

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE History 6HI01 D

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.

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/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk. You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028127

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

General comments

This is the third year of GCE 2008 and the sixth examination session for Unit 1. Candidates are now aware of how to approach the examination. They understand the need to produce a balanced answer, and they know that the most effective way to structure this answer is to make a number of relevant points, support these with examples, and establish clear links to the question set. Fewer answers than previously were awarded Levels 1 and 2. Most candidates appear to have gained something from their course, and thus are likely to be awarded at least Level 3. Almost all answers include some kind of plan, though some were very long and detailed, to the detriment of their answer overall.

Many candidates still struggle to maintain a focus on the question set. Some are quick to assume that the questions set are similar to those they have met while revising. They must remember that past questions are exactly that, and cannot appear again in the same form. They need to read the questions carefully and respond to what is asked, rather than what they hope they ask of what they have prepared to answer. Knowledge needs to be adapted and employed effectively, rather than taking the form of a prepared answer that may not focus on the question set.

Equally, candidates must ensure that their entire answer focuses on the question. Question D7 required an analysis of the consequences of collectivisation. However, a number of candidates began with a lengthy explanation of the reasons for the introduction of this policy. Similarly, Question D10 required a focus on the civil rights movement, yet many discussed Black Power in their answers. This could be of some relevance, but was rarely made so.

Past reports have highlighted the importance of focusing on the timescale set in the question. Many otherwise strong answers were weakened, sometimes substantially, by failing to cover the period set. Question A11 targeted 1455-61, but many ignored this and wrote only on the causes of civil conflict. Question B1's timescale was 1517-25. Some ignored this completely, focusing instead on the long-term causes of the German Reformation. Question D11 set the parameters of 1954-63, yet many candidates discussed the roles of Truman and Johnson in their answers. An understanding of chronology, and the accurate use of dates, was often a factor which discriminated between Level 3 and Level 4 answers.

It seemed that many candidates did not have the specific knowledge which is essential for accessing the higher levels, but provided generalised examples which showed little depth. Dates, numerical evidence, reference to key individuals and events are all important if candidates are to produce a convincing analysis. If we assume that each topic is studied for at least six weeks, the majority of candidates should have this depth of knowledge.

Many candidates appear to have been armed with a writing template for their answers. The formula appeared to be taking note of the factor raised in the question and then mentioning that other factors (usually three) were also significant. Key marker phrases, such as 'however' and 'on the other hand' were then deployed before reaching some sort of conclusion. This approach can work as long as effective links to the question are established. Several answers looked at other relevant factors but failed to establish their significance beyond asserting that they were important.

Question 1

Candidates were aware of the wide range of reasons behind the fall of the Qing dynasty and many of the better answers categorised them clearly on a chronological basis to explain which were of short term importance and which could be traced back to the nineteenth century. The best candidates were able to take this to its logical conclusion and explain why 1912 was the year of the dynasty's fall. Weaker candidates were unsure of what constituted 'revolutionary beliefs', assuming it must mean Communism, but most could write about resentment at foreign economic domination and could see the start of serious trouble in the Boxer Rising and its aftermath. The contributions of the key individuals were underplayed by some, with Sun Yat-Sen getting more attention than Yuan Shi-Kai. The ambiguous role of Japan as a role model for change, but also a predatory power exploiting China, was also rather neglected.

(This page is for your first answer.)

How accurate is it to say that the spread of revolutionary beliefs was the main reason for the fall of the Qing dynasty in 1911-1912?

Plan.

① Revolutionary beliefs.

- new party - offer attractive alternative

- Sun popular - people's livelihood, Japanese influence

(Victory in Japanese - Russian war 1904)

② Qing reforms too little too late.

- e.g. took too long to implement

③ Foreigners inflicting humiliation

- had alienated many against Manchus

④ Short term trigger events.

- railways, Wuhan uprising, local provinces

declaring independence, flooding - loss of mandate?

nationalism of 3 principles but since 1600?

(This page is for your first answer.) The spread of revolutionary beliefs was a factor in the fall of the Qing dynasty, as now Chinese people had an attractive alternative to the Qing. However, other factors were involved, including short term triggers such as the nationalisation of the railways and the Wuchang uprising, and the long term resentment of the Qing after humiliations ~~throughout~~ ^{throughout} the 19th century. It was a combination of all these that built up hatred and longing for change and eventually caused the downfall of the Qing.

The spread of revolutionary beliefs was key in the downfall of the Qing dynasty. Sun Yat-sen's Nationalist Party offered an attractive alternative to what was seen as an old fashioned rule dominated by Confucian values and ~~was~~ ^{a rule that was} ~~was~~ ^{was} vastly old fashioned compared to Western powers. The GMD's 'Three Principles' were attractive to the masses as they promoted democracy, people's livelihood and nationalism which was lacking during the Qing's ~~rule~~ ^{rule}. This therefore would have had an

(This page is for your first answer.) impact in the downfall of the Qing as there would have been increasing opposition against them.

Similarly, the reforms offered by the Qing between 1905 and ~~190~~ 1909 were considered to be too little too late. For example, constitutional reforms in 1906 would take 9 years to implement, A Cabinet of Ministers set up in 1909 gave 7 out of 13 places to Manchu noblemen, and the establishment of provincial assemblies would eventually lead to the downfall of the Qing. ~~All of~~ Such reforms, or lack ~~there of~~ thereof, would have caused great frustration to the Chinese public as the desire for a modernised China was not being met. This ~~can be listed~~ ~~and~~ would have encouraged more people to support the revolutionary ideas of the GMD, also, and so can be considered a very important factor in the downfall of the Qing.

Resentment against the Qing had been building up for some time, however, for

(This page is for your first answer.) example foreign powers taking Treaty Ports, Japan taking Korea (a Chinese satellite state) in 1911 and the taking of Indochina by the French. This had caused growing ~~resentment~~ resentment towards the Qing as they had ~~appeared~~ done nothing, - and it appeared they would never do anything, - to stop foreign humiliation. Also, the Qing's were Manchus, which led to the belief ~~of~~ for many Chinese that they were being led by foreigners, as 10% of the population were Han Chinese. Although these ~~fa~~ feelings of resentment didn't directly lead to the downfall of the Qing, they had built up gradually over time so that the trigger events in their ~~do~~ downfall were the final straw.

The nationalisation of the railways, the Wuchang uprising and the declaration of independence by the provincial Assemblies are all short term triggers that ultimately led to the downfall of the Qing dynasty. The anger growing against the Qing's ~~the~~ reached breaking point in 1911 when the

(This page is for your first answer.)

Qing, using foreign loans, bought out the railways from foreigners. This angered many as, not only was China borrowing even more money from foreigners (and China already ~~was~~ owed millions in reparations after the Boxer Rebellion in 1900) but locals had set up railway protection societies to buy out the railways themselves. The Chinese public felt they had, once again, been undermined by the Qing. The Wuchang Uprising in 1911, after the execution of Han students who had accidentally exploded a bomb, caused even more anger and rebellion against the Manchus and riots started out in the streets. However, it was the declaration of independence by the provincial Assemblies in December 1911, which the Qing themselves had established in 1909, that ~~ultimately led~~ was the final factor in leading to their downfall.

In conclusion, the spread of revolutionary ideas in China is a very important factor in the downfall of the Qing. It is the

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~building~~ ^{growing} resentment of the Qing that increased the desire and support for the revolutionary GMD - it cannot be this ^{from} ~~alone~~ ^{resentment} as the Qing Dynasty had been ruling since the 1600 and so a revolution may have occurred sooner if this was the case. The lack of reforms only increased opposition to the Qing, and support for the Nationalists who instead offered ~~fast~~ modern, Japanese-style reforms that many believed were the only thing that would make China once again powerful. The short-term factors such as the nationalization of the railways, the Wuchang Uprising and also the severe flooding in 1911 which led to many believing the Qing had lost the Mandate of Heaven were the final straw for the Chinese public and only increased realisation that the GMD were what China needed. It was the spread of revolutionary ideas that, like never before, had offered the Chinese an appealing alternative.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The introduction notes the long-term and short-term factors at work in leading to the fall of the Qing. The appeal and promise of the GMD is set against the Qing's perceived inability to reform effectively. There is an extensive and thoughtful conclusion which takes a broad overview. Mid Level 5.

Question 2

Many candidates were able to deploy a range of detailed knowledge concerning Chiang Kai-shek's successes and failures in his attempts to restore effective central government to China in the years 1926-37. On the one hand students recognised that Chiang should be justly credited with defeating the Northern Warlords during the Northern Expedition of 1926-28, with modernisation projects to improve communication across the country, and with improving relationships between China and the rest of the world, leading to greater government revenue from tariffs. Indeed, some students went further, arguing that for most of the 'decade of stability' Chiang's successes persuaded many within China that the new leader enjoyed the Mandate of Heaven. On the other hand candidates pointed to his neglect of the peasants, Chiang's prioritisation of defeating the CCP rather than the Japanese, the outrage caused by the treaty of Tangu, the perceived trivialness of the New Life Movement, and the fact that the scale of reforms was not great enough to sustain support for the regime in the long run. Some of the best answers pointed out some of the ambiguities of Chiang's rule – appearing to stamp out Communism initially after the Shanghai massacre, only for it to survive and re-emerge stronger after the Long March; and creating the New Life Movement, which could be seen as a sign of national renewal, or as an admission that Chiang was merely rooted in the past and had run out of ideas. At lower levels, students described some of these issues, without analysing how factors such as the improvement of China's infrastructure or relations with other nations affected the effectiveness of government. At the higher levels, candidates examined many of these factors, analysing their impact on Chiang's success and reaching an overall judgement which directly answered the question.

(This page is for your first answer.)

How Successful was Chiang Kai Shek in restoring effective Central government in China in the years 1926 - 37?

