

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

GCE History 6HI01 D

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2014

Publications Code US039066

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

This year most candidates were able to provide some explanatory framework as a basic scaffolding for their answer, had a general understanding of the demands of the question and were able to sustain a focus on the question set. The ability to call on some relevant information, and to develop it to some extent, means that fewer answers were placed in Level 2. Level 1 answers were, as always, characterised by their brevity, often just one or two paragraphs of generalised material with no development. At the other end of the scale of attainment, many answers accessed Level 5. These answers were directly focused and analytical, considered a number of relevant points, and exemplified these with a range of detailed information. Moreover, most Level 5 answers came from candidates with good communication skills and the ability to use historical words and phrases confidently.

There was a variety of approaches towards questions which had a multi-factored focus, usually signalled by the phrase 'the most important reason'. Some of the most confident answers included an introduction which either agreed with the role of the stated factor or proposed an alternative. Many candidates, however, were more reluctant to commit themselves. Their introduction usually agreed with the stated factor 'to some extent' but did not propose an alternative. Weighing up different factors before reaching a clear conclusion often differentiated between Level 4 and Level 5 answers.

Some questions were not multi-factored, though a number of candidates mistakenly believed that they were. Question D10, for example, was focused on the extent to which Black Power hindered or promoted the rights of African Americans. Several candidates went beyond the question's remit to address other factors influencing African American rights, and thus took their answer out of focus. This weakness was also evident in, for example, answers to Question A14.

A number of questions were shaped around double headers: questions of this type include A5 and A13, B2 and D12. While many answers accessed Level 4, the mark awarded was often influenced by the extent to which both factors were treated fairly evenly. Some answers to A5 were strongly weighted towards Henry II, with much less development on John; while on B2 the Papacy was often mentioned almost as an afterthought.

Previous reports have highlighted the problems which many candidates have in interpreting 'social policies' and, regrettably, this year was no exception. On D4, for example, many believed that social policies included economic and political change; while 'social and cultural change' in D13 was sometimes interpreted as political and cultural change.

There have been some improvements overall in the quality of written communication, with far fewer abbreviations and colloquialisms scattered through candidates' answers. However, the quality of handwriting on a small number of scripts meant that some words and phrases were impossible to decipher, and this factor weakened communication overall.

## Question 1

Question 1 asked about the causes of change over a long period of time. It required candidates to select examples of foreign intervention which had a significant impact on domestic developments and to assess the importance of these, as opposed to other factors that also caused change inside China. Candidates who selected an example of foreign influence from each decade were able to demonstrate a breadth of knowledge which was not possible for those who focused merely on 1900 -1911, as some did.

Many candidates assumed that foreign influence meant 'intervention' or at least involved seizing or threatening Chinese territory; the more discerning referred to the different forms it took, including economic, cultural, educational and diplomatic involvement.

While some candidates struggled to identify the additional factors that caused change, others did so successfully by focusing on certain key individuals or key actions that they took. In a question like this that covered such a potentially large range of material, selection of relevant support was of paramount importance and this proved a good discriminator between well prepared candidates who were able to do this, and those who simply wrote all they knew, often on the period before 1900. There was also a minority of candidates who adapted the question to suit one they would have preferred on the contribution of foreign influence in causing the fall of the Qing.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Many factors shaped internal development with China between 1900-1927, with foreign influence being the key. However, other factors such as unstable governments and the people's disillusion with them also played a role in what was a time of great change for China.

The Scramble for China ~~between~~ between European powers angered the Chinese public and caused resentment towards the Qing, who were already seen as 'foreign rulers'. The fact that the Qing did very little to stop important areas such as Hong Kong from falling under foreign ownership decreased support for what was already a very ~~unpopular~~ unpopular ruler, Dowager Cixi. This unpopularity grew throughout the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, with events such as the Boxer rebellion and the 100

(This page is for your first answer.) days of reform backfiring for the Qing, ultimately leading to the abdication of ~~Pu Yi~~ Pu Yi/the Qing in 1911.

Yuan Shikai was the next leader after the Qing, and with him came a ~~new~~ new host of issues regarding foreign powers. The pivotal event for China during this time was Japan's 21 demands, and the subsequent humiliation of China in the Treaty of Versailles. With most of ~~the world~~ Europe busy with the first world war, Japan saw a prime opportunity to take advantage of a very unstable and weak China. With the nation divided between the GMD and Yuan Shikai, along with its crippling debt to the USA, Japan put forward 21 demands which gave Japan a large degree of power in China. With nobody to turn to Yuan Shikai accepted the terms. This sparked public outrage, especially among the radical intellectuals of the time. The outrage led to the ~~19th~~ May 4<sup>th</sup> movement which lasted many years until Yuan Shikai's abdication and death in 1916. This sequence of events led many in China to believe a full scale modernisation was required to prosper once again, and later paved the way for ~~several~~ many prominent

(This page is for your first answer.) CCP members.

