agriculture towards the end of the New Economic Policy, the grain procurement crisis of 1927-28, and the process of collectivisation over the next decade. They were clearly aware of the devastating effects that collectivisation had; the elimination of the kulaks, the collapse in livestock numbers and the widespread famines, notably the Ukrainian holodomor of 1932-33. Only few links were made to the question, though these were usually sufficient to allow for a Level 3 award. Better answers focused on the fact that the question referred to Stalin's transformation of the Russian economy. They explored Stalin's motivation, especially in 1927-28, and noted that, for Stalin, agricultural collectivisation would have a double purpose. Not only would it allow for grain exports which would pay for industrial machinery, but it would release millions of peasants to work in the new towns and industrial complexes that were planned. The strongest answers established clear links between agricultural and industrial policies of the late 1920s and 1930s. Candidates explained the necessity of collectivisation if Stalin's industrial policies were to succeed, and focused on both 'essential' and 'transformation' in shaping their answers. Secure links were made between agriculture and the Five Year Plans, recognising the contribution of both food and manpower for the cities. A few perceptively noted that an important effect of collectivisation was that communist ideology was finally imposed on the countryside, some years after it had been established in the towns and cities.

The following example was marked within high Level 3.

#### Indicative content

The question is focused on Stalin's collectivisation policy of the late 1920s and 1930s and the extent to which collectivisation was essential for the transformation of the Russian economy as a whole. Answers may consider effects of collectivisation both on the countryside and in the towns, and may link collectivisation to the progress of the Five Year Plans. In the countryside private ownership was abolished, partly through the destruction of the so-called kulaks; party and government control was at last extended to the countryside; and the problems highlighted by the grain procurement crisis of 1927-28 were dealt with through the regular supply of food to the towns to feed the rising labour force. The economic effects of collectivisation include the collapse of livestock numbers and the massive loss of human lives, especially during the Ukrainian famine of 1932-33. However, grain production held up during the 1930s, and was exported to help fund Stalin's industrial plans. Millions of peasants migrated to the towns to boost industrialisation by joining the ranks of the urban proletariat. A simple outline of events, perhaps focused on the effects of collectivisation in the countryside, is unlikely to go beyond Level 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who offer an analysis of the effects of Stalin's policy will access Level 3, though there may be extended sections of narrative. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the extent to which Stalin's economic ambitions were met, with clear links established between collectivisation and industrialisation. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the overall effects of the policy of collectivisation, and its importance in allowing for the development of the Five Year Plans.

How far do you agree that the collectivisation of agriculture made an essential contribution to Stalin's transformation of the Russian economy.

Stalin's transformation of the Russian economy was mainly reliant on the successfulness of the collectivised agriculture program he had introduced. However it was also helped by trade and ~~of~~ by the other countries that were under Stalin's rule.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Simple statements which state that industrialisation relied on the collectivisation of agriculture.

Collectivisation was introduced ~~to~~ in order to increase the productivity of the Russian peasants. Stalin added targets at the end of each harvest to motivate the workers into producing more grain and meat for him ~~to~~ then send to the army and trade with different countries.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Reasons for the introduction of collectivisation are suggested. The importance of foreign trade is hinted at, but not explained.

~~He~~ it would strengthen the economy and give the country a good name. He also hoped that it would help to modernise the agricultural industry and make it more efficient.

However collectivisation wasn't the only thing that helped ~~improve the efficiency of~~ to transform the Russian economy, there was also the thriving steel and mining industries that were producing a higher yield of materials than the agricultural side was. This also helped to transform the economy as there was a greater demand for raw materials such as coal and steel than there was of grain and meat in terms of trade so more money was being brought into the country.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Some attempt to consider other ways in which Stalin transformed the economy, but the points made are not securely developed.

\*He then later introduced the 5 year Plans and the NEP. These were the main source of income for transforming the Russian economy. Each 5 year plan had specific targets for each aspect of industry and almost all the targets were reached, if not ~~met~~ exceeded, and each one focussed on a specific area.

In conclusion the collectivisation of ~~the~~ [new paragraph] agriculture did help to ~~help~~ transform the Russian economy however things that Stalin introduced such as the 5 year plans had a much



greater impact on improving the economy  
as the product yields were higher and  
he also managed to industrialise the  
majority of the country.