Intro: (P1) Unification - N. Expedition - Canton warlord rebelled - 1/3 control - CCP persecution

(P2) Domestic - Communism - altered peasantry - secondary schools - modernisation - western economy - customs x3 - Guen Gong - TO Seung

(P3) Economic - unified currency - Gwong - kidnapping

(P4) Foreign - customs - concession 13 Jan 33 - Sino-Japanese War

(This page is for your first answer.) After the dissolution of any effective central government for China in the past decades due to the Warlord Era, at the end of the Northern Expedition Chiang Kai Shek and the GMD were to take on the role. In the Nanjing decade, changes in economy, domestic and foreign policy. And the task of reunifying China. However even though these were addressed they were not necessarily successful.

Chiang Kai Shek saw him and his party emerge as a strong party with significant control of China after the completed Northern Expedition with the CCP under the United front in 1926. Chiang's military force, the National Revolutionary Army had successfully beaten many warlord areas in China, such as the Old Marshall, this dealt with the unification of China, which was highly important as this stated the creation of a central government which had not been seen since before the fall of the Qing. Chiang also unified the currency which had previously been dispersed during the Warlord Era, creating a further sense of unity across

(This page is for your first answer.)

China. However throughout the Nanjing decade, Chiang never had full control of China, never amounting to more than a third, and often resorted to bribing of the Warlords in order to keep his government intact. Even one of his closest allied Warlords, one in Canton rebelled against him during his reign. And the Nanjing decade suffered countless rebellions and uprisings until 1936. Showing in fact Chiang did not unify China, especially with the continuous persecution of his former allies, the CCP, causing them to scatter after the Shanghai massacre in 1928.

Chiang domestically made many changes in domestic issues. Such as introducing Western influences of culture and implementing his 'New Life Movement' - a part fascist, part Christian and part Confucian set of ideals put in to change the morals of China and create an effective military state, however this was not liked by the majority of China. Further Chiang built 3,000 new miles of railway and 15,000 miles of new road which opened China up from North to South, and further improved communications.

(This page is for your first answer.) with the addition of a centralised postal system and telephone networks. He also set up 3,000 new secondary schools, however they were only adequate for a population of 500,000, compared to China's 500 million. He also did fund China's first airline. However Chiang's government was extremely corrupt and alienated the mass peasantry of China. 88% of the Chinese population were peasants, and Chiang and his government were ruled by the 4.5% urban elite. Chiang's finance minister was his own brother-in-law T.V. Soong, and one of his best allies was the head of the notorious 'Green Gang' an organised crime group. Also he persecuted any opposition and got his 'blue shirts' or Military Bureau of Statistics (his secret police) to carry out assassinations. Also many of his modernisations failed to reach the mass peasantry, and when they suffered natural disasters such as floods and droughts the government did little to help. By alienating the peasantry and not listening to their needs, Chiang's government could not be effective.

Concerning the economy, Chiang introduced Western influences, such as shopping centres

(This page is for your first answer.)

Chiang Kai-shek and a variety of businessmen in order to rebuild it. Also he successfully took control of customs, which halted its annual takings. However due to the government's corrupt nature, taxes weren't sorted properly and much went into bribing. Also when low and in need of money, Chiang kidnapped and ransomed off merchants and getting children creating a lot of mistrust.

Chiang knew in order to create an effective central government, he must deal with foreign policy and he did successfully negotiate foreign concessions from 33 to 13. However he failed in dealing with China's biggest and ~~entire~~ increasingly aggressive foreign threat - Japan. His government turned a blind eye to Japan's invasion of Manchuria in 1931, even when they further renamed it Manchukuo and put Puyi in charge as a puppet leader. He refused to deal with 'a disease of the skin' and this ultimately led to a break down and serious weakness in his government.

Overall although Chiang did set up a central government and make changes in all

(This page is for your first answer.) ... aspects of China such as modernising the economy and ~~lowering~~ ^{reducing} foreign concessions. However his government can in no way be seen as effective as corruption caused through it and it failed to deal with the problems of the peasant masses. His attempts at creating an effective government were dashed by his inability to deal with Japan, only dealing persecuting his former allies. This mistrust the masses had towards Chiang's government were exacerbated by his inadequate ruling and refusal to deal with the important issues. Conclusively his government had little actual support and was no way successful in ruling China.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The introduction withholds judgement on the 'Nanjing Decade'. The answer suggests that Chiang's achievements were only moderately successful and investigates a wide range of relevant points in considerable detail. A secure evaluation overall. Mid Level 5.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to write appropriately about the human disaster of the famine, attributing blame to specific aspects of the Great Leap Forward: disruption caused by establishing the communes, Lysenkoism and the culture of lying by the statisticians. Fewer candidates knew the chronology of the plan in enough detail to explain that the effects worsened after a reasonable start in 1958; or the regional variations in terms of natural disasters with drought in the north and floods in the south, adding to the self inflicted damage of the misguided policies.

In terms of industrial impact candidates were generally less secure, though the failure of backyard furnaces in raising good quality steel production was well known, as was the impact of focusing communal attention on this at the expense of agriculture. The withdrawal of Russian technical aid half way through the plan might have been given more attention.

To their credit, some candidates sought to analyse the question further by looking for possible benefits that certain social groups might have derived from the plan, but this was no easy task in an area where the impact was overwhelmingly negative for most people. Communal life may have brought some advantages depending on what it replaced and the creation of Tiananmen Square improved life for some in Beijing, but otherwise the fact that the details of the famine were not admitted until 1980 says it all.

(This page is for your first answer.) Mao Zedong started the Great Leap Forward (GLF) ~~to~~ with the supposed intention of catching up with the west in terms of agricultural and industrial production in order to prove his power and success of a communist regime. Many historians have argued ^{overall} this was not achieved and the GLF ~~was~~ ^{was} indeed a catastrophe for the Chinese people, although some ^{small} arguments can be seen ^{to suggest} otherwise.

Mao's GLF was ~~focused~~ focused on the peasants of China, who made up the majority of the ~~pop~~ country's population and these are the people we can see ~~to~~ the GLF had the greatest effect on. A great indicator of the failings of the GLF, perhaps the most important was the famine that occurred in 1960 which resulted in an estimated 45 million deaths of ~~people~~ peasants in China. ^{causes} The famine has been suggested ^{made up of} as well as the bad weather (drought and floods) failures and methods of the GLF (Lysenko style farming adopted by Mao hindered the yield of crops).

(This page is for your first answer.) and so the agricultural production was dramatically decreased. moreover, mao's concentration/obsession with the production of steel in backyard furnaces meant crops were neglected and again contributed to the starvation of so many deaths across the country - a clear ^(even cases of cannibalism were seen showcasing desperation of the situation) sign of catastrophic failings for the chinese people.

moreover, another ~~failure~~ indicator of the catastrophic effect the GLF had on chinese people was ~~the~~ the loss of family life and nurture seen in the communes set up by mao in 1966 ~~in~~ in preparation for the GLF and push for unrealistic production levels. Family life was destroyed as men and women slept in separate dormitories and children were raised in creches and so ~~a~~ mothers across the country had lost their maternal role which is a catastrophe for many people in china at that time - gave little incentive to work //

Furthermore, ~~the~~ the chinese urban population also suffered greatly under the regime of the GLF as they too suffered ~~for~~ from food shortages and had to live in work units. Also their lives ~~+~~ were dramatically changed by the GLF and mao's policy of 'walking on both ~~feet~~ legs' (which meant focus ~~on~~ on agriculture and industry) as again the backyard furnaces meant all their jobs were neglected in order to produce useless impure steel which they were then sent to use impossibly.

(This page is for your first answer.) Additionally, the GLF was catastrophic for the Chinese people as despite their extreme hard work the aims were not achieved by 1962 and Mao stepped down as leader of CCP and a more capitalist system was introduced to restore the economy and living conditions of the Chinese people. The fact Mao had to step down power, and Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping had to introduce capitalist ideas to a socialist state is proof the CCP leader ~~saw~~ saw GLF as a failure ^{This} ~~failure~~ needed ^{to be} corrected ^{even} though ^{Mao} would never admit his failings.

However some arguments can be seen to say that the GLF was not a complete catastrophe for the Chinese people. For ~~instance~~ instance industrial production had increased by 9%, although they did not meet their ~~gastromonomical~~ targets, this ~~to~~ increase was large and meant in one way the economy was improving. Consequently the GLF was not a complete catastrophe for all Chinese people.

In addition, employment of Chinese people was extremely high and so Chinese people benefitted from having a job and consistent wages. Although the workers were ~~extreme~~ poorly paid and their jobs were often not skilled and so workers still did suffer from the employment they were in.

Moreover, it could also be argued the GLF was not a complete catastrophe for all Chinese people as some

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~People~~ people of the population benefited such as the party leaders of Chinese Communist Party because they were rewarded for 'achieving' the inflated figures of production and agricultural harvest. therefore they would not see the GLF as a complete failure by ~~the~~ 1962.

In conclusion although ^{extremely} a small amount of the Chinese population benefited from the GLF by 1962, the vast majority only saw devastation & come from the GLF, perhaps the most drastic and horrific evidence of ~~the~~ this was the 45 million death ^{resulting from} ~~caused by~~ the famine ~~in~~ from 1960. It is clear no amount of industrial growth and high crop yield can justify this amount of deaths which is why the GLF was a catastrophe for the Chinese population.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer notes the catastrophic effects of the Great Leap Forward for rural China, referring to the famine and the development of the communes. The impact on the cities is less secure. There is an attempt to frame a balanced argument, but this is not entirely persuasive and might have benefited from more detailed information. An analytical shape to the answer: mid Level 4.

Question 4

The question lent itself to an analytical approach, with many candidates taking the opportunity to balance the motive of political control against other possible motives. For many this proved easier for the Cultural Revolution, where less ambiguity surrounds Mao's actions, but most candidates were also able to support arguments which could explain the Hundred Flowers campaign. The best answers were those that related the campaigns to wider contextual knowledge, bringing in the actions of key individuals (especially in 1966), ideological debates about the nature of the revolution and external issues (notably relations with the Soviet Union). Doing this of course did require accurate knowledge of the chronology and the specific developments of the two periods in question.

