

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE History 9HI0 38

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_38_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Candidates across the ability range continue to be able to engage effectively with the A Level Paper 38 which deals with The Making of Modern Russia, 1855-1991 (38.1) and The Making of Modern China, 1860-1997 (38.2).

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two enquiries linked to one source. 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. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1).

Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated, although a very small number did not complete their response to Section C. There was again an increase this year in the number of scripts that posed problems for examiners because of the legibility of handwriting. Centres are reminded that examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There was again some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, e.g. the use of 'gov' instead of government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source.

Some candidates continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events, sometimes with only tangential links to what is in the source, in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the source adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. It is disappointing to note that a number of candidates did not explicitly address the focus of at least one of the enquiries or that candidates overlooked some element of the question. Some responses were seen where candidates dismissed one of the enquiries as having no material available for it. This will never be the case. Both enquiries always have some relevant material, even though it is not necessarily always balanced.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second-order concept that was being targeted by the question and shaped their responses appropriately to meet the demands of the question. It continues to be the case that a number of responses were seen that had a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were very impressive in dealing with 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 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.

In Section C, most candidates were able to engage with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. This is a breadth question and the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded again that this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology.

Question 1

There were some very impressive responses to this question. Overall, most candidates found it easier to address the second enquiry (with regard to the immediate priorities of the Bolshevik government) than to the first (the way the Bolsheviks came to power) though all at least attempted to examine both to some degree. Many noted, for example, that the Bolsheviks had come to power by overthrowing the Provisional Government and there were some very good examinations, using contextual knowledge, of Lenin's claims in this regard. When examining Lenin's immediate priorities, many inferred his desire to provide 'Peace, Bread and Land' in line with his previous promises, though others also detected a pressing need to secure the support of the armed forces for a government that lacked popular support, certainly outside St Petersburg and Moscow. With reference to the provenance of the source, most wrote something of the nature, purpose and timing of Lenin's proclamation, while stronger answers often pointed out that his need to rally support and stress the legitimacy of his government, led him to over-claim and over-promise.

On the other hand, weaker responses had a less secure understanding of the Bolshevik seizure of power and struggled to make use of the source as a result. Comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the source were often generic and not applied in coming to a judgement on its use to the enquiries specified in 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 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Source 1 is fairly valuable in revealing the way in which the Bolsheviks came to power in Russia 1917 but very valuable to assess the immediate priorities of the new government. Bolshevik strategies to obtain power are less explicitly stated in the source whilst immediate priorities of the new government relating to the war, land reform and working conditions are all addressed to varying degrees in the source. Therefore, whilst the source is slightly valuable to assess the means by which the Bolsheviks came into power, it is even more valuable to understand immediate priorities of the new government.

The source is written by Lenin, leader of the Bolsheviks, just a day after the Bolsheviks came to power in the storming of the Winter Palace on the 25th of October. As leader, we can infer that he would have ~~the~~ a clear idea regarding the immediate priorities of the new government which he hopes to convey strongly in this congress (also due to the fact that congress was called 'under pressure' from the Bolsheviks suggesting perhaps that their seizure of power was not as strong and their control

Still unstable.) The fact that congress was 'dominated' by Bolsheviks further demonstrates how Lenin perhaps intended to make clear the immediate priorities of the new government to be in line with the Bolshevik agenda. The nature of this source is a proclamation, suggesting Lenin wanted to publically portray a strong and stable front to the Russian people when in reality the reason they came to power was not solely due to their own organisation and propaganda but also due to the failings of the provisional government. We can infer that a reason why the Bolsheviks were able to seize the Winter Palace was due to the fact that the provisional government did not control the army due to April's Order No. 1 stating that the Petrograd Soviet (led by Trotsky, who was loyal to the Bolsheviks) was in control of the army so they were not protecting the provisional government. However, whilst the potential purpose of the source ~~is~~ ^{is a} ~~valuable~~ ^{slightly} valuable in assessing the ways in which Bolsheviks came to power, the origin is perhaps limiting in understanding how long the desired immediate priorities of the new government actually took to implement, such as the Treaty to end the war which wasn't signed

until March (the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk where Russia gave $\frac{1}{2}$ of its land, 55 million people and 3 billion rubles in reparations). Therefore, the nature, origin and purpose of the source are fairly valuable in assessing both the ways Bolsheviks came to power and the new government's immediate priorities.

Source 1's content is slightly valuable in revealing ways in which Bolsheviks came to power. Lenin states a 'victorious uprising of the workers and soldiers' took place in Petrograd. Whilst the Bolsheviks did take control of the Winter Palace, it was not perhaps as 'victorious' as Lenin states (potentially due to the fact that Lenin was in exile at the time). We can infer that the Kronstadt sailors and Red Guard cleverly organised by Trotsky seized control in what was perhaps more a shuffle than a storming. Lenin states that the 'majority' of the provisional government was arrested though in reality it was roughly 10 on the 25th. The image which Lenin is projecting of a provisional government being dramatically 'overthrown' is perhaps exaggerative which is valuable as it suggests that Lenin himself understands that other

factors such as failures of the Provisional government resulted in ^{the} Bolsheviks coming to power. We can also infer that if the Mensheviks and social revolutionaries had remained in the Winter Palace the Bolshevik seizure of power may not have been so easy. Lenin appeals to 'workers' and 'soldiers' perhaps as he understands that that is where the provisional government failed.