**ResultsPlus**

## Examiner Comments

Attempts in the conclusion to compare collectivisation and other factors making for the transformation of the Russian economy, but these points are stated rather than explained.

**ResultsPlus**

## Examiner Comments

The answer tries to sustain a focus on the question. There is some understanding of the link between agricultural and industrial change, but the points made need to be supported with more extensive information in order to make them stand up. This is a clear Level 3 response: an attempt at analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, supported by factual material which lacks depth. Mid Level 3, 17 marks.

### Question 8

To what extent did Stalin establish a personal dictatorship in the years 1929-39?

Candidates might be reminded that Option D4 is entitled 'Stalin's Russia, 1924-53', and that the clarification of content states that 'the focus of this topic is on the most dramatic and traumatic years of Soviet history under the leadership of Joseph Stalin'. Questions are thus likely to be set on the personal role of Stalin in these years. It is also important to note that many candidates seemed to be unsure of the meaning of the phrase 'personal dictatorship', which is unusual given the focus of the option. Thus many answers provided a detailed narrative of the given period, sometimes extending it back to the years 1924-28 and the elimination of Stalin's opponents. This proved to be contextually relevant for the events of the 1930s. Others spent time analysing the Five Year Plans and collectivisation, which meant that relevant material often lacked depth. Almost all answers referred to the purges of the 1930s. Most could discuss these in general terms, but some lacked specific detail about these events, and links with Stalin's power were often unclear. Many saw the purges as a single event, with little reference to their changing intensity.

Stronger answers reached Levels 4 and 5 by exploring a range of relevant material to illustrate the growth of Stalin's personal power. Kirov's murder and the declining power of both the party and the state were addressed, and there were valuable references to the cult of personality, control of the media and the importance of Socialist Realism in the arts. Some of the best answers evaluated the nature and extent of Stalin's power in the late 1920s, noting, for example, that the Politburo prevented him from executing Ryutin, and comparing it with extent of his control by the end of the 1930s. Several considered Stalin's growing paranoia and his apparent obsession with destroying real or imaginary opponents. These candidates focused securely on the nature and the extent of change over time.

The following example was marked in mid Level 4.

#### Indicative content

The question is focused on Stalin's collectivisation policy of the late 1920s and 1930s and the extent to which collectivisation was essential for the transformation of the Russian economy as a whole. Answers may consider effects of collectivisation both on the countryside and in the towns, and may link collectivisation to the progress of the Five Year Plans. In the countryside private ownership was abolished, partly through the destruction of the so-called kulaks; party and government control was at last extended to the countryside; and the problems highlighted by the grain procurement crisis of 1927-28 were dealt with through the regular supply of food to the towns to feed the rising labour force. The economic effects of collectivisation include the collapse of livestock numbers and the massive loss of human lives, especially during the Ukrainian famine of 1932-33. However, grain production held up during the 1930s, and was exported to help fund Stalin's industrial plans. Millions of peasants migrated to the towns to boost industrialisation by joining the ranks of the urban proletariat. A simple outline of events, perhaps focused on the effects of collectivisation in the countryside, is unlikely to go beyond Level 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who offer an analysis of the effects of Stalin's policy will access Level 3, though there may be extended sections of narrative. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the extent to which Stalin's economic ambitions were met, with clear links established between collectivisation and industrialisation. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the overall effects of the policy of collectivisation, and its importance in allowing for the development of the Five Year Plans.

'How far do you agree that collectivization of agriculture made an essential contribution to Stalin's transformation of the Russian economy?'

Plan =

Yes

Shared machinery →

Provided grain export money → industry building

Plan.

Got rid of opponents

Purged party / NKVD - congress of victors - only who opposed him

Put who he wanted in positions of power - gen sec. all owed him.

After Kirov murder could claim terrorist opponents fully murdered before.

However - ~~planning~~ veto things.

No

Failed to collectivise properly  
not sharing goods etc.

'To what extent established personal dictatorship 29-39?'