Post these events came the warlord era, which was mostly unaffected by foreign powers thus providing a counter argument for the claim that foreign powers were the most important factor in shaping China's internal developments. The key feature of China between 1916-1927 was instability, with a wide range of people fighting for power over certain territories. During this time the CCP were also formed, and under instruction from Comintern forged an alliance with the GMD to rid China of as many warlords as possible in what is known as the Northern Expedition. To this end it is safe to say that foreign powers played no real part in terms of internal developments during this time.

In conclusion I would say that while foreign influence undoubtedly played a vital role in shaping China's internal development, the most important factor was instead the failings of those in power and to effectively rule China and bring them onto the world stage in a non-disasterous manner.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The answer attempts to shape an analytical focus on the question, but range and depth of support are both weak. More could have been made of the last years of the Qing, and it is not clear what the implications for China of the Twenty-One Demands made in 1915 would be. There is reference to one other relevant factor, the rule of the warlords, but this is not exemplified with evidence. The lack of depth of support overall makes for a mark of mid Level 3.

## **Question 2**

Question 2 concerned Mao's contribution to 'the survival and ultimate triumph of the CCP'. Taking 'survival' to mean the Long March and Yanan period, and 'ultimate triumph' to be the Civil War victory proved an effective approach for many. Some candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge of the way Mao imposed his personality and ideas on the CCP in the 1930s, noting the importance of the 1935 Zunyi meeting during the march, and the way he used the Yanan period to make Marxism fit the Chinese situation, rather than the other way round. Most candidates were better prepared in explaining Mao's contribution to the Civil War, and were able to make some telling contrasts here with the record of Chiang. Indeed, contrasting Mao's successes with Chiang's failings was a popular way of structuring the answer, which could be highly effective. The question did cover a fifteen year period, so answers that confined themselves to the four years of Civil War did not relate well to the question.

## **Question 3**

Candidates tackling Question 3 were clearly aware that force did play a significant role in helping the Communists impose their authority in the early years of the PRC, and were not short of relevant examples to demonstrate this. Many could provide details of the reunification campaigns in outlying areas and the brutal crackdowns in Shanghai and Guangzhou. The role of the PLA in regional government was also used to show the way that the threat of force underpinned the new China. Some candidates were able to show that force was not just imposed from above but also unleashed from below, as peasants were encouraged to take revenge on their former landlords in the early land reforms. Some candidates also made good use of the two 'anti' campaigns to show the implicit threat of force that lay behind them, and also the U-turn that marked the Hundred Flowers campaign right at the end of the period. Candidates were aware that Communist control was asserted through other approaches as well: for example, some of the social reforms which won widespread approval, and the use of surveillance that the various registration schemes made possible. However, relatively few candidates referred to the control exerted over the 'blue ants' who worked on the new engineering projects, and the propaganda value of projects such as the Yangtze Bridge, which served to enhance the prestige of the new regime.

## **Question 4**

Most candidates attempting Question 4 were able to demonstrate knowledge of the social policies affecting women's rights, education and health, but fewer were familiar with those which concerned religious groups. It has been noted in previous reports that candidates need to be able to identify social policies accurately: answers that covered cultural or economic policy were simply not relevant. More able candidates took the trouble to explain the possible criteria for judging success, rather than asserting that a certain policy must have been successful because a certain group was better off as a result. Many candidates were aware that the impact of the social policies changed during the twenty seven years covered by the question, particularly in education after 1966 when the Cultural Revolution interrupted previous progress.

## Question 5

Question 5 required a judgment on the extent of change in both the economy and government. Candidates who looked back from 1914 and explained what had or had not changed since 1881 avoided writing information-driven answers that "told the story" of developments and risked losing focus in doing so. Answers that dealt with each theme separately kept a sharper focus than those which dealt in turn with the reigns of Alexander III and Nicholas II. Only a few answers mentioned Bunge and Vyshnegradsky, but most candidates were aware of the key initiatives set in motion by Witte, including some good comments on the significance of the Trans-Siberian railway. Fewer were confident on Stolypin's contribution, often getting side-tracked into addressing his work mopping up dissidents after 1906, rather than his efforts to create a class of prosperous peasantry. The limitations of the Duma, thanks to the Fundamental Law, were well known to most, although the limited progress towards a parliamentary democracy (as illustrated by the constructive legislation of the fourth Duma and the development of parliamentary committees) was generally overlooked. Some answers drifted out of period at each end of the chronology, referring to emancipation or the events of 1917. Despite comments in previous reports, some answers still include extensive, and largely irrelevant, material on Alexander II.

