

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE History 9HI0 2E

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_2E_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Candidates from across the ability range were able to engage effectively with the A Level paper 2E which deals with Mao's China, 1949-76 (2E.1) and The German Democratic Republic, 1949-90 (2E.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second-order concepts: cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated.

Significantly, examiners continue to note that a number of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. This appears to have become more marked again this year. Candidates are reminded that examiners can only give credit for what they can read. Similarly, examiners have remarked on the increasing use of shorthand and abbreviations in candidates' answers, which often hinder meaning and spoil the flow of an argument, though this appears to have become less noticeable this year.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It continues to be disappointing to have to note that a number of candidates do not explicitly address the focus of the enquiry, but rather discuss issues arising from the sources in general terms. This question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and most candidates are now able to deal with this reasonably well. Approaches to how it is approached do vary, but that is perfectly acceptable, as long as it is present. Some candidates still continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or, on occasion, no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. These were not always weaker candidates; some answers were seen that were strong in bullet points 1 and 3 of the mark scheme, but had very little that could be credited for bullet point 2. The impact of this was to hold down the marks that were achievable in this question.

In Section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second-order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or alternatively shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. It continues to be the case that there are a number of responses that have a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering

a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates continue to need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

Question 1

Responses to this question came from across the ability range but there were many strong and impressive answers that accessed top L4 and L5 marks. These were able to develop inferences from both sources with regard to reaction in China to the death of Mao and added to these with impressive, focused contextual knowledge. From Source One, for example, many candidates noted the claims made by the CCP with regards to Mao's achievements and tested these against their own knowledge of his record since 1949. It was common for candidates to use, in combination, the observation made in Source Two about the reaction of older people in rural areas, that appeared to back up the claims made in Source One. In considering the weight that the evidence of the sources could bear in relation to the enquiry, candidates frequently made valid comments on the origins of Source One in particular, but there were some excellent appraisals of Source Two's value to the enquiry as well, with regard to the author's previous life as a Red Guard for example.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources, a problem caused by rushed reading perhaps but one which affected candidates' ability to engage with the enquiry. Many wrote extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources, often along stereotypical lines, without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement. A significant minority of candidates did not consider the utility of the sources at all.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

to an extent

Both of the sources are valuable in investigating the reaction towards the death of Mao. They both depict the mood of mourning that was imminent after his death, with different viewpoints being made across the country. * Source 1 is from the official CCP Central Committee obituary of Chairman Mao, which we would expect to celebrate the life and works of Chairman Mao, whilst Source 2 is an extract from the memoirs of Liang Heng who was a member of Mao's Red Guards, despite the fact that his family lived in repression in the 1950s and 1960s. This shows that there is a clear difference in reaction from the CCP and the ~~was~~ general public. * new paragraph

Source 1 starts off by praising Mao as a figure who was adored and loved by the public and Party members. This is shown in the quote, "the esteemed and beloved great leader of our Party... and the people of all nationalities in our country".

This quote shows that the CCP believed (or were made to believe) that Mao was adored by all during his time as leader, however, this is untruthful and misleading. Mao had banished and neglected many nationalities including those from Tibet and Taiwan. Furthermore, to call Mao a 'wise leader' could also be seen as misleading, as he actually created more problems than he solved, which led to dire consequences such as, an economic depletion/stagnation^{and} mass killings through starvation and malnutrition. This source can be seen as a mode of indoctrination, painting Mao as a great leader who did no wrong, ~~and~~ which is far from the truth. In summary, ~~the~~ Source 1 isn't as valuable as Source 2 for the historian, as it doesn't paint the full picture of ~~now~~ the reaction to Mao's death, as it is seen as painting the positive aspect of Mao, and hiding the negatives.