In 1929 although Stalin had successfully outmanoeuvred both his left and right wing opponents and ~~removed~~ removed them from positions of power it is arguable that despite emerging as the sole leader of the communist party, he was still reliant on the Politburo and to a lesser extent (due to his influence in it) the Central Committee. However by 1939 he had instigated the Great Terror and murdered who he ~~felt~~ wanted to, ~~was~~ but was this a personal dictatorship or a protection of the communist party's leadership ruled partly by the Politburo?


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A thoughtful introduction, hinting at the extent of Stalin's power in 1929 and again a decade later.

After the Congress of Victors where many voted against Stalin for The Congress of Victors gave Stalin the motivation to want to kill his opponents, who until this Congress he had not been so fearful of, but when he had tried to order the execution of political opponents the Politburo had refused to allow this. This shows that in the early 1930's Stalin's ~~late~~ leadership was not singular enough for his will not to be opposed by other leading senior officials within the party.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Suggests that Stalin's power was by no means secured as late as the Congress of Victors in 1934, and hints that this was about to change.

However this changed with the murder of Kirov. ~~At~~ this point provided a turning point in Stalin's leadership as it allowed him to search for the 'terrorist' group which had murdered Kirov, thus allowing him to pin the blame on his opponents within the party, such as Zinoviev, ~~the~~ and Trotskyites. By claiming the terrorists worked for these fallen ~~polit~~ senior officials, this opened the door to Stalin 'investigating' other ~~op~~ political opponents, which the Politburo could no longer stop him doing due to Kirov's murder and a terrorist threat, ~~this~~ His actions in investigating opponents and having many executed suggests that after Kirov's murder, Stalin had much

greater control of the party at this point.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Notes the importance of Kirov's murder and how it led to a strengthening of Stalin's power over the party.

Despite Stalin's new found power of executing at will, this does not mean he had a personal dictatorship and it wasn't until the party purges and Red Army purges of 1936/1937 that Stalin truly began to establish a personal dictatorship as it didn't matter how loyal you were to the party, if you weren't loyal to Stalin directly he would now remove you from your job and possibly execute you. The show trials of ~~the~~ the sixteen, the seventeen and the twentyone proving this, as one man was forced to admit to murdering Kirov as 'evidence' However this man had been in prison during at the time of his murder, this showing how Stalin was just finding ways to remove his political enemies and to try to legitimise it afterwards. The success of Stalin at carrying off these blatantly false trials with blatantly false accusations and no one stepping forward within the Politburo to complain suggests that by 1936 at the time of the trial of the sixteen Stalin had established a personal dictatorship and was now unaccountable to the Politburo.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Aware of the significance of the purges, especially in 1936-37. Supporting material might have been more precise, but the candidate is suggesting a further development in the creation of a personal dictatorship.

As far as party policy went, due to his Stalin's various positions within the party, congress was filled with his supporters who owed their career to him, therefore he did not receive much opposition after the party purges in the mid to late '30's as these removed all 'old' Bolsheviks who may have felt differently to him and who weren't accountable to him, giving him single leadership without opposition to dictate party policy.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The removal of Old Bolsheviks is explored, though more specific detail would strengthen the point being made.

Therefore ~~to~~ 'due' to the lack of opposition from the Politburo and Central Committee ~~as well as~~ on the running of the USSR as well as the unopposed removal of all his opponents and the effect this had on strengthening his hold on the party and making it answerable to him and him alone, it is fairly accurate to conclude that from having been a single leader answerable to many, by 1939 Stalin had become a formidable dictator who none dared to oppose.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer operates at mid Level 4. The candidate is aware of the process of change over time, and notes the gradual way in which Stalin developed his hold over the party and, to a lesser extent, the government. Other key issues might have been addressed, such as the growth of the personality cult, the domination of all forms of media, and Stalin's growing hold over all aspects of economic and political life. However, an analytical response with some understanding of the key issues raised by the question.

Mid Level 4, 22 marks.