To what extent did the economy + gov of Russia change in the years 1881-1914?

During the period of 1881 - 1914 there were two ~~many~~ main reformers of Russia. Stolypin and Witte were the most fundamental characters changing the economy of Russia industrially + agriculturally. There were few political changes such as the introduction of the dumas - the first elected parliament in Russia. It can be argued that these ~~top~~ figures changed the Russian economy and government to a large extent, yet it can also be argued that the changes were very limited.

On one hand, the economy changed dramatically. ~~#~~ Firstly, ~~the~~ finance minister - Witte bought



(This page is for your first answer.) About many fundamental changes to the way Russian industry was run. He changed Russia's priorities and ~~supply~~ <sup>focused</sup> on the rapid growth of industries such as heavy industry. Crucially, this led to a dramatic increase of production of ~~of~~ goods such as coal and oil, with a rise of about 8% in the first year. Stolypin was also crucial in changing Russian economy. He, for example, ended redemption payments and dissolved any ~~mis~~ where land distribution had not happened since the emancipation of the serfs. His work in the ~~industrial~~ agricultural areas ~~proved~~ <sup>proved</sup> to be very popular with the peasants in Russia. This was extremely important as peasants made up 80% of Russia at the time and therefore gained support for the Tsar as well as ~~causing~~ easing tensions in the countryside. This proves that to a large extent the Russian economy did change in the years 1881-1914. // further more, there was one major political change in the period 1881-1914. The Tsar responded to growing demands for an elected parliament by creating the State Duma. Crucially, this meant that ordinary people of Russia could now have some potential influence in the way that Russia was run. This was a fundamental

(This page is for your first answer.) Leap in the much needed modernisation of Russia and also eased of tensions for the Tsar during this period. As this was the first elected parliament to ever be introduced in Russia. On the other hand however, it can be argued that there was a very limited amount of change to the Russian economic system at this time. After the agricultural changes of Stolypin, ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> peasants could leave their communes and therefore moved into the towns and cities. This increased the pressure and growing demand in the cities for things like food and oil, thus due to the movement of peasants off the land, it was made ever harder to cope with this growing demand for food. Moreover, after Witte's industrial reforms, there was a huge decline in the living conditions of people in the cities. Linking with Stolypin's reforms and the movement of peasants, these poor living conditions of a wide for such a large proportion of Russia meant that this would act as a catalyst for not only the revolution in 1904, but for the Fall of the Tsar in the years to come after 1914.

Ultimately, the change in government ~~had~~ <sup>was</sup> extremely limited. The Dumas, despite being Russia's first elected body, was fundamentally under the Tsar's complete control. Despite the allowance to ~~these~~ vote for new policies that could potentially be ~~held~~ proposed to the Tsar, if he did not like or agree with them, they could not be passed. The second Duma was changed so that ~~only~~ only the top 30% wealthiest men could vote, which ~~did~~ did not importantly mean that the majority of Russia could not vote (80% peasant as well as the women and children of Russia). Critically, as the Tsar had absolute power, when he saw the Duma's demands growing too high, he was able to dissolve the establishment and therefore proving that the government of Russia hardly changed in the years 1881-1914.

In conclusion, despite the significant reforms passed by Stolypin and Witte in the years 1881-1914, it can be more strongly argued that there was very little change in the Russian economy and government during this

(This page is for your first answer.) period. The ultimate reason for this would be that the living and working conditions in the towns and cities decreased dramatically during this period and people's unrest and discontent was growing increasingly. The most fundamental (op on the reason for little growth in economy and government was the fact that the Tsar had absolute control, and due to this there was little room for any reforms due to <sup>the Tsar (notably Nicholas II)</sup> ~~his~~ unwillingness to change.

\*It proves that the system of Russian government did change to an extremely significant extent.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer considers the extent of change in both economy and government over the whole timeframe. Economic change is exemplified through Witte's drive for industrialisation, and with Stolypin's agricultural reforms aimed at improving the condition of the peasantry. The contrary argument on economic change lacks security on Witte, though there is reasonable understanding displayed on the role of the Dumas. The answer thus addresses the question and considers a number of relevant points, but there is some uneven development of material overall. A mid Level 4 response.