By the end of the provisional government's leadership 500 factories had closed in ~~the~~ Petrograd and 10,000 people had lost their jobs.

Moreover, 2 million soldiers had deserted the army and come back to the countryside to seize land for themselves and their 'families' who Lenin directly addresses.

This begins to change focus and highlight how source 1 is more valuable in understanding immediate priorities. The direct address to the 'soldiers' families' alludes to the Land Decree of October (which was essentially a paper decree) but still meant that the government condoned the actions of peasants and soldiers who seized land for themselves. However, in addition to appealing to soldiers and peasants, Lenin

addresses the workers of the cities, stating that the 'majority of the soviets of workers' are misrepresented (which we can infer to be false as the constituent assembly vote of January showed only 24% of votes for Bolsheviks and 53% for Social revolutionaries) suggesting that an immediate priority of the new party was beginning to assert political dominance and garner support as they were perhaps aware that they were not in the most stable situation. Lenin's motto from the April Theses 'Peace, Bread and Land' does summarise the immediate priorities and intentions of the new party. Lenin signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk despite knowing it would lead to civil war (emphasising that decision as a priority despite consequences), he also addressed land reform with the land decree and introduced 'complete democracy in the army' with the Abolition of army ranks in December. Therefore, the content of Source 1 is slightly ~~less~~ valuable for assessing how Bolsheviks gained power but very valuable in revealing immediate priorities for the new party.

)

In conclusion, Source 1 is slightly ~~helpful~~^{valuable} in revealing ways in which the Bolsheviks came to power, but very valuable in revealing immediate priorities of the new government. The nature of the source helps to understand the difference in value for different criteria as the Bolsheviks wanted to portray a strong front instead of weak opposition but wanted to garner support by making their immediate intentions clear.



A strength of this answer is that it makes reasoned inferences from the source content with regard to both enquiries. It adds some very good and relevant contextual knowledge to illuminate what can be gained from the source with reference to the question. In evaluation, the candidate makes valid comments on Lenin's purposes in issuing the proclamation at this time, though this is the least secure element of the answer. It was awarded a low L5 mark.

Question 2

This question was often answered very well indeed. The stronger candidates made reasoned inferences with regard to China's position following its defeat in the first Sino-Japanese War and used extensive knowledge of the historical context to illuminate the content of the source. For example, many commented on the loss of territory, the ceding of any claim to Korea and the vast reparations demanded to argue that China was now in a very weak position and had lost any claim to pre-eminence in south-east Asia. When considering the aims of Japan's government, perceptive comments were made about Japanese ambitions to rival the western powers in China. In consideration of the provenance of the source, many noted that it reflected the situation China faced only in the immediate aftermath of defeat, and possibly did not illuminate Japan's wider ambitions in China. Some candidates attempted, however, to evaluate its utility with reference to events (such as the Boxer Rebellion) that could not be expected to be included in a treaty of peace between Japan and China in 1895, an approach that was not valid.

Weaker responses often tended to paraphrase the source content. Comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the source were often generic and not applied in coming to a judgement on its use to the two enquiries.

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 ☒

Source 2 is strong at showing China's position ^{after} of the 1894-95 Sino Japanese War as it accurately highlights what Japan obtained following the Sino-Japanese War. For example, the source refers to the loss of Korea and Taiwan, including the 200 million taels indemnity, to portray China in an extremely weak position. This is extremely as the conservative opposition in China to the self strengthening movement, such as the end of the education overseas scheme in 1881, put China in a position where it was able to be humiliated by Japan, who had undergone successful industrialisation following the 1868 Meiji Revolution. Source 2 is also strong as it acknowledges China's vulnerable position to not only Japan but also Europe. The dynamics of the relationship are accurately hinted at, as Britain were able to sell their goods at a low tariff of just 5%, harming the domestic cottage industry, and powers such as France were able to ~~access~~ obtain Vietnam in the 1880s. Therefore, Source 2 accurately demonstrates the weakness of China relative to Japan, and the existing levels of foreign influence European powers had in 1895 China.

However, as the Treaty of Shimonoseki ended the war in 1895, it is not useful at showing how China's position changed in the years following, particularly the further concessions to European powers towards the end of the decade. For example, in 1896, France gained the ability to lease South-West China and Russia gained the Trans-Siberian Railway and in 1897 Germany gained control of the Shandong Peninsula and Britain obtained a 99 year lease on Hong Kong in 1898. Given the source's date, the source is only useful at showing the Chinese position in the moment in time of the treaty in 1895 and is not extremely useful when analysing how the situation evolved in the aftermath of the treaty. Moreover, it could be argued that the further exploitation was stemmed from the Treaty of Shimonoseki, with the European powers having grown paranoid of Japan's expanding influence.

Given the source's nature as a treaty, it provides an explicit account of the immediate concessions and given its lack of ambiguity, the source is extremely useful at showing how China's position immediately changed. However, given the source's date, it is weakened due to its inability to consider how China's position further worsened.

Given the focus from the source on land concessions, it suggests that the aims of the Japanese in China were based around territorial expansion and imperialism. The source treaty refers to the concession of Tianan and Korea and Liaoning and these concessions being situated near the top of the treaty suggest that they were somewhat of a priority for Japan. This suggestion of imperialism ~~was~~ strengthens the source's value at showing the Japanese intent as Japan were keen to obtain Korea due to its rice, markets to new individuals and ability to develop industry there. Moreover, the Meiji revolution and rapid industrialisation in Japan after 1868 created an internal idea of Japanese invincibility, enforcing their international and imperialistic ambitions. Therefore, the source is valuable at showing the imperialistic ~~so~~ ambition Japan had for China during this time period.