(This page is for your second answer.) During Mao Zedong's time in power he carried out many campaigns which caused purges of people that were 'rightist' and were not following the Communist ways he felt to be right. In 1957 he led the Hundred Flowers Campaign and in 1966 he introduced the Cultural Revolution. It could be argued that the main reasons for carrying these out were in order for him to ~~regain~~ strengthen his political control but there were also other factors due to his ideological beliefs & want for help in bringing in new campaigns.

It could be argued that Mao brought in both the Hundred Flowers Campaign and Cultural Revolution in order to rid himself of opposition from intellectuals and rightists. This was evident as Mao was scared of losing power as he had seen that in the USSR, Khrushchev had been kicked out of the party for his poor economic policies. Mao therefore headed to strengthen his power.

(This page is for your second answer.) by getting rid of those who would criticise him. However, ~~that~~ there were also reasons why he needed experts and intellectuals and therefore he launched these campaigns not for ~~just~~ strengthening his political control but in order to find ways to get advice from experts which would help him form the basis of the Great Leap forward which he launched in 1958, a year after the hundred flowers campaign. Overall, it is accurate to say he launched the hundred flowers campaign and cultural revolution in order to strengthen his ~~control~~ political power but he had also wanted the help of intellectuals in the hundred flowers campaign which meant strengthening his control wasn't just by getting rid of opposition.

It could be argued that the Cultural Revolution was launched to strengthen Mao's political control as by 1966 there ~~was~~ were splits & factionalisms in the party which Mao felt threatened by. Liu & Deng had brought in policies that Mao felt were moving China into a more capitalist state whereas the Gang of 4 were much more extreme Maoists. By launching the cultural revolution he could reassert himself as supreme leader of China & stop himself from feeling threatened by ~~others~~ divisions within the party. However, it could be argued that instead of due to political strengthening,

(This page is for your second answer.) Mao launched the cultural revolution because of his ideological beliefs. He felt that the revolution should be a constant struggle & wanted to give the new generation a revolutionary experience. Although the factionalism within the party meant ~~to~~ Mao felt he had to strengthen his political control, his ideological communist beliefs were the driving force behind launching ^{& carrying out} the Cultural Revolution as 'the revolution is not a fed party' & he needed to reassert the fight against the bourgeoisie in order to achieve the perfect communist state that he wanted.

in touch improve
Mao carried out the hundred flowers campaign & cultural revolution in order to strengthen his control. In 1954 the Gao Gang & Rao Rashi affair had shown Mao that even those in his own party could be a threat to him. By carrying out the hundred flowers campaign he led China to the Anti Rightist movement and used this to purge anyone that spoke against him. Before the cultural revolution Mao also saw criticisms of his power, including in a play by Huftan which symbolised the unfair dismissal of Peng Dehuai. In carrying out both campaigns he got rid of anything or anyone that he felt was criticising him or a threat to his power & deterred anyone else from even trying to do it. However there are arguments that show

(This page is for your second answer.) Mao wanted criticisms, especially in the hundred flowers campaign, in order to improve the country. Just before the hundred flowers Mao had gone on a tour of China & felt he was in touch with the Chinese people. Instead of strengthening his political power he had carried it out in order to show there was a 'people's revolution'. Mao had also stepped in to stop the terror & violence which the cleansing of the class ranks had created during the cultural revolution to assert Mao's power. Overall, Mao did carry out both campaigns in order to strengthen his political power due to earlier events which had threatened or criticised what he had done, but there is also evidence which shows instead he felt the people were more important & carried them out in order to keep in touch with them which he felt was more important.

In conclusion, although ^{Mao's} his ideology and need for expertise were reasons why he launched both the cultural revolution & hundred flowers campaign, the reasons for carrying them out to the extent that he did was ultimately to strengthen his political control & reassert himself as the Supreme leader of China.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The answer considers both the Hundred Flowers movement and the Cultural Revolution together, and provides a sharp focus on Mao's determination to maintain his own power. A well detailed evaluation, which is perhaps more persuasive on the Cultural Revolution. Mid Level 5.

Question 5

Some candidates attempted Question 5 without grasping that 'system of government' referred to the political system and went on to write irrelevantly about economic modernisation or the 1905 Revolution. Another common error was to spend too long describing how Alexander II had changed the political system before 1881, when it would have been better to have made selective use of this knowledge to highlight the repressive nature of Alexander III's regime after 1881. While many candidates knew that Alexander III had tightened central control, reduced the powers of the zemstva and persecuted the non-Russian peoples of the empire, they had difficulty making their knowledge relevant to what the question was asking. Obviously the Duma, Fundamental Law and subsequent electoral changes lay at the core of this question and many candidates were able to make some attempt to evaluate how much change was made in reality. The overwhelming consensus was to argue that change was indeed limited, although there was scope to discuss the advance in terms of parliamentary practice (such as the development of committees) and the constructive legislation (land reform and social insurance) that was passed before 1914.

(This page is for your first answer.) To what extent was the Tsarist system of government modified in the years 1881-1914?

Following the rule of Tsar Alexander II who died in 1881, Alexander III and Nicholas II introduced economic, social and political changes in attempt to retain autocracy, boost the industrialisation of Russia and modernise society so that it could potentially one day be able to compete with the West. On the one hand, one could argue that to a large extent the system of government was modified during the years leading up to the outbreak of the first world war, yet there is also question as to whether the numerous reforms implemented actually had as great an effect on the Tsarist system of government as intended.

One of the fundamental ways in which the system of government was modified was the

(This page is for your first answer.)

attitude towards the economy ^{and foreign investors in the West} during the early years of Nicholas II's reign. Nicholas's minister of finance, Witte, had made it his task to achieve a stable system of government dominated by the nobility, all brought about by his transforming of the economy. In 1897 ^{Witte} introduced a new currency of the rouble, which was linked to the gold standard, therefore attracting foreign investors from richer countries in the West such as Britain and France. This had a huge impact on the Tsarist system of government - as previously Russia had been separated economically from the West but now due to Witte's economic policies attracting foreign investors, this changed the government's attitude to international relations as in the early 1900s, 47% of government revenue was funded by foreign investors. Although Nicholas' government remained largely wary in their attitude towards ~~foreign~~ the West, they could not help but accept that it was international funding which was fuelling Witte's industrialisation ^{reformation}. More important than ^{reformation} government attitude was the direct changes in government structure between the years of 1905 to 1914. Following the concessions brought about by the 1905 Uprising, a "Duma" or Constituent Assembly was formed from April 1906 onwards, in attempt to have a

(This page is for your first answer.) more democratic, less autocratic approach to managing internal Russian affairs. There were 4 dumas over the course of the years leading up to the war, all of which intended to implement economic and social reforms in the interest of Russian citizens, such as greater freedom of the press, sickness benefits and ~~greater~~ greater funding in education, ^(17000 roubles were spent on education in 1912) to a large extent, the Dumas succeeded in implementing some change to Tsarist system of government, as they ~~had~~ had the option of putting considerable pressure on Nicholas in order to achieve reform. Symbolically, the Dumas were a huge modification to the Tsarist system of government, as up until this point there had not been an "elected assembly of ministers, as Russia had been under the thumb of Tsarist autocracy.

On the other hand, one could argue that although Nicholas politically and economically made changes to the Tsarist system, in reality his reforms had little practical impact. The Dumas, although theoretically an "elected" constituent assembly did not, in fact, represent the opinion of the people. Because of the 1907 Electoral laws which diluted the vote of some classes within

(This page is for your first answer.) society; it took 230 nobles' or 60 000 peasants' votes to elect just one member of the Duma. Because the vote of peasants was so unjustly diluted, the make up of the Duma was largely conservative and supported the Tsarist regime of autocracy anyway (as members were elected by the nobility, who by and large stood behind the Tsar.) This meant that, in theory, it seemed that government system had taken a more democratic turn, but in reality the members of the "democratically" elected assembly were just puppets of autocracy ~~with~~ acting on behalf of their puppeteer, the Tsar. This idea was clarified in the 1906 Fundamental Laws, stating that Nicholas had the power to dissolve the Duma whenever he wished (so they had very little power if they did not come favour with the Tsar) and although he was obliged to listen to their advice, he had no obligation whatsoever to accept it. This is solid proof that, although from an outsider's perspective it seemed that Russia was following a more democratic system of government, in reality Nicholas was determined to maintain autocracy "as firmly and unyieldingly as his father." The idea that Nicholas had

(This page is for your first answer.) no genuine intention to reform the system of government ~~was shown~~ after his establishment of the First Duma in 1906 - "the Duma is a tiresome necessity." Here, we see that the only reason he implemented change to government structure was due to the October Manifesto of 1905 and his promises for an elected assembly, but in reality he had no desire to change anything to do with the nature of Tsarism and autocratic rule.

As well as having no desire whatsoever to implement reform regarding the government, Nicholas' ideas were reflected by his actions; he dissolved the first Duma after only 3 months, claiming that their ideas were ~~impossible~~ not only impossible but too radical to be carried through. In addition, ~~in~~ during the 3rd Duma (1907 - 1914), Stolypin, Nicholas' minister, encountered ^{in 1910} landlord opposition, whilst trying to implement land reforms. In spite of the clear opposition of ~~the~~ electoral assembly (which was composed mainly of the ^{less radical} nobility at the time), Stolypin passed his land reforms under Article 87 of the 1906 Fundamental Laws - therefore solidifying that the new form of government had no power whatsoever, and that the power ultimately

(This page is for your first answer.)

lay with Nicholas and his ministerial friends. Although Stolypin was forced to go to the Duma to account for his blatant ~~was~~ undermining of the Constitution, Nicholas dissolved the Duma shortly afterwards anyway, proving that all laws were put for show and the Tsar's word was the only law.