Source 2 talks about the reactions of the older workers who had been present during the height of Mao's time

as leader, and clearly depicts the image of mourning, similarly found in Source 1. This is seen in the quote, "The older workers who had lived in ~~old~~ old China were perhaps the saddest of all of us". The quote essentially explains the idea that there was a section of society that were truly upset at the passing of Mao, however, it is important to note that these old workers lived in a time where propaganda and indoctrination tactics were very prevalent, and so, it can be argued that these workers might've been indoctrinated to the point where they felt emotional at the death of Mao. This is clear in the quote, "I just couldn't seem to make myself cry". The quote highlights the difference between the older workers and the younger people, as the older people were ~~proba~~ loyal to Mao through the ups and downs, whilst the younger people did not build a genuine relationship with Mao. Overall, Source 2 could be used to investigate the reaction of Mao's death, as it shows the contrast between the older and younger people and how they felt about the death of

Mao.

However, it is clear that both sources can be used by an historian to investigate the reaction towards Mao's death as they both highlight the idea that the people were grateful for Mao's leadership in their lives. Source 1 depicts that Mao was the reason for every positive aspect of the Chinese individual's life in the quote, "All the victories of the Chinese people have been achieved under the leadership of Chairman Mao". Similarly, in Source 2, the extract shows that the older people are grateful for the leadership of Mao in creating a better life for them. This is seen in the quote, "Most of the older people felt that Chairman Mao's socialism had brought them a better life". This quote shows the idea that the older people (through indoctrination) were made to believe that their lives had been ^{made} better ~~through~~ through the leadership of Mao, which shares similarities with Source 1. This ^{shows} ~~means~~ that both sources

could be used together as they both depict a mood of mourning and gratitude towards Mao.

In conclusion, the historian, to an extent, can make use of Sources 1 and 2 together to investigate the reaction in China to the death of Mao, as they both depict a similar mood of gratitude shown to Mao and his leadership, however it is important to note that Source 2 shows more of a contrast in the reactions between the older and younger people in China, who would've experienced different lives under Mao, whilst Source 1, shows more ~~of~~ praise and gratitude to Mao and doesn't accurately show the full story.



Throughout this answer, the candidate makes reasoned inferences from the source material with regard to the reaction to Mao's death. The sense of interrogating the sources can be seen most clearly reference to Source Two, where they talk about 'the contrast between the younger and the older people', and in the following paragraph, where the candidate uses the sources together to comment on 'the idea that the people were for Mao's leadership.' In addition, the candidate uses their contextual knowledge to discuss the limitations of what can be gained from Source One, for example with reference to Mao's record, commenting that the source is 'painting the positive aspects... and hiding the negatives.' Also, in paragraph three, the candidate shows some understanding of the values and concerns of the society from which Source Two is drawn, when they talk about the 'old workers' (who had a more positive attitude towards Mao) living 'in a time when propaganda and indoctrination tactics were very prevalent'. Finally, the candidate uses valid criteria as they address the weight the evidence will bear in coming to a judgement. This draws on the observations made concerning the provenance of the two sources earlier in the answer; however the judgement as a whole is weakly substantiated. As a result, this answer was awarded a top L4 mark.

Question 2

This question was often answered very well indeed. Many of the better answers clearly identified the various reasons suggested in Source Three for the increase in emigration from the GDR in 1989, and used their contextual knowledge to consider the validity of the claims made. There were, for example, perceptive comments made with regard to the rigidity of the labour market in East Germany and the ambitions of emigrants to pursue more fulfilling careers in the West. From Source Four, many made valid inferences on the various 'pull' factors pertaining to emigration, perhaps the possibility of reuniting families divided by the Wall. With regard to provenance, meanwhile, candidates often referred to the veracity of the evidence given in Source Three as a West German newspaper, though many comments often appeared stereotypical or generic.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources, a problem caused by rushed reading perhaps but one which affected candidates' ability to engage with the enquiry. Many wrote extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources often along stereotypical lines without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement. A significant minority of candidates lacked any engagement with the utility of the sources.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

A historian could make significant use of sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the reason for the increase in emigration from the GDR into FRG in 1989.