## **Question 6**

Several candidates gave thorough attention to Trotsky's contribution to organising the October coup and monitoring discipline in the Red Army during the Civil War. A productive approach taken by many was to examine the respective contributions of Trotsky and Lenin to Bolshevik success in the period, although this carried the risk of attributing everything that happened in the period to either Trotsky or Lenin. Some less able answers confined themselves to the Civil War period, and wrongly interpreted the question to be on why the Reds won the Civil War. Apart from having the wrong focus, answers of this type omitted the significant early moves by Lenin to exit the First World War and pass the decrees concerning land and working conditions, and the later switch from War Communism to NEP. However, there were some perceptive comments from well-prepared candidates about the value of the new constitutions in organising the political infrastructure and on the underlying role that terror played throughout the period.

## **Question 7**

A significant number of candidates misread the question as being one about the leadership contest in the years after Lenin's death in 1924. This suggests that they did not consider the time period of 1928-38 in the question or that they were determined to offer a prepared answer to a question with which they felt comfortable. There was, of course, some information which could be credited, such as Stalin's roles within the party and the failings of others such as Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin, but these responses failed to achieve more than a modest level of attainment. Others appeared to hedge their bets with an answer which looked at the power struggle and at Stalin's consolidation of power in the 1930s, but time constraints often meant that points were not developed in great detail. Many could, however, explain the lack of an effective challenge to Stalin's power between 1928 and 1938. Most focused on the Show Trials and purges of the period, often in impressive detail, explaining their value in removing potential rivals and in creating the climate of fear that engulfed all areas of society, not just the political elite. The purges were also examined in some depth, especially the Yezhovshchina. The more able answers were able to explain the additional role of wider factors relating to propaganda and the personality cult, and it was encouraging to note that many were aware of control of the arts through Socialist Realism.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Question 9

Question 10

Question 11

Question 12

Question 13

Question 14

Central  
Committee  
1928-38.

Stalin's opponents  
ineffective + no challenge

(This page is for your first answer.)

Primarily, after Lenin's death in 1924, there had been no <sup>confirmed</sup> official choice into who would take over the Communist Party, <sup>creating</sup> leaving an atmosphere of determination and hostility. Additionally, contenders on the left of the party (Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky) were competing with the right of the party (Bukharin and Tomsky) in the power struggle. What they did not apprehend was that in the centre of the party stood a man who held the most knowledge out of them all, and would eventually become leader of the USSR in 1928. But why were these political contenders unable to challenge Stalin's growing power?

Firstly, after ~~the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917,~~  
Lenin's death in 1924

(This page is for your first answer.) Stalin was already in the best position for the party, working as a bureaucrat, dealing with all the paper work of the Communist Party, and was able to organize and control the day to day business of the party. Here, Stalin achieved an advantage as he was able to obtain large amounts of information about the different contenders, and how he could manipulate them. In addition, the majority of the Communist Party members refused to work through their paper work, and instead were more bothered about defeating one another. As a bureaucrat, Stalin was almost 'hidden' in the background, and no one saw him as a particular threat, and he was even referred to as a 'grey blur' - someone with no political dominance or real expertise in the political struggle. Also, when the struggle began, Stalin initially formed an alliance with Zinoviev and Kamenev, called the Triumvirate, designed to eliminate Trotsky. After that, Stalin then decided to form an alliance with Bukharin as Trotsky had been ~~the~~ eliminated from the party, and Zinoviev and Kamenev appeared weak. This portrays



(This page is for your first answer.) Now by the year of 1928, Stalin had politically defeated his opponents and adopted different policies, which he knew would appeal to Congress.

likewise, Stalin was also able to defeat his political purges during the purges which occurred ~~from~~ after the Congress of Victors in 1934. This was when, ~~for~~ Stalin discovered that he had been voted against, and decided to eliminate those from the party that he saw as a 'threat to the Communist Party'. From the years 1934-1937 Stalin had purged over 380,000 Communist Party members, showing how quickly he eliminated them. Moreover, Stalin eliminated and successfully overruled those who were against his policies. Also, he began ~~to~~ introducing Show Trials which would humiliate his enemies, forcing them to confess conspiracies of which weren't entirely true. The 16th Show Trial that took place in 1936 eliminated Zinoviev and Kamenev, and accused them of trying to assassinate Lenin. Later Show Trials in 1937, ~~accused~~ ~~but~~ eliminated

(This page is for your first answer.) Bulharin: This therefore meant anyone who wished to defeat or challenge Stalin would be persecuted and murdered, by ~~Stalin~~ Yagoda (who would be in charge of the exploitation of Stalin's political rivals) & 1