In conclusion, although several faux attempts were made to modify the Tsarist form of government, ultimately power lay with the Tsar and his ministers in the archaic, autocratic form of rule. It was due to his inability to modify this that Nicholas encountered opposition leading up to 1917, as the ^{Russian} people slowly but surely realised that the system was superannuated and unjust, and had no place in the progressive future of Russian society.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer is a confident and focused response to the question. The candidate makes interesting and persuasive links between Witte's economic reforms and the stability of Tsarism. The Dumas are investigated in detail, and the answer concludes that these do not represent a dramatic break with the past. An assured evaluation: high Level 5.

Question 6

Candidates appeared comfortable with Question 6 and most were able to weigh Lenin's contribution to Bolshevik success against the various other factors, usually the weaknesses or mistakes of the Provisional Government. There were some misconceptions about Lenin's popularity (Eisenstein would have been gratified to read of the huge crowds greeting Lenin on his return to the Finland Station, and of his rapport with the peasantry). Better informed candidates emphasised the importance of cultivating the Petrograd Soviet as the Bolshevik power base and ending the initial period of its cooperation with the Provisional Government. The automatic appeal of 'peace, bread and land' was exaggerated in many weaker answers, with some believing that mass support was the means by which the Bolsheviks seized power. There were however, some telling references to Lenin's twist on Marxist ideology to show how he accelerated the revolution, rather than waiting for the bourgeois revolution of March to run its course. In terms of Provisional Government mistakes, the obvious disadvantage of continuing to perform badly in the war and the counterproductive impact of releasing and arming the Bolsheviks during the Kornilov episode were frequently used well. However, few candidates seemed aware that there were two separate Provisional Governments during this period, led by Prince Lvov and Alexander Kerensky respectively. Candidates who emphasised that it was Lenin's success in persuading the Bolshevik Central Committee to act, in order to pre-empt both the convening of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets and Constituent Assembly elections, were able to argue more convincingly in support of the stated factor. Of the other individuals whose contributions were assessed, Trotsky received most attention but candidates with poor chronology often went on to include actions he took after the seizure of power, which were not relevant.

~~It would~~ It would be largely accurate to say that Lenin's leadership was the most important reason for the Bolsheviks' success in the revolution of November 1917. This is due to ~~his~~ ^{the} timing, the use of tactics used in the Kornilov affair and his ideologies of having a party with a small number of committed revolutionaries. However, Lenin is not the only reason for Bolshevik success; Trotsky played a huge role in the planning of the revolution as well.

The first reason why it is largely accurate to say that Bolshevik success in the November revolution of 1917 was due to Lenin ~~was~~ ^{is} due to the timing. Lenin planned the revolution to take place overnight and this helped making it a success as there was little fighting and ~~the~~ bloodshed. Also, the fact that it took place before the elections of

(This page is for your first answer.) the Constituent assembly gave the Bolsheviks a chance of running for the elections. Lenin organised the timing in such a way that it happened after his April Theses and after the July Days. The April Theses was when Lenin announced his policies in public and they were 'peace, bread and land' and 'all power to the soviets'. These policies by Lenin helped increase support for the party and gained support from the largest percentage of the population; the peasants. Timing was also crucial to the fact that Lenin was responsible for the success of the revolution as the Bolsheviks were able to learn from the failure of the July Days in which Lenin had to flee to Finland and many Bolshevik leaders were also arrested. Overall, the success of the 1917 revolution was largely due to the timing of it which was under Lenin's control.

The second reason why it's largely accurate to say that Bolshevik success in the November revolution in 1917 was due to Lenin is due to the tactics used by Lenin. ~~The Bolsheviks~~ The July Days ~~was~~ was a failure for the Bolsheviks as they were disorganised and unable to seize power. This was a learning point and helped the Bolsheviks

(This page is for your first answer.) became more united. Although the July Days gave a bad image of the Bolsheviks; this image drastically changed during the Kornilov Affair. This affair was when General Kornilov attempted to overthrow the provisional government and create a military dictatorship. To prevent this, the Bolsheviks were given arms by the Provisional Government to help put down the affair. This was a success as not only ~~was~~ Lenin able to get rid of opposition from Kornilov; but the Bolsheviks were now seen as the defenders of Russia and were also able to keep the weapons they were given during this to aid them during the November revolution. Furthermore, Lenin's use of tactics also led to success in the revolution as he used a small number of committed revolutionaries to carry out the revolution overnight. This not only meant that there was little bloodshed as the Bolsheviks were able to seize power in a short time; but also that they faced little opposition such as some women soldiers at the Winter Palace that showed little ~~resistance~~ opposition and were easily put down. Overall, the use of these tactics by Lenin was a large reason for their success during the revolution.

(This page is for your first answer.) The third and final reason why it is largely accurate to hold Lenin responsible for the success of the revolution in November 1917 is ~~was~~ due to his party ideologies. This is important as it kept the party united; even though they were a minority in contrast to the Mensheviks initially. Furthermore, ~~his~~ ^{Lenin's} personal ideology of ~~the~~ having the revolution carried out by a small number of committed revolutionaries proved to be a success. Lenin's policies of 'Peace, bread and land' and 'all power to the soviets' proved to be a contributing factor to the success of their takeover because the policies were largely favoured by the ~~pe~~ Russians. This is because the policies tackled all the issues which the provisional government didn't. 'Peace' was tackling the issue of ending Russian involvement in ~~at~~ World War One, 'Bread' tackled the famine and food concerns and 'land' tackled the issue of peasant land. 'All power to the soviets' was also a largely popular policy as it gave power to the soviets workers, ~~is~~ thus gaining more popularity amongst peasants and industrial workers. Overall, ~~the~~ Lenin was largely responsible for Bolshevik success because his policies and ideologies kept the party united and

(This page is for your first answer.) gained support from the large amounts of Russian peasants that counted for 80% of the entire population.

However, Lenin is not the only reason for Bolshevik success in the revolution of 1917. Trotsky also played a key role in leading the Reds and revolutionaries to success. For example, Trotsky's planning of the takeover shows that it was itself a major contributing factor. The fact that he planned the Reds taking over the major places such as, the Telegraph Exchange and the Banks and the Reds signaled for the takeover from the Cruiser Aurora shows that the plans were executed as smoothly as possible - Trotsky was in control of the military department and from his office he issued weapons to be used in the revolution. The Reds were also able to put down quite early the minimal opposition they faced in the Winter Palace and at the All-Russian Congress Meeting. ~~XXXXXX~~ Although initially Trotsky led the Mensheviks, he left them and joined the Bolsheviks to aid Lenin in the takeover and his plans were executed smoothly; this also led to Kerensky having little support to stop the takeover. ~~XXXXXX~~ This is as he

(This page is for your first answer.) had little support from the army at the front. Overall, Trotsky was also a contributing factor alongside Lenin that led to the success of the November 1917 revolution as his planning and authority in the issuing of orders helped the Bolsheviks successfully take over.

In conclusion, I think that ~~was~~ it would still be largely accurate to say that Lenin was more responsible for the success of the revolution because of his knowledge of timing and the use of careful tactics as well as party ideology. Although Trotsky played a large role in the planning of the revolution, he joined the party much later and initially had a different view point than that of the Bolsheviks. Lenin was able to use his good oratory skills and motivational skills to keep the party united and motivated as well as gaining masses of support from peasants and industrial workers.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer might have benefited from a more straightforward chronological approach: to begin with considering the timing of the revolution leads to a lack of overall clarity. There is plenty of information on the Bolsheviks and their organisation, but less on the difficulties faced by the Provisional Government. There is an assumption that Lenin gained considerable support among the peasants, though the results of the Constituent assembly elections would suggest otherwise. An analytical response, with sufficient development for mid Level 4.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan - Weakness of opposition - pg weakness

Lenin's leadership

~~July days~~

Kornilov Affair

June Offensive

Trotsky troops

people's discontent

4 peace, bread and

land

Lenin's leadership played a vital role in the success of the Bolsheviks in the November revolution, as it brought the Bolsheviks together and encouraged them to have an armed takeover which would lead to the revolution.

However there are other factors which influenced the Bolshevik's success too. The provisional government were weak and had not dealt with

(This page is for your first answer.) The problems that the people of Russia faced, thus helped the Bolsheviks take a heroic pace. Furthermore the Kornilov affair in August was incredibly important to the Bolshevik success. ~~As a result of the public's discontent~~ Therefore although Lenin's leadership was an important factor, the weakness of the opposition played a greater role in the Bolshevik success in 1917, November revolution.

The provisional government, under the leadership of the prince Lvov was under immense pressure to bring the country back into stability and also consolidate power. However this was very difficult ~~to~~ to do as Russia was still fighting in the first world war, which the public as well as the ^{Petrograd} Soviet were against. Also the Petrograd Soviet had given a speech to 'the people of the world' stating they would continue to fight in the war only to bring about peace, but not to gain indemnities. Furthermore the Soviet had issued 'order number one' which stated the army would

(This page is for your first answer.) elect its own chief Commander from within the troops and also that the army would not act against the wishes of the Soviet. As the Petrograd Soviet and the Provisional government^(PG) had a dual authority, it was difficult for the PG to overrule the Petrograd Soviet and the order number one, greatly deteriorated the power of the government as the army was effectively out of their control. All this affected the provisional government (PG) relationship with the Soviet even more and contributed to the weakness of its government in Russia, as without the army and full support of the Soviet the provisional government could not win the war effectively or handle the affairs of the country as there were always two opposing bodies which had to share the power. This therefore made it easier for the Bolsheviks to succeed as they were able to look more efficient and stronger than the provisional government.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Another factor which contributed to the Bolsheviks succeeding was the Kornilov affair. This incident, in which General Kornilov told the troops to go into Petrograd to protect it was misinterpreted by Kerensky. Kerensky thought a military uprising would take place and therefore, in this fear, arrested Kornilov and armed people, including the formerly arrested Bolshevik members, in order to handle this. When the public found out what had happened ~~they~~ their support for the Bolsheviks increased as they were made to look like heroes protecting the country, on the other hand the PC were made to look even weaker and unable to handle the country, especially after the wrong decision of the June offensive which backfired greatly. This second mistake was almost the final straw and the people were angered and upset further more. Thus, the Bolsheviks were lucky that the Kornilov affair played into their hands and weakened the position

(This page is for your first answer.) the provisional government. As the peasants made up most of the country, this meant that the PC lost a majority of support, allowing the Bolsheviks to ease their way in. The Bolsheviks slogan of 'peace, bread and land' effectively brought support from all areas of society as the peasants were being promised land, the army were promised the war would end and the rest of the country suffering the economic impact of the war being promised food to eat. In this way Lenin's leadership was important as he used propaganda well to his advantage but also the PC's failure of tackling the issues at hand was very important too.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer relates to the question and has some understanding of the key issues raised. The candidate notes the weaknesses of the Provisional Government, especially the division of power with the Petrograd Soviet. There is some lack of clarity on the Kornilov affair, though this is linked with the growing power and influence of the Bolsheviks. The state of the countryside has some relevance, but links to the question are not strong. The analysis is supported by largely accurate material, which makes for Level 4. However, the candidate barely mentions the given factor, so low Level 4 is preferred.