Whilst the source hints at an intention of economic exploitation, it does not acknowledge the partial Japanese intent of economic development. For example, following the war, Japan invested 6 billion yen into industrial progress in the areas of China they occupied. This led to a development in the mining industry and created a growth in wages, which had previously been decimated due to the outflow of silver, and

also led to an increase in trade in the region. Therefore the source arguably inflates the colonial ~~section~~ intent that Japan held in 1895 for China, mitigating the use of the source.

Moreover, as the source is not ~~an~~ a subjective account of a Japanese leader, using the source to evaluate intent is difficult. Even though the treaty would have been negotiated by Japanese officials, the source demonstrates that Japan wanted land and financial concessions, but does not consider why. Therefore the nature of the source, as a treaty, not an explained viewpoint, limits its ability to consider Japanese intent.

Overall, whilst the source shows the harm of to China's position ~~on~~ with regards to primary impacts of the Treaty of Shimonoseki, it does not consider the further deterioration to China from the secondary impacts of the war, such as the triple commitment. Moreover, whilst the ~~source~~ treaty accurately shows Japanese imperialism as a reason for Japanese interest in China, its nature as a treaty and not a view makes intent a challenge to analyse. Therefore whilst the source may be more useful when considering the immediate worsening of China's position, it is weak at showing explicit Japanese intent.



In this answer reasoned inferences are made from the source content with regard to both enquiries and relevant contextual knowledge is used to illuminate what can be gained from the source with reference to the question. A strength of this response is the range of valid comments made about the provenance of the source and the source's use to the enquiry, which are then applied in coming to a judgement. It was awarded a low L5 mark.

Question 3

This was the more popular essay in Section B of Paper 38.1 and there was a range of good answers that scored in Level 4 and Level 5. Such answers were able to use very secure knowledge to examine the use of repression and reform by the Tsarist government in Russia in the years 1905-06. Most tended to argue that repression was used effectively, though sometimes counter-productively, to put down unrest in the cities, countryside and among the armed forces while reform, or at least the promise of reform, was effectively targeted to secure middle class support for the regime. Weaker answers tended to recount the details of the events like Bloody Sunday without real depth or precision. Rather than coming to a reasoned judgement, these tended to rely on assertion.

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 partial degree, the statement 'Repression was more effective in dealing with unrest in Russia than reform in the years 1905-6' is agreeable. Repression was utilised effectively against unrest in Russia by Nicholas II in 1905-6 due to the loyalty of the Cossacks and clever propaganda by his subordinates; however, reform and promises of reform were also very effective in quelling unrest though reform was often neglected and retracted suggesting that truthful implemented reform would have been just as effective as repression in dealing with unrest if given the chance. Therefore, the statement is only partially agreeable.

It is undeniable that repression played a large role in dealing with unrest in 1905-6. The first large form of unrest was arguable on Bloody Sunday (9th January 1905). Father Gapon had a petition signed by 159,000 people and marched in strong numbers to present it to the Tsar but were met by the imperial

guard who killed 200 people by rifle fire. This earned Nicholas the nickname ~~sher~~ 'Nicholas the Bloody' showing how brutal repression was met by fostering resentment (in turn fueling further unrest to come). By ~~October of~~ September 1905 there were 2 million people on strike (due to food shortages, inflation and poor working conditions, 300 people died in the metal industry that year). This perhaps is indication that repression stops unrest in the short term but creates even more resentment and unrest for the future.

Such repression had been used regardless, 1000s killed by Black hundreds in the countryside, 15,000 killed by Stolypin's necktie in the countryside without a trial and 6000 pogroms motivated by anti-semitic pamphlets released by Trepov ~~to~~ all to remove the blame from the Tsar and onto the people.

However,
1 Reform promised more long-term solutions to unrest. Though not considered reform, the Treaty of Portsmouth (Aug-Sept) ended the devastating Russo-Japanese War (where 45,000 more Russians were killed than Japanese) which began to quell unrest in Russia. What followed

was definitely promise of reform in the form of the October Manifesto which stated that dumas would be held, freedom of speech for the people and relaxation on censorship. This was a significant factor to the appeasement of the 2 million workers on strike in the cities compared to the couple hundred thousand strikers in January who had been dealt with using repression tactics. The Tsar and his advisors potentially understood that fact that larger scale strikes met with repression would result in too much bloodshed and repeat the cycle of resentment. The Kadets were in fact wanting more reform than the October Manifesto provided, whilst liberal groups were pleased as long as the manifesto be implemented accurately. However in the following February, the Tsar released the Bulygin Rescript which defined parameters for freedom of speech and slightly lowered redemption payments. Though this did please peasants to a small degree, a pattern of lack of commitment towards reform was becoming prevalent as freedom of speech was defined. This pattern became even more apparent in April

with the Fundamental Laws which stated that the Tsar could veto any decision made by the Duma, dissolve the Duma at any time and the government could use Article 28 to bypass the Duma. The last of which Stolypin used for his reforms from 1906 which were more effective in appealing to peasants by offering them freedom from redemption payments and the mir. But in terms of Nicholas, the Fundamental Laws showed that he could not commit to reform as well as dissolving of first and second duma's due to disagreement about reform to land. Therefore, it is perhaps an unfair comparison between reform and repression in 1905-6 because it was more accurately brutal repression versus promises of reform (that ultimately were backtracked in some ways). Despite this, ~~the~~ even promise of reform did provide more long term ^{contentment} ~~peace~~ and on greater ~~a~~ scale (2 million) than repression which bred resentment, short scale solutions on smaller scales.