Also, by 1938 Stalin had stamped his authority in the USSR due to the Great Terror. ~~that~~ During this period, Stalin would send anyone who was critical of him, or who opposed him straight off to the Gulags (labour camps), and their families would be destroyed too. Due to the ~~best~~ climate of fear that the Soviet citizens remained in, ~~that this targets~~ no one would be able to challenge him, as in 1937-1938 ~~10-20~~ 10-30 million people were sent off to the Gulags. &

& Stalin also defeated old Bolsheviks with the Communist Party, as he saw them as a huge threat due to their extensive knowledge about ~~so~~ Communism, and the way a communist society should be raised. Similarly, Stalin persecuted those who knew

(This page is for your first answer.) about the contents of Lenin's Testament, which ordered that Stalin should be immediately replaced. Therefore, I think that the purges played an important role in the reasoning as to why Stalin's opponents were unable to challenge him, as he physically murdered ~~as~~ those who made him feel less powerful and weak.

2. Additionally, Stalin introduced many of his supporters into the Communist Party and set up the OGPU (Secret Police) ~~to~~ to enforce his rulings all over Russia. Likewise, Stalin encouraged his people to report on any person or group who spoke badly of him, which resulted in many friends, neighbours and even teachers being destroyed and sent away to the Gulags.

Conclusively, I think the main reasoning as to why Stalin's opponents were ineffective in challenging his growing power in Russia in the years of 1928-38 was due to ~~his~~ the climate of fear he created, and the loss of Old Bolsheviks who could have

(This page is for your first answer.) *easily built an alliance against him and took over the ~~the~~ Communist Party.*



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Some of the material in the early part of the answer is out of period as it focuses on the struggle for power after Lenin's death. However, there is some relevance on Stalin's role as a bureaucrat and the wide-ranging support this afforded him. The Congress of Victors and the subsequent purges and terror are all mentioned, though supporting information here is patchy, and it is this lack of depth that makes the answer a mid Level 3 response overall.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The timescale here is crucial to success. The years 1928-38 mean that you have to look at some aspects of Stalin's rule in the 1930s, and consider how Stalin's rule was strengthened by key developments.

## **Question 8**

Candidates were aware of many reasons why the Soviet Union was victorious in the Second World War, but the problem for many here was to adequately explain the contribution of the stated factor, 'the efforts of the Soviet people in maintaining war production'. This required some explanation of the achievements of pre-war economic planning, as well as of how these levels of production were kept up in wartime, and the use to which they were put. Some answers mentioned only the removal of factories to beyond the Urals, while others referred only to the privations suffered by the Soviet people on the home front. More able answers used the information from core textbooks to address the stated factor in some detail, referring to the long shifts completed by women and children and the nature of war production overall. There were some interesting comparisons between the German and Soviet economies, and that the transition from Gosplan and the Five-Year Plans to Stavka and the war economy was managed smoothly. Once the stated factor was dealt with, candidates were more confident addressing the variety of wider factors that affected the outcome in terms of Stalin's leadership, German miscalculations and allied help. Some were uncertain about the importance of lend-lease. Many were aware of its significance in transport and communications, and for food supplies, but some wrongly believed that lend-lease supplied troops for the eastern front. Future candidates need to be aware that Stalin never abolished religion and then restored it during the war; a few hundred churches were reopened and Stalin tapped into the Soviet people's need for spiritual comfort.

## Question 9

The question presented few problems, unless candidates were unfamiliar with the constitutional powers of the Supreme Court or had an insecure grasp of chronology, in which case they often brought in Rosa Parks, King and post 1955 Civil Rights material that was irrelevant here. Most candidates avoided these errors and were able to show how the Supreme Court operated in tandem with the NAACP, especially Thurgood Marshall, with more able candidates putting the 'improvements in status' into perspective by underlining the limitations and showing that key decisions, like Brown II, came right at the end of the period, so that the improvements were relatively modest. Many listed significant judgements such as Morgan v Virginia and Sweatt v Painter, but these were often simply described instead of their importance being explained. Most were aware of the distinction between de jure and de facto change. Knowledge and understanding of Truman's involvement in civil rights has improved significantly in recent years. There was detailed information offered on 'To Secure These Rights' (though some believed it was legislation proposed to Congress), on the desegregation of the armed forces, and on Truman's inauguration of 1949. There were some excellent comments on the significance of World War Two, whether on the development of the Double V campaign or on the economic and social impact of the northern migration during the war.