Question 7

The question was about the outcomes of collectivisation, not its causes: these were not necessarily the same. There was some discussion on the campaign against the kulaks and the climate of fear that accompanied it, linking this to wider economic outcomes of feeding the industrial workforce of the Five-Year Plans. The role of the MTS in enforcing continued control was less well covered but the fact that collectivisation was enforced against the will of its opponents was testament to the control it helped Stalin to establish over the countryside. Surprisingly, some candidates omitted to mention the famine, especially the Ukrainian Holodomor, as an outcome, although this was relatively rare. Stalin's strengthened political position was well known and many explained that criticisms of collectivisation polarised opinion inside the Communist Party, enabling Stalin to isolate his right wing rivals Bukharin, Kirov and Rykov. On an ideological level, better informed candidates used their knowledge of the Twenty Five Thousand to explain how the spirit of Bolshevism was finally being exported to the countryside to establish the smychka (in propaganda claims at least).

(This page is for your second answer.) How accurate is it to say that the most important result of collectivisation of agriculture was that it imposed Communist control of the countryside?

Collectivisation was introduced in 1928 by Stalin in order to fund industrialisation by providing money for cities, and to solve the grain crisis and shortages of food. It is also argued that it was implemented largely to impose control over the rural members of the population, and that as well as an economic reform, it was a means of political control and spread of Communist ideology.

On the one hand, one could argue that collectivisation was a method of Communist domination over the peasantry farmers whom otherwise would not have been subject to as much Communist influence as the people in the

(This page is for your second answer.) cities. By putting peasants into larger farms of kol khovy (collective farms) and sovkhozy (state farms) instead of independent small holdings, it was an effective way to not only increase profit of grain for the state (as the farms belonged to them and not individuals) but also to control the actions of peasants who otherwise would have been individual entrepreneurs. 100-150 small holding farms could be put into one large collective farm, meaning that ~~production~~ ~~and~~ everyone working together under the same ideology would lead to support of the regime.

As well as collecting peasants ~~and~~ in order to make them work exclusively for the state, collectivisation was also crucial in the spread of Communist ideology around the countryside. This is seen by the fierce "Dekulakisation" as the kulaks (wealthier peasants) were deemed class enemies and "servants of the bourgeoisie" - and consequently suffered at the mercy of the kulak requisitioning squads who requisitioned their grain and attacked the individual kulaks violently. As other peasants could see the hardships the kulaks were suffering, this induced fear into them to ~~the~~ collaborate with the collectivisation ^{policy} ~~regime~~, through worry of

(This page is for your second answer.) suffering the same fate as the kulaks. From this point of view, it is clear that collectivisation not only grouped people together to work for the name of Stalin and Communism, but also induced fear as a motive for acquiescing to the regime and a spread of Communist ideology.

On the other hand, one could argue that although political control was a by-product of collectivisation, the most important result was that ~~with~~ by freeing up the workforce by those means, rural workers were able to migrate to the cities to fuel the workforce for industrialisation in Stalin's Five Year Plans. ~~As~~ As to agricultural labour was more effective under collective farms with more advanced technology than small holdings, it was unnecessary for all peasants to work on farms, so consequently many migrated to the main cities such as Petrograd (in particular the Vyborg District) in order to work in factories and provide manual labour for industrialisation. As well as ^{manually} funding industrialisation, a very important result of collectivisation was the direct product - an increase in grain production. As there was greater technological advancements and a stronger labour force operating in collective

(This page is for your second answer.) made to work as intensively but with less personal profit.

To conclude, it is clear that although political control over the Rural areas of Russia was an important by-product of Collectivisation, the fact that Collectivisation made it possible to carry out Stalin's Five Year Plans, as well as completely destabilising agriculture, was definitely more important. By ensuring political control and inducing fear through the Dekulakisation scheme, this meant that Stalin was able to continue without opposition when the famine of 1932-33 struck, as starving peasants were too afraid in any case to speak out against him. In practice, the most important ~~or~~ direct result of Collectivisation was the destabilising of agriculture and the fuelling of industry, however a relatively important side product was how the policy tapped into the mentality of the peasants and therefore to a large degree, imposed Communist control over the countryside.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer notes how collectivisation imposed Communist control on the countryside through the creation of the collective farm and the attack on the kulaks (which created a climate of fear and therefore of obedience among the peasants). Other outcomes which are addressed include the freeing up of a large pool of labour to work in the cities, and the short-term destabilisation of the economy. A well argued evaluative answer; high Level 5.

Question 8

The majority of students approached this question with confidence, producing answers which considered a range of factors. At the highest levels, candidates applied detailed and specific own knowledge to support their points. For example, they could employ statistics to show the impact of lend-lease, they knew the impact of the Third Five-Year Plan, and they were aware of specific battles and campaigns. Some candidates believed that the three Five-Year Plans had set the USSR up as a finely honed fighting machine for which the Germans were no match: the reality was, of course, far more complex. In addition, at these levels, candidates were able to evaluate how these factors enabled the USSR to defeat Germany, making explicit reference to how each factor strengthened the Russian campaign. The best answers evaluated throughout, stating an overall judgement in the introduction, defending this judgement throughout the answer, and explaining it in the conclusion. For example, a number of candidates argued that the Russian Home Front was the most important factor, as it was the Russian people who maintained the war economy, which supplemented lend-lease, which enabled the Russians to capitalise on German mistakes. In addition, at the highest level, candidates engaged with the exact wording of the question, explaining why the war changed course after the defeats of 1941. At high levels there was some discriminating use of detail to highlight the comparative differences in the way Hitler and Stalin handled their economic priorities (Germany keeping up living standards at the cost of full economic mobilisation, unlike Russia where consumer goods were never prioritised) and their military leaders (Hitler interfering, while Stalin gave Zhukov a free hand). The best answers conveyed a sense of change between 1941 and 1945 to show how the dynamics shifted in Russia's favour after a calamitous start to the campaign. These answers stressed the role of civilians on the Soviet home front who were already used to grim obedience. Many also referred to aspects of Stalin's pragmatism, such as relaxing his control on the Church and emphasising the war as a patriotic struggle.

Lower level answers were aware of the need to discuss a range of factors. However, these candidates did not have the detailed own knowledge necessary to reach the higher levels. Their examples were often generalised, showing a basic grasp of the topic, but no more. Additionally, candidates at these levels made only implicit links to the question. For example, they may have stated a factor, and provided some examples to support this, but then they did not explain how this factor helped the USSR to defeat Germany.

(This page is for your second answer.) Despite the disasters that Stalin and Russia faced in World War Two, they were able to defeat Nazi Germany for a number of different reasons. These included the Nazi failures, Russia's economic situation, the triple alliance and the policy of Lend-Lease. It seems that a mixture of these factors led to the success of the USSR.

A main reason for the USSR victory in World War Two was the Nazi weaknesses. Firstly, Hitler was overconfident and interfered with his general's decisions, meaning they did not always do the correct thing because Hitler was not a strategist. The German army were also ill-equipped and lacked vital weapons. This also meant they were unprepared for the harsh Russian winter. Hitler also tried hard to ~~stretch~~ move

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~them. He~~ It was also important to note that Hitler staged sieges instead of attacking cities like Leningrad which gave the USSR time to prepare in response.

Sieges such as Leningrad, which the people ~~endure~~ endured for 900 days, showed the resistance of the Russian people. The German's brutal treatment of the Russian people gave them more incentive to fight against them. They were determined to fight for the 'Motherland' as Stalin told them. Stalin also allowed people to look to the church to raise morale. By 1943, there were over 700,000 resistance fighters working against Germany for the good of the country. Stalin was clear to point out that he did not want them to fight for communism, but for 'Mother Russia'.

This was coupled by the improvement in the economic policies of the USSR at this time. They focused much of their attention on the war effort, building arms and new technologies such as the T34 tank. They also made it so that adults of the USSR would only receive

(This page is for your second answer.) rations if they worked for the war effort. They improved communications and were able to effectively halt the Germans many times due to their Scorched Earth Policy. The fact that they produced so many arms was an advantage because Germany could not supply their army efficiently.

The policy of Lend-lease from the Americans was also important. Roosevelt ~~good~~ began this policy with the USSR in 1942. Effects on the military were minor. However, in terms of food and transport it was vital. 1900 trains used by the USSR were American, and around 17% of the Red Army's calorie intake was from American food. The USSR relied on US and Canadian wheat and spam. Without this, it seems unlikely that the Army would have been as successful.

The triple alliance between the USSR, Britain and the USA was important because it was a triple threat for Germany. By ~~adding~~ joining forces with Britain, the USSR could rely on allied bombing to disrupt German armament, giving the USSR an advantage over them. The Germans, already ill-equipped, were unprepared for this triple

(This page is for your second answer.) threat. The USA supplying goods, coupled with allied bombing meant that Hitler could not fight the war efficiently.