In conclusion, the statement 'Repression was more effective than reform in dealing with unrest in 1905-6' is only partially agreeable as even the promise of reform was enough to quell unrest on larger scales more long term as opposed to repression which fostered resentment and short term solutions. Therefore the statement of the question is only partially agreeable as repression was an effective tool to deal with unrest.



This response sustains an analytical focus on the key issues relevant to the question and examines the relationship between them in coming to a judgement. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to respond fully to the demands of the question. Valid criteria are established in coming to a judgement and their relative significance is evaluated in substantiating its conclusions. The argument is logical throughout, and communicated with clarity. It received a safe L5 mark.

Question 4

This question was often done very well. There was quite a wide definition taken by some of 'the Soviet system', some including agricultural reforms and foreign policy. All valid approaches were credited. Most candidates, however, focused their answers mostly on Khrushchev's attempts to de-Stalinise the USSR in the period specified, evaluating the effectiveness of his reforms to the legal and justice systems, decision-making within the Party and to the cultural and religious environment. Weaker answers frequently knew little that was precise and accurate about the USSR in the period, and were unable to come to a reasoned judgement.

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 ☒

Khrushchev's reforms to the Soviet system in the years 1956-61 were ~~largely~~ ^{unlikely somewhat} successful, however they were not completely successful as they did not alleviate the long standing economic backwardness, political inefficiencies, and lack of many ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~ideas~~ rights. Instead, they were largely successful at the time due to ~~these~~ ^{the} previous ~~a~~ ^{the} leaders reforms making very limited improvements, and as they showed a more open and willing USSR. ~~for~~

Khrushchev's reforms were ^{largely} ~~completely~~ successful due to his policies on censorship, economic stagnation and political inefficiencies. One of Khrushchev's most notable achievements was the closure of many gulags, this meant that many political prisoners were freed from the poor conditions and forced labour, with over ~~an~~ ^{approximately} 400,000 political prisoners being held in these camps. ~~This was~~ Khrushchev's policies on economic stagnation meant that there was an increase in ~~grain from 1920 to 1922~~ ^{maize production, due}

to his 'maize mania', a policy that involved enforcing farmers to produce an increased level of maize over other products.

There were also policies to decrease censorship within the USSR during Khrushchev's reign leadership which meant that there were increases

in the freedom of speech and artworks.

This also meant more journals and newsletters

could be published. Khrushchev made reforms to

housing, 'Khrushchikovs' which were state funded and

allocated apartments to help with the housing

crisis and the high levels of homelessness. These

reforms were all significant to Khrushchev's time

as leader, however they were not entirely

successful, despite having an impact on reforming

Soviet systems.

Khrushchev's reforms were successful to a limited degree

as they had many limitations and did not

successfully transform Soviet lives. Therefore it is

inaccurate to say that Khrushchev's reforms were

completely successful. One key example was the

release of political prisoners from gulags, the

government was reluctant to release those in

gulags as they were wrongfully convicted and

sent there under Stalin's reign and would therefore

lead to an increase in people that had grievances with the Soviet government and may even create a new class of people who were unafraid to question government officials. This reluctance was shown by having over 450,000 cases heard, with only 1% of that being released. This shows how limited Khrushchev's reforms were. ~~for~~ ~~never~~ Another factor that had a significant limitation was his economic policy or 'maize mania', this maize heavy focus meant that other necessary crops, such as cereals or ^{wheat} grain decreased significantly, this inevitably led to a decrease in cattle or animal farming too as many people had to feed their animals the grain produced, or slaughter them. This issue, eventually worsened by crop failures, meant that the USSR had to import grain from the USA and Australia which highlights how Khrushchev's reforms were not completely successful and instead rather limited. Censorship was also an area Khrushchev failed to completely reform, as whilst there were concessions that increased freedom of speech, there were also significant limitations, such as Doctor Zhivago by Pasternak.

being banned in 1956 due to its depiction of the civil war and then Pasternak's forced decline of the Nobel Prize. This highlights the idea that Khrushchev's reforms were not completely successful. Finally, the housing reforms made by Khrushchev; Khrushchyovs, were poor quality houses that did not significantly improve lives of people in the Soviet system.

To conclude, it is not accurate to a very limited extent to say that Khrushchev's reforms in the Soviet system were completely successful due to as while on the one hand, they provided increased freedoms for the Soviet people, they were incredibly limited and failed to reverse long standing political, economic and cultural inefficiencies within the USSR.



This answer identifies various key factors that are relevant to the question. Also, accurate knowledge is included to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question, and to meet most of its demands. There is an attempt throughout to establish criteria for judgement though the judgement is, overall, only partly substantiated. It was given a mid-L4 mark.

Question 5

This was by far the less popular of the questions in Section B of Paper 38.2 and there were relatively few strong answers. Some did address directly the ways in which the Treaty of Tianjin could have been responsible for the later massacre, the way in which it granted Christian missionaries fuller access to China, for example, and the anger this created among some Chinese people. However, weaker responses often lacked depth of knowledge of the years in question, with some resorting to a general consideration of China's position under the Unequal Treaties in the late nineteenth century with scant focus on the Tianjin Massacre.