(This page is for your first answer.) Supreme Court, 1945-58.  
Brown vs Board of Education <sup>1953</sup> - Eisenhower  
Shelley vs Kraemer - said nothing  
Emmett Till <sup>28th</sup> August 1955. NAACP - Fair Employment Practices.  
Individuals - 500,000 \$ to 450,000.  
Rosa Parks - Montgomery Bus Boycot  
Ella J. Baker - first black to attend  
Aurhine Lucy - a white Uni.  
Adam Clayton Powell - Eisenhower didn't get her qualification  
criticised for being inclusive until she was 82  
A Phillip Randolph - pressure with march on Washington.  
Presidents: E Fredrick Morrow.  
Truman - To secure these rights  
- 'living 80 years behind the time'  
- Shook hands with AA in Macc  
- desegregation stopped for a day in Dallas.  
Social - NIMBY. not in my backyard.  
Opposition from AA themselves - Black Panthers. separate but equal

Arguably, the role of the Supreme Court was the most important factor in improving the status of African-Americans in the USA in the years 1945-55. This time period featured rulings such as *Brown vs Board of Education* and *Shelley vs Kraemer*, which were both highly influential in bringing improvements to the lives of African-Americans. Despite this, there were also other factors that were beneficial to the civil rights movement during this decade. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower were particularly key, as were individuals such as Rosa Parks <sup>with the 1955 bus boycott</sup>, Authine Lucy and Asa Phillip Randolph <sup>with the threat of the march on Washington</sup>. Organisations were also important factors during 1945-1955, the main ones at this period being the Fair Employment Practices Commission <sup>(FEPC)</sup> and the NAACP.

In 1953, the Supreme Court's ruling on *Brown vs Board of Education* was a key moment of the civil rights movement in 1945-55. It ruled that schools should be desegregated, allowing African-Americans to mix with whites at school. This was important due to the fact that African-Americans were often disadvantaged as their schools were inferior to those of white students. As a result, they (African-Americans) received low-level jobs and fewer jobs.

(This page is for your first answer.) opportunities in comparison to whites). Therefore, the Brown Ruling demonstrates the importance of the Supreme Court in improving the status of African-Americans, as the ruling was able to improve education (and employment opportunities as a result of this) for African-Americans in 1953.

On the other hand, this ruling was largely ignored - particularly in the South, where tensions between whites and African-Americans ran high. Evidence for this is Authrine Lucy. She was the first African-American that was allowed to go to an all-white university. However, riots and multiple threats to Lucy's life meant that she was unable to attend the University, and did not receive her qualification at the school until she was 32 years old. This shows that the Supreme Court was not wholly successful at improving the status of African-Americans in this decade, as Lucy didn't graduate until after 1955.

The Supreme Court Ruling of Shelley vs Kraemer was also an important factor to consider. It ruled that African-Americans should be allowed to live in the same area as whites, and called for desegregation in



(This page is for your first answer.) neighbourhoods. This was important as it raised awareness for African-Americans' right to be able to live where they wanted to without fear. However, the opposition to this ruling is evidence to show that the Supreme Court was unable to improve the social status of African-Americans.

The Presidents were particularly important between 1945 and 1955 as well. Truman's 'To Secure These Rights' Act in 1947 called for equality, claiming that Americans couldn't pretend to lead the free world while African-Americans were treated as second class citizens. His presidential campaign in 1948 was another valuable factor - he campaigned frequently in racist ~~the~~ Texas, stopped segregation for a day in Dallas, and shook hands with an African-American woman in Moco (even though ~~for~~ he was booed for this). As a result, Truman won two thirds of the African-American vote in 1948 - demonstrating that African-Americans supported him and believed he could improve their conditions further.

Eisenhower called for equality in his first presidential speech in 1953, and appointed

(This page is for your first answer.) P. Frederick MORROW to his staff: Despite this, it's argued that Eisenhower didn't help <sup>the status of</sup> African-Americans as much as Truman did: he never spoke to MORROW about Civil Rights, and refused to say anything about the Brown Ruling - suggesting that he didn't care about the status of African-Americans. Considering this, the Supreme Court was a more important factor in improving the status of African-Americans than Eisenhower during 1945-1948.

Organisations were also important. The FEPC was focused on improving employment opportunities for African-Americans and the NAACP's membership increased to 450,000 in 1945 (in comparison to 50,000 in 1943). However, the FEPC lacked funding (despite Truman's attempts to convince Congress to provide financial support) and the NAACP faced racial injustice, as many employment cases were turned away.

Ultimately, while the Supreme Court was <sup>an</sup> important factor in improving the status of African-Americans in 1945-55, there were other factors that were more important. Particularly the

(This page is for your first answer.) role of President Truman, who helped improve the status of African-Americans more than any of his recent predecessors with 'To Secure These Rights' in 1947, and continuing to publically support the civil rights movement in his second term.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The answer addresses the issue of the Supreme Court with sufficient, though not extensive, evidence. The role of the presidents is examined, with a clear comparison made between Truman's positive actions and Eisenhower's more detached view of civil rights. The separate roles of the FEPC and the NAACP are both understood, and the candidate reaches a clear evaluative judgement at the end of the answer. Sufficient range and accuracy of material allows for a low Level 5 award.