In conclusion, there were a number of factors which helped the USSR win the war, including the Stalin's economic system, Russia's allies in Britain and the USA and of course, the strength of the Russian people. It is unlikely that, without combining all these factors and also the inherent weakness of the German enemy that the USSR would have won World War Two. ~~the strength of the USSR and the~~ The strength that the USSR built up during the years 1941 - 45 gave them enough power to push back the German enemy and win the war.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer makes a number of clear and relevant points. Supporting information is adequate rather than extensive, and several points are considered in isolation rather than being linked to the question. A securely analytical approach, however: mid Level 4.

Question 9

Answers discussed a variety of factors which lead to changes in the position of African Americans in the decade following the Second World War. Most students were able to describe, in some detail, several contributing factors including the measures of President Truman, the campaigns of the NAACP, and the changes brought about by the Second World War. Moreover, they were often able to consider different aspects of the War, the economic revival it brought about, the way in which it precipitated a wave of migration from South to North, the impact of the revelations concerning Nazi racism, the role of black servicemen and the GI Bill of Rights. A small number of students went beyond the period specified to discuss Kennedy's role, the campaigns of the 1960s and in some cases black power. Equally, a few conflated the Federal Government with Civil Rights groups, with some perhaps overstating Truman's role. However, far more stuck to the period deploying a range of detailed and accurate knowledge, and at the higher levels analysed their relative contribution to the legal, economic and social change witnessed in the period.

(This page is for your first answer.)

How far do you agree that the impact of NW2 was the main reason why the position of African Americans improved in the years 1945-1955?

PLAN

Impact
NW2 -

- Double V sign.
- Brave soldiers wanted recognition for their bravery.
e.g. Woodrow Cockett
- facing a racist opponent - Hitler - extermination camps showed horror of racism.
- bravery/veterans won support/sympathy from whites.
- economy - gave people work - unemployment 937,000 down to 157,000.
- migration - less segregation.
- confidence
- lynching increased.

Campaigns 1945, 1955

- 1946 - Morgan vs Virginia
1950 - Sweatt vs. Parker
1954 - Brown ✓
1955 - Brown II ✓
- 1947 - New Orleans - blocked department stores
UDL - Bus boycott - operation free left.
CNO - voting registration campaign
↑ 3% Arkansas
- Learned a lot of lessons.
- attention turned to education

(This page is for your first answer.)

WW2
Main reason?

- President Truman - To Secure These Rights - Re-elected - first President since Lincoln to be openly committed to helping Civil Rights movement.

Essay

The Second World War was an enormous turning point in the African Americans' struggle for freedom. For many Black Americans, the war gave them the opportunity to experience segregation ^(for the first time). Over 1.2 million Black soldiers fought in the war and experienced countries in Europe without segregation and realised they weren't prepared to fight for a country that couldn't even treat them fairly. African Americans created the 'Double V' sign, for victory at home ^{to be free} (from segregation and discrimination) and victory abroad (to be free from the racist opponent - Hitler).

The Second World War definitely improved the lives of African Americans in the years 1945-1955. After fighting in the war, black soldiers were more confident and wanted recognition for their bravery. For example, a black pilot, Woodrow Crockett. He flew 149 missions in the last year of the war and not one plane in his squadron was shot down. It was black heroes like these that gave campaigners confidence and brought sympathy from white Americans who felt guilty about treating them badly in the past.

The Second World War showed how horrific racism could be. After the war, people were more willing to bring about equality when they saw things like the extermination camps and saw what terrible things could come from racism. ~~Americans knew there~~ White Americans started to support equality because of this and became more

(This page is for your first answer.) Sympathetic.

The war was important for America's economy. The war itself had created thousands of jobs in the industry so that by the end of the war, unemployment had plummeted from 937,000 to 151,000. ~~It had~~ In addition, ^{500,000} many African Americans had moved to the North during the war so in the years after they were receiving ~~the~~ better ~~big~~ wages (however these were only half the amount whites received) and could therefore ~~receive~~ ^{afford} better homes. However many blacks after the war were forced to live in ghettos. In Washington D.C. 40% of housing available to black Americans was sub-standard. This was only 12% for whites. Additionally, in the years following the war 61% of Black Americans were living in urban areas in ghettos. ~~However~~ ^{However}, in the North, there was no legal segregation so blacks received less discrimination.

By moving to the North, after the war blacks received less discrimination, more blacks were able to vote, they were paid more than their previous agricultural work and were generally better organised. e.g. A. Philip Randolph created the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

By fighting in the Second World War, veterans' and ^{black} soldiers' confidence increased and returned to America determined to fight racial injustice. However when white Americans saw this increase in confidence, the number of lynchings increased. The Second World War caused an increase in the Ku Klux Klan's actions.

It could be argued that the only reason African American's

(This page is for your first answer.) Lines improved was because of the campaigns. Between 1945 and 1955 there were a series of campaigns that were extremely important for the civil rights movement. For example in 1946 Morgan vs. Virginia. This was important as it highlighted there was severe segregation on interstate buses. This ~~case~~ case ~~was important as it showed~~ made segregation on interstate buses illegal however de jure change did not result in de facto change. Many bus companies ignored the ruling. This was shown in 1947 by CORE's Journey of Reconciliation. The activists were arrested and proved that de facto change was still to come.

In the early 1950's campaigns began to focus on education; as it was believed it was easy to show that 'separate but equal' was not being practised and that by giving Black Americans better education, they could have better lives. The 1950 Sweatt vs. Painter case was the starting point. Then in 1954 the Brown case ^(Brown vs Board of Topeka) was highly significant ~~proving~~ where the Supreme Court ruled you can not ~~have~~ have 'separate' and 'equal'. This was groundbreaking in the civil rights campaigns as it gave Black Americans even more confidence to fight for freedom through the courts. Lawyers like Thurgood Marshall showed ^{that} persistence & fighting through the courts could be successful. However like Morgan vs Virginia, de facto change was slow and this was the cause of the Brown II case in 1955.

I think the Second World War was clearly critical in

(This page is for your first answer.) going people ~~more~~ ~~for~~ better paid jobs and confidence however the campaigns in this time (1945-55) were crucial to the improvement to the lives of African Americans. On the other hand, it could be said that these campaigns didn't really help at all as de facto change was so slow. For instance, after the Brown vs Board of Topeka case only 750 out of 6,300 school districts desegregated.

Other campaigns that improved the lives of black Americans were in 1947 ~~the~~ in New Orleans, activists blocked the entrances to department stores. This type of protest was effective as it was simple ~~and~~ and quickly spread throughout the country. In addition the UDL bus boycott in 1951 with 'Operation Free Lift'. However this was not very effective as it did not last long enough to get media attention or damage the company's finances. An effective campaign was the CNO's in Arkansas - the voter registration campaign increased the ~~no~~ number of black voters by 3%.

It could be said that the second world war was not the main reason for ~~the~~ the improvement. ~~the~~ It could be argued that it was all down to President Truman, the first President openly committed to civil rights since Lincoln. His 1947 report 'To Secure These Rights' was his attempt at sorting out the problems. He also used his power to appoint people to important places. E.g. Ralph Bunche as the ambassador to the United Nations and William Hastie as the first black federal judge. (Black Americans also voted William L. Dawson and Adam Clayton Powell to Congress however those were the only 2 black Americans

(This page is for your first answer.) to make congress between 1943-1955.)

Truman also desegregated the armed forces, Dulles Airport restaurant and his inauguration speech was in front of a desegregated crowd.

Overall, it is clear that the second world war had ~~overall it definitely shows~~ that a clearly positive effect on black Americans lives in the years 1945-55. It ~~gave~~ ^{showed} them ~~what~~ what a country without segregation could be like and the dangers inherent in racism. ~~It~~ It gave them new jobs, ~~and~~ better wages and a better economy. Most importantly, it gave them confidence to succeed. Even though white racists were still clearly present, for example lynching increased and the Detroit riots of 1943, this only made black Americans more determined. The second world war was a turning point in peoples attitudes towards blacks.

However the war wasn't the only reason for improvement. All the campaigns and efforts of activists brought about change in transport, education and public areas however ~~the~~ de facto change was slow but progress was still being made. ~~However~~ It has to be said though that these campaigns probably ~~wouldn't~~ wouldn't have happened without the war. Those campaigns were also important because campaigners learnt from them - for example CORES bus boycott - activists learnt they had to make future boycotts longer.

(This page is for your first answer.) Finally another reason for improving black Americans lives was their devoted president Truman. Even though his plans and ideas were lacking funds & stumped by Congress, he still managed to desegregate so much - ~~the~~ perhaps most importantly the armed services.

In conclusion, the Second World War was critical in improving black Americans lives. However this wouldn't have been possible without the President and the persistence of Court campaigners e.g. Thurgood Marshall and ~~campaigners~~ activists.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer has a strong focus on the question. The candidate investigates the impact of the war on the status of African Americans, considering both the serving soldiers and those who gained employment in defence industries. Other factors are noted, notably the campaigns of the early 1950s, and the support given by Truman in 'To Secure These Rights'. More might have been made of the role of the NAACP, but a strong evaluation overall; mid Level 5.

Question 10

Stronger candidates understood that this question required analysis of a range of factors that contributed to the successes of the civil rights movement. They considered factors such as Presidential support, the media and support from white people. In addition, they understood that the question allowed them to focus on peaceful protests not directly connected to King. The strongest answers had two characteristics. First, they linked the factors discussed to specific achievements – that is to say, they showed exactly how these factors led to the successes of the civil rights movement. Secondly, they drew links between the factors discussed, and used these links to reach a judgement about which factor was most important. For example, a number of candidates argued that the most important reason for successes was federal government support, as only the federal government had the power to enforce desegregation. Answers at this level showed a confident grasp of a range of protests and achievements.

