



Pearson
Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In History (9HI0)

Paper 3: Themes in breadth with aspects in depth

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855–
1991

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860–
1997

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

November 2021

Question Paper Log Number P66291

Publications Code 9HI0_38_rms_20211216

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two enquiries may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of the source in relation to both enquiries with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Sections B and C

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855-91

Question	Indicative content
1.	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source to consider its value for revealing the reasons for Alexander II's introduction of legal reforms in 1864 and the changes proposed by the reforms to the operation of the legal system. Alexander II is named in the specification and candidates can be expected to be aware of the causes and significance of his reforms of the legal system.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source was issued with the direct approval of Alexander II and should accurately reflect his reasons for introducing legal reform• Issued before the reforms took effect, the source will give an indication of the theoretical purpose of the reforms• The tone and language of the source are clear and detailed as befits a legal document issued by an autocratic ruler. <p>2. The following inferences and significant points of information could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <p>The reasons for Alexander II's introduction of legal reforms in 1864:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source indicates that the legal reforms were intended to speed up the administration of justice ('swift')• The source implies that a reason behind the reforms was to strengthen the confidence of the Russian people in the operation of the legal system ('strengthen respect for the law...made impossible')• The source suggests that a legal system that was equitable and fair for all was a priority for the Tsar as this aspiration is repeated several times ('equal...subjects', 'highest...lowest', 'all classes...cases'). <p>The changes proposed by the reforms to the operation of the legal system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source suggests that the reforms were to bring clarity to the operation of the legal system ('Judicial authority belongs to...', 'both criminal and civil')• The source suggests that the changes would modernise court procedures bringing them into line with Western norms ('Examining magistrates...', 'chief prosecutors...supervise prosecutions', 'Juries...elected...all classes')• The source suggests that the reforms would improve the legal system by the educational standards now set for officials ('higher or secondary education', 'certificate in law')• The source suggests the judicial officers would now be independent of influences other than the Tsar ('appointed by...Majesty', 'dismissed only...criminal court') <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the value of the source in revealing the reasons for Alexander II's introduction of legal reforms in 1864 and the changes made by the reforms to the operation of the legal system. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The justice system before 1864 was based on 'estates of the realm' courts and was heavily skewed in favour of the upper classes, e.g. the evidence of nobles counted for much more than a peasant's

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Before the Tsar's reforms, the legal system was slow and opaque in its operation with cases being conducted in private and often lasting years – corruption was common among both the police and court officials• Elements of the old system were not reformed, e.g. church and military courts were exempt, extra-judicial tribunals were used often and peasants were still tried in separate volost courts.

Option 38.2: The making of Modern China, 1860-1997

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source to consider its value for revealing the state of Sino-Soviet relations in 1966 and the reasons for disagreement between China and the USSR. Although the author is not named in the specification, the Sino-Soviet split is, and candidates can be expected to have knowledge of its causes and its course.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As a letter issued by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party it will reflect the view of Sino-Soviet relations from the most senior politicians in China• It was written 8 years after Sino-Soviet relations began to sour and shortly before the launch of the Cultural Revolution in May 1966• As the letter was released publicly through the official news agency of the Communist Party of China soon after it was sent, it will likely have been drafted to make an impression internationally• The tone of the letter is aggrieved and accusatory, attempting to portray China as an innocent party that is justified in its actions. <p>2. The following inferences and significant points of information could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <p>The state of Sino-Soviet relations in 1966:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source suggests that Sino-Soviet relations are poor in 1966, the CPC declining an invitation to the CPSU's Congress despite cordial relations in the past ('attended many...Party')• The source indicates that relations have deteriorated to the point that China now believes that the USSR regards it as an 'enemy' and is actively seeking to harm it ('intensified your activities')• The source suggests that the USSR may not view Sino-Soviet relations in quite the same way as China by the fact that an invitation to their Congress was sent to the CPC in the first place. <p>The reasons for disagreement between China and the USSR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source indicates that a reason for disagreement is the USSR's alleged attempts to isolate China among international communists ('whipping up hysteria', 'encouraging them...opposing China')• It provides evidence of Chinese allegations that the USSR is plotting with China's enemies, the USA especially ('In close co-ordination...around China.')• It suggests that the roots of the Sino-Soviet split lie in ideological differences ('China is not a truly socialist country.', 'In attacking Stalin...betrayers of Lenin.')• It suggests that a reason for disagreement is supremacy over, and leadership of, the communist world ('we have made a series of efforts...slightest regret', 'as a serious Marxist-Leninist party'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the value of the source in revealing the effectiveness of the. Relevant points may include:</p>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="370 138 1311 232">• Sino-Soviet relations began to deteriorate in the late 1950s over issues such as the USSR's reluctance to provide China with nuclear arms and the wisdom of armed action against Taiwan<li data-bbox="370 241 1337 336">• Poor personal relations between Mao and Khrushchev, also the belief that the USSR was acting in a patronising and chauvinistic manner towards China, made the situation worse during the early 1960s<li data-bbox="370 344 1362 439">• Ideological differences over the manner of industrialisation and collectivisation contributed to Mao's accusation that the USSR's leaders were revisionists, unfit to lead the communist world<li data-bbox="370 448 1340 542">• The launch of the Cultural Revolution, which explicitly rejected the top-down and bureaucratic nature of Soviet-style communism, was a clear demonstration of the size of the breach in relations by 1966.