## **Question 10**

Most candidates were aware that the achievements of Black Power were mixed, and that social and cultural benefits derived from their activities, even if political progress appeared to have been halted by the loss of goodwill from the political establishment. Candidates understood the importance of key individuals such as Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael and their promotion of a separate black identity. Many viewed the Black Panthers in a positive light, noting the importance of the 'patrol the pigs' campaign and highlighting the Panthers' highly developed educational, social and medical programmes, many of which were funded by Jimi Hendrix and other leading black figures. Some telling points were made by those who argued that some indirect political gain resulted from Black Power violence since it made the authorities and white liberals more willing to listen to the voices of moderation that the radicals were replacing.

## **Question 11**

Previous reports, along with almost all textbooks, make it very clear that Korea is not in south-east Asia. Nonetheless, many candidates, who also ignored the chronology in the question of 'the 1950s', wrote exclusively on the Korean War and thus gained little or no credit. Others, also ignoring the chronology, wrote on Vietnam in the Kennedy and Johnson years, which was not relevant. The question covered material in the second and third bullet points in the specification: the situation in south-east Asia between 1950 and 1954; and escalating US participation in the conflict in Vietnam under three successive presidents. Many candidates noted the importance of the collapse of French power in the region by 1954, and Eisenhower's decision to support the Diem regime simply because Diem was anti-communist: the dictatorial and corrupt nature of his regime was overlooked, or at least tolerated. Effective answers supplied detailed knowledge of what the Americans were trying to achieve, while less able responses relied more on general impressions. Some noted the creation of SEATO, and its role in allowing US forces to intervene in south-east Asia. Some of the more able answers observed that, in the late 1950s, Eisenhower took the critical step of sending 1500 US advisers to help train the ARVN, beginning a process of military involvement that would be escalated under Kennedy and Johnson.

## Question 12

Answers noted the domino and quagmire theories, and the importance of the Truman Doctrine, and that both Kennedy and Johnson had to counter Republican claims that they were 'soft on communism'. Kennedy's intervention was perhaps less well known than Johnson's, and some mistakenly suggested that, since Kennedy and Diem were both Catholics, the US President felt duty bound to support his co-religionist. More able candidates showed how specific developments inside Vietnam affected US presidents. The ARVN's military failings, notably at Ap Bac in 1963, Diem's assassination later the same year, and the Gulf of Tonkin incident of 1964 were all used to explain why US involvement increased. Several noted that Johnson's policies in 1963-64 were influenced by the presidential election, but only a few made the point that the sending of ground troops in 1965 changed the nature of the conflict dramatically. While most were aware of the importance of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, several answers mistakenly suggested that the Tet offensive of 1968 only increased US involvement. Domestic pressures from hawkish advisers, against the background of a generally supportive public, were also made relevant.

There are many different reasons why both President Kennedy and ~~Eisenhower~~ <sup>Johnson</sup> was unable to avoid increasing US involvement. One reason <sup>that</sup> both President Kennedy and Johnson was unable to avoid US involvement is the idea of commitment trap. Both presidents were trapped in the commitment made by their predecessor. The commitment made by ~~John~~ Eisenhower made it difficult for Kennedy to avoid involvement. In 1961 there was around 800 advisors in Vietnam sent by the previous president Eisenhower, which increased to 12,000 by 1962 and 17,000 by 1963. Similarly, President Johnson was trapped in the commitment and increasing involvement made by President Kennedy, where he increased the number of military advisors to 17,000. This can be linked back to the Quagmire Theory as

(This page is for your second answer.) more the US got involved ~~the~~ it became much harder for the successive President to get out of the war. President Johnson was the first one to send in ground troops, in 1964 it was 35,000 which increased to 200,000 by the end of 1965. It can arguably said that both President increased US involvement in Vietnam as the president didn't want to seen as the one who lost the war.

Another reason could be that the idea of domino theory. Both president increased US involvement as they didn't want Vietnam to turn communist which could have triggered neighbouring countries such as Laos, Cambodia, Thailand ~~turning~~ turning into communist. Both president had the same ideology to contain communist. This can be linked to 'loss of china' as US didn't increase any involvement in china; led to a country governed by a communist Mao. Both President was unable to avoid the US involvement as they didn't want Vietnam to be under the Chinese and Soviet threat. Both President felt the duty to protect any country under the threat of Communism.