Weaker candidates produced more limited responses. Some candidates misunderstood the requirements of the question and produced answers assessing the strengths and weaknesses of peaceful protest, with no reference to other factors. Others wrote only about peaceful protest and Black Power, making no attempt to make the latter relevant to the question set. Many candidates knew only a limited number of protests: the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the March on Washington, and the Birmingham Campaign. This restricted the scope of their answer. Finally, at the lowest levels, candidates described a couple of protests, focusing more on the narrative of those protests than on the question set. In these answers, there was no attempt at analysis.

Future candidates are advised to learn not only the narrative of the civil rights movement, but also how to analyse this narrative and adapt their knowledge to meet the demands of specific questions.

(This page is for your second answer.) Martin Luther King is without a doubt the most famous and inspirational figure in the Civil Rights Movement today. But whether or not the movement succeeds, from his first serious involvement in the movement in 1955 during the Montgomery Bus boycott to his death in 1968 ~~was~~ ^{is} ~~mainly~~ ^{mainly} ~~down~~ ^{down} to his campaign of peaceful protest is another matter.

The policy of using non-violence during the Civil Rights movement certainly encouraged white sympathisers to the cause and helped negotiate with federal Government, which is unlikely to of yielded ~~to their~~ ^{to their} demands were they using violence.

~~The policy certainly worked successfully during the~~ ^{The policy certainly worked successfully during the} Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955-6 in which their peaceful protest resulted in the buses almost going bankrupt and resulting in them being forced to

(This page is for your second answer.) desegregate the buses. Similarly in Birmingham in 1963 which King targeted tactically as the most racist city in America. The ~~protest~~ peaceful march in face of such heavy police brutality made a great statement to the cause and great embarrassment for federal Government when the media became involved. King's most famous peaceful movement was in 1963 in his march on Washington where he made his iconic 'I have a dream' speech. This undoubtedly helped push through the 1964 Civil Rights act which put an end to De Jure racism in the South.

It could be said, however, King's methods did not always work. In Selma, 1965, King adopted a similar tactic as in Birmingham - relying on police brutality to ensure large scale media attention but it failed to do so, perhaps because the Vietnam war ~~was~~ ^{was in full swing} at this point, not getting nearly as much press as King had hoped for. Not only this but King increased divisions between his own group, SCLC and SNCC when he retreated from state troops during the same event, SNCC seeing this as both cowardice and betrayal on King's part.

Another example of when his peaceful protest failed was in Chicago in 1966 when King was attempting to tackle ghetto poverty. King's expected estimations of a

(This page is for your second answer.) ...100,000 march was quashed by a horde of just 30,000. White mobs pelted the marchers with stones in protest, King not having anticipated such a reaction in a Northern city.

The policy of peaceful protest was also not satisfying for the more militant members of the movement such as CORE and SNCC. Clearly seen in the total divide in groups on the Meredith march in 1966 when the leader of SNCC, Stokely Carmichael, began turning away white marchers and began chanting black power. From this event onward the movement was split in two.

It is fair to argue, however, that the violence in the Civil Rights movement rarely had a successful outcome. Albany in 1964-2 failed due to black violence creating bad publicity for the cause.

Similarly the 'black power' movement can be seen to have been highly damaging to the ~~the~~ movement causing the alienation of many white sympathisers. Also, it is clear by the destruction of the militant group 'the black panthers' by federal Government that they were unwilling to negotiate with groups that used such violent means.

(This page is for your second answer.) Overall, I do agree that Martin Luther King's policy of ~~non~~peaceful protest was the main cause of the success of the movement's success between the years 1955-68. This method proving successful on numerous occasions and causing the passing of the Civil Rights Acts, ~~which~~ ^{which} improved the lives of ~~the~~ African Americans living in the USA.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is an analytical assessment of success and failure with regard to King's methods. However, other factors promoting change are alluded to rather than investigated in detail. This is a confident answer with a secure grasp of the topic, but ends up answering a slightly different question on the impact of popular protest. Mid Level 4.

Question 11

Candidates generally knew more about Kennedy than Eisenhower in escalating US involvement in SE Asia. Some struggled to focus on the actions of the two presidents and wrote about their motives for being involved, while others sought to twist the question by comparing Eisenhower/Kennedy with Truman before and Johnson afterwards. However, stronger candidates commented accurately on the increasing use of 'advisors' and provision of equipment, relating the escalation to explanations of developments in the USA and in Vietnam itself which influenced presidential thinking. Many candidates expressed the legitimate difficulty in judging Kennedy given the doubts surrounding his future intentions when he was assassinated.

(This page is for your second answer.) During the years 1954-1963 it could be said that the groundwork was laid for US involvement in Vietnam, signalled by the Geneva Accords of 1954. Although never sending in troops, Eisenhower and Kennedy escalated steadily and this created a sort of bog, impossible to escape from known as the quagmire theory. To what extent they are ~~responsible~~ responsible however is a different question however, because although Eisenhower created the situation ^{and} Kennedy is the one who pushed in more and more ~~support~~ support.

On the one hand it could be argued that they must share responsibility for the escalation of the war. This is because they both supported ~~created~~ created, and supported a corrupt regime. Eisenhower placed Diem in power in the South following the Geneva accords which split the country into two, ~~leaving~~ leaving his room, Dulles the secretary of state said, "He was the best we knew". As a consequence of this, ~~American~~ ^{American} were linked

(This page is for your second answer.) to a Communist regime, which was unappealing to the South Vietnamese people because only 1% of the population owned the cultivated land, and the North on the other hand was offered land sweeping changes. Eisenhower said upon leaving office, "We bet pretty heavily on him." Kennedy supported the Communist regime by offering plans such as agreements which were held by the people of Vietnam, as they had to leave the land which they had grown up on, and the assets were buried in. This led to the subsequent overthrow of them, which Kennedy backed, putting the US further and further into the Swamp which was Vietnam, because they were now committed to any regime which followed, and committed to the people. Therefore Kennedy and Eisenhower should share responsibility because they both supported a Communist regime and therefore were committed to the South Vietnamese.

Another way in which they committed the US to Vietnam was through the escalation of aid and men. They supplied the South with F-42 tanks under Eisenhower and billions of dollars worth of aid, as well as sending in around 2000 military advisors during his control of Vietnam. President Kennedy supported this, and sent in an extra 12000 advisors by the end of his role as President, as well as leaving

(This page is for your second answer.)

a heavy burden on the shoulders of Johnson by stating in his inaugural address, "Pay any price, bear any burden", which it could be argued meant that it was impossible for Johnson to avoid escalation in 1965, because it had been ~~previously~~ asked for by Kennedy before him.

A final reason why they may have committed the US to Vietnam was through both of their anti-communism views. At the start of Kennedy's presidency, G.L. Colby recommended creating a separate state, including representatives from the Communists, which was rejected out of hand. As well as this, Kennedy was normally anti-communist, as were his advisors such as McNamara, who also ~~was~~ worked under Johnson, and so JFK left Johnson his military advisors who promoted a anti-communist feel.

On the other hand however it could be said that it was not a case of Kennedy and ^{Johnson} ~~Johnson~~. This is primarily because they were committed ground troops and only advisors. This means that any military problem could have pulled out of Vietnam with ~~little~~ relative ease, as they were not committed to fighting. Even Kennedy said, before his assassination, "We need to know the top to bottom" which included the possibility of withdrawal from the war altogether. The overthrow of them was another opportunity for

(This page is for your second answer.)

^{any} the following would be deescalate because they were no longer committed to a regime in the south. Neither Eisenhower or Johnson actually committed ground troops to Vietnam, and it is always possible to argue that it was always an option for successfully persuading to withdraw from Vietnam.

Another reason why it may not be their fault for escalation between 54 and 63 was due to the domino theory. Truman had already committed the US to S.E. Asia after Korea and showed the chain of the domino effect, and it could therefore be said that the U.S. was already committed by the time of Eisenhower. It was impossible to let Vietnam fall due to the threat it would bring to Asia, particularly Japan. Japan was very important to the US as they had built it up as a trade partner and the loss of Japan to communism would give the Soviets around 25% extra capacity, and would be seen as a clear loss in the Cold War. Prestige was a massive issue to the US, and in 1965 the newly gay had told Eisenhower Johnson has "National prestige and honor are at stake." This was also the case before Johnson, and the President had to act tough in front of communists, particularly after the Cuban Missile Crisis under Kennedy. Withdrawing from Vietnam would have been a massive blow to the US in the fight against Communism and it

(This page is for your second answer.)

Could there be said that President Eisenhower and Kennedy had no other choice than to escalate, and it was therefore not their fault, and they were not responsible for escalation?

A good reason why it could be argued that it was not the fault of Eisenhower and Kennedy was due to the U.S. legacy. No president had ever lost a war, and it was their political survival on the line if they were to just. Neither Kennedy nor Eisenhower could afford to withdraw from Vietnam because of the massive blow they would have received in public opinion, and it was therefore impossible to pull out. It also seemed that the public were in favor of the war, as Kennedy received a 75% approval rate from the public on it, and his address suggested that war was necessary, especially after WW2, under which appeasement had led to the rise of dictators such as Hitler and Mussolini. Therefore it could be argued that it was impossible for Presidents to withdraw from Vietnam because their political survival rested on the line, and due to the cause of appeasement that had come before it in WW2.

In conclusion, although it could be argued that Eisenhower and Kennedy were responsible for the escalation that took place between 1954 and 1963, it would seem that they were already bound to war in Vietnam, due to restrictions placed upon them such as

(This page is for your second answer.) The quagmire theory, also described as a fog of war, which spread, as well as the cause of aggression. The extent of escalation can also be debated because no ground troops were committed under either Eisenhower or Kennedy.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer apportions responsibility equally between Eisenhower and Kennedy, but also develops a counter-argument which considers other factors, such as the 'quagmire theory', and the fear of losing face with the American public. A promising evaluation, at low Level 5.