### Question 9

**How far did the position of Black Americans improve in the years 1945-55?**

This was a popular question amongst candidates and produced some excellent answers at Levels 4 and 5. At the lower levels candidates tended to talk about a general improvement in conditions and explained this was because of the impact of World War Two and President Truman. These answers often lacked detailed knowledge or analysis and also tended to look only at improvement in conditions. At the higher levels the answers were much more sophisticated and crucially analytical. Candidates explained about the impact of World War Two, the actions of President Truman (for example desegregating the armed forces and publishing *To Secure these Rights*), the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* case in 1954 and the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955. Some talked of the violence of the period and illustrated this with the murder of Emmett Till. There was also reference to the NAACP and CORE and the emergence of Dr. Martin Luther King as a key civil rights leader, though some went beyond the given period to consider the outcome of Montgomery and the events at Little Rock in 1957. Answers at the highest levels pointed out that although in theory *de jure* segregation was ended *de facto* segregation continued and that the Supreme Court had no enforcement powers. Thus the theme of change and continuity was highlighted. The key point for candidates to appreciate is that the mark scheme requires candidates to write analytical answers which focus on the given factor and discuss this, and that this analysis needs factual support.

### Question 10

**How far do you agree that the Black Power movement hindered Black civil rights in the 1960s?**

This was a very popular question and produced a broad range of responses, with some really excellent and analytical answers being submitted. The key point to make was that the Black Power movement had both successes and failures and provoked varying reactions. At the lower levels candidates tended to give a potted history of the Black Power movement and in particular focused on Malcolm X. It is important to stress that the question was eliciting an analytical response which directly addressed the focus of the question. Many candidates examined the role of Martin Luther King and his campaign of peaceful protest, and noted the frustration felt by many at the slow rate of progress. Candidates at the higher levels mentioned Malcolm X, Stokely Carmichael, the SNCC, the Black Muslims and the Black Panthers. They were aware that many in the Black Power movement did not want an integrated society and this was in direct contradiction to the aims of King and his supporters. It is also worth mentioning that the Black Power groups were only ever a minority wing of the civil rights movement. Candidates looked at their tactics of violence and city riots, such as Watts, while the best candidates pointed out that Black Power offered something positive, especially to young people. There were many references to the growth of self esteem, and to the positive social work carried out in poorer African American areas. A popular conclusion drawn was, that while Black Power may have alienated many white people and did hinder the development of civil rights, it did promote the development of a positive identity for many young African Americans.

The following example was marked in high Level 5.

#### Indicative content

The question is focused on the various groups which constituted Black Power in the 1960s and the extent to which they hindered advances in civil rights. Answers may place Black Power into context with reference to the Nation of Islam, which stressed divisions between blacks and whites, and rejected King's multiracial approach to civil rights. The essence of Black Power was provided by Malcolm X, with his demands for black supremacy and fundamental social changes, especially in the ghettos. Malcolm's influence helped to radicalise the SNCC and CORE, with the rise of Stokely Carmichael, Rap Brown and Floyd McKissick, leading to growing divisions between Black Power and more moderate groups such as NAACP and SCLC. The Black

Panthers had a radical socialist agenda and developed into a paramilitary organisation. Black Power declined rapidly in the late 1960s because of poor organisation and leadership, the loss of most white support, and the failure to develop an effective programme for change. Answers which outline some features of Black Power are unlikely to go beyond Level 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. At Level 3 there will be some attempt to consider the aims and activities of the movement, though there may be extended passages of narrative, perhaps focused on Malcolm X. At Level 4 answers will begin to assess the nature of Black Power and its perceived negative effects on civil rights, especially in causing growing divisions within the civil rights movement. At Level 5 will be those answers which attempt a clear evaluation of the significance of Black Power, perhaps challenging the question by considering its impact on black people's self esteem, its role in encouraging black nationalism and the fact that it suggested the possibility of real social and economic change, especially among young people.

Plan:	For	Against
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clashed with other groups &gt; fragmented movement</li> <li>- alienated whites &amp; less funding from white groups</li> <li>- ghettos remained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- instilled pride</li> <li>- small economic help</li> </ul>

The black power movement was an irrefutably controversial branch of the civil rights movement as a whole. Advocates of the slogan favoured aggressive rhetoric and put emphasis on pride in an attempt to enhance the terrible economic position of blacks in the U.S.A. However, their bold tactics proved more damaging to the cause of blacks than helpful, as they helped play a major role in fragmenting the civil rights movement and subsequently turned many against what they had previously supported. Despite this, one can not argue that its effects were entirely negative. The movement was not a mere hindrance when viewed in retrospect.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A thoughtful and well organised introduction which suggests a balanced assessment of Black Power will be attempted.

It is however undeniable that the Black Power hindered the progress made by the civil rights movement. The predominant



reason for this was that it managed to alienate the majority of the U.S population. Through demands for a black separatist state (and, in the case of the Nation of Islam, black dominance) ~~they managed~~ they pledged to not grant membership to white to any of the new radicalised organisations (e.g. SNCC and CORE). This alienation of the white majority meant that a major source of not only practical, but financial aid in the form of liberal Northern whites was disposed of.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Notes the importance of Black Power in alienating white people, leading to a collapse in funding for King and more traditional groups such as the NAACP.

Martin Luther King had helped effectively bankrupt ~~as was~~ a notable proportion of his ultimately successful campaigns through appealing to such people. Black Power was turning them away and the more traditional groups such as the NAACP were also seeing a drop in funding. These whites now viewed the funding of the cause for black equality as endorsing violence. They felt threatened. The funding was especially important at a time when the government was pumping its money into Vietnam and so Johnson's "great society" programme was left neglected (This would have helped all the poor and hence ghetto-dwelling blacks in particular). Alienation of whites did not just lead to the depletion of money either. It also led to persecution. The Black Panthers, the most radical advocates of Black Power, certainly fell victim to active persecution by both the FBI and the police as their gun-toting image created a feeling that they were a genuine threat to society's security. This resulted in

were a genuine threat to society's security. This resulted in all of the Black Panthers leaders either being killed, imprisoned or exiled by the late 60's. Black Power also damaged the civil rights movement itself. The extreme rhetoric of figures such as Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael clashed directly with King's non-violent philosophy.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The alienation of white people is further developed with an exploration of the persecution of the Black Panthers.

This division was highlighted on the Meredith March of 1966 when it ended with chants of the opposing ideologies. The ever growing divide between <sup>non-violent</sup> groups such as the NAACP and SCLC and Black Power advocates meant the civil rights cause was no longer united. A <sup>non-</sup>united movement can't hope to achieve as much as a unified one. In this way Black Power severely hindered the civil rights movement and the distinct lack of effective legislation being implemented and general success for the cause following Black Power's rise to prominence displayed this. It turned angry, disenchanted Northern youths (who ~~felt~~ had never seen the supposed successes of King come to fruition for them) against their southern, ~~more devoutly~~ devout Christian counterparts. Because of this the fact they couldn't work together the horrendous living conditions endured by those in ghettos of the North and West remained. This is a rare example of Black Power being a hindrance.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Secure commentary here on the impact of the divisions within the civil rights movement, evidenced with the Meredith March and the growing divisions between various African American organisations.

Despite its obvious drawbacks, Black Power did not have an entirely negative effect on the movement. To begin with, it can't have been expected to achieve the same level of success as King and his affiliates had previously because they had to tackle deep rooted, social and economic problems rather than a mere case of obtaining theoretical rights. The economic situation of blacks was now the prominent issue to tackle and this required huge reforms to help solve. This was one of the reasons Black Power couldn't aid the civil rights movement much, yet in some ways it did help. Groups such as the Nation of Islam and Black Panthers helped establish small businesses such as bakeries and shops. This provided much needed employment in areas where jobs were hard to come by. These examples of small scale economic aid are almost negligible in the long term, yet the help provided is noteworthy nonetheless. The same aforementioned groups also provided many blacks with a reason to be proud. The

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Contrary evidence is well documented and explained here. Good references to the work of Black Power groups within local communities, and to the development of black consciousness among young people.

Black Panthers especially played - up African heritage and ensured that many were no longer ashamed of being black. Features such as the Afro haircut and afros were responsible for such pride. ~~Self~~ These groups also placed a lot of emphasis upon self-help. Due to the fact that they had previously ensured aid from the white authorities would be hard to come by through alienation, they needed to remind blacks they could better themselves. They provided advice and instilled confidence in many. This undoubtedly helped some blacks improve their economic situation. Whatmore, the fact that Black Power was so controversial meant that it gained a lot of media attention. This helped the dire squalor of the ghettos remain at the top of the political agenda. In this sense they were ~~even~~ aiding fellow blacks by ensuring they would not be subject to total neglect by the authorities.