Another reason why both president Kennedy and Johnson was unable to avoid US involvement is the

public support. During the 1960s there was many support for the war in Vietnam. However, it can be argued that they increased US interest for their self interest. ~~But~~ They might want ~~to~~ to show that they are still the most powerful nation in the world. However, it can also be argued that both president didn't want to be the ~~the~~ one that had lost the war.

Overall, I think the most important reason why both president ~~of~~ Kennedy and Johnson were unable to avoid US involvement was the idea of commitment trap. Kennedy was trapped by the commitment shown by Truman and Eisenhower while President Johnson was trapped in the committed shown by President Kennedy. Similarly, the idea of ~~comm~~ quagmire theory is also important as the successive presidents got more involved. When the President tried their policy to get out the more they get ~~trap~~ involved in Vietnam. Domino Theory is also important as both president did not want Vietnam to communist as it would have triggered in other neighbouring country to turn communist.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The answer's analysis centres on a consideration of the commitment trap and the quagmire and domino theories, though supporting evidence is lacking in security and accurate development. The importance of public support for the war is not made very clear. The lack of developed and relevant information makes for a high Level 3 award overall.

### **Question 13**

Relevant material is very substantial, and candidates were credited for studying particular aspects of social and cultural change within the context of wider trends. Many addressed matters such as women's rights, gay power, popular culture and sport. A small number seemed unsure of the nature of social change and wrote on culture wars only with respect to Democratic liberals and the Republican Party's Religious Right: the focus of their answers and the range of material offered were both therefore limited. Others mistook the demands of the question and wrote exclusively on successive presidents. The development of women's rights was well known, including the National Organisation of Women and the importance of the Roe v Wade ruling. Gay rights were investigated in some detail overall, with Clinton's 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy frequently cited. There was a variety of approaches to cultural change. Some identified and analysed broad trends such of the growth of cable television and its influence on programming in general, though more might have been made of the national and global significance of MTV and CNN. Candidates were less assured on changes in the film industry, whether on the popularity of Vietnam War films in the 1970s or the growing number of films with sexually explicit content. Some answers included only generalised information with little explanation, whether on South Park, the Simpsons or prominent exponents of rap culture. Too many believed that black sports and music stars are a recent phenomenon, which unfairly ignored the earlier successes of people such as Josephine Baker, Joe Louis, Jesse Owens and Count Basie. Many referred to the social and cultural changes experienced by black Americans, but also pointed out the importance of Cesar Chavez in fighting for social improvement for Hispanic Americans, and the important advances made by Native American Indians. The more able answers considered the extent to which social and cultural change might be considered dramatic, noting that change in the northern cities was often not accompanied by change in the southern states.

### **Question 14**

Most answers remained focused on both the demands of the question and the timespan of 1981-2001. Some adopted a thematic approach by investigating lower taxes and then free markets: this approach was rarely successful. Most, however, were strictly chronological in their approach and investigated the policies of the three successive presidents, Reagan, George HW Bush, and Clinton. The policies known as 'Reaganomics' were known well, and candidates often explained that the sustained economic growth of his presidency was accompanied by a budget deficit which had reached worrying levels by 1989. Bush's promise, 'Read my lips, no new taxes', was often used to explain his defeat in 1992, but many failed to explain how far he maintained the principles of the free market. Knowledge of Clinton's policies and the significant economic growth experienced during his two terms in office, was often extensive, but few placed his success within the context of the creation of NAFTA and the growth of global trade overall. In considering the extent to which the economic policies of these years triumphed, many pertinently wrote that it all depended on where you were. They contrasted the families who struggled on low wages and food stamps with the growing number of very rich Americans for whom the free market could be considered a triumph.



## Paper Summary

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

- Do not attempt to limit your revision by trying to predict questions or by producing model answers based on past questions. This may lead to a lack of choice or a lack of focus on the demands made by the question.
- Try to analyse causation by using a variety of different methods. This year the factors which influence causation have been largely addressed with confidence. Differentiation between candidates' answers has often arisen when candidates come to evaluate and weigh up the relative significance of conditional against contingent factors and then suggest which factor seems the most important.
- Try to understand issues concerning change and continuity over the whole timescale of your period of study. Consider how things stayed the same, how they changed and, most importantly, why change did or did not take place.
- Develop the skill of using appropriate historical terms with fluency and use these in your answers where appropriate.
- Plan your answer beforehand. This will help you to organise your thoughts before you start to write.
- Familiarise yourself with the format of the examination booklet. You should begin your first answer on page 4 and your second on page 12. On each of these pages you should place a cross to indicate which answer you have chosen. Knowing the format of the examination in advance should help to relieve the stress of the examination overall.

## 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>

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



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