Question 12

Most candidates were able to explain several reasons why obtaining "Peace with Honour" took such a long time and were aware that Nixon followed a dual strategy combining diplomacy with wider military action. Candidates tended to know more about this military action than the diplomacy, and perhaps overlooked the impact of the Sino - Soviet split on Nixon's actions. However, the domestic context of student unrest, while Nixon preferred to listen more to the views of the "silent majority", was picked up by many as an additional delaying factor.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Why did it take Nixon so long to withdraw from Vietnam.

P1: 'Peace with honour'

- elected on this principle.
- retain US credibility
- War could not be won.

P2: Vietnamisation

- Belief in building up ARVN.
- Military schools
- better equipment.

P3: escalation.

P3: Negotiation

- Conflict
- 4 years of war could have been saved
- NVA in SV
- Role of Thieu.

P4:

(This page is for your second answer.)

President Nixon was elected in 1968 on the promise that he would withdraw from Vietnam whilst retaining 'peace with honour'. This would require a long process of coming peace whilst retaining US prestige, yet a number of other factors also prevented him from withdrawing sooner. These include the process of Vietnamisation and escalation of war yet all link back to Nixon's promise to retain US honour.

The USA was seen as the world's policeman and freedom fighter, in 1947, had committed them to defence of democracy and containment of communism. The Viet Vietnam War had not been won and the communist North Vietnam still posed a massive threat to the south. If Nixon withdrew immediately, South Vietnam would almost certainly fall to communism defeating the object of the USA's initial involvement and wasting billions of pounds of US money and thousands of soldier's lives. The USA had committed themselves to protecting freedom and liberty worldwide and to betray this mantra would devastate Nixon's presidency. This meant that immediate withdrawal was not an option.

However, Nixon was a political realist and knew the war could not be won. Years of struggle had

(This page is for your second answer.) US victories

produced few definitive ~~events~~ and the ~~the~~ embarrassing Tet Offensive of 1968 demonstrated the weakness of the US army against their North Vietnamese opponents.

US tactics and army morale were poor. However, therefore, Nixon had to embark on a policy to ensure US withdrawal was done tactfully, retaining ~~some~~ honour. But this policy proved lengthy and difficult.

Nixon embarked on a policy of Vietnamisation. This involved building up the ARVN (Army of South Vietnam) into a stable, effective fighting force. Nixon supplied weapons, such as new M-16 rifles and M-60 machine guns, as well as an air force and new military training schools which trained 100,000 new soldiers per year. However, this process was lengthy. ARVN troops were poorly motivated and desertion rates were high, some 100,000 per year. Therefore, the South Vietnam was still susceptible to a communist attack. Nixon continued to build up more troops regardless ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ as part of his policy of peace with honour and he was able to use the increase in ARVN troops as an excuse to withdraw US troops. This shows that the process of creating a viable South Vietnam was a lengthy process.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Moreover, part of Nixon's strategy involved escalation of the conflict, which also meant withdrawal took longer.

He increased bombing raids on North Vietnam to force them to negotiate. He also invaded Cambodia in 1970 to try to ~~also~~ remove NVA (North Vietnamese Army) bases which he knew could threaten South Vietnam.

In 1971, he used ARVN troops to invade Laos to try to cut the Ho Chi Minh Trail. To ensure US withdrawal, Nixon had to weaken the NVA and force the North Vietnamese government to negotiate. This proved to be another lengthy process as Nixon used the force of the military, which helped serve the purpose of extending the war and increasing conflict.

* which was supplying ~~to~~ the equipment to the Viet Cong in South Vietnam.

Furthermore, the North Vietnamese would not negotiate on US terms. They insisted on allowing NVA troops to remain in South Vietnam yet the US refused. Hence the USA failed to back down and this explains why they needed to exert military pressure on the North Vietnam to force them to negotiate. Negotiations failed to sufficiently progress and ~~it~~ accounted for much of the extension of the war. In 1973, agreement was finally reached as the situation worsened and domestic opposition reached a climax. The USA allowed ^{some} the NVA troops to remain in South Vietnam after the US withdrawal.

(This page is for your second answer.)

This shows that four years of war could have been avoided had the USA simply backed down sooner. The need to withdraw on favourable terms hindered effective US progress and the negotiations process and caused the extension of war.

~~In conclusion, the primary reason that after Nixon took so long to withdraw from Vietnam links to his promise of 'peace with honour'. The USA had a massive ego to uphold and immediate withdrawal from South Vietnam would have destroyed their worldwide prestige.~~

Moreover, North Vietnamese motives appear to be a fundamental explanation as to why Nixon took so long to withdraw. Their desire for an independent, Communist nation that overrode the US desire for international democracy. This belief influenced their ability to withstand bombing and not back down in negotiations with the USA showing how Vietnamese persistence prevented Nixon from withdrawing sooner - the Vietnamese would not allow him to do so entirely on his terms.

In conclusion, the primary reason that Nixon took

(This page is for your second answer.)

So long to withdraw from the Vietnam war was his commitment to 'peace with honour'. The USA had a massive ego and would not back down to a third rate country like Vietnam, if it was not going to be on their terms. Nixon's policies extended the war yet they were based on this notion of 'peace with honour' which effectively did not want immediate US withdrawal. North Vietnamese passion for independence fuelled their stubbornness and essentially hindered the evolution of peace with honour, meaning this also played a key role in explaining the USA's extended involvement.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer includes a clear plan and a focused introduction. The candidate notes the difficulties which Nixon faced on taking office, and addresses both US strategy and the delaying tactics adopted by the North Vietnamese. In the process the answer builds up a clear picture of why it took Nixon so long to bring the war to an honourable close. Mid Level 5.

Question 13

The question presented no problems of interpretation and there were some impressively wide ranging and detailed answers that addressed the many policy areas that Carter struggled in – economic, political, cultural, social and foreign with stronger answers able to show which factors had greatest impact in the immediate run up to the election. The perceived appeal of Reagan was well documented. The best candidates could categorise the factors thematically without losing sight of the chronology, while at the other extreme were answers that listed factors without explaining their impact.

Question 14

Question 14 was rarely done at all, and tended to attract generalised answers that could have applied to feminism and gay rights anywhere in the west.

(This page is for your second answer.)

~~Plan~~

- ~~② Failure to fix stagflation~~
- ~~③ Failure with women & with blacks~~ ^{race riots ghettos}
- ~~④ Sheer popularity of Reagan~~ ^{movie star glamour charisma good orator}
- ~~① Failed due problems with Congress~~
 - ~~↓~~
 - ~~↳ Could not get legislation through → not good enough relationships.~~
 - ~~↓~~
 - ~~Energy Crisis~~

(This page is for your second answer.) I think one of the key reasons Carter failed to get re-elected in 1980 was his problems with Congress that occurred all the way through his presidency. Carter put huge emphasis on micro-managing in his presidency, trying to do too much himself rather than delegating jobs, and so not enough really got done. He also failed to establish good relationships on Capitol Hill and ~~so~~ also ^{often} failed to consult Congress when he drew up bills. He also did not bother to lobby Congress on bills he wished to pass, the best example this ~~bill~~ being the bill he wished to help the Energy Crisis. The USA was dependant on Middle Eastern oil & when there was a shortage there was an energy crisis in the USA. When Carter attempted to bring in legislation to help, because of his poor relationships with Congress, his bill became extremely diluted and when it was not particularly effective, the public & media blamed him, so his struggles to have strong relationships in Congress was an important factor.

(This page is for your second answer.)

There was also Carter's failure to do much about the high unemployment and inflation (stagflation). This had been a lasting problem all the way from Nixon but Carter seemed to do very little to help the situation. This was likely because of Carter's focus on social policy.

Carter also failed to really gain the support of women, although he was more sensitive to their issues than previous presidents. His views on abortion were moderate (as in he believed it should be permitted where there had been rape, incest or having the baby was a threat to the mother's life). However yet again failures in Congress meant there was little action to back up Carter's words and so he could not gain the support of women's votes.

He also failed to gain the votes of African Americans. Again he was more sensitive to their issues than previous presidents, despite being from the extremely white Southern state of Georgia, however he struggled to get any influence

(This page is for your second answer.)

reform legislation through. There were race riots in the ghettos under Carter about problems with housing, which Carter had also used the 'big issues' like welfare & housing to back his campaign against Ford in 1976, and he now looked ineffectual & inept through the public's eyes, particularly through the eyes of black voters. He did manage to bring in a Housing Act in 1978 however black leaders said it had been a little late.

Another reason Carter failed to get re-elected was the sheer strength of his opponent Ronald Reagan. Reagan was a B-list movie star before he was a politician so he already had the media on his side along with the sex appeal of being a movie star. He was also an extremely charismatic individual along with being a brilliant orator, although a lot of what he said was rehearsed, and written by his aides. Reagan also looked like he had strong policies which could fix the problems Americans were suffering, particularly stagflation.

(This page is for your second answer.) and so he made Carter look even weaker.

Carter left office in 1980 with one of the lowest approval ratings in history. His relationship with Congress had made him unable to do most of what he wanted and stopped him from helping most of the people he promised (eg. blacks & women.) Part of the reason, I think, that Carter was so disliked by the end of his term was partially because of why he was originally elected. One of the major reasons Carter was elected was the fact he was not a Republican and so when they saw him not just as a Democrat but as Carter, the public & media simply soured on him. Proof of this is shown in the fact that at the end of his term, a lot of newspapers were asking 'Can Carter cope?' showing how weak & ineffectual he looked. I think this, combined with his inability to get minority votes, his failed relation with Congress and the strength of Reagan was why Carter was not re-elected in 1980.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer considers a good range of factors, mostly on Carter's difficulties during his term of office. Problems with Congress and different social groups are assessed, along with his economic failings. The answer notes the importance of Ronald Reagan, but only considers his sunny personality rather than addressing his policies. A good evaluation overall: low Level 5.

Paper Summary

Those candidates who were well prepared in terms of knowledge and understanding of their topics produced answers within Levels 4 and 5, and some of these have been included in this report. For students who completed GCSE just one year earlier, the best answers are remarkable examples of young minds at work.

Grade Boundaries

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

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028127 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning