

Examiners' Report
June 2012

GCE History 6HI01 D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



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 us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2012

Publications Code US032398

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

General comments

Examiners reported that many candidates were comfortable with the essential requirements of the examination. They were able to structure their work effectively, provide a range of relevant and accurate material to support the points they were making, and maintain a sustained focus on the question set. At the highest levels of attainment were those who displayed the ability to analyse a range of factors in detail and present a convincing answer overall.

However, there were some candidates who did not do themselves justice overall. A number failed to respond to the specific demands of the questions in front of them. These candidates often focused their answers on material with which they felt comfortable rather than targeting the specifics of the question set. Centres are advised to ensure that candidates are ready to use, and to adapt, the material they have learnt. Most centres use previous questions for revision and preparation for the examination, but they might warn candidates that their paper will consist entirely of previously unseen questions, and that they should be prepared for this uncertainty.

Many students became trapped within Level 3 or low Level 4 because of a lack of accurate and relevant exemplification. Most are able to develop some argument in an answer, but assertions must be supported with sufficient evidence to make these points stand up. In addition, they should explain how these points relate to the question, whether in supporting or challenging the premise of the question.

Many very good answers reached high Level 4, but were unable to access Level 5. It is important to note that otherwise strong answers sometimes stayed in Level 4 for one of two reasons. Firstly, the support material offered, while accurate and broadly relevant, was lacking balance in places, with uneven evidence in parts of the answer. A more widespread concern was that some able candidates were unfamiliar with, or unable to use, analytical concepts and terminology used by historians. While most are able to investigate economic and political factors, many were unsure of the precise meaning of, for example, 'social conditions' in Options A and B, and even 'foreign policy' in Options E and F.

It is worth reminding candidates of the importance of recognising the type of question they are answering. While the commonest type is the multi-factored causation question, where it is appropriate to discuss the importance of the stated factor and then various other factors involved, not all questions focus on causation and not all are multi-factored. Questions D7 and D11 both asked why an outcome resulted without giving a stated factor. Questions D3 and D8 both focused on the extent of change. Questions D9 and D13 both focused on the nature of change. Structuring an effective answer depends on recognising exactly what it is that you are being asked to do.

One other general point might be worth making: while candidates are often comfortable explaining an outcome in terms of the strengths of 'the winners' and the weaknesses of 'the losers' (for example the white forces in Question D6 and Chiang in Question D2) these do need to be known in detail. There is a tendency to sum up such weaknesses rather blandly so that they could apply to many situations at many times in history. The message is: be specific.

The comments on spelling, punctuation and grammar made in previous reports remain relevant and valid. The literacy curriculum notes that, in a formal setting such as a public examination, appropriate language must be used, and should be free of abbreviations and colloquialisms. It also states that, if a candidate is to communicate effectively, what is written down must be legible. On several occasions this summer examiners could not decipher what might have been key words or phrases, and this inevitably influenced the final mark awarded.

Question 1

Some weaker answers were able to press into service only a limited number of relevant factors, usually the defeat of the warlords and the encirclement campaigns against the CCP in the early 1930s. The success of Chiang's government was thus measured only in military terms. Better answers referred to some successes in domestic policy, including the start of a campaign of electrification and the development of the national infrastructure. Some of the best answers noted that the success of the GMD government depended almost exclusively on the strong and autocratic leadership provided by Chiang, and the use of the army to eliminate opposition and promote domestic stability. A few mentioned the New Life Movement, but the aims and intentions of the organisation were not clearly understood or explained.

(This page is for your first answer.) → HOW ACURATE IS IT TO SAY EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR SUCCESS OF THE GMD 1927-39?

Chiang's good leadership during Nationalist rule in China 1926-1937 is one of the fundamental underpinnings of his successful government during that period. Chiang's consistently strong leadership formulated a fairly successful period of rule in China, through a series of military, economic and social gains.

Firstly, Chiang's leadership, although aimed at the urban, anti-Marxist middle classes, was well placed in terms of success for China; his main policy was to defeat warlordism, a prolonged period of regionalism (1916-26), to fulfil such an initiative, he launched the Northern Expedition in 1926-28, which aimed to eliminate ~~regional~~ regional power from southern, northern and central provinces, thus

(This page is for your first answer.) showing him to retain a high calibre of power in China. This scheme to defeat warlordism displays Chiang's positive leadership. Although, the Northern Expedition was never fully completed; some harder to reach areas were still ruled by warlords; perhaps suggesting, tactically Chiang lacked the ability to initiate and follow through such schemes. Demonstrating how heavy American influence was not working in such Vietnam, too modern ideas failed.

Additionally, alongside Chiang's aim to defeat warlordism, he also wished to defeat foreign opposition; Namely Japan and the European mini-states established after the ~~1895~~¹⁸⁹⁵-99 Scramble for concessions. Eg; British Hong Kong. Chiang's success as a leader is clearly demonstrated, as he reduced foreign concessions from 33, to just 13 in the period of leadership. Potentially suggesting, had domestic opposition in the form of the CCP + Civil War not have occurred, Chiang could have continued to eliminate opposition in ~~China~~ Nationalist China.

Furthermore, alongside such military schemes, Chiang's leadership produced some social gains; for example from 1926-35 the number of secondary schools trebled. Provision of education by Chiang would

(This page is for your first answer.) Later potentially allow economic growth and modernisation - Possibly mirroring the Japanese Meiji period of westernisation. However, Chiang's reforms in education may not have benefited the 90% peasantry masses in China, as primary and basic adult education were needed to eliminate deep rooted social problems. None the less, Chiang undeniably made social reforms.

Additional social reforms also include Chiang's attempts to overhaul society via the New Life Movement 1930, although this movement proved confusing and futile, Chiang's intentions appeared good. Chiang, unlike previous Chinese leaders had a will to modernise China, probably due to his nationalist beliefs. Other attempts at reforming society include the United Front, which was formed in 1924, such a unification of the CCP and GMD, could highlight Chiang's wish to benefit China in the long term - however the United Front ended in 1927.

However, although Chiang's positive leadership style led to a successful nationalist government through 1926-37, many historians don't believe it was solely due to Chiang's leadership; which many criticise for its corruption and brutality.

(This page is for your first answer.) Firstly, Chiang's government was heavily backed by America, the aid given to prop up Chiang's capitalist regime which led to a successful government by the GMD. USA funding, alongside funding from Chiang's wife's family, the predominant Soong family, led to the GMD being an economically rich government; especially compared to ~~the~~ the CCP's lack of prosperity. Chiang's leadership was average, however the large quantity of money at his disposal led to a successful GMD rule.

Additionally, Chiang's leadership was confirmed by his military brutality, now heavily bankrolled by the USA, via the Lend-Lease scheme. Such high funding was a stark contrast to political opposition, the CCP. A prime example of Chiang utilising his many resources can be noted in the Long March, in 1934-35, in which he drove the CCP out of central China, via guerrilla technique, to Yenan - subsequently 3 weeks of conflict left the CCP with 5,000 members - previously the figure was 80,000. Such events demonstrate Chiang's ability and willingness for violence and brutality - perhaps suggesting strength as a leader - willing to

(This page is for your first answer.) go to distant lengths to protect the GMD, or perhaps a leader with poor diplomacy, tactics and dictator like values, whom uses sheer displays of violence to threaten, thus defeat domestic opposition.

In conclusion, Chiang ^{created} ~~was~~ a successful government throughout 1926-37, characterised mainly by shows of severe violence (the Shanghai massacre 1927 - 250,000 communists killed in Mao's home province) alongside a myriad of resources to further establish his rule. Chiang was not charismatic, popular and lacked an electoral mandate, as the USA rigged his election, however managed, mostly via force (often against the CCP) to remain in power for a substantial time period, suggesting tactical brilliance.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer notes Chiang's success in defeating warlordism and reducing the foreign concessions; and there is some reference to social change, notably education and the New Life Movement. A direct approach on the question, with an analytical shape and secure development overall. Low Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan

~~Mao ⇒ survived LM (34-5)~~

~~⇒ lead new peasant~~

~~⇒ land reform~~

~~⇒ happy to dis USSR~~

~~CCP ⇒ after power~~

Plan

Leadership ⇒ united China, one leader

⇒ promised 3 p's

⇒ however ⇒ 1930 encircle ⇒ Not all gone
warlord

⇒ 1931 Manch

⇒ 1933 treaty

⇒ printing of ~~ft~~

Warlord failure ⇒ 1912-26 ⇒ desperate pop in 1927

⇒ prospect of peace

Foreign int ⇒ USSR aid with advisors, managers, military
and f

Effective leadership was not the most important factor for GMD success' between 1927-34, in fact (while there are some examples of good leadership) it was poor leadership that limited the potential success that was available from a welcoming population and a generous USSR.

In 1927, Chiang and the GMD (along with the CCP) had defeated or come to terms with all the major warlords in China (eg. Xiang Zeulin and Peng Dehu). This meant that for the first time since 1911 China was united as a country behind one leader, Chiang Kai-shek. The ability to get to that stage after so many years of anarchy shows strong leadership in itself.

It was also the promise that the GMD brought with them that showed they understood the people's needs, an important aspect of leadership. They promised to introduce Sun Yat-sen's '3 Principles of the People'. These were Democracy, Nationalism and People's Livelihood. This promise created a large support base for Chiang, something that every

(This page is for your first answer.) good leader has to establish.

However, while it is evident that success could be accomplished if Chiang followed the plan he promised, it may not have been the case. Firstly, Chiang and the CCP had not been able to defeat all the warlords and so a lot of people (especially in the rural ~~east~~ west) were still ~~to~~ living in fear. This was due to the fact that Chiang, when a united and peaceful China looked possible, turned on the CCP and instructed massacres to take place such as the Shanghai Massacre ^(15,000 dead) in 1927. This was followed by encirclement campaigns in 1930, meaning that, through Chiang's own hatred of Communists, he was creating a civil war, which was sure to effect the People's Livelihood. This showed poor leadership, and continued well beyond 1934 (when the CCP undertook the long march).

Chiang's obsession with defeating the CCP had further consequences for Nationalism and the People's Livelihood. In 1931 Japan

(This page is for your first answer.) invaded Manchuria. However, Chiang allowed this to happen as he said "the Japanese are an infection of the skin, the Communists an infection of the heart". In 1932 Japan took Shanghai and in 1933 Chiang signed a treaty that handed over most of north-east China to the Japanese. This poor leadership was betraying the people's trust in his promise of the 3 Principles of the People.

Furthermore, Chiang's rule was tyrannical and corrupt. It was his personal hatred that led to 50% of the economy being spent trying to defeat the CCP. This left only 30% to pay of the debt he had inherited from the Warlord Era (1912-27, for example Yuan Shikai's \$10 million loan in 1913) and only 20% to be spent on improvement and industrialisation. Chiang shows poor leadership again by deciding that printing money was the solution to his problems, which saw vast inflation of prices that led to bare necessities being unaffordable for peasants.

However, it is evident that there was

(This page is for your first answer.) some improvement due to the GMD's reign in 1927-34, when compared to the period of anarchy that had preceded it. This was not, however, due to GMD's successful leadership. In 1937 China had a population that had ~~had~~ had Democracy torn from them in 1912 by Yuan Shikai and had then had to suffer constant war, famine and fear ~~for~~ up till 1927. This meant that the population were desperate for change and desperate for peace. This is what Chiang promised and it was this belief of the Chinese population in 1927, that helped to keep China moving forward whilst the GMD were in power, as, despite the GMD showing poor leadership, China needed to put its support in one Government and give it a chance and that is what the population did.

The ultimate explanation for ^{the} GMD's relative success between 1927-34 comes from the support the USSR provided. Marxist beliefs were that a Communist Revolution (which was what they sought in China) would happen first by the Middle Class overthrowing

(This page is for your first answer.) The elite classes and then the lower class overthrowing the middle. The USSR believed the CCP were not strong enough to overthrow the elites and thus lent most of their support to the GMD (in the hope that after the GMD had defeated the elites the CCP would defeat the GMD). This invaluable support of money, advisors, industrial managers and military guru's help to keep China moving forward between 1927-32. If it had not been for the money then it is likely that the GMD would have had even lower than 20% of the economy to spend on industrialisation and the industrial managers help to maximise the output with the minimal funding that Chiang gave them. The advisors helped to create propaganda which convinced some that the GMD were the correct government to be in power. Ironically, the military guru's and a lot of the money went towards trying to defeat the CCP. However, it is undeniable that USSR aid help to minimise the damage of the poor CCP leadership and move China forward.

(This page is for your first answer.) To conclude, it was not effective leadership that kept China moving ~~fast~~ forward and the GMD being a success but it was the help of the USSR and a population seeking some stability that meant that, despite the poor leadership shown by the GMD in the years 1927-36, China saw some improvement.




ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is some attempt to analyse the question and consider the failures of Chiang's leadership, but attempts to provide an alternative theory rely on inaccurate material on the USSR. Material from the period is relevant but not well focused. Level 3 engagement and analysis, but weaknesses in both accuracy and relevance make for mid Level 3 marks overall.

Question 2

Despite the timescale in the question, many candidates were determined to write extensively on the role of Mao in the years 1934-49. Sometimes this proved contextually relevant. Many noted that in the years 1937-45 the CCP had developed the tactics of guerrilla warfare, and these proved highly effective in the early period of the civil war. However, reference to the Long March was barely relevant. Strong answers balanced the CCP's successes with the failures and weaknesses of the GMD forces and their leaders. These answers noted that Mao's military role in the years 1946-49 was limited, and that credit for military successes belonged to the leadership of Lin Biao. GMD failures were exemplified through the weak morale of its forces, many of whom defected to the CCP whenever they could; and the poor leadership of incompetent generals was a significant factor in the GMD defeats.



Many historians argue that the reason for the Chinese Communist Party's ~~leadership~~ victory was due to Mao Zedong's strong leadership. The victory of the CCP against the GMD was a momentous moment in Chinese history. It is true to argue that Mao was responsible for many of the victories of the CCP during the Civil War. However, other factors also played an important role in the ~~leadership~~ victory. For example, the failure of Chiang Kai Shek as leader of the GMD to create effective campaigns, his military decisions ultimately led to the GMD downfall. However, linking to this was the overall GMD unpopularity amongst the people, which gave the CCP more support. Another factor that could be argued that was responsible was the economic situation that the GMD had managed to get themselves into, huge inflation and debt to other countries. All these factors would ultimately lead to the GMD downfall, and the GMD were responsible for CCP victory.

Mao's leadership was ruthless, this had been proved in the Jiangxi Soviet where Mao adopted rectification campaigns to destroy his opponents. It was then once more adopted in 1942 in Yanan where officials had to self-criticise. It was in Yanan (1936-45) where Mao began to develop ultimate

(This page is for your first answer.) Control over the CCP, which would eventually be the party to unite China. Mao's authority was unquestionable with even his closest advisors such as Zhou Enlai having to self-criticise. It was this domination that helped the CCP in battles. Mao's strong authority meant little questioned him. However the superb generalship of his commanders such as Lin Biao and Zhu De also helped in the CCP victory.

Mao knew that in order to defeat the GMD it was essential for the CCP to maintain Manchuria (a CCP stronghold). To make life difficult for the ~~CCP~~ GMD Mao adopted Guerilla tactics, this to the Nationalist proved hard to overcome as they had trained in direct full frontal war. Mao knew that the GMD had superior air power and weaponry (which had been supplied to them by the USA), so the CCP attacked air runways to make the situation harder for the GMD. ~~Similarly~~ Similarly, Mao's willingness to give up Yanan to the GMD in 1947 proved pivotal in the CCP victory. Mao said 'we will give Chiang Yanan, he will give us China'. Mao knew that the victory of Yanan would be a hollow one for the GMD as most forces had moved out, this led to a GMD lack in morale.

(This page is for your first answer.) Although Mao's cunning leadership and tactics was vital in GMD defeat, Chiang Kai Shek and his military and political mistakes made a huge contribution to CCP victory. Firstly Politically the GMD had begun to lose support of the people. Chiang adopted harsh recruitment campaigns, which resulted in families being split up. This left the GMD without whole hearted support from the public. Similarly the GMD soldiers compared to the CCP were brutal and harsh to the peasants leaving Nationalist support isolated. However a major factor in the GMD loss was Chiang Kai Shek's poor leadership. For example in the taking of Manchuria Chiang insisted on entering the area before supply lines had been set up. This proved a fatal mistake, and soon the GMD found themselves under counter attack. ~~Since~~ Unlike Mao Chiang chose his generals on those who were most loyal to him, not on military merit, this meant the GMD was not governed by the best possible people resulting in the GMD's defeat in Manchuria. Similar tactical mistakes were made in the Strong Point Offensive where Chiang overstretched his army lines offering the CCP many areas for attack. Finally ~~at~~ in Chiang's last feeble attempt to gain control, Chiang placed his army at a place where they could be attacked from 3

(This page is for your first answer.) sides. Going against the advice of his Generals and indeed USA advisors, Chiang insisted on being stubborn which left the CCP awaiting victory.

However Economic factors could be argued proved pivotal in CCP victory. Huge inflation had begun to occur and the peasants began to revolt at the rising of taxes. The USA which had proved a huge military and economic aid, ~~in~~ in 1947 after giving 1 billion dollars disinclined to give further aid. This resulted in the GMD losing the funds for the ridiculous campaigns and it could be argued led to their downfall.

In conclusion a variety of factors played a key role in CCP victory, however I believe that the skilled leadership of Mao was essential, if Mao had not been patient then perhaps the CCP would not have won, if he hadn't chosen the right opportune moments China may have been under GMD control. 'The Great Helmsman' was certainly the key in the CCP victory in 1949.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The clear introduction establishes a sound agenda. A good range of factors is considered, notably on the Strong Point Offensive. The importance of the CCP's links with the peasants is not investigated in detail, but overall this is a confident and well-organised response. Mid Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.)

PLAN

Mao's strengths

- 1) - military capability - willingness to deleyete - Lin Biao
- guerilla tactics reinstated
- Deng Xiaoping (x-shen bottle)
highly undivided ✓ after failure of Otto Braun.
- took advantage of Chiang's errors. (released GMD)
- 2) His other policies - Japan - Anti Japanese University
- Support - Cities
- Intellectuals + Liberals - War - potential for democracy.
- peasants -

But 3) Chiang's military failures

- fight to in Manchuria
- distrust of generals.
- poorly trained soldiers

4) Chiang - failed to win north + west

(This page is for your first answer.) Both the CCP (Chinese Communist Party) and GMD (Guomindang) were damaged by the Second World War. Despite the GMD going into the civil war with the majority of cities and general territory under their control, and having the backing of the USA, and having a far larger army than the CCP, they still lost the civil war. This victory for the CCP was largely down to Mao Zedong, both the strength he instilled in the military and the strength he had in gaining popular support. However, the failings of Chiang and the GMD in both their military tactics and winning popular support led to their the CCP victory.

The CCP military were powerful, confident and well organised, due to Mao's leadership. Mao showed a willingness to trust his generals and delegate military decisions to them. Lin Biao, for example, was a competent military general who was given responsibility. Furthermore, the organizers, such as Deng Xiaoping, were important. Deng managed to inspire two million peasants across four provinces to lend support in the vital battle of Xushan. The guerrilla tactics instilled upon by Mao were also significant. Following Otto Braun's failure in advising confrontational tactics, Mao introduced guerrilla war tactics after the Long March (1934-35). This evidence suggests that Mao's

(This page is for your first answer.) military tactics helped the CCP win in 1949.

// The victory in 1949 of the CCP was also due to the fact that the CCP had popular support, and this was because of Mao. Mao's policies ^{and decisions} were hugely popular. His decision to fight the Japanese in World War Two gave Mao huge support from the public. On top of this the peasants were well treated by Mao's army. He instilled in them great discipline and this was appreciated by the peasants. The peasants ~~also~~ supported them in these years because of the promise of land reform, which was already in place in some areas ^(like Jiangxi) since 1930. The CCP was the party of the peasants, of which which made up 85% of China's population. This popular support placed the CCP in a great position to take over. In the cities, Mao placed great emphasis on restoring them, and this is recalled in 'Wild Swans' as a period of happiness. Within weeks they had cities up and running with banks reopening and electricity and water supply back on. They won the support of many in the middle class who hoped the CCP would be as moderate as they appeared. Mao also appeared to accept liberals and intellectuals, despite his later campaigns against them in the Cultural Revolution. These groups of intellectuals were attracted to by Mao's ~~promise~~ promise the hope of democracy, which Mao suggested in 'On New Democracy'. This evidence suggests that the CCP gained popular support through

(This page is for your first answer.) Mao and his was a reason for their victory.

However, the weakness of the GMD's military could explain the reason for why the CCP won. Chiang assigned his best troops to fight Manchuria to ensure the Japanese did not surrender cities to the CCP. This meant that central and northern China was not fully secured, leaving it ~~open~~ open to CCP takeover. Since Chiang had little faith in his generals, who he knew were essentially ~~corrupt~~ warlords, he favored graduates from Whampoa. This disparity in the ranks caused tension, which was made worse by the fact the Chiang tried to make military decisions from hundreds of miles away. The military was often conscripted and tried to be forced to avoid the trap than fleeing. This evidence suggests that Chiang's military failures could be a reason for CCP victory, rather than ~~just~~ Mao's leadership.

Furthermore, Chiang and the GMD failed to win the people's hearts and minds. Not only did he refuse to fight Japan and focused on the CCP instead, he also treated the peasants poorly, and so did his troops. The ill-disciplined troops lost much support. Chiang also lost the cities due to his poor economic management and failure to enforce promised reforms, such

(This page is for your first answer.) ^{on} enriched labour and working conditions.

This evidence suggests that ^{it was} Chiang's failure to gain popular support ^{that} could have led to CCP victory, and perhaps not Mao's leadership.

To conclude, the GMD failed in many ways, but overall the evidence would suggest that it was Mao's leadership that led to a strong military who were highly motivated, unlike the conscripts in the GMD. His leadership also gained support of the peasants and much of the middle class, helping the CCP to victory in 1949.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is some agenda established in the introduction. The answer is focused and analytical. Mao's strengths are assessed, though other factors are largely on the weaknesses of the GMD. A good depth of knowledge is demonstrated, though the range of material here is lacking in some balance. High Level 4.

Question 3

Those candidates who made it clear they understood the scale of change involved in 'transformation' could make more focused judgements on the extent of change than those who merely assessed 'change'. There was a significant minority who wanted to twist the question into an assessment of whether the changes were for the better or the worse, which was not the question asked. However, for agriculture plenty of knowledge was displayed of the changes to land ownership and in farming methods (Lysenkoism being a favourite of many) and in terms of village life the changes in family arrangements and women's rights were well known, especially in the communes. The best answers often showed that conservative attitudes and distance from Beijing reduced the extent of change.

To what extent was agriculture and village life transformed in the years 1949-62?

Village people still remained in farms but just part of a programme
 → ^{Process of collectivisation} significant extent → ^{The First Five Year Plan} land reform in the early years - favoured the peasants

'General Grain' - Lysenkoism → The Great Leap Forward 1958-62
 ↓
 The Famine 1958
 - behemoth change in terms of communes

Chairman Mao to a significant extent transformed agriculture and village life in the years 1949-62. The early years of the PRC saw land reform changes favouring the peasants. But this kind of 'favour' from the new regime was short lived as in The Great Leap Forward from 1958, the CCP imposed the villages into

(This page is for your first answer.) communes. Traditional family roles were squeezed out and collectivisation was the method to develop the agriculture in China, under 'Great Leap Forward'. Despite this the people of the villages remained at the bottom of the power structure China, even under the CCP.

During the early years of the PRC, after the victory of the CCP over the GMD (Nationalist Party), the country was in ruins due to the revolution. The new one-party state wanted to get rid of the 'bureaucratic capitalist class' not only through the Anti-Rightist Campaigns of 1957 which served solely for that purpose, but also private ownership of land. The early land reforms during the 1950's took land away from land owners and redistributed ^{this} equally in villages. The ~~peasants~~ worked in the advantages of the peasants who believed the new regime would be of their favour. This was a significant change as landlords and warlords could no longer be in charge of the villages as they had been during the revolution 1911-49. The warlords had been leaders who imposed

(This page is for your first answer.) their rules. Village life was being transformed.

The PRC transformed village life further through the mass killings, ~~terror campaigns~~ and changes in the role of women.

The mass killings ~~and terror campaigns~~ were executed during the early years as political techniques to get rid of the corruption after the revolution. There were mass killings of gangsters, mobs and criminal gangs. Whilst, prostitutes were sent into 're-education' centres where they could improve their lives. The role of women also changed dramatically as ~~current~~ old traditions were being diminished by Mao's government. Concubinage was outlawed in the 1950's (the tradition of marrying more than one wife), foot binding was ^{also} outlawed as well as forced marriages. These were categorically huge changes to the society and consequently the village life of the people who had shared the experiences. It was these changes that transformed life, for the better perhaps, under the PRC.

Another huge policy which changed agriculture and village life was The Great Leap Forward. This was a five year plan devised by Mao to 'industrialise China through man power' and in turn create a modern China. Mao had ~~that~~ said in Moscow in 1957, 'first and foremost things are determined by the hearts and minds of people. It has always been like that in history. The weak have always bent on the strong'. Here he was showing that China no longer needed to follow the Soviet example as they had done in the First Five Year Plan to save the economy. However, the Second Five Year Plan, the Great Leap Forward was not as successful. The reform in agriculture was 'General Grain'. Mao wanted the people in the country to provide a surplus of food which could be sold internationally for profit. He first developed 'communes' ~~for~~ a collectivisation technique ~~for~~ by ~~the~~ abolishing ~~the~~ private land ownership and handing over to the government. The communes would change village life greatly as

traditional family roles will be rejected and people would have to work for instead. This dramatic change in roles was perhaps revolutionary, China's customs were changed. Village life had changed dramatically as well as how agriculture was managed during this time.

However, despite the changes to agriculture policies and in turn village life the ~~villagers~~^{peasants} were still the ones at the bottom of the PRC structure. To the time of the dynasty, it had been the emperors who had dominated the hierarchy structure but now it was the CCP, or in other words Mao. Despite the peasants receiving their land in the early land reforms it is taken away from them again. Also, Mao who had shown discontentment with the treatment of women still had no women in the government. Village life had not changed significantly so that the power structure in China was different.

In conclusion, the agriculture and village life transformed in the years 1949-62. This was mainly due to the change of traditional roles in society and land reform laws. The way that ~~villages~~ agriculture had operated had changed, the local peasants would provide for their country by working in communes. It was these drastic changes that transformed the lives of many and the way that China was run.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments


This answer is analytical, with some understanding of key issues. There is some specific evidence offered, though the range of material is not very extensive: Lysenkoism is an important omission. The points made on the changing status of women are appropriate. This is a mid Level 4 analysis.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

This question requires a strong focus on agriculture and village life. Be careful of introducing extensive material on social change, such as education.

(This page is for your first answer.)



Part of the ideology of Mao Zedong and the Chinese Communist Party was to "feed the people" thus improve agriculture. Mao also believed that power lied with the peasants so methods were imposed to improve their livelihood in the years 1949-1962.

Mao was a huge communist so early on in his chairmanship China under went "land reform", this took land from land owners "Capitalists" and redistributed it fairly among the peasants. promoting a sense of equality and Communism.

(This page is for your first answer.) Despite being hugely popular with the peasants this method highlighted Mao's ~~see~~ inadequate economical knowledge, as taking land from people who understood agriculture didn't increase production of crops etc.

In 1952 Mao initiated the first five year plan, the first replica of Soviet five year plans. Communist Russia had huge input sending their experts in to construct the plan and also training Chinese people. Despite his previous policy of land reform, peasants were now organised in small scale collectives - which removed the sense of pride and ownership village workers had only just received. Village life received transformation during the first five year plan, however dramatic change hadn't occurred.

In the first five year plan the collectives meant less machinery and workers to produce more crops and Mao devised targets for the peasants to meet, the increase in agriculture meant an increase in heavy industry - Mao's main focus, this was because funding was received via agriculture. This however imparted no benefits to the village people; only those in towns, who got the benefits of heavy

(This page is for your first answer.) industry. More agriculture didn't mean more food, ~~and~~ ~~benefit~~ for villagers, indirectly it meant more ~~heavy~~ heavy industry and industrialisation.

In the years 1958-1962 Mao initiated a second five year plan, the "Great Leap forward". The exceeding of targets in the first five year plan caused Mao to be ambitious in this targetting. Impossible targets were set; ~~and not so~~ The Chinese Communist Party also controlled the Media where they used propaganda to give the impression targets were once again being exceeded. Mao painted a society of transformation, one of villages full with crops however China was heading for a famine.

The success of collectives, also made Communist Mao ambitious, small scale collectives became large scale communes. Families were broken up so people worked only for Chairman Mao. It is safe to say radical transformation had occurred but not to the benefit of the villagers. Communes had better machinery due to the first five year plan, but with inferior knowledge

(This page is for your first answer.) ... and the denunciation of land owners "experienced farmers" who could work the machinery.

Communes were assigned cadres who were party officials, these officials monitored production and progress to report to Mao. Realistically a country as large as China couldn't be fully observed by one man so cadres monitored production. These cadres however falsified agricultural figures, to meet targets impossible targets set by Mao, this was done because of the portrayal of success and the fear Mao imposed. No one would tell Mao and the CCP targets cannot be achieved especially after the 100 flowers campaign in 1957. To criticise was not an option. falsification to please Mao wouldn't be so detrimental to villagers and their agriculture if it didn't impact the amount of food taken into town. Mao was unknowingly leaving the peasants starving - which would be shown by the famine in 1963.

To say radical transformation had occurred in agriculture and village life

(This page is for your first answer.) would be correct, but to say this transformation was positive wouldn't. Mao's lack of economical knowledge was masked by Soviet intervention in the first five year plan but when China stood alone in the great leap forward Mao's limited understanding and overarching desire to "catch up with the West" led to disaster.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Overall, there is an attempt at analysis, but the answer tends to wander out of focus. Many important points lack development or, as in the case of Lysenkoism, are missing completely. Sufficient understanding and development for high Level 3.

Question 4

Recognising the intended focus of the question was a problem for some candidates who wanted to explain Mao's motives for starting the Cultural Revolution rather than assessing its consequences: these were not necessarily the same thing. Since the effects were 'destructive' in most senses, a profitable way to structure an answer would have been to examine the various negative consequences (on the economy and on different social groups) before assessing the positives for Mao and the PLA in terms of political power. Most could discuss at least the physical aspects of the destruction of traditional culture (such as damage to buildings and shrines), while some candidates managed to extend this to address the impact on traditional beliefs and loyalties. Fewer were able to look at the impact on minority cultures on the fringes of China. In terms of political consequences, the benefits for Mao himself were well known, as was the demise of Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. However, the subsequent growth in importance of the PLA and of Lin Biao was less well covered, as was the militarisation of society.

(This page is for your first answer.) While there were other effects that the Cultural Revolution brought about, it is accurate to say the main effect was the destruction of Chinese culture. Jiang Qing and her dominant role in the Chinese Cultural Revolution group essentially created a cultural wasteland. There were other consequences that ran parallel to this consequence but like the power dispute between Liu Shaoqi and Lin Biao as well as the purges. These however, contributed to the destruction of Chinese culture as they were examples of the force that was used to suppress any opposition.

It must be noted that an important aspect of the Cultural Revolution was the intensification of the role of Mao. Mao came back into frontline politics with a bang and showed it to the nation by swimming the length of the Yangzi river, the site of the 1911 revolution. He had been informed earlier in May 1966 by the CCRC that the main threat to the nation was the "revisionists" and the "bourgeois elements" of the population. Mao made this the new dogma of the CCP by declaring that these elements had infiltrated the party. He encouraged the young students and radical teachers

(This page is for your first answer.) to attack these elements of China. He gave one university a banner that read "Bombard the establishment." In other words he wanted them to attack the pre-communist leaders. The students responded enthusiastically and in 1966 schools and universities were closed for two years. Moreover throughout the summer of 1966, large mass rallies were held in Tiananmen Square with nearly 1 million young people attending each time. They waved their little red books and shouted "Let Mao live for 1000 years." The Cultural Revolution should be credited with improving the cult of Mao, however this can be said to be in itself a contribution to the destruction of Chinese culture as the younger generation became more obsessed with the culture around Mao.

Yet one of the returns of Mao came a power struggle which was a large essence of the new cultural revolution. Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shaoqi's economic policies alleviated economic distress among the people but they were seen as "revisionists" by the other members of the party, more notably the Gang of Four and Jiang Qing. Jiang Qing called for their removal from the party. Mao listened and demoted Liu Shaoqi and promoted the head of the PLA Lin Biao to be his successor. This was a direct result of the power that the Shanghai Group held as they in their influence contributed to the fall of Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shaoqi. They were expelled from the party in October 1966.

However, the most prominent essence of the Cultural Revolution was the destruction of Chinese culture. The CCP and Jiang Qing essentially made China a cultural wasteland. Their attitude maintained that there should be no art for the sake of art and it should directly

(This page is for your first answer.) Contribute to the revolution, case. All pieces of art produced by big artists and writers were controlled by the CCP. There was no freedom of expression as the artists were under strict surveillance. Moreover, Red Guards and young people were encouraged to smash up temples and other places of cultural interest. In November 1966, 5000 or 7000 places of cultural interest in Beijing were smashed up by 200 students over a week's period. The CCP had identified the "Four olds" as old ideas, old customs, old habits and old culture. This gave details as to the whereabouts of those "olds" to the Red Guards who consequently destroyed them. Furthermore, this was directed at people as well. Anyone who showed "decadent" or "revisionist" tendencies was attacked and subjected to "struggle" sessions, in which victims were put in the cross-hair position and forced to confess. The CCP demanded complete cultural obedience and Jiang Qing commissioned opera ballets which were being and tedious yet the people were forced to applaud or else risk their lives. This was the most important aspect of the cultural revolution as an expression of the "Four olds" was treated as a severe example of heresy.

A contribution to this was the "up to the villages, and down to the villages" campaign which essentially disillusioned a generation or twelve million young people. These people were sent to the villages to, as Mao put it, learn about the "dignity of labor". Instead they didn't experience the practice of the revolution, case but found themselves alienated and ignored. Mao destroyed their cultural lives by ~~also~~ essentially exiling them away from the cities.

To conclude it is extremely accurate to say that the main aspect

(This page is for your first answer.) as the cultural revolution was the destruction of Chinese culture. Jiang Qing and the CCRC's control over artistic expression and the "Red Guards" demanded complete obedience to their actions. All other aspects like the cult of Mao and his social policies contributed to the overall destruction of Chinese culture.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer shows an explicit understanding of key issues and is both wide-ranging and well-informed. Some explanation might have been provided for Mao's policy of sending students to the countryside, but the overall quality here, notably the linking of different factors, is impressive. High Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.) The Cultural Revolution, was started as Mao and the Gang of 4 believed that old Chinese culture was not portraying the correct message to the Chinese people, about Mao.

The main targets of the Cultural Revolution was to eradicate the '4 olds' & Mao believed the Youth of China should be the ones to attack these old ways of thinking as they had not been born when China was without Mao. It can be shown that the main effect of the Cultural Revolution then was the 'destruction of traditional Chinese Culture'. As Peng Duhai - the Chinese writer had written a play seen to be 'anti-Maoist' was purged, showing people could no longer express their feelings. The aspects of traditional Chinese Culture were bleak, as all songs, dances, plays & books all had to show that Communism was good & that Mao was China's savior. Censorship was used to ensure it stayed this way and so, this is a way that shows the main effect of

(This page is for your first answer.) the Cultural Revolution was to destroy traditional culture.

A point which implies that it was not the main effect of the Cultural Revolution was how the Red Guards used the Cultural Revolution as a chance to attack any authoritative figure believed to be 'Anti-Maoist'. Official such as Cadres, Teachers & even Party members were being purged as they were seen as corrupt. The reasoning for the attack on teachers, was because supposedly, they were teaching things that went against Mao. And so this attack on the corrupted individuals of China was like a terror attack from the

'ever-paranoid' Mao to try and stop anyone from going against him. The Red Guards were even purging their parents if they said anything against Mao as the love for Mao they showed was so strong, they would do anything to try and please him. And this shows that the attack on traditional culture was maybe not the main effect for the Cultural Revolution.

Another point to suggest that the main effect of the Cultural Revolution was the destruction of traditional Chinese culture, was shown first in the 'Hundred Flowers Campaign' after which showed that Mao could not take criticism and the launch of the 'Anti-Rightist' campaign immediately after seemed to prove this. And if culture in China was of a traditional sense, i.e. before the reign of Mao, and that people liked it, Mao saw it as a direct criticism that

(This page is for your first answer.) The Chinese people did not like living under Mao's rule. So by irradiating these old values and traditions there would be no influences over the people to suggest there was another way other than 'Mao's way'. So Mao's aim mainly would have been to destroy all old influences and show the Chinese people the 'Glorious Communism'. And this is showing the main effect of the Cultural Revolution was the destruction of traditional Chinese culture. A point that shows that the main effect of the Cultural Revolution was not the destruction of traditional culture was the effect on China's youth being the 'main effect' Mao saw by the amount of passion that they dedicated to him and decided to use it as a way of destroying

his enemies, during the Cultural revolution, both of Mao's former 'right-hand men' Lin Biao & Liu Shaoqi were purged from the party, Lin was imprisoned & Liu tried to flee but died in a plane crash. This shows that the destruction of traditional culture was not the main effect of the Cultural Revolution.

In conclusion, although it was a big effect of the Cultural Revolution, the destruction of traditional culture in China was not the main effect, as it seems the removal of Mao's

(This page is for your first answer.) Rivals seem to be the 'main' effect, after Lin Biao, Liu Shaoqi & Deng Xiaoping were all purged during the Cultural Revolution.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The analysis here is good and the argument is very sound in many places. However, supporting evidence is quite uneven, and thin in places. The analysis, coupled with an explicit conclusion, allows for a mid Level 4 award.

Question 5

This was a clear multi-factor causation question, and so provided few problems in terms of interpretation. Candidates were well informed on the personal errors of judgement made by Nicholas II during the war, and many also attempted to assess the damage he caused the Romanovs by his handling of longer term pre-war problems, notably involving the Duma. There was, however, a tendency on the part of some candidates to describe any perceived failure of Nicholas (say, the mishandling of the Japanese War) and to state that this must therefore have been a cause of the downfall of the Romanovs without making any serious attempt to explain why or to link it to the circumstances of February 1917: unsubstantiated links of this nature do not constitute a supported argument. Some insisted on pressing into service the reforms created by Alexander II and the repressive policies of Alexander III, usually without justification. Stronger candidates focused on the effects that Nicholas' wartime errors had on the ruling elite and explained how losing their support was crucial in leaving Nicholas isolated in February, as well as explaining the escalation of economic hardship in Petrograd in terms of provoking popular unrest.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Nicholas II was responsible as he left Russia in attempt to boost morale and lead the soldiers on the front^{of WWI}line. This left Russia unprotected as he did not leave a strong leader to govern his country whilst he was absent. Russia was losing the war and people at home were also under hard times giving what food supplies they had to the army. This indicates Tsar Nicholas II was *for the fall of the Romanovs*

(This page is for your first answer.) responsible for the fall of the Romanovs as control was falling out of his hands.

WWI was also ~~responsible~~ responsible for the fall of the Romanovs. As the Russians were suffering large defeats on every battlefield and a poor ^{weakened the forces} stock of supplies and ammunition. This divided the Tsar from his home so he could help lead the war effort, giving way for anyone to take power in his absence. This is responsible, so far as it forced the Tsar vacate the country. But he did this at his own will making him responsible for leaving Russia unprotected.

The Tsar left Russia for the war, leaving his wife Tsarina and the holy man Rasputin to govern the country in his absence. This is responsible for the fall of the Romanovs because it crippled the Tsars already bad reputation as his wife was German born, the public were in anger and believed that she was

(This page is for your first answer.) the enemy, Rasputin also had a bad reputation for drinking. This made it easy for anyone to

take power as they were weak leaders. They were responsible so far as they couldn't govern properly. But Nicholas II was responsible for leaving them in power.

The final group responsible for the fall of the Romanovs was the red army as they stopped the Tsar returning on the Trans-Siberian Railway and they marched for the Dnieper ordering them to govern the state. Effectively without control of the army the Tsar was forced to abdicate being the last Romanov Tsar.

Overall Nicholas II was responsible for the fall of the Romanovs as he left for the front leaving two inexperienced leaders to govern his country and lost control of the army which ultimately ended

(This page is for your first answer.) his reign.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer does make an attempt to answer the question, supporting the explanation with an essentially valid, but generalised, explanation of the stated factor. Only one other factor is mentioned, but in a very insecure way. Mid Level 3.




ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Questions of this type could include material covering the whole 23 year reign of Nicholas II. Selection of material is thus very important.

(This page is for your first answer.)

"How far was Nicholas II responsible for ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~the~~ ~~downfall~~ downfall of the Romanovs in 1917?"



Nicholas II was abdicated at Pskov in February 1917. He handed down the crown to his brother who swiftly rejected it and so the Romanov family's 200 year reign was over. There are clear reasons for us to believe that it was in fact entirely his fault but there

(This page is for your first answer.) are also other factors we must take into consideration.

In 1905, following the revolution, Nicholas II introduced the October Manifesto in order to temporarily please the radicals and protesters.

It outlined the population's freedom of movement, freedom of religion and most importantly created a Duma which 'bought off' the liberals as they only wanted a share of power with the Tsar. Just a year later after two Dumas had already been dissolved by Nicholas II, the Fundamental Laws (1906) were introduced.

This outlined that the Tsar could step into any decision in the Dumas and that they could only legislate and scrutinize on what had the Tsar's approval. Also, only 30% of working men could vote to elect the Duma so the population of Russia were not best pleased knowing their most major successful reform had been almost entirely undone, leading the way for more radical groups to work against the Tsar, proving the Tsar was in fact responsible for his own downfall.

(This page is for your first answer.) A second reason we could consider Nicholas entirely responsible for the downfall of the Romanovs is because of his use of violence and terror. The Tsar used what was known as the Black Hundreds who would go out into villages ~~along with the~~ and search out any radical reformer who was known to have taken part in protest. The individuals would then be killed on the spot or taken back to a city and imprisoned. This role was also shared by the Okhrana who were the Tsar's "Secret Police." They too would target known radicals and act as a defence alongside the Black Hundreds during revolutions in major cities. ~~the~~ As both of these vicious, violent groups were encouraged and/or organized by the Tsar Nicholas II we can only blame him for the downfall of the Romanov family, because overall, (and including the fundamental laws) he thought he could assert his authority and stay in power.

However there is reason to believe it was

(This page is for your first answer.) not just Nicholas II's fault. One reason is the radicals and revolutionaries had started taking action in 1881 when Alexander II was killed by the People's Will. Many of the groups already existed before Nicholas II's reign. Lenin was exiled and the Bolsheviks were in Switzerland before and during ~~the~~^{his} reign. We could even say that Nicholas' predecessor^{Alexander III} was responsible for the Romanov's fall because he named his time in power "The Reaction" and undid the reforms his father had made. He banned factions so no other political parties could influence the people and cracked down on reformers using the Okhrana, which would have fuelled the radicals to only try harder for a revolution and get more of the population involved.

~~especially~~ The radicals especially had the advantage of numbers after the doubling in population of Moscow after Witte's Great Spurt which proves that the downfall of the Romanovs was not completely Nicholas II's fault, it could easily be blamed on the radicals, Alexander II, and III and to some extent even Witte.

(This page is for your first answer.) * and decrease in living conditions

A second reason to believe the fall of the Romanov family wasn't due to Nicholas is the first world war. In the first few months of Russian participation, 130,000 soldiers were killed or captured at the battle of Tannenberg. This led to much further unrest among reservists and the peasants, most of whom were fighting. This had problems of its own. As most people fighting for their country were peasants and knew nothing about fighting wars, grain production and export lowered significantly from 2,200 trucks to just 600. ~~peasants~~ Not only did this mean no food for the peasants and no grain for export to build up the capital and make money to pay foreign debt, inflation rose to 200% and there was a huge famine. With this information we could blame world war one almost entirely for the fall of the Romanovs and the unhappiness of the population because of it, but we could also blame the finance minister for not

(This page is for your first answer.) interesting and finding a better way to fight the war and keep the economy strong at the same time.

To conclude there are many factors to consider when we are discussing whether Nicholas' reign was the nail in the coffin of the Romanov reign. World War One plays a huge part in annoying and causing unrest in every radical group in Russia through the huge number of deaths, the famine and the inflation but this could also be considered the Tsar's fault because he didn't train his soldiers ~~one~~ think ~~one~~ about his country's economy upon entering the war, only his own power.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Although the introduction is quite general and does not establish an agenda for discussion, this is a focused and competent response. The answer overall is well linked to the question, and there is an appreciation of the issues involved. A little more depth of development might have taken this into Level 5, but a high Level 4 answer overall.

Question 6

Where candidates misinterpreted Question 6 it was because they paid inadequate attention to the word 'survival' in the question, which meant it required an explanation of why the Bolsheviks won the Civil War and continued in power afterwards (up to 1924). Some answers focused only on the Civil War, while others produced sometimes extensive but irrelevant material on the seizure of power in October/November 1917. Candidates found little difficulty in explaining Trotsky's contribution to winning the war, although weaker answers portrayed him purely as a heroic inspirational leader, neglecting to emphasise the role of brutal discipline and the part played by political commissars in enforcing Red Army discipline. Many chose to structure their answers by weighing up the relative contributions of Trotsky and Lenin, which allowed them to discuss the value of Lenin's pragmatic approach to economic policy (changing to NEP once the war was all but won and in the light of the Kronstadt revolt) and political control (closing the Constituent Assembly and creating the Cheka). There were also wider factors to consider such as the many divisions among the anti-Bolshevik forces, although precise details of these were needed to make a convincing point. Only the strongest candidates pointed out the importance of the moves to organise a new political system by quickly creating new organs of government and writing a constitution, but this too was crucial to the Bolsheviks' survival.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

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

*Intro: Trotsky was
 first Menshevik, Bolshevik
 1917
 Para 1: Seize power
 1917 Winter
 Palace
 Para 2: October
 Revolution +
 Civil War
 Para 3: Poor by
 opinion
 Para 4: War
 Commission*

(This page is for your first answer.)

Leon Trotsky began his revolutionary career as a Menshevik, but once exiled for crimes of revolutionary activities, he was sentenced to exile in Siberia, where he met Lenin and returned with him once the first provisional Government forced Tsar Nicholas II to abdicate himself, ending 300 years of Tsarism. Throughout Trotsky's campaign, he was a very confident enthusiastic man, and his great charisma and determination during wars and under the Bolshevik regimes granted him rewards, such as the Red Army. After seizing power in 1917, Trotsky was a hero.

In 1917, Lenin & Trotsky formulated a plan to seize power from a weak provisional government under Alexander Kerensky. Trotsky stormed the Winter Palace overnight, without any fight being put up, and the next morning Lenin made a speech, alerting to the All-Russian Congress power

(This page is for your first answer.) was seized! Trotsky's ambitious determination didn't go un-seen, his great organisation and his timings were perfect, especially when no fight was put up. This I believe, was the start of a very prestigious Bolshevik campaign for Leon Trotsky, as he showed Lenin and the party his capability & enthusiasm to succeed and change the Motherland.

Later that year, the October Manifesto arose but ~~it~~ this was about the granting and agreements of asked laws of the people, wanting better pay, shorter work hours and food! At first, agreements were made & delivered to the people, until soon later some were broke, causing revolutions which were easily put down by Trotsky, again showing pure dominance and control of his army, especially when they idolised their leader!

In 1918-21, Civil War broke out due to the backing out of war, leading to the creation of many enemies. These were the Whites, built up off 3 armies, under Yudenich, Denikin and Kolchak which controlled certain sectors of Russia, however, foreign countries were enraged with the backing out of war, so British and American

troops were sent to aid over armies to persuade Russia to re-enter the war. There were other

(This page is for your first answer.) groups like the Green's and Czech Legion that had persuasion from foreign countries. At the end of the war, somehow the Red's came out victorious under Trotsky's army. Firstly, Trotsky's outplay upon Russia led to him un-pickling each army at a time instead of fighting numerous enemies at once. Also, the positioning of the army was great, in a old industrialized part of Russia, especially with good railway connections to move troops & ammunition, but also Trotsky brought great moral & confidence to the army, giving progressive speeches and visiting the front line, as this enabled a stop to desertions, strong unity and a successful victory. In the Civil War, it is clear to say Trotsky was the main-player and reason for Bolshevik victory.

Although, opposing armies were very dis-functional, fighting for other ~~aims~~ aims and co-ordination/unity was weak, allowing Trotsky to break down his opposition. Even, the enemies began fighting each other, easing Trotsky's worries while he would maintain his prosperous position and eliminate armies one by one.

Throughout the party, many members didn't

(This page is for your first answer.) Like Trotsky because he was too self-confident, even Lenin quoted this in his Testament in 1924. However, for some he struck fear into them, he used strict discipline with his army which increased effectiveness and performance, although many believed he was that powerful, he could become a military dictator, and this lasted until his dismissal from the party. However, I believe his discipline on the army was completely necessary, as a un-co-ordinated army would cause crumbling to occur which would lead to loss of power, so this is another reason for Trotsky's leadership was responsible for Bolshevik survival!

Finally, the aftermath of the Civil War brought on war communism, which again Trotsky dealt with yet again, using his well-disciplined army to put down threats & rebellions. His dominance over the army was amazing, they worshipped Trotsky, especially young radicals as they want to aspire to be Trotsky, a prestigious dominant force!

In conclusion, I believe Trotsky was in many cases responsible for the survival of the Bolshevik government. His determination & hard

(This page is for your first answer.) Work for the party led to promotions and rewards, gaining control of the Red Army. His efficiency and effectiveness of the army was amazing, they were a force to be reckoned with, a well disciplined unity force that was controlled purely by Trotsky. However, I believe Trotsky was the main player in the actual seizure of power in 1917, even though it was Lenin's idea, Trotsky's organisation and timings were spot on! Trotsky went against all odds in the civil war and emerged victorious, not only sustaining but increasing Bolshevik power. Even though he was self-confident, I believe he had a right to be, his achievements were amazing, especially with the resources he had! Overall, I agree in depth, that Lenin Trotsky was responsible for Bolshevik survival!



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction does not set an agenda for the answer. There is some effective development on the role of Trotsky, but some points (such as the suppression of opposition) might have been illustrated and explained in more detail. The answer touches on other factors, but lacks specific development, notably on Lenin. This is a high Level 3 explanation.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Trotsky's leadership of the Red Army played a very big part in the survival of the Bolshevik government. During the Russian civil war, which ~~effectively~~ started following the October Revolution of 1917, Trotsky was constantly touring the front lines in his armoured train. Trotsky himself wrote in his memoirs "for two years I virtually lived in a train carriage." During his time on the front lines he would rally troops, no matter how demoralised, with passionate political speeches, and then go with them back to the front line. He did this even when his advisers told him that he shouldn't be putting himself ~~at~~ risk. When Trotsky formed the Red Army in 1918 he noticed that there was a lack of military leadership or experience within the Red Army. As a result of this, he recruited former Tsarist officers to command the Red Army, to insure their loyalty, he took their families hostage.

Another factor that ensured the survival of the Bolshevik government was the economics used by Lenin. Following Bolshevik seizure of power, War Communism was introduced. Under this system, everything was geared towards war. All means of production were nationalised and put under the control of the Bolsheviks. Following this, workers had to work double, even triple shifts with no pay, and to ensure that the workers kept on working they were threatened with imprisonment if they slacked or weren't seen to be working hard enough. Meanwhile in the countryside, the ^{Red} army implemented its side of War Communism, known as 'grain requisitioning'. Under this, the Red army would take whatever cattle and grain they wanted and ship it to the cities. The peasants hated this ~~system~~ and resisted by hiding more and growing less and slaughtering their cattle. Some historians argue that the Green army, which wanted political and economic power to go to the peasants, benefited so well in the countryside, until it was defeated in 1919. Peasants who resisted were imprisoned, shot or had their villages burned down.

This new system of how the workers had to work would not have been possible if it were not for the territory the Bolsheviks controlled. Even

(This page is for your first answer.)

through the territory the Bolsheviks controlled was small, it contained Petrograd (modern day St Petersburg) and Moscow, the two industrial heartlands of Russia. This meant that the Red army were self sufficient; they could produce their own weapons, ammunition and equipment.

This was helped by the fact that the Bolsheviks led a very efficient railway system, so whatever was produced could quickly be transported to where it was needed. It was also one whose territory

Terror also played a big part. Following a failed assassination attempt while giving a speech in Moscow in 1918, Lenin implemented a wave of ~~British~~ terror, the Cheka, a secret political police terrorised the country, one Cheka agent recalled "we would do ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ house, if there was meat in the pot then ~~the~~ ^{he} ~~was~~ he was a traitor and would be shot. The Red army also carried out terror. Their 'hot terror' meaning it was planned, was as brutal as the Cheka. They would go in towns and villages and give men the option of joining the reds or being shot.

However, the main reason, in my view in why the Bolshevik government survived was the disorganisation of the White ^{army} ~~armies~~. For starters they were made up of groups with

(This page is for your first answer.) very different views. On the one hand you had Mensheviks and socialist revolutionaries, who were Marxists, and on the other hand you had Liberals, who wanted the provisional government back in power, and Tsarists who wanted the Tsar back in power. You also had nationalists such as the ~~Czechs~~ Ukrainians, who fought both white and Red armies. There were also Finnish and Polish nationalists. The Whites never organised attacks, they were sporadic and one at a time, so the Bolsheviks could move forces and defeat them one by one. Also, the Whites lacked industry so had to rely on foreign aid. This allowed Lenin to play the national card and claim he was fighting to protect Russia from occupying ~~foreign~~ foreign forces.

In conclusion, while I believe that Trotsky played an important part, I believe that it was the disorganisation of the White armies that ultimately led to their defeat and the survival of the Bolshevik government.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a well organised answer. The focus is maintained, and the candidate identifies and illustrates a good range of factors. NEP is an important omission, but the direction in the answer, and the range and depth of material, all make for a mid Level 5 response.

Question 7

The reasons for Stalin's victory in the power struggle were well known by all, but the focus here was explaining why 'his opponents failed to stop him' rather than why Stalin won, which covers similar ground but needs a slightly different emphasis. Many candidates successfully explained Stalin's ability to outmanoeuvre them in the alliances and emphasised the value to him of being in the ideological centre in the disputes over world revolution and industrialisation. Discussion of the relative strengths of their power bases was important and the stronger answers were often those that could put key events in their wider chronological context – for example, explaining that Stalin found it easier to get support in Congress for abandoning NEP (and hence outmanoeuvre Bukharin) because the grain procurement crisis of 1927-8 coincided with the fears of foreign invasion. Stronger candidates also made it clear that they knew where power in Russia lay – which was not with 'the people' as weaker candidates assumed, but with the Politburo and the annual Congress, which Stalin's powers of patronage allowed him to exploit better than did the power bases of his rivals.

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~Why~~ PLAN: Why Stalin's opponent unable to stop him by 1929. Lenin testament, patronage, Lenin enrolment, weakness of others.

By the time of Lenin's death in 1924 Stalin had secured himself a very powerful position in the communist party, he was clever and willing to do anything to take power, but, the weaknesses of Stalin's opponents were very important in Stalin's seizure of power by 1929.

Those struggling for power were: Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, Bukharin and Stalin. All of them had decided to suppress the content of Lenin's Testament and it was only revealed to the Politburo what Lenin wrote. If the opponents of Stalin had released the contents of the testament then it would have hugely ~~affected~~ affected Stalin's bid for

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~power~~ ^{because} Lenin revealed his distrust for Stalin and his desire to replace him. But ~~the~~ none of them did this as they were scared the Lenin's testament would endanger their chances for power too. This ~~is~~ allowed Stalin to continue his bid for leader of Russia.

Zinoviev and Kamenev were weak and easy for Stalin to manipulate so when they formed the triumvirate against Stalin with Trotsky it was very easy for Stalin to defeat them. Trotsky had never shown much interest in politics and often fell asleep or read a book at Politburo meetings, if he turned up. He refused a place as the deputy chairman of the Sovnarkom and so did not further his position in the communist party by the time of Lenin's death. Trotsky denied public release of Lenin's ~~Testament~~ Testament even though it highlighted him as the next leader of the communist party. Trotsky also did not utilise his position as Lead of the Red Army and all the support that gave him before Stalin took away his position. It is obvious that the shortcomings of Trotsky's personality, as well as the other candidates, were very important in Stalin's rise to leadership in 1929, and why they couldn't prevent it.

(This page is for your second answer.) Bukharin also worsened his position as a contender for the leader of the USSR. Before Lenin's death Bukharin was the editor of Pravda, a Russian newspaper, so was naive in the field of politics. But Bukharin was fiercely loyal to Lenin and defended Lenin's New Economic Policy without thinking about the support he could lose, the NEP was unpopular with a lot of communists for its capitalist values. Bukharin failed to secure ~~himself~~ himself a powerful position, though he took over the Moscow Soviet from Zinoviev, and because of his blind loyalty was very easy for Stalin to manipulate in the defeat of the War Opposition and United Opposition. By the time it was only Bukharin and Stalin left in the power struggle, Bukharin had lost too many supporters and made it ~~easy~~ easy for Stalin to switch to the Left and defeat Bukharin.

Though Stalin's opponents were weak, Stalin himself was a strong opponent to force. He was commonly referred to as the 'grey man' of the party as he preferred to avoid conflict and debate while accumulating power. He managed to secure himself the powerful position of General Secretary and

(This page is for your second answer.) become a member of the Politburo, this meant Stalin had patronage, so could help people progress in the party and dismiss them. He used this power to its fullest during the Lenin enrolment. Under the guise of wanting to boost party membership in memory of Lenin, Stalin recruited hundreds of new young communists who were totally loyal to him. Stalin then placed them in important positions in the communist party so that when he needed support he had it at all levels in the party.

Stalin made sure to stay out of the debate between Leon Trotsky and Bukharin over whether the NEP should continue despite his own hatred for the NEP ~~and~~ thus allowing him to switch to the Pro-NEP Left wing against Bukharin during the power struggle. ~~and~~ This meant he had the support of the left to defeat Bukharin before abolishing the NEP once he gained power in 1929. Stalin ~~was~~ played a key role in suppressing Lenin's Testament as he knew it would damage his bid to power so he used his political skills to persuade the Politburo to keep it a secret.

(This page is for your second answer.) Though Stalin did play a key part in his own rise to power, such as telling Trotsky the wrong day of Lenin's funeral and so making him seem uncaring, it was ~~ultimately~~ ultimately the ~~great~~ shortcomings of Stalin's opponents that prevented them from stopping Stalin's rise to power in 1929.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate engages with the question and identifies and develops a sound range of points. There is some effective development of specific evidence such as the Lenin Enrolment, and the answer displays secure balance overall. The candidate begins to weigh up the relative significance of factors, making for a directly focused response at low Level 5.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Opponents unable to stop leader USSR 1929.

Plan.

① Power Struggle - Shift Sides.

Manipulate

S+Z+K → T

S+B → Z+K

S+Party → B.

General Secretary ②

Little jobs

appointing his followers - got rid of Trotsky's ③

← Because of ①

Dedicated. - Strong Marxist.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Stalin's opponents were unable to prevent him from becoming the leader of the USSR by 1929 because he would use members of the party to remove other members, he had a high role as General Secretary and would appoint his followers into positions that could help him achieve his Marxist views.

During the Power Struggle of 1924, to achieve Lenin's position Stalin had to use some extreme manipulating skills to remove certain opposing threats from the party. His first opponent, and main threat, was Leon Trotsky. Trotsky was the leader of the Red Army and Stalin feared he would rise to become a military dictator. Stalin made alliances with Zinoviev and Kamenev in order to remove Trotsky, together they removed him and sent him to exile. Once Trotsky was removed Stalin made an alliance with Bukharin in order to remove Zinoviev and Kamenev from their positions in the party. Stalin's last opponent was then Bukharin. Stalin used the leaderless Bolshevik party to remove Bukharin from his

(This page is for your second answer.)

position in the party leaving Stalin, himself, the only remaining contender and the leader of the Bolsheviks, in what was Lenin's position. As the opponents were removed they were obviously unable to prevent Stalin becoming the leader of the USSR by 1929.

Stalin had ~~the~~ ^{the} role General Secretary in the Bolshevik party when ~~lead~~ ^{led} by Lenin. Along with this he would accept small tasks or requirements from higher up politicians, so it could seem as if he ~~was~~ ~~just~~ was a helpful party member, when in reality he would use these favours as a reason to ask something of his fellow politicians. As he had done so many favours for the other politicians he was able to manipulate his way up the party until eventually he was the leader of the USSR. His steps were small but did not go unnoticed.

As Stalin was emerging as the leader of the USSR, he needed his supporters to have high official roles in the party, to help him maintain the leader. He would use the fact he had done

many favours for other party members to ~~replace~~ ^{replace} them with people who would support ~~Stalin~~ ^{him} throughout his time as leader. Any of the party officials who supported Trotsky, as a leader, would be removed from the party immediately. The removal and replacement of people in the party meant that the majority of the higher up politicians would be supporters of Stalin and ~~therefore~~ ^{therefore} unwilling to challenge him and his views. ~~As~~ ^{there were} ~~there were~~ none of his opponents in the party so they were unable to stop him becoming the leader of the USSR.

In Conclusion, Stalin's opponents were unable to ~~to~~ prevent him from becoming the leader of the USSR by 1929 because there were now ~~or very, very few of~~ his ~~opponents~~ ^{opponents} in the party as they had been removed from the party ~~or~~ removed by Stalin and his temporary alliances in the power struggle, leaving Stalin as the only leader. Also, his ~~or~~ challenges had been replaced by ~~to~~ many of his supporters by 1929 creating a Bolshevik party which still supported

(This page is for your second answer.)

Stalin and his Ideologues, these were renamed the 'Communist' party, due to their Communist and Marxist views.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer is focused and structured, but is lacking in both range and depth. The points made require more detailed development and there are some significant omissions, such as Lenin's Testament and the ideological divisions over NEP. This is a high Level 3 explanation.

Question 8

This question required an assessment of the impact of collectivisation on agriculture and an evaluation of the extent to which it advanced or hindered it. However, a minority of candidates saw it as asking for the motives behind the policy, and there were others who examined collectivisation's impact and then went on to discuss other influences on agriculture. There were also some who discussed the political value to Stalin of forcing through collectivisation, while others insisted on linking agricultural change to industrialisation and the Five-Year Plans. None of these approaches was answering the question directly. Whilst candidates can generally be relied upon to reel off the order of the Five-Year Plans when required, they seemed far less adept at recounting the order and dates of collectivisation. A profitable way into the answer for some was to differentiate between short-term negatives and longer-term positive effects, since there was plenty of evidence of short-term damage (the peasant resistance and destruction of food, the statistical evidence of falling production and of course the Holodomor). There is also some evidence of eventual recovery (due to large-scale production, scientific farming and mechanisation) and the argument that the success of industrialisation depended on more efficient, less labour intensive agriculture which is what they eventually got at enormous cost.

(This page is for your first answer.) Collectivisation of agriculture was the grouping of individual farms to form a *kolkhoz*, a collective farm. Whilst proving unpopular with the workers, it was a triumph for Stalin who gained control of the countryside. However, collectivisation drastically weakened the strength of Soviet agriculture through the brutality with which it was enforced.

When it was introduced, Soviet farmers were angered; it seemed as if they were once again being tied to the land, working not for themselves (as they did under the NEP) but for the profit of the state. This ill-feeling resulted in a form of retribution against the state: they slaughtered their livestock rather than let them be taken for the collective. This contributed to the famine.

(This page is for your first answer.) that would go on to kill millions //

The collective also provided the peasants with no motivation to work hard. This is shown by the fall in the production of grain by millions, resulting in Russia going from the world's largest net exporter of grain to having to import grain from the great capitalist enemy itself: America, just to stave off famine. Grain requisitioning was also employed by Stalin, so convinced was he that the peasants were treacherous. This was also done purely to keep generic foodstuffs on the tables of those in the cities, the revolutionaries, who if angered, could overthrow Stalin.

Communist ideals also got in the way of allowing the collective to thrive. Stalin started a form of class-warfare against the rich peasant, the Kulak. The reason for this persecution was simple - how could they have gotten rich, if not at the expense of others? Stalin, when he stated that he wanted to 'liquidate the Kulaks as a class' was also liquidating some of the best farmers in Soviet agriculture. Whilst the experienced farmers were sent to the gulags, the inadequate farmers were left to run the collective.

(This page is for your first answer.)

~~During~~ the Collectivisation was so unpopular peasants even revolted against the state. This required the Red Army to get involved and lay siege on those who defied Stalin. After they had won, those who revolted were sent to the gulags, further reducing the manpower of the collective.

However, Collectivisation did have its benefits. It freed up labour on the farms to go and work in the new industrial plants being built, allowing industrialisation under the Five Year plans to profit. This profit, combined with the money made from exporting surplus grain, financed the use of machinery on the collective, speeding up the process. However, on the other hand, not many of the farmers knew how to use such machinery, thus it was left to rust in many cases. Although it can be said that collectivisation, alongside rapid industrialisation, worked in harmony to transform Russia and the Soviet Union from a very much backwards state, to a world

(This page is for your first answer.) *Superpower*

Therefore, in conclusion I believe that Collectivisation weakened Soviet agriculture more than it benefited it. Collectivisation was too rapid and too brutal to ever function properly as it caused the peasants to revolt and was hugely unpopular with the people who could make or break Soviet agriculture: the farmers themselves.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A judgement is made in the introduction, and the answer goes on to address a number of successes and failures. The answer is well focused, balanced and analytical, with a good understanding of relevant issues, and secure depth of knowledge. Mid Level 5.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Note that the question is focused only on the successes and failures of collectivisation. You could make some links to Stalin's industrial policies, but extensive reference to the latter would take the answer out of focus.

(This page is for your second answer.) To what extent did collectivisation improve Soviet agriculture in the years 1928-41?

- Intro

- How it improved agriculture - made it more efficient, more incentive, bigger farms, own plot - Shot term ^{machinery}
- Other failures - many peasants left - grain requisitioning
- unrealistic targets, harvest failures, prices rising because of Kulaks

Conc To a certain extent collectivisation did improve Soviet agriculture however there were also many failures, for instance the Kulaks interference which led to Collectivisation not being a huge success.

First, collectivisation was Stalin's way of putting plots together to make larger farms for the peasants. He wanted the peasants to lead the way in agriculture as he ended up liquidating the Kulaks. It improved agriculture because peasants

(This page is for your second answer.) now had a more incentive to produce as much as they could by Stalin setting targets for each farm to produce. This is because before Russia was still behind many countries in the Western Europe such as France and this was Stalin's way of improving. Also before, peasants had very little incentive because they only had to produce enough food for themselves/family. However, by collectivising it could mean that Stalin had more grain for export which gave him the money to achieve rapid industrialisation. In addition to this the state provided more machinery to each collective farm, which instantly improved the agricultural techniques as they didn't have to do it themselves or not at all. This instantly made farming more efficient for them, therefore producing better surpluses of grain. * 1930s over half of peasants were now on collective farms.

However, it didn't really improve agriculture that much because Stalin ended up reintroducing grain requisitioning to produce more and keep to himself. This was never a good thing for peasants as he was using terror against them and didn't have an input into how grain they kept after working hard for it. Also it was because of the kulaks this happened as they were withholding grain to make the prices go up

(This page is for your second answer.) which Stalin had to get rid of them in order to attempt to make his collectivising work.

Kulaks caused disruption as they burnt down and destroyed machinery as they would rather not have it than let it fall into Communist hands. Therefore they had little machinery than they thought they had, not improving agriculture.

In addition the targets Stalin set were highly unrealistic, therefore Peasants were unable to produce much which led to major consequences. Also, he may have given them machinery however they didn't, in reality, have much more than they did before to produce a lot of grain. This slowed down production as there was too much land and too little resources.

Another reason why it didn't improve agriculture that much was that there was still the problem of harvest failures from 1927 onwards. Therefore it was still the same as before because harvest failures meant very little production and widespread famine. Collectivisation was supposed to make a change yet peasants were still in devastation and suffered agricultural failures.

Another reason why it didn't improve agriculture

(This page is for your second answer.) ... was the fact that by the end of the 1930s very little of the peasants remained on the collective farms, therefore clearly shows that they didn't live up to the expectations Stalin had set out around them. There was little as a $\frac{1}{4}$ of peasants people remaining on the collective farms by the end of 1930s.

Also war broke out in 1939, which put a stop to agricultural development and focused everything on the war effort. Therefore the collective farms were no use because Russia was more focused on ~~the~~ creating military resources.

In conclusion, I believe that collectivisation was only an improvement to agriculture in the short term as it was more efficient and provided incentive. However harvest failures, grain requisitioning and war disrupted this as ^{majority} peasants ended up leaving the collective farms, therefore no improvement. Also they couldn't match up to the targets set due to lack of resources, therefore didn't improve agriculture, ~~a~~ only slightly.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is an attempt to analyse the successes and failures of collectivisation, and to reach a judgement in the conclusion. However, the answer is limited in both depth of development and the quality of evidence provided. High Level 3.

Question 9

There has been significant improvement in candidates' knowledge of the period 1945-55, and answers in this session have been notably more confident, detailed and wide-ranging than those on the topic in previous sessions. Candidates understood what they were being asked to do, but some weaker ones were caught out by the time period and strayed beyond it or focused extensively on the events at the very end (Brown cases and Montgomery Bus Boycott). Some candidates, perhaps hoping to write at length about King, seemed determined to refer to him at every opportunity: sadly, most of the points made were naturally out of period. However, there were plenty of strong answers which dealt with the period thematically (political, economic, social) and by focusing on the difference between de jure and de facto changes. Truman was better covered than Eisenhower. While there was plenty of coverage of 'To Secure These Rights', some were uncertain of the status of the document, with several believing that it was a bill placed before Congress. There were some candidates who spent an excessive amount of time describing the state of affairs at the start of the period rather than examining the nature of change within it. Nevertheless, most candidates could show where changes did occur in theory, if not always in practice, and explain some of the factors that slowed down the pace of change.

Plan: 1945-1955 saw limited progress in improving the status of African Americans.

~~FTT~~ F I M I E
, x x ✓ x ✓

Intro → Pre-1945

Political → Supreme court, cases, Brown v B

Social → MBB

~~Economic~~

~~Before 1945~~ Before 1945, African Americans had a very low status in the USA. The majority of areas were segregated and a lot of de jure and de facto racism was prominent. The end of the Second World War was a turning point for many African Americans, as they had been off to fight and seen a different kind of life.

In the early years of 1945-1950, the Supreme Court played a major role in improving the status of African Americans. The Brown v Board of Education of Topeka case in ~~1940~~¹⁹⁵² - where Linda Brown's father, a

(This page is for your second answer.) member of the NAACP took the case of desegregation in schools right up to the Supreme Court. After 3 years battling, the Supreme Court desegregated schools. This was a major success for the Civil Rights movement as it was one of the first, major de jure changes. Another case taken all the way to the Supreme Court was *Sweatt V. Painter* ^{in 1950}. This is when the black student wanted to attend Mississippi Law School but was denied access as the university was segregated. Eventually the student was allowed to attend. This was another de jure victory, however only one student was allowed in - limiting the success. Overall, the evidence shows that although the Supreme Court played a vital role in the improving the status of African Americans, the progress was very limited as the Brown case had no time scale on which desegregation of schools had to occur and the Sweatt case only allowed that one student into Mississippi university.

De facto racism was a lot harder to challenge and eliminate and this brought many challenges to the Civil Rights movement. The Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955 was one of the best examples of African Americans trying to eliminate de facto racism and increase their status. The Bus Boycott meant that many African Americans that rode on the segregated buses in Montgomery would find other ways to reach their destination. Car pooling was arranged. Eventually the buses were almost bankrupt and the desegregation of interstate buses was to be carried out.

Overall, the more successes in tackling de jure and de facto racism and improving the status for African Americans was very limited, as ~~well~~ although they saw some de facto & just change, the de facto racism was still prominent meaning their status was not significantly improved.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer addresses the two Brown judgements and Sweatt v Painter, though supporting detail and commentary are very limited. The Montgomery Bus Boycott's outcome is out of period. Low Level 3.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Remember that the Montgomery Bus Boycott starts in December 1955 and ends a year later. Thus you should not include the boycott in answer to questions on the period 1945-55 beyond, perhaps, a passing mention.

(This page is for your second answer.) "HOW FAR DO YOU

AGREE THAT THE YEARS 1945-55 saw only limited progress in improving the status of black Americans.

AGREE BECAUSE:

- limited economic gains - whilst blacks were better off in the desegregated north they received barely $\frac{1}{2}$ of white wage
- Important legal victories = ^{ROBERTSON VS. VIRGINIA} very little de-segregation change. little federal intervention to enforce desegregation
- Few social gains - murder of Emmett Till, rise of white Citizens Councils

The status of black Americans changed very little in the years 1945-55 for a number of reasons. Firstly, whilst wartime desegregation as a result of federal intervention improved the ^{economic} status of black Americans, many were still working for a fraction of the white wage. Secondly, the inability of the Supreme Court to enforce desegregation in the South solved important legal victories won by the NAACP and others. Finally, there was little social change in the societal attitude towards black people. Racist organisations such as the white Citizens Councils were a powerful force, especially in the South. The murder of Emmett Till and the subsequent acquittal of his killers by a racist jury exemplified how little the social status of black people had changed by 1955.

By 1955 the economic status of black people had changed, but there were few significant gains. Federal intervention had forced both desegregation and fair hiring practices for the federal government positions after the war. Also, many black people had migrated north to get

(This page is for your second answer.) ... as the growth of western post-war industry occurred in the north. However, many of the basic economic problems that black people had encountered in the south continued in the north. Black people worked for a fraction of the pay and entitlements of white people. Additionally, new economic problems were created. Urbanisation created the social phenomenon of 'white flight' created new economically deprived areas in northern cities. Both of these factors conspired to ensure black economic status had largely not improved by 1955.

Second to black economic status - legally there was very little change in the status of black people. The Supreme Court was by its very nature unable to enforce important legal victories such as *Morgan vs. Virginia* (which would have desegregated interstate transport) and *Brown vs. Board of Education* (which would have set a legal precedent for desegregation of schools.) As a result southern states were largely free to ignore Supreme Court rulings. A Congress with a general southern voice was similarly reluctant to propose enforcement legislation. As demonstrated

(This page is for your second answer.)

by the 'To Secure these rights' report and the 'Journey of Reconciliation', segregation of transport and of other areas still posed serious legal problems for the status of black people in 1955. Very little had changed.

Socially black people were still considered inferior to whites. In 1955 the brutal murder of the young Emmett Till shocked the world, yet a racist white jury saw no problem with acquitting his murderers - something that would not have happened had Emmett been white. The formation of white Citizens Councils after 1954 showed the extent of ingrained racist attitudes towards black people. Without an increase in their social status black people could not hope to dispense with the segregationist state establishment. ~~For~~ ~~the~~ ~~most~~ ~~part~~ ~~the~~ ~~establishment~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~prepared~~ ~~to~~ ~~change~~ ~~its~~ ~~policy~~ ~~without~~ ~~a~~ ~~significant~~ ~~cross-section~~ ~~of~~ ~~leaders~~ ~~calling~~ ~~for~~ ~~desegregation~~ black people's social status had improved little by 1955.

(This page is for your second answer.)

In the years 1945-55 there was ~~was~~ ^{absolutely} only limited progress on civil rights. The lack of improvement in the economic status of black people led directly to an inability to challenge legal segregation. Even with ~~legal~~ segregation in certain areas declared unconstitutional the lack of enforcement powers of the Supreme Court meant that little progress could be made without significant federal intervention. The lack of change in social attitudes only sought to solidify the racist establishment and prevent black people significantly improving their status by 1955.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction establishes several key points for discussion, and goes on to consider economic and legal changes. A balanced and structured answer is developed, with a good sense of focus. Relevant and accurate knowledge is deployed, though it could be more detailed overall. Mid Level 4.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Accurate language is essential in any answer on civil rights. Referring to people as 'blacks' and 'whites' is not acceptable these days, and to use the term 'coloured' is offensive and anachronistic. Use 'African Americans' or 'black people', and 'white people'.

Question 10

Although clearly set out as a multi-factor question on the causes of change (on the factors responsible for the weakening of the civil rights movement) some candidates could not resist the lure of writing just about the Black Power movement and assessing its strengths and weaknesses. Positive achievements of Black Power in tackling social issues could be made relevant to the answer by explaining that they gave black communities confidence to pursue other aims in civil rights or that they impressed white politicians with their capacity to organise, but too often they were presented as free standing knowledge that added nothing to the argument. However, stronger candidates avoided such errors and were able to explain the damage that a more violent and divisive approach seemed to inflict on the civil rights movement, and set this against other factors that also caused it to weaken – notably King's alienation of Johnson through his criticism of the Vietnam War, and the notion that King had taken civil rights as far as he could in the south but was unable to make progress using similar methods in the north.

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

(This page is for your first answer.)

alleged liberal white due to black separatism
whites no longer gave funds

black power's violent image
radicalised CORE + SNCC, vs. SCLC and NAACP
split the movement
disunited movement cause a fight which = united one on
no 20 demands = no effective legislation

US growth of black power
black power's violent image
split the movement
disunited movement cause a fight which = united one on
no 20 demands = no effective legislation

mark no effective legislation
Chicago - failed to understand problems, wide range of issues
violated image
radicalised CORE + SNCC, vs. SCLC and NAACP
split the movement
disunited movement cause a fight which = united one on
no 20 demands = no effective legislation

PLAN

criticised 'Nam
relations w/ Johnson cooled
figure of King
other factors
no more
other factors
no more
tax/funds for civil rights legislation
draw money away from the Great Society
Vietnam War
no more
tax/funds for civil rights legislation
draw money away from the Great Society
Congress
waited down legislation e.g. 1964/5 Civil Rights Act not enforced early
radicals e.g. J. Strom Thurmond opposed civil rights

(This page is for your first answer.) To an extent it is accurate to say that the rise of Black Power was responsible for the weakening of the civil rights movement in the 1960's. The movement's violent image cost them support and funding, and split the movement to such an extent that all of their demands could not be met. However, there were other ~~reasons~~ ^{reasons} for ~~this~~ ^{the weakening} as well, such as the failures of Martin Luther King, the cost of the Vietnam War and a lack of support from Congress.

Black Power certainly weakened the civil ~~rights~~ ^{rights} ~~movement~~ ^{movement} in many ways. First, the movement's violent image and message of black separatism drove away potential supporters. The word of Malcolm X and the Black Panthers and the black superiority teachings of the Nation of Islam drove away white liberals ^{including the federal government} who were terrified by the violent image of Black Power. They did not want to be associated with a movement that endorsed violence, and so not only drew away their support but also their funding. This lack of funds hurt some of Martin Luther King's later campaigns very badly, especially the Poor People's March, ~~and~~ ~~the~~ thereby decreasing their impact and effectiveness.

Second, Black Power's lucrative image for the North and its solutions to socio-economic ~~issues~~ ^{issues} split the ~~active~~ ^{active} movement. This became evident in the March Against Fear, when the SNCC and CORE slowly radicalised to follow Malcolm X's image and began to criticise Martin Luther King, the SCLC and the NAACP.

(This page is for your first answer.) Obviously, a disunited movement cannot hope to achieve the same level of success as ~~was~~ a united one, and so as the Black Power Groups, the SCLC and NAACP ~~fell~~ fell out and stopped co-ordinating their actions, so their many and varying demands could no longer be met by effective civil rights legislation, hence why no more Civil Rights Acts were brought out ^{in the} ~~after~~ 1960's.

However, there were other reasons for the weakness of the Civil Rights movement. First, the Vietnam War was drawing away time and money from ^{President} Johnson's "Great Society" movement. As more money was given to the Vietnam War, less was given towards making new civil rights legislation for blacks, and by 1968 Johnson had no time or interest in providing civil ~~rights~~ rights, especially to many groups, including Martin Luther King and the SCLC, who were criticising the war.

Second, opposition from Congress and beyond weakened the movement. President Kennedy opposed King's methods of action in the early 1960's, and like Eisenhower before him believed change would come of its own accord, so ~~took~~ took no voluntary action. In addition, radicals in Congress such as J. Strom Thurmond opposed black civil ~~rights~~ rights to such an extent ~~that~~ that he and ~~other~~ other senators filibustered bills ^{for hours} and forced the President Johnson to vote down many of his Civil Rights Bills, including the 1965 bill which had no

(This page is for your first answer.) method of enforcing its statutes. [⊕] This weakened the impact of the Civil Rights movement and led to frustration in its ranks.

Third, the March on Washington made some major mistakes in his later campaigns which seriously impacted the strength of his movement. His first major mistake was underestimating the social and economic problems of the north and trying to use ^{Christian-influenced} non-violent protests to gain legal equality in the north. ~~Countered~~ ^{Countered} by determined opposition from the mayor and the white populace in Chicago ^{and lacking support from the blacks} he was forced to compromise and accept unrealistic promises which were never fulfilled. This not only brought shame to him and his campaign and weakened his standing and the of the SCLC, but the disillusioned northern blacks saw the King's methods were useless and so turned to another method of gaining civil rights - Black Power. This increased its impact and therefore decreased the effectiveness of the entire movement.

King's second mistake was to criticise the Vietnam War. This alienated him from his biggest supporter, President Johnson, who now refused to support his campaigns and criticised his methods, diminishing King's integrity. Also, his criticism of the war lost him support from many white liberals who supported the war as well, thereby denying him more support and - crucially - funding.

In conclusion, however, I must conclude that the growth of Black

(This page is for your first answer.) Power was the most important factor in the weakening of the Civil Rights movement. Although Martin Luther King's ^{mistake} may have caused more blacks to join Black Power, its impact before 1966 was still causing tremors, even in the March Against Fear. Its splitting of the movement and its violent message had driven away white support as indeed the main factor that weakened the movement, and as a result of its impact the civil rights movement became disunited, unco-ordinated and hated by much of the white liberal populace in America.

⊗ This limited the Movement's impact in the early 1960's and slowed its progress.

⊕ Also, violence ^{and lynchings} from organisations like the Ku Klux Klan and from white racists scared some blacks away from participating in the movement.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The bulk of the answer is sandwiched between a focused introduction and a concluding judgement. Supporting material is accurate and appropriately selected, with good range and depth. There is controlled deployment of the argument throughout, making for a mid Level 5 award.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan: Black Power

most important factor for the weakening of the civil rights? not completely accurate

- did show lack of unity in the black community completely contradicted MLK
- The U.S. Presidents wouldn't help CRM towards the end of the 60's - reason
- MLK's failed Chicago campaign

(This page is for your second answer.)

Black Power was based on the teachings of Malcolm X, and were completely ideologically opposed to what Martin Luther King was trying to achieve. Because of this, the weakening of the Civil Rights Movement (CRM) could be attributed to the growth of the Black Power movement but there were other factors at hand.

The Black Power movement did show a lack of unity in the Black Community as they completely opposed what King was trying to achieve. While King ~~wanted~~ wanted equal rights and full integration, the Black Power movement ~~wanted~~ supported Black nationalism and wanted the Blacks to have their own community separate from the ~~rest~~ Whites. While King preached non-violence, the BPM (Black Power Movement) profoundly advocated violence as

a means of establishing themselves as their own community and fighting against the oppressive whites. As ~~this~~ the federal government couldn't comply with the B.P.M.'s demands, ~~it~~ it was hard to work with them and overall it brought negative media attention to the Black community as a whole, which you could say was

(This page is for your second answer.) a reason for the weakening of the ~~movement~~ CRM.

~~In terms of~~ Some of the weakening of the CRM could be attributed to the federal government, and how they helped King. Kennedy was a gradualist, and believed that the Black community was ~~asking~~ asking for too much change. He was also a politician which meant he was more concerned with the voters than the state of ~~the Black American~~ American's rights. Although Johnson did originally support the efforts of the CRM ~~King's~~ as shown through his efforts to pass the 1964 Civil Rights act, he stopped helping King during the Vietnam war due to King's ~~criticism~~ criticism of it. This meant that King and the resto of the CRM couldn't get the economic help they needed to abolish the de facto segregation in the North which ~~ultimately~~ ultimately led to the demise of King's campaign in the north towards the end of the 60's.

(This page is for your second answer.)

The most important factor could be ~~seen as~~ MLK's Northern campaign as the reasoning for the weakening of the CRM. King ~~had~~ was from the South, and knew all the problems and how to solve them, mainly through ~~subverting~~ solving de jure segregation while the North suffered from de facto segregation which needed much more time and money, which the government wouldn't back to due to King's criticism and also the amount of the attention that the U.S. Government were putting towards the ~~cold~~ Vietnam War. ~~Because of these~~ King's Christian-influenced and nonviolent teaches did not inspire the Black Americans of the North who did not regularly go to church. Because of this, his words did little to inspire the Northern ~~Black~~ Black community who found more inspiration from the words of Malcolm X, who knew their problems. In short, King's northern campaign was a complete failure and did nothing in the way of emulating his success in the South, as shown through the failed Chicago ~~campaign~~ campaign. This lack of success weakened the CRM immensely.

(This page is for your second answer.) In conclusion, I do not think the Black Power Movement's growth was the most important factor. Although they showed a lack of unity in the ~~black~~ Black Community, and the federal government were reluctant to help the problems in the North it was ultimately King's misinterpretation of the needs, wants and problems of the North which were the reason for the the CRM's weakening.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The focus is quite general and not strongly targeted. A fair range of points is made, with some illustration and explanation, though more specific and detailed examples would have been helpful. It is somewhat narrow on Black Power itself, with nothing on the role of the Black Panthers. An analytical shape here, but with support that lacks balance. Low Level 4.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

This question can be misread as one on Black Power, but in fact it is on the growing weakness of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Careful reading of the question is important!

Question 11

Many candidates had detailed knowledge of the military campaigns of the war, but few were able to directly address the question of why it lasted so long by structuring an answer directly around reasons. Nevertheless most candidates with a working knowledge of the events were able to comment on developments that prolonged the conflict, notably MacArthur's behaviour after the success at Inchon and Mao's decision to intervene. Clearly, since the peace talks lasted two years, the lack of progress here was vital to explain but many candidates glossed over this or merely commented in passing that there was stalemate and an argument over prisoners. More attention to this would have been advisable. Many, perhaps understandably, saw the long war as being attributable to its causes, and thus wrote about the domino theory and Truman's determination not to lose another country to communism so soon after Mao's triumph in China; but this was not really what was required.

The Korean War was a battle that could have ended, and was planned to end, far before the time it did. When Korea was split, and America pledged their support to the South, they did not foresee the involvement of China, nor the escalated issues that arised from this.

America saw Korea as an important mission in the safeguarding of capitalist values. After their success in the Pacific and capture of Japan in WW2, the US wanted to make sure the rest of South-East Asia did not fall under communist rule, and saw Korea as a main part of this 'domino theory', where they believed if Korea fell, Cambodia and Laos would follow.

At the head of US operations was veteran war general Douglas MacArthur, and he is the first reason that

(This page is for your first answer.) The Korean war lasted so long, McArthur was so far away to battle, having lead the US to victory in the Pacific, he did not however know when to stop. The mastermind behind the Inchon landings of 1951, tried to bring USA forces into a full war with China, which strained diplomatic and political relations back home, and eventually led to his Sacking. His tactics provoked Chinese involvement, and this is what urged them to become involved, which undoubtedly prolonged the war.

The Chinese were by no means certain to become involved, protecting their borders, they became wary of US involvement and reacted in the only way they saw possible - with force. The communist government of China was at the time unstable, and would have not engaged unless it saw it as the only option. The Chinese force launched shock attacks, first pushing over the Yalu River, then re-capturing Pyongyang, before eventually taking the capital of the South, ~~Seoul~~ Seoul. Although the US aided with Syngman Rhee's Southern forces did soon after re-capture Seoul, all their planning and work had been wiped out by the Chinese involvement in November 1951. The capture of

(This page is for your first answer.)

Pyongyang and Seoul in December and January respectively, was testament to poor American tactics, and lost the huge advantages made by the Inchon landings.

The final point is that politicians such as Truman should have attempted to negotiate a peace treaty earlier. One did not come until March 1953, but it was clearly obvious by that point that the Chinese were not willing to accept hostile aggression to the North and Communism, and therefore without starting a possible third world war, attacking and degrading the North was not a justified possibility.

The main reason then, is clearly evident, the Chinese intervention and the threat of a global superpower meant it took more detailed tactics and less hostile aggression for the Americans to try and achieve their goal, and longer to accept the fact a ceasefire was the only option.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer has some structure, and addresses some key issues, including the role of MacArthur and the intervention of the Chinese. While the information provided is broadly relevant, there is insufficiently detailed and extensive analysis for Level 4. It was awarded high Level 3 marks.

(This page is for your first answer.)

- battle Dien Bien Phu U.S. 3000 + Koreans 3000 +

~~300000~~ ~~Koreans~~ 38°

~~Con + Cap~~

in MIA 3000 + advisors

- Bao Dai 68 120 1950 G.E.

- Syngman Rhee ~~South~~ ~~unpopular~~ → North appealing local people

- 70% backed Korea when they

→ ~~Algeria theory~~

- Failure of the French → 80% ~~with~~

→ President Eisenhower 1952 "I will go to Korea"

- D.D. (1947)

General MacArthur

July 1953 were ~~pastors~~ of war.

~~300000~~ ~~6~~ ~~troops~~

~~MacArthur~~

(This page is for your first answer.)

There are a variety of reasons as to why the Korean war lasted so long. The factors ~~that~~ why the Korean war lasted so long are Cold war context, Chinese intervention, Unpopular Southern leader, Quagmire theory, failure of the French ~~and the~~, role of the President and fear of Japan.

The Cold war was based on a conflict in ideologies. There were Communism and Capitalism. Communism was the belief of the Soviet Union where the means of production are state owned. In this one party dictatorship they lack the right to free speech and are deprived of human rights in some cases. This is why arguably the US feared this style of living. Capitalism however is based on free market economics where members of the public are able to trade their goods to make a profit. The main reason with this point as to why the ~~the~~ Korean war lasted so long is because these ideologies oppose each other and either can't exist with the other in place.

Another reason as to why the ~~the~~ Korean war lasted so long was due to the intervention of the Chinese. A member of the military in North Korea

(This page is for your first answer.) called Peng Dehuai stood 300,000 Chinese troops on the 38° parallel (the geographic line dividing North and South Korea) and marched US troops back 300 miles. This is the largest retreat by the US in their history. The North Korean Army had pushed back one of the world's superpowers. This meant that the US had to invest more time and money into ~~the~~ the Korean war if to stop ^{as well as Chinese help} falling to communism.

Another reason as to why the Korean war lasted as long as it did was because of the unpopular South Korean leaders. ~~Between the years 1954 Korea had~~. In the 1950 general election ~~the~~ ^{Syngman Rhee} received 40 seats and 120 of the seats went to the political left. Also due to a lot of the people living in Korea being working class farmers they wanted the type of land reform Ho Chi Minh was offering in the North. This evidence suggests that due to a weak government that the US backed but the public did not support, meant the US had to invest more time and money to solve this problem.

Also another reason as to why the ~~US~~ spent

(This page is for your first answer.) Korean War lasted so long was because of the failure of the French. The emperor Bao Dai which the French put in place was very unpopular. # Because of the bad leadership of the South it lost the hearts and minds of the ^{South} Korean public. During the war the US had to help pay 80% of the French war bill as they had lost a lot of money over the Second World War. Also at the beginning of the war the US did not send in any troops, he just sent in advisors. Over 300 advisors had been sent in at the beginning of the war to advise the government over tactics. The factors discussed here effected the amount of time the Korean War went on for.

~~And~~

Another factor effecting the amount of time the Korean War went on for is the quagmire theory. This theory states that no matter how much money ^{and time} is put into the Korean war the ~~the~~ Communists could match it. In order to support Korea Stalin sent T-34 tanks to the North Korean army. When the US sent in more troops the ~~the~~ North Korean forces could match it. The evidence discussed suggests that the war continued for so long because either could back out without looking like a failure to the public.

(This page is for your first answer.) Another factor affecting the war is the role of the presidents. Under the presidency of Truman and Eisenhower there was large scale support for the war. A survey performed showed that 70% of the population backed the government. This was mainly due to the introduction of president Eisenhower, ^{in 1952} when he said "I will go to Korea" this meant that he was had to be seen as the president who won the war as he aimed to fulfill it. The points discussed ~~to~~ have suggested the Korean war took a long time because of a rivalry in leadership in the US as both presidents found it difficult to win the war.

Another factor affecting the length of the war was the battles that occurred throughout it. The battle of Dien Bien Phu occurred where the North Korean army ^{destroyed} 3000 ~~US~~ troops and the US lost just over 300 ~~troops~~. This hastened the end of the war as both sides were still heavily engaged with each other and this prolonged the idea of a ceasefire.

Finally, ~~the~~ ~~the~~ reason why the ~~the~~ Korean war lasted so long was over fears for Japan. In 1947 the US captured Japan after winning the war in 1945. It was in the US interest

(This page is for your first answer.) to keep the Japan capitalist for trade reasons among others. So the US had to keep fighting to defend the South as it was effectively a buffer state between Communist North Korea and capitalist Japan.

In conclusion, based on evidence, the reason why the Korean war took so long is because of China's intervention. If China had not intervened then the US could have taken control of the north and continued to fight off Communism (if as they changed their tactic to "roll back" instead of "contain" communism)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer demonstrates secure range and depth of appropriate knowledge. A focus is sustained on the question, and some evaluation in places makes for a low Level 5 award.

Question 12

Candidates tended to be well versed in military and psychological reasons why Johnson found victory in Vietnam elusive, but were less confident on the stated factor of 'growing opposition'. Weaker candidates assumed that serious opposition was present throughout rather than seeing 1968 (the last year of the period) as the turning point. Most knew what Cronkite had said, but few knew when he had said it. While there was earlier student opposition in the form of teach-ins and the self immolation of individuals hit the headlines, the polls tell us that until 1968 less than 10% of Americans favoured immediate withdrawal. However, more balanced answers were able to show the nature of 'growing' opposition and explain that it came not just from universities but also within Congress, where Westmoreland's reassuring speech of late 1967 was intended to allay their concerns. Some of the best answers came from candidates who embraced the contrast between Johnson's early support and the growing lapse in public and political conflict that caused him not to seek re-election in 1968.

(This page is for your second answer.) growing opposition in USA responsible for LBJ failure in Vietnam 63-68.

People in his office going against him

P1 - Senators who had granted him gift of Tonkin went against him. (2 senators at first then 12)

Rob. Kennedy running against him, McNamara resigning.

'68 - TV + newspapers against

P2 - Protests. → '66 Yale uni & Washington, '67 set on fire
MLK, MASS Marches San Fran, NY, Washington, CBS news anchorman spoke out (after tet)

P3 - ~~tet offensive~~ ~~lost support~~ Media coverage
- 20% drop in polls after shot VC fighter in cold blood.

68 - lost the US embassy in Saigon - media coverage in US. P4 - loss of support in US → tet offensive

P5 - Good VC. - support for Nixon 20% drop in polls after VC shot

mainly wars

To some extent the growing opposition in USA was responsible for LBJ's failure to defeat the communists in Vietnam in the years 1963-68, for example people running against him in his own party and opposition parties getting a lot of support however there were other reasons that made

(Lyndon Baines Johnson)

(This page is for your second answer.) it impossible for ~~the~~ LBJ to defeat the communist forces in Vietnam. Also the ~~new~~ new technology of media meant that US citizens were more in touch with what was going on in Vietnam and this led to mass protests. However there was also the fact that the Vietcong were skilled Guerrilla war fighters and so were not easily defeated. But because of the mass of ~~problems~~ ~~with~~ LBJ's domestic problems - these were ~~the~~ the most responsible for his failure to defeat the Vietnamese communists.

Firstly, ~~the~~ LBJ's problems within his own democrat party caused him to lose support. At the beginning of his time in office he had lots of support ~~for~~ internally ~~for example senators were against him~~ ~~for example~~ for example whenever he wanted to increase the number of troops or amount of money in Vietnam the senators obliged but towards the end of his ~~time~~ time in office more and more senators spoke out against him and Robert Kennedy even ran against him ~~in~~ from within the same party ~~with~~ on the back of an anti-war campaign. This growing internal opposition made it difficult for LBJ to pass anything through congress and in turn this made the defeat of the Vietnamese communists harder because LBJ didn't have full power to try and solve the problem. Another damaging loss of support was when McNamara resigned in 1968, and as commander-in-chief this

(This page is for your second answer.) Showed to the people of America and the world that even LBJ's top staff were going against him, which lost him credibility and again, made it harder to defeat his enemies in Vietnam.

However LBJ's loss of support wasn't just internal. There was growing support for the republican party under Nixon, who was also running ~~on~~ on the back of an anti-war ~~campaign~~ campaign. ~~the~~ LBJ couldn't ~~even~~ get ~~so~~ support from his own country to defeat those Vietnamese communists that he needed, especially after the Tet offensive. This was a VC (vietcong) uprising trying to inspire a revolution in the rest of ~~the~~ South ~~but~~ Vietnam, but it failed. And because of the ~~media~~ new media coverage in USA, americans witnessed all of the horrific killings and disorder in Vietnam - which then made them question what their boys were doing fighting and dying miles away from home in a seemingly pointless war.

This links to my next point of media coverage, another reason LBJ couldn't defeat the communists was because americans could see what their soldiers were going through + they didn't understand it. Opinions polls were down 20% ~~after~~ on LBJ after a video was released in the US of a soldier shooting a VC fighter in cold blood. This also led to a massive wave of

(This page is for your second answer.) protests, for example ~~the~~ 1966 march of 20,000 Yale University students.

Finally the VC were very skilled fighters in the art of guerrilla warfare which made it hard for LBJ to defeat them.

In conclusion, there were many problems at home in the US which made it difficult for LBJ to defeat the communists ~~and~~ and these were the main reasons but the fact that VC were such skilled guerrilla fighters made it difficult for him to. However³ his lack of support + massive opposition were the main reasons.




ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is good analysis of growing opposition within the USA, supported by some well-chosen detail. Thus, there is a clear understanding of the stated factor, and the impact of opposition on US politics. However, military factors and the situation overall in North and South Vietnam, all require more development. This weakness puts the whole answer out of balance. Low Level 4.

Growing opposition 63-68 main reason for inability to defeat.



Opposition to the growing escalation in Vietnam certainly played a crucial role in ~~creating an atmosphere~~ ^{even destroying the United} States' ability to defeat the communist forces.

However, it appears ~~secondary~~ both secondary, and indeed forms part of, other factors.

Under Johnson's premiership opposition to the Vietnam War grew tremendously. Its ~~and~~ birth really came in 1964, when ~~the~~ 1000 Yale students marched in protest against the war, and 5000 of their

(This page is for your second answer.) academic leaders wrote in support.

It then transformed until America reached the point in 1967 where 100,000 people marched through Washington, and a Phaker attempted to burn himself and his baby daughter alive outside the Pentagon.

Images like these were crucial in preventing the US from defeating ~~the~~, really on five levels.

Fourthly, the growing opposition destroyed troop morale.

Soldiers began to question what they were fighting for, when upon return home after their 12 to 13 month tours, they were ~~not~~ ostracised, and in some cases, pelted with stones. This led to the growth of

drug abuse and indiscipline, where troops refused, as in 1968, to enter tunnels or trails, and fragging of officers began. This lack of discipline and absence of a moral principle underbunding of why the US was fighting was meant that it was clear to Johnson that his troops, at their frighteningly high number at 537,000 in 1968, but also their frightening indiscipline, could not stand a fight against the truly dedicated PAVN forces, who fought for survival, not wages. Thus, public opposition made the war unwinnable.

Secondly, growing public opposition destroyed ^{much of the} political will behind the war. The change in public opinion, where in 1968 Johnson's approval rating fell from 48% to

(This page is for your second answer.) 35%, having already fallen from 72% in 1965, destroyed Johnson's confidence and much of congress' support, which made the 'defeat' of communism unachievable. Johnson could not escalate any further without the risk of destroying the Democratic Party, who were severely damaged in the congressional elections of 1966. Thus, politics trumped ideology with Johnson, and he had to halt attempts to 'win' the war through escalation, out of fear of facing a political annihilation. This was embodied in congress, where politicians like Senator Fulbright, who was crucial in passing the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin resolution, began to turn against the war. Senate hearings began in 1967, and began to question the legality of the war, and congress made moves

to block Johnson's further escalation. A fine example is the fact that Johnson was so derided by Congress after the Tet Offensive that he turned down Westmoreland's request for more troops. Thus, he could not defeat communism as his political support collapsed.

However, another crucial factor in Johnson's inability to defeat communism in ~~the~~ Vietnam was the inherent weakness of the Southern regime. Johnson inherited a situation in 1963, where Diem was dead, and constant coups had put the South into

(This page is for your second answer.) political turmoil, where leaders were corrupt, such as Ky and Thieu, and had little incentive to allow the US to 'defeat' the communist forces. The ARVN were incredibly weak, despite huge spending by Johnson when he pushed his budget deficit up to \$25.3 billion, meaning the US could not wobble in the war. They would have to create a situation where South Vietnam was able to defend itself, and the inherent weakness of South Vietnam meant that this would never happen. Whilst its leaders were corrupt and stole thousands of dollars of resources, the peasants in the South were incredibly poor, often living with piles of feces in their houses. This contrast meant communism could easily take hold, as bitterness was prevalent. Thus, Johnson could not defeat communism in Vietnam, as the Southern government was corrupt, and the ~~people~~ army of the South so weak that peasants, the crucial factor in deciding they won, helped ^{organise food and shelter.} communists. Johnson could not defeat communist forces

as his insistence on aiding the South created an atmosphere of hatred among combatants and thereby strengthened communist sympathies. However, these two factors only form part of the story deciding them as why Johnson could not defeat communism: the nature of the war.

~~As for the US~~ Johnson's increasing commitment to

(This page is for your second answer.) Vietnam, by increasing troop numbers, and bombing heavily, so much so that Operation Rolling Thunder dropped more bombs on the North than had been dropped on all of Europe in the Second World War, had changed the war. The 'quagmire' theory had trapped the US: they could not withdraw, or win. Thus, the war became one of not losing face. Thus, ~~the~~ events like the Tet offensive of 1968, where despite the deaths of over 55,000 PAVN soldiers, the US suffered a psychological defeat at home, destroying political will, meant that the war was easily loseable, more than winnable: the US could not sustain such high political costs.

On contrast, the North Vietnamese were fighting for liberation - a pure ideology. Furthermore, they had nowhere to go - they had to win. Thus, they could last far longer than US troops, and take far higher risks without the political repercussions.

This, overall, Johnson could not defeat Communist forces due to the nature of the war. This incorporates the loss of public support as well as Southern weakness, and created a war where the Communist forces could only win or die, and so evolved far harsher conditions, often including Malaria among their troops, while the US

(This page is for your second answer.) could not sustain the war, nor win it, despite their advantages.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The candidate maintains a clear focus on the question. The stated factor is investigated in some depth, along with other relevant points, notably the inherent weaknesses of the South Vietnamese government and armed forces. A clear understanding of key factors, coupled with strong supporting material, makes for a mid Level 4 award.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Many answers mentioned My Lai as increasing US opposition to the war. You should note that, although the massacre took place in 1968, it did not become public knowledge until the following year.

Question 13

While candidates were knowledgeable about the policies of the relevant presidents and knew that presidential power had been curtailed by the Watergate scandal, they found it harder to explain in any detail what the limitations on their power actually were. This meant that the general trends in power were described, with Nixon exploiting them to the full until he fell from grace, and then eventually Reagan restoring them until he too jeopardised the presidential position over the Iran - Contra affair. However, the actual detail of how presidential power was restricted was rarely explained. The timescale in the question of 1969-89 was ignored by many, who jumped straight to Watergate and thus ignored an investigation of Nixon's use (and misuse) of presidential power during his first term.

There is a saying in US politics that "the President is only as powerful as the Congress allows it to be". Perhaps the best way to assess the transition of Presidential Power throughout the years 1969-89 is to chart the relationship between the President and the Congress, and what caused the changing circumstances in this relationship.

When Richard Nixon became President in 1969, Congress for the most part had been Democrat for the last 30 years. However, Congress at this time was generally supportive of a President regarding his decisions on foreign policy. Nixon signed SALT, and oversaw a period of detente with the Soviet Union. He was attempting to secure "peace with honour" in Vietnam and as Commander in Chief

(This page is for your second answer.) could initiate bombings such as the one in Cambodia without the consent of Congress. However, Congress usually gave the President a harder time over ~~that~~ domestic policy, particularly regarding ~~the~~ economic policy and taxation. Nixon found it difficult to get his budgets through a Democrat House that wanted a big federal government.

The real turning point in presidential power came after the Watergate scandal^{in 1974} where it was revealed that Nixon had abused the power of his office and had acted illegally in an attempt to find out information on the Democrat campaign in 1972. This led to some historians talking about an "imperial presidency" where Presidents since Roosevelt had acted with a lot of power, overseeing huge federal investments in domestic policy, and ~~being~~ fighting wars across the world in foreign policy when historically America is isolationist. Congress was furious that the Executive had acted over their heads and instituted 2 Acts in an attempt to curb Presidential Power. The first was the Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974 which gave Congress

(This page is for your second answer.) greater control over budgets and finances. The second was an Act regarding the Economy in 1978. It is debatable as to how effective these acts were in limiting Presidential power.

When Ford ~~was~~ ascended to the Presidency in 1974, he talked of an "impeiled Presidency" whereby Congress was in a sense holding the president hostage. His point was illustrated by the record number of times that Congress overruled the Presidential veto. Ford therefore was indecisive on the economy, raising taxes, lowering taxes, because of Congress and this led to stag-station.

"The impeiled Presidency" continued into the Carter years from 1977-81. Congress complained that they didn't get to see Carter enough, that he was a micro-manager and that he only conisidered to his "Georgia Magic". Congress therefore rejected Carter's Energy Bill which Carter called "the moral equivalent to war". Furthermore, like Ford, Carter's inability and ~~reluctance~~ to make hard, decisive decisions on the economy with the consent of Congress, meant high inflation of 13%.

(This page is for your second answer.)

and unemployment at over 8 million. Regarding foreign policy, Congress rejected

The Reagan years of 1981-89 marked a shift in the presidential power and returned a lot of legitimacy to the presidency that had been affected by Watergate.

Reagan, known as "the great communicator" was very much liked by Congress and he managed to pass his "1981 Budget", which focused on supply-side policies, without any objections from Congress.

Furthermore, Reagan had more of a free hand over foreign policy, not only because he got on so well with Congress but because "Vietnam syndrome was over."


In conclusion, we have looked at the changing status of Presidential power during the years 1969-89. The Watergate scandal ^{had} ~~was~~ the biggest impact on Presidential power, perhaps causing the failure of the Ford and Carter administrations. However, the Reagan years reestablished the ^{legitimacy of the} Presidency and restored the relationship with Congress.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The answer directly addresses the question. There is a developed section of Nixon's relations with Congress during his first term, and the extent to which Watergate can be seen as a turning point in presidential power. There is good depth on the 'imperilled presidency' of Ford and Carter, and explicit reference to the powers exercised by Reagan. An analytical response at low Level 5.

(This page is for your second answer.)



It is accurate to say that during this period the power exercised by each president fluctuated. The ~~biggest~~ ~~increase~~ most significant increase in power expressed was seen in the economy and the foreign policy and slightly in the environment. Areas in which the power exercised decreased were the ~~extra~~ handling of scandals and the power exercised stayed the same in the handling of drugs.

The amount of power expressed over the economy changed the most. Ford was the weakest president in this area, in his first few days he wanted a tax increase, a few weeks later a decrease of \$16b to which ~~he~~ congress said no. He then settles for a \$7b decrease instead. Ford had very little power. Reagan on the other hand cut \$40b from the federal budget and raised the spending on defence to \$7.2b, even in his second term although his power was weakened by the Emergency Budget and ~~def~~ deficits control Act he was still able to pass a tax reform bill in 1986. Therefore the amount of power expressed increased significantly.

A similar effect was seen in foreign policy. Ford was forced to meet a Soviet union dissident and after inappropriate dates such as the 4th of July are suggested a meeting is scheduled by which time Congress had dropped the matter. Ford was also ineffective in the Cyprus crisis when Congress cuts off Ford's aid to Turkey because they want to help Greece instead. The lack of power continues under Carter who hands over control of the Panama canal, particularly damaging as he said he wouldn't do in his campaign. It is only under Reagan that power is expressed and even then, it was illegal. Reagan was selling arms to Iran and giving the profits to the Contra rebels in 1986 which although it dropped his approval rating by 64% to 44%, he had expressed power. In general, in this period, power expressed in foreign affairs did not change significantly.

The power expressed slightly increased in the environment however this was due to the situation at the time. Carter seemed ineffective in his environmental dealings. His legislation was rejected. Also there were energy riots in Pennsylvania in which 100 000 were injured however this was down to the shortage of \$

natural gas and the inability to mine coal in the ~~the~~ harsh winter of 1977. Therefore, it may have seemed that power expressed increased when Reagan opened 624 National parks but this was largely due to the difficult circumstances Carter faced. On the whole power expressed had not increased.

Power decreased in the handling of scandals. Nixon had narrowly avoided impeachment in 1973. This then caused a power earthquake under Ford who had to testify on Nixon's pardon. Under Carter, there was the scandal of Billygate which caused the public to question Carter's abilities to control those around him leading to the press asking 'Can Carter Cope?'. In this aspect, the power expressed by presidents diminished.

The amount of power ~~were~~ seemed to increase in the handling of drugs, however like the environment this was ~~to~~ mainly due to circumstances. Reagan waged a war on drugs which cost \$15 b. This appears to ~~to~~ imply an increase in power expressed however earlier in the time period drugs was not a ~~large~~ ~~of~~ problem. It was only ~~and~~ while Reagan was in power that 30% of people under 45

(This page is for your second answer.) had tried marijuana. Therefore it was only now that power needed to increase.

In conclusion power increased the most in ~~an~~ economy and foreign policy. It appeared to increase in ~~so~~ the environment and drugs. It decreased in the handling of scandals. Generally the ~~increases~~ of power ~~the~~ were seen under Reagan.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer has some understanding of the demands of the question, but approaches it in an oblique way. Instead of focusing on the nature of presidential power as a whole, the candidate considers how successive presidents influenced matters such as the economy, foreign policy, the environment and drugs. There is an attempt to develop an analysis, but there is a drift out of focus here. Relevant material and explanation allows for a high Level 3 award.

Question 14

Some candidates appeared to have strayed into Question 14 by mistake, having learned the civil rights topic and been attracted by the phrase 'racially tolerant'. Others ignored 'racially' and produced an extended answer on changing attitudes towards African Americans, women, gay people and the young, and described the clashes over Roe v Wade. These answers were, inevitably, relatively unsuccessful. Better answers focused on racial matters, but many saw the issue solely in terms of changes affecting African Americans, thus producing only a partial response. The best answers had both range and depth of relevant material. Change for African Americans was exemplified with reference to sport, films and television (the significance of the Cosby Show was well known). Political change was also considered, but, while many saw the importance of the appointment of Colin Powell, only a few referred to Jesse Jackson's campaign to win the Democratic Party's presidential nomination. There was some good knowledge displayed about changes for Hispanic and Native Americans, with a handful of answers also referring to Asian Americans. Despite all these changes, most candidates realised that pockets of prejudice still existed in 2001, especially in the south, and that the USA still had some way to go on the road to racial equality and tolerance.

(This page is for your second answer.) Race relations ~~was~~ were a major issue in American Society from 1968 - 2001. With America seeming to become a much more tolerable society on the issue of race

African Americans had struggled to be seen as equal members of society, but became a lot more successful from 1968-2001. They had various political successes under various presidents. Under Jimmy Carter, Patricia Harris became secretary of Housing and Urban development, and Andrew Young became US ~~the~~ ambassador for the UN. ~~the~~ Ronald Reagan had a black cabinet member, and George H.W. Bush employed Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court. All of these political appointments suggest that America had become a lot more racially tolerant society. But the most

(This page is for your second answer.) Significant African American in terms of politics is Jesse Jackson who ran for the democratic nomination in 1984. ~~His~~ His run for the nomination furthered the belief that America had become more racially tolerant than ever before.

Socially, the lives of blacks also changed. Basketball star Michael Jordan was admired all over the country by blacks and whites alike. Oprah Winfrey and Bill Cosby had successful TV shows. The improving lives of blacks in society can also suggest that America was becoming more ~~racially~~ racially tolerable through the media.

Other races were also becoming more accepted into American Society. Hispanics had some success ~~in~~ in politics. Jimmy Carter appointed various hispanics in his offices and federal courts. Ronald Reagan employed fifteen hispanics as federal judges also, suggesting that African Americans were not the only race making progress in American society.

The ~~work~~ work of Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers had contributed greatly to the improvement of Hispanics socially. Many hispanics previously lived in ghettoised and

(This page is for your second answer.) Urban conditions, but the amount of hispanics living in integrated areas soon increased, suggesting America was helping all races to achieve better lifestyles.

American Indians also became more accepted into society. Politically, they had campaigned hard, with Richard Nixon once granting them 43,000 acres of their sacred land back. The Bureau of Indian Affairs had previously been dominated by whites, but control was given to the American Indians through the work of AIM, and they have become an effective lobbying party ever since. The improving situation for American Indians politically has allowed them to gain much more benefits in living conditions, once again suggesting America has become much more racially tolerable.

After their ~~hard~~ ~~time~~ suffering during the Second World War, Asian Americans have also been accepted into American society. They were granted reparation payment of \$20,000 for the abuse they suffered, and are also one of the highest earning races in America behind whites. ~~However~~ Although only small numbers of them ~~have~~ become involved in politics.

(This page is for your second answer.) However, there are various reasons that imply America has not become a more racially tolerant society.

African Americans suffered greatly in the case of Rodney King, in which the brutal police officers were acquitted of their charges.

This caused mass rioting in L.A. as the blacks were tired of police brutality and biased federals. The action taken by the court to acquit the police officer highlights the racial injustice that continued in America.

As far as they got politically, blacks still struggled economically. Especially under Reagan, in which there were great job losses and a rise in the homeless from 200,000 to 400,000, the majority which were black African Americans remained in the lowest of earners in the American economy.

Although American Indians advanced greatly politically, they struggled socially and economically along with Hispanics. Both races ~~struggled~~ remained at the bottom of America's earners along with blacks. And unlike African Americans neither could make a huge impact on sport or the media. There was also a huge suicide rate between

(This page is for your second answer.) American Indians who felt they were losing their culture.


Asian Americans also suffered socially, such as when Vincent Chin was murdered because he was believed to be Japanese; whites were angry at job losses in the car industry due to large Japanese imports. The murderer was only given a three year sentence which caused outcry from Asian Americans.

To conclude, America had become a more racially tolerant society to a high extent. Many races benefited economically, politically, and socially. However, the races never became truly tolerant in all three, blacks benefited socially but struggled economically, whereas Asian Americans benefited economically but struggled socially.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer does not focus exclusively on African Americans, but also deals with Hispanic Americans, American Indians and Asian Americans. There is an attempt at a balanced answer by considering both sides of the argument, and there is some judgement in the conclusion. While there is some lack of clarity and coherence in places, the answer has sufficient range and depth of support for a high Level 4 award.



It is fair to say that between the years 1968-2001, the United States of America became slightly more racially tolerant and helped secure equal rights for African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, etc.

During this period however, many different races suffered abuse and racial discrimination to the extreme. Native Americans and Hispanics, who were in fact living in America before it was taken over, had become outcasts of some sort and weren't seen as 'True' Americans, therefore resulting in them being abused physically and mentally by the majority of white Americans. They were barred from public places such as bars, restaurants and cinemas. However, while this occurred, many government officials and presidents supported these races, and to an extent tried to help gain better rights for African Americans, Hispanics, etc; it not equal

(This page is for your second answer.) rights with white Americans. Although they did help different races with equality, such as many civil rights act, court cases such as 'Brown vs Board of Education' and other ways, presidents didn't fully support their cause, meaning full equality wasn't going to be gain for a while.

The main reason for this was because of the majority, white Americans. White Americans didn't want to see black Americans, etc get equal rights due to the massive change it would bring to many people's lives. This meant whichever government were in full support of civil rights wouldn't necessarily get full support of white Americans, therefore losing popularity and votes.

Also, during this period, many acts and courts cases helped make America more 'racially tolerant' meaning they did help the different races in their course for equality, however hindered many white supporters. For example, 'Brown vs Board of Education', many blacks had already gained equality within schools before the period 1968-2001; however this didn't show as many white Americans were against it.

Many organisations were falling apart because of their ineffective methods and views. Extreme groups such as the Black Panthers had resulted to nothing during the beginning of this period and many black Americans (and many other races) felt as if equality would never be achieved. Many presidents were not exercising their views on black equality, therefore resulting in nothing being achieved. However, more and more white Americans became involved with the fight for equality for African Americans, showing their tolerance of blacks being mixed with whites. Many people up in what they thought of the different races to try and help the civil rights movement further. Key black influential figures such as Muhammad Ali, Mike Tyson and Oprah Winfrey help make the white public realise that they were against the black civil rights movement, however watched their favourite black Americans on TV. Key black sportsmen

(This page is for your second answer.) such as Michael Jordan, Magic Johnson and key comedians and actors such as Eddie Murphy helped many people realise how similar they were and showed that they shouldn't be racially abused due to their support of the white public who watched them, reported them, etc.

Overall, the USA as a whole became more racially tolerant within the years 1968-2001. During this period, many key figures such as Muhammad Ali and Eddie Murphy helped show the white majority that they were the same people and that they should be granted equal rights. Although many white Americans still disagreed with racial equality, more and more people than before showed their support of the black civil rights movement, meaning it had become more popular within the public. Whites were still tolerant of different races in America during this period in American history, helping the movement as well as hindering it.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The answer has some understanding of the demands of the question, and tries to develop an explanatory framework. However, the candidate considers only change for African Americans. Supporting information is quite slight, especially in the early part of the answer, and much here is outside the time period given in the question. Mid Level 3 marks were awarded.

Paper Summary

Centres might consider the following ways in which future performance might be improved.

- Candidates must answer the question set, not the one they were hoping for.
- The whole chronological range given in the question should be covered.
- Candidates should be familiar with, and comfortable with, historical words and phrases appropriate to the course of study.
- Candidates should study the factors relevant to an aspect of their course as a set rather than as a number of disconnected factors; and their relative importance could be weighed up accordingly.

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 US032398 June 2012

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