Source 3, comprises various testimonies from East German emigrants published in a West German newspaper in October 1989, is useful for understanding the push factors for emigration. The experiences of individuals like the 2 refugees who "didn't even see ~~a~~ bodyguards" and the skilled baker who stated "I'll go anywhere I want a job" directly highlights the urgent incentive for leaving the GDR.

The testimonies make an explicit point on economic discontent as a critical reason. Their observation that "The GDR is stagnating: nothing is progressing here" underscores the economic hardships and perceived lack of opportunity within the ~~the~~ GDR, thus why many sought better living standards and employment prospects in a more prosperous FRG.

Furthermore, although not explicitly stating political persecution ~~many many~~

the implication that "people are likely to be nosey" can be linked to the repressive nature of of the communist regime and lack of individual freedoms. The ease with which some crossed the border, due to Hungary opening its border indicates the changing political landscape of 1989 which facilitated the movement.

Finally, the young long-haired blond man's statement; "I can say to that is the West just for material reasons, then they're wrong. All I can say to that is that just one month living in the GDR would be enough for somebody to understand" strongly suggests a deep-seated social disillusionment with life in the GDR beyond economic concerns. This reflects a broader societal malaise, including limited choices and a general feeling of suffocation.

However, historians must consider the limitations of source 3. As a collection of testimonies published in a West-German newspaper, it can carry some bias. West German media will naturally highlight the negative aspects of the GDR to justify the influx of refugees while also promoting the FRG's democratic and economic model. The individuals

quoted are those who successfully emigrated, their experiences may not be representative of all GDR citizens or those who chose to stay. Also, they are personal anecdotes, they lack a statistical or structural analysis.

Source 4's "Instructions for Germans arriving from the GDR", the leaflet issued by the FRG's interior ministry offers important insight into the pull factors drawing emigrants to West Germany and the practical realities they faced upon arrival.

The leaflet's welcoming tone and assurances of assistance "The Federal Gov't... have made provisions... you will soon find a new home here" directly addresses the anxieties of potential emigrants, by providing strong incentives. This includes immediate transport, financial aid, application forms for immigration and help with unemployment and housing. These measures were made to facilitate the integration of GDR citizens into the FRG, making the prospect of emigration more appealing, less daunting.

The very existence, and distribution of such leaflets "some being distributed in the GDR itself" demonstrates the FRG's active role in encouraging and managing the emigration process. Confirming that West Germany was not only a desirable destination

but also a supportive one, ready for the influx of people.

The limitations of source 4 include its inherent purpose as a propaganda tool. It outlines the support available, but it is designed to attract emigrants and may downplay potential difficulties or the long-term challenges of integration. It does not explain why people were leaving the GDR, only what awaited them on arrival. Reflecting the FRG's perspective, not necessarily the internal motivations of the emigrants themselves.

Together, source 3 and 4 provide ~~powerful~~ ~~narrative~~ substantial insight into the reasons for increased emigration, illustrating both the 'push' and 'pull' factors. Source 3 highlights internal GDR motivations like economic stagnation and social disillusionment, while source 4 demonstrates the attractive support systems and practical assistance offered by the FRG. Their combined utility reveals that emigration was both a flight from GDR shortcomings and a deliberate move towards perceived Western prosperity, actively facilitated by the FRG.

So the historian must integrate ~~extensive~~ contextual ~~know~~ ~~on~~ their own knowledge to fully

investigate these reasons. For example; the political opening across ~~western~~ Eastern Europe in 1989. Including the decision by Hungary to open its borders with Austria in May and then fully in September, creating new escape routes. This event, ~~it~~ indirectly referenced in source 3, was fundamental as it bypassed the heavily guarded Inner German Border and the Berlin Wall. The USSR's ~~attempt~~ non-intervention policy under Gorbachev; 'the Sinatra Doctrine' prevented a military crackdown on these movements. Alongside this, growing internal dissent within the GDR itself was paramount. The escalating Monday Demonstrations in Leipzig for example gained significant momentum throughout 1989. The protests, included demand for 'Wir bleiben hier!' (We are staying here) demonstrate a desire for reform and freedom that directly mirrored the disillusionment expressed in source 3. The ageing GDR authority's inability to effectively suppress these movements broke down the regime's legitimacy and control.

We also ~~know~~ confirm the economic decline of the GDR as it was burdened ~~to~~ with massive debt, had outdated industries and suffered with constant shortages of essential consumer goods. Contrasting the FRG's "economic miracle" making emigration more alluring.

The dissatisfaction was further fueled by continuous exposure to western t.v. and radios which provided a direct and aspirational comparison with life in the FRG. Furthermore the hardline and aging Erich Honecker resisted all meaningful reforms and proved ~~a~~ incapable of addressing the ~~na~~ economic and political crises.

To conclude, while source 3₂ and 4 offer complementary insight into both push and pull factors, their use is maximised with contextualisation, to allow a nuanced understanding of this historical period.



One of the notable features of this answer is the confidence with which the candidate interrogates the evidence of the sources to make reasoned inferences. For example, in the first paragraphs, they note the 'push factors' for emigration and the 'urgent incentive' that motivated some emigrants. They draw out 'economic' and other factors for the increase in the number crossing into the FRG, and that a 'broader societal malaise including limited choices and a general feeling of suffocation' was behind the decision to leave for many East Germans in 1989. There are valid comments on the origins of both sources, but also on the limitations of the evidence presented. The candidate rightly points out, for example, that the evidence in Source Three may be compromised from being from those who 'successfully emigrated' and that these are 'personal anecdotes' with nothing to suggest how typical they are. This critical tone is also applied to Source Four, where they note that the leaflet was specifically designed 'to attract emigrants and may play down the long-term challenges of emigration.' Contextual knowledge is used effectively (e.g. with reference to the better living standards and employment prospects' of the FRG and the 'changing political landscape of 1989'). It is clear that the candidate is well informed of the issues raised in the two sources and is aware of the values and concerns of the society from which the sources are drawn though it is only right at the end of the answer that more knowledge is displayed, and this is hardly integrated into the argument. Overall, this answer was given a mid L5 mark.

Question 3

This was a popular essay question, and it was often done very well with a variety of arguments being made. Many candidates had extensive and detailed knowledge of the range of ways in which the CCP benefited from participation in the Korean War, the Party being able to use it as cover to strengthen its control domestically, for example through the various campaigns of the early 1950s. Many often went on to look at how participation also benefited others in China such as the reputations of Mao personally and/or the PLA for example, and argued convincingly that the War certainly impacted many ordinary people negatively, perhaps because of the heavy losses in battle. Others argued just as persuasively, that not even the CCP truly benefited from the War given the economic damage done to China by participation and the souring of its relations with both the USSR and the USA.

Many weaker answers lacked range and depth of knowledge, and their answers were often imprecise and lacking accuracy. Judgements tended to assertion without being supported by the evidence presented.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☐

Question 5 ☐ Question 6 ☐

The Korean war allowed China to be viewed as competent and strong using its military, but its cost meant that every other aspect of China did not benefit from it. The CCP was able to use the Korean war to eliminate its opponents effectively but the economy suffered due to China's participation.

Some historians may argue ~~that the CCP did benefit~~ it was the only benefactor of the Korean war. Mao's plan to eliminate rightist opponents emerged as part of the Resist America, Aid Korea campaign. Over 800,000 people were killed, which

reinforced the strength of the CCP. Furthermore, Chinese intervention in an international proxy war uplifted the government's image as ~~a~~ having great military powers. By resisting America, China cemented itself as a formidable communist state alongside the USSR. The increase of China's reputation reinforces ~~of~~ the CCP as the sole ~~benefactor~~ benefactor of the Korean War.

However, it could be argued that the CCP did not benefit from the Korean War ~~because~~. The government designated 70% of state budget to the military, ~~which~~ contributing to the ailing economy which would mostly impact peasants and farmers.

negatively. The Korean War cost China around \$10 billion in total, meaning it was a waste of government resources, not benefitting the CCP at all.

~~It could alter~~

Alternatively, it could be argued that the CCP was the sole benefactor because everyone else suffered. China had contributed over 1 million soldiers to the war, and 400,000 had died in combat. Despite military aid from the USSR, the huge loss of life of the Korean War ~~made it~~ ~~was a huge~~ negatively impacted everyone. ~~to the~~

Even Mao's son died during the ~~the~~ Korean war, proving that only the CCP's image benefited from the war.

It is clear that the CCP was the sole benefactor of the Korean war. The human and economic cost negatively affected most people. ~~at~~ The ability to eliminate the Rightist opponents of the CCP was greatly beneficial to Mao's regime, in terms of establishing power. The Korean war also solidified China as a great communist state alongside the USSR. The Korean war even strengthened the Sino-Soviet pact as China received military aid. Overall, the Korean war was a huge drain on resources, but greatly

beneficial for the image of
the CCP to instill patriotism
within China and respect
within its peers.



In this response, the candidate focuses clearly on some of the key features raised by the question throughout their answer (for example in paragraph two, where different means by which the CCP was strengthened by participation in the War are explained). The knowledge displayed is sufficient to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and meets most of its demands (details of the extent of the financial burden placed on the PRC is an example). In coming to a judgement, the candidate considers the central issues in the introduction and establishes criteria for judgement in the last paragraph by considering the benefits accruing to the CCP in eliminating its opponents, against the economic costs of the War. Overall, the answer is generally well organised, advancing its argument coherently and clearly throughout with support and challenge to the given statement. As a result, it was given a mid L4 mark.

Question 4

This was the less popular essay question on Paper 2E.1 and there was a range of responses from across the ability range. Some very good answers had an impressive knowledge of developments in Chinese agriculture in the years 1949-57 and were able to assess, convincingly, the degree to which the problems inherited by the CCP following the Civil War were addressed in this period. Thus, for example, many argued that for all the ideological and organisational changes of the early 1950s, from peasant proprietorship to MATs and, ultimately, cooperatives and communes, production and efficiency levels improved, but did not do so significantly, hence the need for still greater reform.

Weaker candidates knew something of the reforms and organisational changes made to Chinese agriculture in the early 1950s, though this was often patchy and imprecise. Above all, however, a significant number of candidates did not correctly identify the limitations placed on them by the time period specified in the question. As a result, many wrote extensively about the agricultural changes introduced in China as part of the Great Leap Forward after 1957 and/or wrongly attributed the Four Pests Campaign or the Great Famine to the early 1950s. This resulted in large parts of their answers being irrelevant to the question.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

To a certain extent the problems faced by Chinese agriculture in 1949 been overcome by 1957 since China faced many issues when trying to revolutionise their agricultural system. By 1957 the whole agricultural system had changed and China was able to get rid of their problems they had in 1949.

In 1949, right after the Chinese civil war where Mao's Communists won the war against Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists, The CCP took control of China which was a success for Mao but also he unfortunately had to inherit a ~~very~~ poor failing economy with many issues such as hyperinflation due to the nationalists printing too much money, damaged infrastructure and more specifically in terms of agriculture a scorched earth and low agricultural production levels. When Mao inherited this agricultural problem he knew what he had to. Mao had the aim to revive China's agricultural system and he started off by introducing voluntary collectivisation where households of 10-15 could share their agricultural belongings amongst each other to help increase and push agricultural production. This was his initial step to improve Chinese agriculture known as the Mutual Aid Teams. Here it was

willing to start with and families still had ownership in 1951 when the Mutual Aid Teams were introduced.

Then the following year, Mao was feeling impatient and wanted to hasten the production of agriculture in China. And so, By 1952 he introduced APC's which are Agricultural Producers Co-operatives enforcing a much larger collectivisation in China where ~~more~~ more than 20 households ~~would~~ would share their land and combine it so that agricultural production would now become more efficient. By 1953, 10-15 million households were already involved in these APC's and compared to the levels of agricultural production in 1949, Chinese agricultural has made not a large ~~much~~ increase but a great amount of agricultural improvement has been made which was around a 6% increase in agricultural output from 1949-1953.

However, the agricultural production levels still weren't up to Mao's standard as he was very ambitious to improve agriculture and take it from its challenges in 1949 and make it greater. Which is why 1953 Mao launched his first five year plan with the aim to make China self-sufficient in agriculture and create China as this global superpower ~~by~~ enforcing his policy of collectivisation all over China. Despite slight increases in agricultural production numbers they weren't enough to feed the whole of China's workforce more specifically it's industrial workforce. Mao knew this which is why he decided in 1955 to push through with forced collectivisation

and went on ahead to make speeches to encourage the people of China to join him in revolutionising China's agricultural system leading to by the end of 1955 75 million families joining the APC's which would later be called HPC since these ~~household~~ collectives would now have hundreds of households working together to increase agriculture in China, which eventually started to increase the level of China's agricultural output.

~~However,~~ However, this is to an extent since Mao's agricultural reforms were not effective enough to make a huge entire change to agriculture since Mao's collectivisation did not exactly go fully to plan. This is evident since in later years passed 1957 China suffered large agricultural problems and famine proving that the reforms Mao was making during the time between 1949 - 1957 wouldn't be enough to save China from its agricultural problems since these problems would worsen down the line.

Overall, to an extent the reforms made by Mao from 1949 to 1957 did manage to overcome a few problems they were facing agriculturally however Mao's reforms only led to these agricultural problems worsening later down the line. Meaning that to an extent the problems these agricultural problems had not been overcome.



This response addresses some of the key issues relevant to the question and includes knowledge sufficient to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question, and meet most of its demands. However, it tends to deal mostly with the process of agricultural reorganisation and lacks some depth. Certainly the answer is well organised and the argument is communicated with clarity. Valid criteria are established in the process of coming to a judgement. Overall, it was given a mid L4 mark.

Question 5

This was the less popular of the two essay questions on Paper 2E.2. Most answers focused clearly on the various factors that led to the creation of the GDR in 1949, most commonly those relating to the breakdown in relations between East and West in the years preceding, for example, the growing cohesion of the western zones and eventual creation of the FRG. Others placed emphasis on the influence of the USSR under Stalin, which gave the final decision on the creation of the GDR. Where even good answers were often less convincing was in evidencing the role of the SED in this process. Beyond some descriptions of the role of Ulbricht on his return to Germany following the War and the SED's creation as a 'merger' between the KPD and SPD, many candidates seemed unsure of how the SED paved the way for the creation of the GDR by, for example, asserting control of civil society in the East during the late 1940s and removing potential opponents.

The weaker responses tended to lack precise knowledge of the issues raised by the question. Some also paid little attention to the date in the question and wrote extensively about the manner in which the SED ruled the GDR during the 1950s.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

The GDR was formed in October of 1949 ~~after~~ as a response to a series of moves brought about after the end of World War Two in 1945. The four Powers, Britain, France, US and the USSR met at Yalta in 1945 where they agreed that Germany would be split into 4 zones, each power occupying a different sector of Germany; Berlin being located within the USSR's zone of occupation. It was further decided at Potsdam in 1946 that Berlin would also be split into zones, each being occupied by the different powers. This distribution of land is one reason for the ~~production of~~ establishment of the GDR. Additionally, other factors contributed to its creation such as the differing ideological differences between the zones which can be represented during the Berlin blockade in 1948 and the Berlin Airlift which followed. ~~Despite this,~~ These two factors catalysed the ideological differences between the East and the West, especially when the West merged their zones to one, producing the foundations for the two separate states, ultimately acting as a core role in the formation of the GDR. Although the creation

of the Socialist Unity Party (SED) played a vital role in ~~not~~ centrally controlling the state, making it both economically and ideologically different. The actions of the western powers ultimately created the foundations for two ideologically different states, leaving the SED no choice but to create the GDR (German Democratic Republic (GDR).)

The SED was formed when ~~two parties, the SPD and the KPD~~ + 600,000 members of the KPD merged with 700,000 members of the SPD, despite the efforts of Ulbricht's Group who returned to Germany after being banished to Moscow during the Second World War for being communist. They returned in order to promote the KPD in attempts to get people to vote for them so Soviet owned areas of Germany could adopt communist ideals. However, in the vote, they lost, with the SPD winning the majority of the vote (90%). Despite their victory, the two parties merged in 1967 to produce the SED to prevent two ^{left-wing} socialist parties competing for votes; the public did not want to retreat back to hardline capitalist values which had been under during Nazi Germany. Consequently, the SED was formed, ~~many people often joined to further their careers~~ After it was established, the party being

headed by Ulbricht, the party was urged to remove any individuals who were part of the SPD prior to the merge and any individuals who joined the party just to further their career. Ulbricht wanted a party which was wholly committed to the communist ideals. This was an extremely successful process, ~~not~~ in the long term, with the SED being unwaveringly communist up until the collapse of the GDR in 1990 when some Politburo members wished for reunification. This establishes how the SED, now heavily communist, was a state ideologically different from the other allied powers zone's which arguably led to the creation of a the GDR, separate from the west.

However, it would be naive to suggest the formation of the GDR was primarily due to the creation of the role of the SED. Despite having huge long term impacts, arguably the creation of Bizonia in 1946 ~~angered the Soviets, Stalin believed~~ created initiated the resentment between the Western allies and the Soviets, reducing the likelihood of a united Germany, leading to the creation of the GDR and FRG. ~~Bizonia was~~ Bizonia was a production of Britain and the United States ~~areas of~~ owned zones of Germany, creating a large, shared

area. This angered Stalin as it was decided without consulting the Soviets, it was also later expanded to Trizonia to include ~~France's zone~~ France's zone of occupation. ~~This~~ To Stalin, the head of the USSR, this was seen as a deliberate act against him and the Soviets which produced masses of anger and resentment towards the west. This ~~was further~~ was worsened when the western zones created a new currency, the Deutschmark (DM) making the two zones both ideologically and economically separated, strengthening the divide between the two zones. The divide can also be emphasised when the highly Anti-Soviet President Truman gained power. He announced the policy of containment during the Truman Doctrine, announcing support would be given to a state to prevent it from turning to communism. This was supported by the Marshall Plan where \$13 bil was given to countries that needed it.

Arguably, the breaking point, solidifying the divide between the two zones was the Berlin blockade in 1948. This was when Stalin blocked all land routes ~~from~~ between the West's ~~owned~~ sector of Berlin and the West's zone of Germany. ^{3 days after the ~~plans~~ was announced.} This meant that ~~no~~ ~~resources~~ and

The West couldn't transport any supplies or food to their aimed sector of Berlin. The West responded peacefully, due to risk of war, and sent planes full of supplies. Despite the planes operating in awful conditions and poor runways, with workers working long, tireless hours, at its peak, the Berlin Airlift transported 6,000 tonnes of supplies a day, with a plane landing every second. After rumors spread of one of the US Planes carrying a bomb, the blockade was dropped, after 323 days. This emphasises the West's desire to keep their zone of occupation, showing no signs of giving up, creating a united Germany. Much to the surprise of Stalin who heavily stripped their East zone of supplies, with over $\frac{1}{2}$ of their train tracks being taken as compensation for war damage; 25 million Soviet lives lost during the war. The inability for the West to back down led to the realization that the two zones would remain separate. This led to the creation of the FRG in May 1949, closely followed by the GDR in October 1949.

To conclude, despite the SED producing the building blocks for Communism in the Eastern zones of occupation, it was the role of the Western states who were arguably more

significant in the formation of the GDR, even Stalin himself anticipated a reunited Germany. The creation of a new currency acted as a final straw, finalising the idea that the GDR would exist as a separate state. It was the West who initiated the West divide, the SED simply responded with the creation of the GDR in response to the creation of the FRG in order to continue to survive.



Here, the candidate provides a range of key issues relevant to the question, that is reasons for the creation of the GDR in 1949. It certainly provides knowledge sufficient to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. However, it is less convincing when discussing the main factor, the role of the SED, than it is when considering the others. Therefore, while the answer is communicated with clarity and precision and valid criteria are established in coming to a judgement, it was given a top L4 mark rather than anything higher.

Question 6

This was the more popular of the essay questions for Paper 2E.2. There were a variety of approaches taken and there were many impressive answers. The best were able to sustain their focus on the various differences and similarities between the GDR under Ulbricht and Honecker. Most agreed that the fundamentals of communist rule were the same under both, for example the emphasis on the command economy, the control of the population through censorship and propaganda, and the Stasi. Such answers went on to argue, however, that most of the key differences were in emphasis, for example how policy under Honecker paid more attention to the quality of life of East Germans, or prioritised better relations with the FRG. The better responses were able to respond specifically to the degree of difference between the two GDRs raised by the word 'very' in the question.

Weaker responses sometimes did not have sufficient precision and sometimes mistook the GDR under Ulbricht for the GDR under Honecker. As a result, their judgements lacked conviction.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

The statement that the GDP was different under the rule of Honecker in the years 1971 to 85 in comparison to Ulbricht in the years 1949 to 71 is ~~correct~~ ^{correct in moderation}. This is through Honecker changing / adjusting prior rules, holidays set by Ulbricht, however still wanting to meet the same objectives.

for example, post war in the GDP Ulbricht ensured that there was a mothers household day once a month due to the double burden of mothers working whilst also having to maintain household chores, due to there being at least 105 : 100 , women : men , showing how the majority of the work force was women. However, Honecker favoured more efficient production and less days off, with Honecker issuing harsher conditions in the work force of longer hours, decreased minimum wage.

harsher punishment for absenteeism and punishment for not meeting production quotas 30%, which were almost impossible to meet. Punishments such as prison time, fines and increased work hours with decreased pay were introduced.

Although, under both Ulbricht and Honecker heavy industry increased with Ulbricht increasing production of Braun coal and pig iron by 2%, as well as Honecker increasing production of steel, iron etc. with both sacrificing consumer goods and living standards in the GDR, leading to consistently raising prices as well as food shortages during Ulbricht with no flour, bread, butter, oil etc.

In comparison, Ulbricht led operation Rose, the building of the Berlin wall whereas Honecker led to its collapse in 1990. Operation Rose was builders working throughout the night putting up fencing and the wall.

to decrease emigration due to individuals living in the East but working in the West. In which Ulbricht put an end to. Whereas, under Honecker emigration began to increase again due to less put down against rebellion and protests, with Honecker sending out the order to allow individuals to pass through the border, being the collapse of the GDR.

Although many rules in relation to working conditions changed, both Honecker and Ulbricht followed the same aim, of meeting the objective of industrialisation, increasing heavy industry, improving agriculture, and keeping up with the FRG. They both did this through creating five year plans, the NSD and central planning. With both Honecker and Ulbricht suffering from failures e.g. central planning led to farmers abandoning 13% of useful land affecting production in the long term.



Here, the candidate focuses throughout on the similarities and differences between the East Germany of Ulbricht and the East Germany of Honecker. For example, they make attempts to compare their attitudes towards women and work, towards industrial policy and towards foreign powers, therefore showing some analysis and attempts to explain links between key features of the period and the question. Similarly, mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included (for example, concerning central planning in the last paragraph) though the material lacks depth and, on occasion, is wrong. The candidate does make a judgement in the first paragraph and attempts are made to establish criteria. For example, it is noted that both leaders were similar in approach by their sacrifice of consumer goods for heavy industrial progress. The evaluation (largely in paragraph one) has some support but is imprecise. Finally, the answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear though coherence and precision are missing in places. Therefore, this answer was given a mid L3 mark.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully and ensure that they explicitly address the focus of the enquiry rather than merely discussing the issues raised by the sources in general terms
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption and make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure that their responses address the demands of all three bullet points that are assessed in this section of the paper.

Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach. This undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely presenting a list of factors
- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both sides of an argument where the question requires this.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