Overall one can easily come to the conclusion that Black Power was a hindrance to the civil rights movement in the 1960s. The amount it achieved was hardly noteworthy and its only real achievement was instilling pride in many. Apart from this the irreparable damage it caused to the unity of the civil rights movement meant that progress became even slower.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Not a very strong conclusion, but does attempt to maintain a balanced approach.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer maintains a strong focus on the question and shows a clear understanding of the key issues under investigation. The candidate demonstrates that, although Black Power did hinder progress towards civil rights (with plenty of securely developed material) the movement was not entirely negative in its impact. Some points are very well made, notably that Black Power was less concerned with theoretical civil rights than with improving the economic and social position of all African Americans. A thoughtful and focused answer which deserves high Level 5, 29 marks.

### Question 11

**How significant was China's intervention in deciding the course and outcome of the Korean War?**

Most responses had at least some success in addressing the role Chinese intervention played in the Korean War, although many failed to really make distinctions between the consequence of this for the course and outcome of the war. Most were able to identify the role Chinese forces played in pushing UN forces back into South Korea and ultimately prolonging the conflict and creating a stalemate, supporting this with effective detail, such as the scale of Mao's 'volunteers'. Of the stronger responses, many effectively argued that not only did this prevent the defeat of North Korea, it also 'saved communism' on the peninsula. This changed US attitudes to the war itself and stiffened American resolve as an ultimate outcome. Many stronger responses also explored the consequences this had for the US leadership during the war, with much discussion of the importance of Truman's dismissal of MacArthur. However, a significant minority drifted from this into an assessment of the USA's role. Of the more successful candidates, many were able to explore the significance across a range of themes, including detailed material on the destruction of infrastructure, the cost to all parties and the impact China had on the rejection of peace terms. Most agreed that Chinese intervention was significant in altering the course and outcome of the war, and many also argued that ultimately it contributed to an outcome that effectively returned Korea to the situation that existed at the outset. Whilst many attempted to widen the question into other factors, those who were successful in this concentrated on linking these back to China's role. A significant minority of answers that were less successful tended to give a chronological account of the war with limited focus, or offered very little depth on Chinese intervention. Surprisingly few explored the nature of Chinese intervention as a 'volunteer' force.

## Question 12

**How far was opposition within the USA responsible for the United States' withdrawal from the Vietnam War?**

Most candidates seemed well prepared for this question and were familiar with a range of factors contributing to Nixon's withdrawal from Vietnam; this was the more popular choice within Option D6. Many stronger candidates were able to consider a range of issues within the given factor, including the public, media and government. Some responses gave very effective assessments of Nixon's own ambitions, the conditions placed upon him by Congress and the role of Kissinger in negotiating withdrawal. More generally, those successful in providing analytical responses tended to explore the changing nature of opposition, often considering the relatively sizeable growth in opposition from around the time of Nixon's election, with many strong responses considering the significance of key figures such as Cronkite, MacNamara, Martin Luther King and Edward Kennedy, analysing the impact their shifting allegiances had on public support in the period after the Tet offensive. Many candidates also offered a valid exploration of the differing motives for support, often considering economic and electoral issues alongside media and military matters. There was great variation in the range of other factors considered, drawing from a range on the military situation, Vietnamisation and the changing context of the Cold War. It was surprising that only a minority really challenged the view that Nixon's was anything other than an admission of failure. Of those that did, there was some very strong analysis of Nixon's 'Silent Majority' appeal and the scale of the 1972 election victory as it relates to the question. Of the weaker answers, these tended towards being either narrative responses that struggled effectively to shepherd a wide range of material towards the demands of the question, or seemingly prepared responses that had a certain general effectiveness without always engaging with the specific requirements of the question.

The following example was marked in high Level 4.

### Indicative content

The question is focused on the extent to which domestic opposition to the war in Vietnam influenced the decision taken by Nixon to withdraw from the conflict. Candidates are not required to cover a given chronology: chronological or thematic approaches can be equally successful. Kennedy enjoyed broad media and public support in the early 1960s for his policies towards Vietnam. Equally, there was no significant opposition mounted towards Johnson's policies until 1967. While there was growing opposition from Congress, from leading figures such as Martin Luther King, and increased opposition to the draft, Johnson's policies retained broad public support. There is evidence that radical opposition may have alienated majority opinion in the country. Anti-war sentiment grew rapidly after Nixon's election in 1968, especially after he launched ground operations in Cambodia. Events such as the Kent State shootings in May 1970 and the publication of the Pentagon Papers in 1971 fuelled anti-war feeling and affected Nixon's standing with the American electorate. However, following his landslide victory in 1972, Nixon was able to extricate the USA from Vietnam with the Paris Peace Accords of 1973. Responses at Levels 1 and 2 will be characterised by simple description of some relevant events over the period, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Responses at Level 3 will begin to address causation but may include significant descriptive or narrative material. At Level 4 candidates will offer reasonable range and depth of accurate and appropriate material and will address the extent to which domestic opposition influenced the decision to withdraw from Vietnam. Other relevant factors may be considered, including the policy of Vietnamisation and Nixon's global priorities, which included reaching an accord with China. At Level 5 will be answers which evaluate the reasons for US withdrawal, setting domestic opposition within a broader context.

How far was opposition within the ~~western~~ USA responsible for the United States withdrawal from the Vietnam war

was due to opposition = 1969 moratorium 4m - ultimatum  
 1970 campus unrest 4m - Cambodia  
 \* Student protests - 150,000

- Full brought  
 - 60% repeated

The opposition within the United States was partly responsible for the US withdrawal from Vietnam. There were many other factors that also contributed and even brought about the withdrawal.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The introduction might have mentioned some of the 'many other factors'.

The strongest opposition to the Vietnam war started around 1969 with the moratorium protests. These protests were conducted by over four million people protesting against the war. This put so much pressure on Nixon that he dropped his ultimatum to Hanoi. This shows that public opposition within the USA has forced the president to take a weaker stance on Vietnam. This brings them closer to defeat and therefore withdrawal. In 1970 there was another huge

anti war protest. It was nicknamed 'campus unrest' and again over 16 million people took part. This put more pressure on Nixon he could not lose public support or his campaign would suffer. ~~Other~~ Congress were also putting pressure on Nixon to keep the public happy. This protest was focused on campaigning against Nixon's advance into Cambodia, which was a neutral country. This opposition at home directly

forced Nixon to withdraw from Cambodia. This meant Nixon never found the COSVN which would have ended the war. This shows opposition at home stopped Nixon winning the war and brought the US closer to withdrawal.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Aware of popular and political pressure on Nixon in 1969 and 1970 which forced the withdrawal from Cambodia.

opposition was not only limited to public protests Nixon met opposition from within the government. Senator full bright openly opposed Nixon. ~~The~~ The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was also Repealed. This took away Nixon's powers of escalation. It also drastically limited his spending powers. Without the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution Nixon could not win this war. This shows that opposition from ~~the~~ within the US government was responsible for the withdrawal of the US from the war as it could no longer be won. The opposition from the government was most likely brought about by the opposition from the public. The Government had to follow popular public opinion.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Opposition from within Congress is discussed, and the importance of the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution is understood. There is some confusion between Congress and government here.

There are other factors that caused the USA to withdraw from Vietnam. There were economic problems that meant the US would not carry on the war. In 1968



During the Tet offensive government debt increased to \$26 billion. This was a large worry. Nixon tried to hide government debt as he knew this would cause outrage. This was combined with the fact there had just been tax rises in 1967. This angered the public and they did not want a war that was costing this much. The Government debt could have been why the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was repealed. This shows that economics played a part in the US withdrawal from Vietnam and it was not just opposition from within US.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The role of economic factors is well understood and developed.

Another factor contributing to US withdrawal was that the VC & NVA were ~~not~~ as just so strong. They were being supplied light arms from China and heavy artillery from Russia. This made them a formidable enemy. It is very probable that one of the main reasons the US withdrew from Vietnam is that they realised they could not win the war. The VC guerrilla tactics and the backing of large Communist countries made them superior in the war. This shows it was not opposition within the US.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Aware of the continued resilience of the VC, and the important support they were given by both China and the USSR.

The opposition ~~at~~ within the US was ~~obviously~~ obviously a very important factor for bringing around the withdrawal of the US. I would say it does not go all the way in being responsible for US withdrawal. This is because there were many other factors like N. Vietnam's support from Russia and China and the economic cost of the war. Also within America there were still pro war people although after 1968 they became a minority. I would say that the opposition at home was the ~~main~~ ~~cause~~ largest factor though. It can be shown to have direct links to withdrawal. This is shown when Nixon withdraws 150,000 troops to settle down the student protests. Without the troops the US could not win and every time Nixon withdrew troops to settle a protest he brought the US a little closer to full withdrawal.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The conclusion revisits points made earlier.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer is focused on the question throughout. The given factor is addressed very clearly along with other relevant factors. Analytical throughout, with secure understanding of the key issues raised by the question. Communication skills are very secure.

The answer deals with each factor effectively, though separately. An answer which evaluates the points made overall, and which establishes links between factors, would move into Level 5. Consequently, this answer gains a high Level 4 mark of 24.

### Question 13

**How far do you agree that the Watergate scandal seriously undermined the power and prestige of the presidency in the 1970s and 1980s?**

The majority of candidates were able to draw upon a range of material in order to answer the question. Most were able to give sufficient weight within their answer to a consideration of Watergate. A minority were weaker responses which tended to give an account of Watergate, which struggled to get beyond a narrative of events and with only limited discussion of its impact. On occasion these provided great depth on Watergate, from the activities of CREEP through to the attempted cover-up and resignation. Thankfully most candidates were successful in relating this to the impact Watergate had on subsequent Presidencies. Of these the most common theme in candidates' answers was that the damage done to the Presidency under Nixon had an adverse impact during the presidencies of both Ford and Carter, although a clear rehabilitation was visible by the Reagan era. Many did offer ranging discussion within these areas, with effective consideration of the distinction between the damage done to individual Presidents through their connections to Watergate and Nixon, and that of the Presidency as an institution of government. Other successful areas of analysis included an exploration of Carter's positioning as a Washington outsider, or that despite continued efforts and pressure during the 1970s, the reforms enacted by Congress were limited. Many candidates were able to draw upon events nearer to Watergate in chronological terms, such as the controversy over Ford's pardon; responses were relatively less successful in making convincing connections between Watergate and the 1980s. Similarly, whilst most responses offered some exploration of the issue of prestige, often with a real focus on scandal and the tarnish this brought about, the issue of power was dealt with less effectively. Strong answers made good use of knowledge, tending to stay focused on evaluating issues across what is a broad ranging question; less successful responses used similar material whilst drifting into a narrative of what presidents did, with limited focus, typically only in introductory and concluding paragraphs.

### Question 14

**To what extent did social issues increase the divisions between the Democratic and Republican parties in the years 1968-2001?**

Fewer candidates opted for Question 14. Of those that did, the approaches were ranging in both effectiveness and material deployed. In terms of content, many drew from a diverse range of issues, including the Equal Rights Act and subsequent related developments, abortion, pornography and the influence of religion. Some candidates were successful by approaching this in terms of the social groups which the two parties drew their support from, although this led to some inevitable generalisations. Whilst these were allowable to a degree, very effective responses made critical distinctions where Presidents were seen to disappoint the more strident elements of their support in terms of a failure to deliver against inflated expectancies, such as Reagan with the Christian Right and Clinton's difficulties over 'Don't ask, don't tell'. Surprisingly few candidates appreciated the role of the Supreme Court, although *Roe v Wade* was considered by some. Another aspect of the question that only a minority of responses explicitly tackled was the focus on 'increase'. Whilst most broadly identified the respective positions of the two parties, a smaller number engaged with the debate as to whether this grew more marked. That said, many did examine this in a more indirect manner. Convincing arguments were made for the extension of Nixon's 'Silent Majority' notion as response to the counter culture and the extent of the influence of the New Right in the Reagan administration. For a minority though, responses were limited by a lack of relevant material, with some attempts to include foreign policy or matters that were more concerned with economic policy. Social issues are flagged up in the second bullet point in the specification, and candidates should expect that questions may be asked in future on social issues.

## Grade Boundaries

### 6HI01 D

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
6HI01 D grade boundaries	60	44	39	34	29	25
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481  
Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)  
Order Code US021421 June 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