Section B: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855-91

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the impact of the Russo-Japanese war was responsible for the unrest in Russia in the years 1905-06.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that in the impact of the Russo-Japanese war was responsible for the unrest in Russia in the years 1905-06 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The humiliation of the war against Japan focused discontent widely on the failings of the autocracy and encouraged mass opposition to it, especially amongst students and the middle classes• The war weakened Russia's, already frail, economy, which prompted unrest, e.g. the need to export grain to help pay for the costs of the war led to further food shortages and rising prices in the cities especially• The losses suffered during the war fuelled unrest amongst the peasantry who made up the backbone of the armed forces – Russia's war dead amounted to over 50 000 in only 18 months• Defeat in the war prompted unrest in the Russian armed forces, focusing on the incompetence of the military leaders, e.g. the defeat at Tsushima in May 1905 was a major cause of the Potemkin mutiny in June• The defeat encouraged unrest amongst the nationalities of the Russian empire, especially Poland and Finland, who used the defeat and its aftermath as an opportunity to agitate for independence. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the impact of the Russo-Japanese war was responsible for the unrest in Russia in the years 1905-06 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discontent with the autocracy had been common in Russia for many years before, e.g. the Union of Union's demand for a representative duma in 1905 had been heard during the reign of Alexander II• The grievances of the peasants, which stoked unrest in 1905-06, were not directly linked to the war, e.g. bad harvests, land hunger, the burden of redemption payments• Unrest in the industrial cities of Russia was more directly caused by poor living and working conditions rather than defeat in the Russo-Japanese war• The unrest of 1905-06 was triggered by Bloody Sunday in January 1905 rather than the defeat - the scale of defeat wasn't confirmed until the Treaty of Portsmouth was signed in September, months later• The defeat may have indirectly helped ameliorate the unrest by bringing Count Witte, Nicholas' most able minister, back into favour – Witte's political skills helped bring an end to the turmoil in the winter of 1905-06. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the significance of Nicholas II's personal failings in the fall of Tsardom in February 1917.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that Nicholas II's personal failings were significant in the fall of Tsardom in February 1917 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nicholas was an indecisive man who regarded criticism as an affront, both to him personally and to the autocracy he was determined to uphold – as such, he was poorly equipped to deal with the growing crisis of 1916-17 • Nicholas' absence from St. Petersburg during 1916-17, due to his ill-judged belief that he could contribute more by being at the front, made him ignorant of the situation at home and was highly significant in his fall • Nicholas contributed massively to the growing instability and unpopularity of his government, even amongst his sympathisers in the <i>duma</i>, by allowing his wife political influence during his absence at the front • Nicholas' stubborn refusal to heed the many warnings given to him, e.g. by the <i>okhrana</i>, leaders of the <i>duma</i> and even by members of his own family, was highly significant in the fall of Tsardom in February 1917 • Nicholas contributed to his own fall by delaying his return to St. Petersburg until it was too late to alter the course of events – subsequently, he meekly accepted demands for his abdication. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that Nicholas II's personal failings were significant in the fall of Tsardom in February 1917 and/or that there were other more significant factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Russia's historic backwardness, politically, socially and economically, played a significant role in the fall of Tsardom – despite attempts at modernisation, Russia was ill-placed to withstand the effects of a long war • The military setbacks of 1916, e.g. the failure of the Brusilov offensive, played a significant role in the fall of Tsardom – by February 1917, Russia had suffered the deaths of over 1.5m men since 1914 • The war worsened the state of the Russian economy, so contributing greatly to the fall of Tsardom, e.g. shortages of food and manufactured goods during 1916 led to rampant inflation and a fall in real wage levels • The role of the Tsarina was significant in the fall of Tsardom, e.g. her lack of political judgement, complicated by the influence of Rasputin, resulted in a rapid turnover of key ministers during 1916 • The reforms of the previous 50 years, notably those introduced reluctantly by Nicholas in 1906, contributed to the fall of Tsardom by creating a platform for middle-class opposition to Tsarist rule • The end of Tsardom occurred when Grand Duke Mikhail refused the offer of the throne following Nicholas' abdication. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860-1997

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the accuracy of the statement that the most important consequence of China's defeat by Japan in 1895 was the extension in influence of the European powers in China.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the most important consequence of China's defeat by Japan in 1895 was the extension in influence of the European powers in China should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The European powers each took advantage of China's weakness after the defeat of 1895 to expand their spheres of influence over Chinese territory, so further diluting its sovereignty and draining its economic strength• Thanks to the Triple Intervention, Russia expanded its influence in north-eastern China, taking <i>de facto</i> control over Manchuria despite China's protests, and establishing a naval base at Port Arthur in 1897• Germany used its naval forces to force China to cede effective control over Shandong in 1897 and with it, valuable mining and manufacturing rights• France gained influence, and mineral concessions in southern China as a consequence of China's defeat by Japan, expanding its railway network from Indochina into the provinces of Yunnan and Guanzhong• Britain took control of the port of Weihaiwei in an attempt to counter German and Russian gains in the north, also forcing China to lease it the New Territories to augment the colony of Hong Kong. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the most important consequence of China's defeat by Japan in 1895 was the extension in influence of the European powers in China should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Though the further gains made by the European powers after 1895 were a significant consequence of the defeat by Japan, they only continued the pattern already established in the mid nineteenth century• Japan gained enormously at China's expense as a consequence of the Treaty of Shimonoseki – though losing out on Liaodong, it gained Korea and Formosa and established itself as a major regional threat• The Qing dynasty was further weakened and divided as a consequence of the defeat, Cixi being forced to cede leadership temporarily to the Emperor Guangxu before restoring her position• A consequence of the defeat was the sharpening of the debate between those who argued for western-style change, e.g. supporters of the Hundred Days Reform of 1898, and those defending China's traditional Confucianism• The Boxer Rebellion of 1900 was a major consequence of the defeat - an attempt, in part, to restore China's self-respect, it was also a response to resentment of western influence, especially Christian missionaries. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the Marco Polo Bridge Incident was the cause of war between China and Japan in 1937.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the view that the Marco Polo Bridge Incident was the cause of war between China and Japan in 1937 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Marco Polo Bridge Incident on 7-8 July was the start of years of continual fighting between China and Japan – although there had been tensions and 'incidents' before, they had not led to all-out hostilities • Though out-fought in the weeks after, Chinese leaders repeatedly refused to accede to a ceasefire – after years of passively allowing Japanese expansion in China, this suggests that the Incident had real significance • Although the original Incident was small in scale, matters rapidly escalated – within a month, Japan had committed 180 000 men to the fighting, and China had lost control of both Beijing and Tianjin • Following defeat in the Battle of Beijing-Tianjin in July, Chinese leaders were faced again by the choice of acceding to Japanese demands or all-out war – this time, Jiang chose to fight • Within months of the Incident, there was heavy fighting throughout eastern China (Shanghai fell to Japan in November and Nanjing in December) and thereafter the war spread into central areas. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the Marco Polo Bridge Incident was the cause of war between China and Japan in 1937 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The war was caused fundamentally by Japan's repeated aggression against China that started in 1931 with the attack on Manchuria and the concessions forced on China by the Treaty of Tanggu • Japan's actions after 1933 suggested that it would not be content without further gains in China – the seizure of Chahar and the terms of the He-Umezu Agreement in 1935 raised tensions between Japan and China • By forcing Jiang to re-appraise his strategy towards Japan, the Xi'an Incident in 1936 made hostilities between China and Japan more likely – the role of the Young Marshal, Zhang Xueliang, was crucial in this • The decision of the Chinese Communist Party to enter a United Front with Jiang, following the Xi'an negotiations, made a Chinese fightback against Japan possible, if and when the opportunity presented itself • The Marco Polo Bridge Incident was merely a trigger to all-out war, given that by 1937, Japan was committed to a further extension of its influence in China and China's leaders were newly-determined to resist. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section C: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855-1991

Question	Indicative content
7	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the accuracy of the statement that, in the years 1855-1979, the most successful attempts by government to improve the status and condition of the peasantry came under the Tsars.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that, in the years 1855-1979, the most successful attempts by government to improve the status and condition of the peasantry, came under the Tsars should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By abolishing serfdom, the Emancipation Decree, issued by Alexander II in 1861, immediately improved the status of the peasantry in Russian society, granting them freedoms previously denied• Tsarist policies benefitted the status of the peasantry in the decades following Emancipation, e.g. the introduction of the <i>zemstvos</i> led to the provision of schools and libraries which boosted literacy rates• Measures introduced in the late nineteenth century, e.g. the Peasant Land Bank in 1883, helped lift the material condition of the peasantry as can be seen in the development of profit-driven farming during this period• Stolypin's reforms benefitted the status of the peasantry by allowing them to break free of the <i>mir</i> and become independent farmers – over 1 million households had done this by 1911• The reforms of 1906-13 also boosted the further development of a prosperous <i>kulak</i> class, e.g. the removal of redemption payments and the encouragement given both to buy land and migrate to Virgin Lands• After the Tsars, many of the policies introduced by the communists were destructive of the status and condition of the peasantry, e.g. the introduction of collectivisation and the later expansion of the <i>sovkhozy</i>. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that, in the years 1855-1979, the most successful attempts by government to improve the status and condition of the peasantry, came under the Tsars should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The improvements to peasant status under the Tsars were minimal - most remained tied to the <i>mir</i>, even in 1917, and the introduction of Land Captains in 1889 subjected them to greater government control• The condition of most peasants before 1917 remained perilous – Emancipation resulted in smaller plots and the best land being reserved to the nobility, while redemption payments were a major burden until 1906• The Land Decree and New Economic Policy are both examples of policies that boosted the status and condition of the peasantry in the early years of the communist era• The concession of peasant plots in 1932 and Khrushchev's relaxation of the powers of the collectives in the 1950s were attempts to boost the status and condition of the peasantry after the Tsars• The increased size of the peasant plots and the removal of internal passports helped improve the status and condition of the peasantry under Brezhnev. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
8	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the significance of the initiatives introduced by Khrushchev in attempts to improve the productivity of Russian agriculture in the years 1861-1997.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the initiatives introduced by Khrushchev were significant in attempts to improve the productivity of Russian agriculture in the years 1861-1997 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Virgin Lands Scheme introduced by Khrushchev was an ambitious attempt to use millions of acres, previously untilled in regions like Kazakhstan and Siberia, to produce grain • The Virgin Lands Scheme was supported by millions of roubles in new investment, especially in machinery, and by the re-settlement of thousands of families from elsewhere in the USSR • Despite setbacks, including drought, yields from the Virgin Lands did show promise proving the wisdom of the scheme if it had been properly managed • Khrushchev sought to boost the productivity of Russian agriculture with the use of new strains of corn brought from the USA – the use of maize as fodder was also intended to increase the production of meat • Khrushchev introduced new regulations intended to encourage the peasantry to produce more, e.g. taxes were abolished on private plots and financial costs on collectives were cut. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the initiatives introduced by Khrushchev were significant in attempts to improve the productivity of Russian agriculture in the years 1861-1997 and/or that there were other more significant attempts should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Virgin Lands Scheme was an over-ambitious and costly failure driven more by ideology than science, e.g. the lack of investment in fertilisers, the neglect of crop rotation that turned millions of acres into dust bowls • The 'Maize Mania' failed abysmally by being applied nationally and indiscriminately of climate and soil – its knock-on effect was a fall in production of other crops, e.g. wheat and potatoes • Khrushchev's commitment to the <i>sovkhozy</i> negated his encouragements given to the peasants, e.g. work on the peasant plots was further limited despite them being the most productive element of Russian agriculture • Initiatives under the Tsars helped boost the productivity of Russian farming, e.g. the extension of the railway system, the Peasant Land Bank, Stolypin's reforms to the <i>mir</i> • Both the Land Decree (1917) and NEP (1921) gave a temporary boost to agricultural production in the early communist years • Under Brezhnev and Gorbachev, agricultural investment increased, e.g. in fertilisers, storage facilities and roads, also the private plots were once more encouraged. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860-1997

Question	Indicative content
9	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the accuracy of the statement that the most significant improvement made to China's communications network, in the years 1860-1997, was the growth of the railways.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the most significant improvement made to China's communications network, in the years 1860-1997, was the growth of the railways should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Railways were crucial to the movement of goods and information in such a large country as China, especially in the decades before road and air – they were also vital to the processes of nation-building and defence• The growth of railways in the nineteenth century gave a huge boost to communications between the coast and the interior, helping to encourage industrial development, e.g. the British-built lines along the Yangtze valley• The development of the railway system in the north-east, begun by the Russians in the 1890s and extended by Japan in the 1930s, helped exploit Manchuria's wealth in raw materials• Both Sun Yat-sen and Jiang Jieshi understood the importance of railways, preparing ambitious plans to help bind the nation together economically as well as politically and militarily• The expansion of the network continued under Mao, especially in the west in response to the Soviet threat – the building of the railways helped stoke industrial development and provided employment• Deng prioritised the re-invigoration of the railway system, following the Cultural Revolution, believing it to be central to China's economic modernisation. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the most significant improvement made to China's communications network, in the years 1860-1997, was the growth of the railways should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For most of this period, the Chinese railway system was tiny for a country of its size and for long periods, e.g. under the warlords or during the Cultural Revolution, it hardly functioned as a network at all• Until the communists, huge parts of the railway network were foreign-owned and designed to help drain China's wealth and/or introduce, often unwanted, foreign influence, e.g. Christian missionaries• Coastal and river transport was massively important to communication in China before the railways and remained so throughout the period especially after the introduction of steam ships in the 1870s• Though often facilitated by the railways, the telegraph network was hugely important in communications in China from the 1880s – it was expanded especially quickly by US investment in the 1920s• Road building accelerated from the 1920s and became particularly important from the 1970s as Deng sought to link every village in China into the road network

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Massive investment in air travel in the 1980s and 1990s made communications in China quicker and easier than ever – internal passenger traffic rose massively in these years. |
|--|---|

Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
<p>10</p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the significance to China's economic growth, in the years 1860-1997, of the rejection of traditional values by the May the Fourth Movement (1915-24).</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the view that the rejection of traditional values by the May the Fourth Movement (1915-24) was significant to China's economic growth in the years 1860-1997 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The May the Fourth Movement unashamedly encouraged the spread of western scientific and technological thought in China, believing that it was the key to the country's future economic growth • Previous calls for modernisation and economic reform, such as the Self-Strengthening Movement, had been limited by the need to work within China's traditions – the May the Fourth Movement rejected this straitjacket • The Movement encouraged students to go abroad to study modern scientific, industrial and economic thought and to consider the emergence of Japan as a template for China's future • The New Culture Movement, which sprang out of the May the Fourth Movement, encouraged the adoption of western ideas which would benefit economic growth in China, e.g. mass literacy, women's liberation • The May the Fourth Movement had a marked influence on the development of communism in China and hence the economic policies followed by Mao and, to some extent, Deng. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the view that the rejection of traditional values by the May the Fourth Movement (1915-24) was significant to China's economic growth in the years 1860-1997 and/or that other developments were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The May the Fourth Movement was largely a movement of intellectuals and students confined to China's largest cities – the impact on economic development of its rejection of traditional values was limited • The challenge to traditional ideas in China had its roots in the Self-Strengthening Movement and individuals such as Sheng Xuanhuai – the May the Fourth Movement evolved from these • Individuals such as TV Soong, in the government of Jiang Jieshi, had a significant impact on economic growth, e.g. Soong's financial and tax reforms laid the basis for faster industrial development • The economic policies followed by the CCP under Mao had a significant impact on China's economic growth, e.g. the Soviet-style First Five-Year Plan and its adaptation in the Great Leap Forward • Deng's adoption of 'capitalism with Chinese characteristics', following Mao's death, was greatly significant to China's economic growth in this period – this was the foundation of China's transformation in the 80s and 90s. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>