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 Tianjin massacre of 1870 was a consequence of the Treaty of Tianjin ~~in 1858~~ ~~in 1860~~ ~~in 1864~~ ~~in 1865~~ ~~in 1866~~ ~~in 1867~~ ~~in 1868~~ ~~in 1869~~ ~~in 1870~~ ~~in 1871~~ ~~in 1872~~ ~~in 1873~~ ~~in 1874~~ ~~in 1875~~ ~~in 1876~~ ~~in 1877~~ ~~in 1878~~ ~~in 1879~~ ~~in 1880~~ ~~in 1881~~ ~~in 1882~~ ~~in 1883~~ ~~in 1884~~ ~~in 1885~~ ~~in 1886~~ ~~in 1887~~ ~~in 1888~~ ~~in 1889~~ ~~in 1890~~ ~~in 1891~~ ~~in 1892~~ ~~in 1893~~ ~~in 1894~~ ~~in 1895~~ ~~in 1896~~ ~~in 1897~~ ~~in 1898~~ ~~in 1899~~ ~~in 1900~~ ~~in 1901~~ ~~in 1902~~ ~~in 1903~~ ~~in 1904~~ ~~in 1905~~ ~~in 1906~~ ~~in 1907~~ ~~in 1908~~ ~~in 1909~~ ~~in 1910~~ ~~in 1911~~ ~~in 1912~~ ~~in 1913~~ ~~in 1914~~ ~~in 1915~~ ~~in 1916~~ ~~in 1917~~ ~~in 1918~~ ~~in 1919~~ ~~in 1920~~ ~~in 1921~~ ~~in 1922~~ ~~in 1923~~ ~~in 1924~~ ~~in 1925~~ ~~in 1926~~ ~~in 1927~~ ~~in 1928~~ ~~in 1929~~ ~~in 1930~~ ~~in 1931~~ ~~in 1932~~ ~~in 1933~~ ~~in 1934~~ ~~in 1935~~ ~~in 1936~~ ~~in 1937~~ ~~in 1938~~ ~~in 1939~~ ~~in 1940~~ ~~in 1941~~ ~~in 1942~~ ~~in 1943~~ ~~in 1944~~ ~~in 1945~~ ~~in 1946~~ ~~in 1947~~ ~~in 1948~~ ~~in 1949~~ ~~in 1950~~ ~~in 1951~~ ~~in 1952~~ ~~in 1953~~ ~~in 1954~~ ~~in 1955~~ ~~in 1956~~ ~~in 1957~~ ~~in 1958~~ ~~in 1959~~ ~~in 1960~~ ~~in 1961~~ ~~in 1962~~ ~~in 1963~~ ~~in 1964~~ ~~in 1965~~ ~~in 1966~~ ~~in 1967~~ ~~in 1968~~ ~~in 1969~~ ~~in 1970~~ ~~in 1971~~ ~~in 1972~~ ~~in 1973~~ ~~in 1974~~ ~~in 1975~~ ~~in 1976~~ ~~in 1977~~ ~~in 1978~~ ~~in 1979~~ ~~in 1980~~ ~~in 1981~~ ~~in 1982~~ ~~in 1983~~ ~~in 1984~~ ~~in 1985~~ ~~in 1986~~ ~~in 1987~~ ~~in 1988~~ ~~in 1989~~ ~~in 1990~~ ~~in 1991~~ ~~in 1992~~ ~~in 1993~~ ~~in 1994~~ ~~in 1995~~ ~~in 1996~~ ~~in 1997~~ ~~in 1998~~ ~~in 1999~~ ~~in 2000~~ ~~in 2001~~ ~~in 2002~~ ~~in 2003~~ ~~in 2004~~ ~~in 2005~~ ~~in 2006~~ ~~in 2007~~ ~~in 2008~~ ~~in 2009~~ ~~in 2010~~ ~~in 2011~~ ~~in 2012~~ ~~in 2013~~ ~~in 2014~~ ~~in 2015~~ ~~in 2016~~ ~~in 2017~~ ~~in 2018~~ ~~in 2019~~ ~~in 2020~~ ~~in 2021~~ ~~in 2022~~ ~~in 2023~~ ~~in 2024~~ ~~in 2025~~ ~~in 2026~~ ~~in 2027~~ ~~in 2028~~ ~~in 2029~~ ~~in 2030~~ ~~in 2031~~ ~~in 2032~~ ~~in 2033~~ ~~in 2034~~ ~~in 2035~~ ~~in 2036~~ ~~in 2037~~ ~~in 2038~~ ~~in 2039~~ ~~in 2040~~ ~~in 2041~~ ~~in 2042~~ ~~in 2043~~ ~~in 2044~~ ~~in 2045~~ ~~in 2046~~ ~~in 2047~~ ~~in 2048~~ ~~in 2049~~ ~~in 2050~~ ~~in 2051~~ ~~in 2052~~ ~~in 2053~~ ~~in 2054~~ ~~in 2055~~ ~~in 2056~~ ~~in 2057~~ ~~in 2058~~ ~~in 2059~~ ~~in 2060~~ ~~in 2061~~ ~~in 2062~~ ~~in 2063~~ ~~in 2064~~ ~~in 2065~~ ~~in 2066~~ ~~in 2067~~ ~~in 2068~~ ~~in 2069~~ ~~in 2070~~ ~~in 2071~~ ~~in 2072~~ ~~in 2073~~ ~~in 2074~~ ~~in 2075~~ ~~in 2076~~ ~~in 2077~~ ~~in 2078~~ ~~in 2079~~ ~~in 2080~~ ~~in 2081~~ ~~in 2082~~ ~~in 2083~~ ~~in 2084~~ ~~in 2085~~ ~~in 2086~~ ~~in 2087~~ ~~in 2088~~ ~~in 2089~~ ~~in 2090~~ ~~in 2091~~ ~~in 2092~~ ~~in 2093~~ ~~in 2094~~ ~~in 2095~~ ~~in 2096~~ ~~in 2097~~ ~~in 2098~~ ~~in 2099~~ ~~in 2100~~ ~~in 2101~~ ~~in 2102~~ ~~in 2103~~ ~~in 2104~~ ~~in 2105~~ ~~in 2106~~ ~~in 2107~~ ~~in 2108~~ ~~in 2109~~ ~~in 2110~~ ~~in 2111~~ ~~in 2112~~ ~~in 2113~~ ~~in 2114~~ ~~in 2115~~ ~~in 2116~~ ~~in 2117~~ ~~in 2118~~ ~~in 2119~~ ~~in 2120~~ ~~in 2121~~ ~~in 2122~~ ~~in 2123~~ ~~in 2124~~ ~~in 2125~~ ~~in 2126~~ ~~in 2127~~ ~~in 2128~~ ~~in 2129~~ ~~in 2130~~ ~~in 2131~~ ~~in 2132~~ ~~in 2133~~ ~~in 2134~~ ~~in 2135~~ ~~in 2136~~ ~~in 2137~~ ~~in 2138~~ ~~in 2139~~ ~~in 2140~~ ~~in 2141~~ ~~in 2142~~ ~~in 2143~~ ~~in 2144~~ ~~in 2145~~ ~~in 2146~~ ~~in 2147~~ ~~in 2148~~ ~~in 2149~~ ~~in 2150~~ ~~in 2151~~ ~~in 2152~~ ~~in 2153~~ ~~in 2154~~ ~~in 2155~~ ~~in 2156~~ ~~in 2157~~ ~~in 2158~~ ~~in 2159~~ ~~in 2160~~ ~~in 2161~~ ~~in 2162~~ ~~in 2163~~ ~~in 2164~~ ~~in 2165~~ ~~in 2166~~ ~~in 2167~~ ~~in 2168~~ ~~in 2169~~ ~~in 2170~~ ~~in 2171~~ ~~in 2172~~ ~~in 2173~~ ~~in 2174~~ ~~in 2175~~ ~~in 2176~~ ~~in 2177~~ ~~in 2178~~ ~~in 2179~~ ~~in 2180~~ ~~in 2181~~ ~~in 2182~~ ~~in 2183~~ ~~in 2184~~ ~~in 2185~~ ~~in 2186~~ ~~in 2187~~ ~~in 2188~~ ~~in 2189~~ ~~in 2190~~ ~~in 2191~~ ~~in 2192~~ ~~in 2193~~ ~~in 2194~~ ~~in 2195~~ ~~in 2196~~ ~~in 2197~~ ~~in 2198~~ ~~in 2199~~ ~~in 2200~~ ~~in 220~~

~~One hand the treaty of Tianjin did~~

On one hand the Tianjin Massacre of 1870 was a consequence of the terms of the Treaty of Tianjin because it was an unequal treaty that increased foreign influence in China. Most of the treaties signed by China were unequal as they benefitted other nations more than China. The terms of the Treaty of Tianjin allowed for increased influence in China from France, Britain and Germany. This also led to the Triple Intervention where France, Britain and Germany gained access to parts of China such as Weihaiwei and mining rights in the North East. The Tianjin Massacre occurred because French missionaries were setting up Catholic churches in China which also led to the building of schools and orphanages which benefitted China as children were getting an education and orphanages reduced the number of children on the streets. However, anti-Catholic groups ~~that~~ did not like the

foreign influenza this was having in China and so burned down countless churches and rioted which ended in the death of 60 people overall. This is a result of the Treaty of Tianjin as the treaty terms allowed for foreign influence which the greater population of China did not like. If the Treaty of Tianjin was not agreed then foreign influenza wouldn't have started to infiltrate into China when it did which means that the Tianjin Massacre may never have happened. However, foreign influence was always going to seep in to China and the Triple Intervention solidified that.

On the other hand ~~in~~ the Tianjin massacre occurred as a result of propaganda and anti-catholicism. Rumours started to spread that the churches and missionaries were kidnapping children and using their eyes for ~~sat~~ unknown rituals. It was admitted by a young man that he had been paid \$6 to kidnap children and he had kidnapped at least 10. This is what sparked outrage by anti-catholic groups and ultimately led to the riot and the 60 deaths. However, it could still be argued that the massacre was a consequence of the Treaty because the Treaty is what allowed the French missionaries into China in the first place and to start setting up churches and orphanages.

The propaganda and the rumours were the catalyst and the trigger for the massacre however it was a long term consequence of the Treaty of Tianjin because of the initial foreign influence.

In conclusion, the Tianjin Massacre was a consequence of the Treaty of Tianjin to a high extent. As mentioned previously the Treaty was unfair and gave foreigners (especially France) influence in China followed by the Triple Intervention. The rumours and propaganda against Catholicism were simply triggers that sparked the riot however the massacre was a long term consequence of the Treaty as that was the initial point where foreign influence was allowed.



Here, there is some analysis of key issues relating to the question. Though the knowledge included is mostly accurate, it lacks depth and while the candidate attempts to establish criteria for judgement, overall the judgement is weakly substantiated. The answer does show some organisation and the argument is generally clear. Therefore, this essay was awarded a top L3 mark.

Question 6

This was the more popular question in Section B of Paper 38.2 and was often done very well indeed. Many candidates had a very impressive knowledge of Jiang Jieshi's approach to Japan in the 1930s, and were able to evaluate his seeming indifference to Japan's incursions, but also of a range of other potential causes of the outbreak of war in 1937, for example the nature of Japanese ambitions and the indifference of the international community to Japanese aggression. This often led to reasoned and convincing judgements. Weaker answers often knew something of these issues but sometimes conflated the first and second Sino-Japanese Wars or ranged beyond 1937 to consider American involvement. Such a lack of depth of knowledge, and accuracy, was often a serious impediment.

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 outbreak of the second Sino-Japanese war was due to a multitude of reasons, especially the weakness of the Chinese government in putting down Japan before they grew too emboldened and pushed further into China. However the growing ideas of imperialism and racial superiority pushed Japan to develop their empire and encouraged all out war by 1937. Furthermore the lack of foreign support during this period due to issues in Europe meant that China lacked the necessary support and resulted in war when Japan were failed to be held accountable for their attacks in China.

Jiang Jieshi and the GMD were not entirely focused on Japan which resulted in weak and lacklustre responses to Japan's movements ~~for~~ from 1931. During this time ~~the~~ the Government's focus was on defeating the CCP, the growing communist party in China, Jieshi was very anti-CCP which resulted in a huge focus on destroying them. ~~Despite this the Marco polo~~ The Marco Polo incident in 1931 where Japanese soldiers attacked a railroad and blamed it on the Chinese resulted in Tokyo approving further pushes into Manchuria resulting in

its full takeover by Japan, despite this obvious start to an all out invasion, Jieshi chose to retreat to ~~the~~ Taiwan and request and investigation from the United Nations so that he could focus on defeating the CCP. This demonstrated complete weakness towards Japan as they were allowed to take a large, historical area of China with little resistance from the government. This then meant that Japan became emboldened and attempted to push further into China where Jieshi finally had to step in which then led to an all out war by 1937. Furthermore when fighting Japan the army was unprepared and the orders were not clear from the GMD that Japan were able to crush Chinese forces whenever they faced, further leading to an inspired Japan and an outbreak of war because China was too weak to push back initially.

However it should also be considered that Japan's growing imperialistic ideas spurred on the nation to declare all out war in 1937. Unlike China Japan were open to modernisation and benefitted from western technology massively and also developed due to investments from the USA, this meant that Japan was a growing power and felt able to take on a China that was struggling internally for dominance in the Asian continent. Additionally Japan gave Mitsubishi government defence contracts to help develop and

modernise their Navy which further inspired calls for imperialism and emboldened Japan ~~for~~ even more that they could easily defeat China in a matter of months, causing the outbreak of war. Furthermore there was a growing idea of racial superiority in Japan that culminated in the 'Rape of Nanjing' which has been theorized to be a result of racism and demonstrates the extent to which Japanese people believed China were lesser than them and deserved to be taken over. While China did not use all their strength on stopping Japan in their tracks resulting in war, the ideas in Japan were the more influential factor in causing war as it meant that they were never content with just some of China which means that they had to go to war eventually to solidify their empire.

The lack of foreign support during this time, from 1931, also led to all out war and was more impactful than Chinese weakness as it exacerbated and worsened that issue while also failing to stop Japan. Europe wasn't very stable at the time due to economic collapse in ~~1929~~ 1930 that left western powers mostly unwilling to involve themselves in another costly war, and issues in central Europe and Germany kept the western nations unoccupied and uninterested in China's issues. As a result China would not receive the

necessary support that it needed to stop Japan and resulted in war by 1937. Furthermore while post 1931 America did try and support China by putting economic sanctions on Japan this did not stop China's struggle and China would not get any real foreign support until after war had broken out in 1941, this demonstrates how the lack of foreign powers supporting China meant all out war as China could not deal with the CCP and Japan all at once by themselves. Also the Lytton committee failed to have any real impact as the GMD had hoped suggesting that it was not weakness of Jieshi but weakness of the League of Nations and foreigners, which should have helped China, that led to all out war.

In conclusion while Jiang Jieshi's government failed to stop Japan when it was necessary, because they believed by fighting the CCP they were attacking the 'disease of the heart' rather than skin, was a big weakness that influenced the war ~~begin~~ growing into an all out war. It was in fact the growth of Japanese imperialism that was the main factor in inspiring war overall and their consistent push into China meant they were hard to stop with negotiation causing all out war to be necessary. Foreign powers failing to support also didn't help to stop the war as China was left to fend for themselves,

however this returns to the ambition of Japan to push and declare war with China despite potential for foreign involvement.



This answer was placed at the top of L4. It addresses itself to a range of key issues relevant to the question, and sufficient knowledge is deployed to meet most of its demands. Though criteria for judgement are established, some of the evaluation is only partly substantiated. Nonetheless the answer is generally well organised and communicated with clarity.

Question 7

This was by far the more popular of the Section C questions for paper 38.1. Candidates who attempted it often knew a great deal about communist policies in the period, and the ways in which they did, or didn't, enhance the condition of the peasantry. They also tended to have sufficient knowledge of a range of other factors that could be compared with the impact of communist policies, most notably Emancipation and the reforms of Stolypin. There were many impressive answers, however, where many candidates often stumbled in using what they knew to plan their answers effectively and come to reasoned judgements. Many ranged across the period with little form or direction and came to rather bland, sometimes unsubstantiated, conclusions that appeared to have little reference to what had come before. Some answers tended to use a chronological approach, considering events in order from 1855 through to 1991. While this can still be valid, it often didn't help evaluation of the question. Also, there was a tendency in some answers to range only across the first part of the period and to neglect developments beyond the NEP or collectivisation.

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 7 ☒ Question 8 ☒

Question 9 ☒ Question 10 ☒

Historians disagree over whether in 1855-1991 communist governments were the most effective at improving the condition of the peasantry. By most effective, I intend the factor that most increased the peasants' standard of living. In this essay, I will analyse Khrushchev's private plots, the 1861 Emancipation Edict and the 1917 Land Decree, coming to the conclusion that I strongly agree with the statement.

Some historians agree with in 1855-1991 communist governments being most effective at improving the condition of the peasantry due to Khrushchev's private plots. Becoming the de facto absolute leader of the USSR in 1956 (after a power struggle starting 1953), Khrushchev immediately announced policies intent on boosting standard of living. Under the Stalinist regime, farms had been agglomerated en masse into sovkhozy (state farms) that were extremely unproductive and wasteful, with peasants earning miserly wages. Stalin's one concession had been the allowing of small private plots for each household, heavily taxed and composing only 3% of tilled land. Under Khrushchev, taxes on these private plots were

greatly eased and later abolished entirely, ^{while private plots were expanded and} ~~while the~~ state began offering to ~~also~~ pay all transport costs after 25km to deliver produced food. The impact of this was so greatly better peasants' standard of living, as they earned more real income and could sell more produce of their own. By 1960, an average private plot contained one bull, two cows, thirty sheep, a pig with offspring, ~~and~~ thirty chickens, and twelve beehives. Peasants with now reduced taxes were now also increasingly able to afford modern machines such as landrams, which meant women ~~now~~ no longer had to spend a day and a half weekly washing clothes and other belongings, further boosting productivity and income. Historians therefore argue that in 1855-1991 communist governments were the most effective at improving the condition of the peasantry, and I strongly agree with the statement, as under Khrushchev standards of living measured by HDS increased by about ~~43%~~ 43%.

Some historians argue against in ~~1855-1991~~ 1855-1991 communist governments being the most effective at improving the condition of the peasantry due to the 1861 Emancipation Edict issued by Tsar Alexander II, ~~then~~ a liberal educated by the poet Zhukovskiy. This released serfs from their ~~legal~~ legal condition of being ~~to be~~

banded to the landowner whose land they worked. Unchanged since 1561, serfdom was essentially a form of slavery. The Emancipation Edict meant that serfs were now free, giving them rights such as the ability to marry freely and own their own private plot of land. It is therefore argued by historians that the 1861 Emancipation Edict under a tsarist government was the most effective at improving the condition of the peasantry. However, I instead still strongly agree with the statement crediting communist governments. While the edict did improve peasants' status to a great extent, it in fact worsened conditions. Serfs were still required to work on their landowners' fields for four days of the week, while the land properly granted to them^{by landowners} was often the least fertile, typically next to swamps or marsh. Peasants also still owed redemption payments to both the ^{tsar} ~~nobility~~ and their landowners to 'compensate' them for their lost lands. These had an annual compound interest rate of ~~one~~ six percent, and by 1900 the arrears owed far outweighed the initial payments. Peasants would often have to face hunger while continuing to pay these instalments.

~~Some historians also argue~~ In conclusion, I strongly agree with the statement that in 1855-1991 →

communist governments were the most effective at improving the condition of the peasantry, ~~the~~ as exemplified by Khrushchev's successful efforts in raising standards of living through encouraging private plots, while the measure typically referred to as the most improving peasant conditions under Tsardom, the 1861 Emancipation Edict, in reality severely worsened their living standards, as on average they farmed 20% less land and owed far more in debt arrears, often being unable to pay.



This answer contains an analysis of the relationship between key factors relevant to the question, though it is limited in range across both of the factors considered and in the chronology. It does, however, display sufficient knowledge to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and meet most of its demands. Valid criteria by which the question could be judged are established though the judgement is only partly substantiated. It received a mid-L4 mark.

Question 8

There were fewer attempts at this question but it was often done well. Stronger candidates focused very clearly on the ways in which Stalin's reforms could be considered a turning point in the drive for greater agricultural productivity, making perceptive comments on collectivisation and other policies, notably Lysenkoism. In comparison they were knowledgeable also of a number of other potential turning points, notably Emancipation, Stolypin's reforms and/or Khrushchev's Virgin Lands Scheme. Weaker answers tended to know something of collectivisation to describe the process rather than analyse its effects on productivity and, for some, the focus on 'turning point' in the question was entirely missed.

The drive to modernise under Stalin resulted in 250,000 peasants being forced to work on 25,000 collective farms, ~~and~~ leading to a dramatic decline in agricultural production, and leading to

schemes involving collectivisation until Khrushchev abolished it in the early 1960s. Therefore, ~~the~~ Stalin's development of collectivisation clearly had great impacts on agriculture throughout the period, making it a turning point in the years 1855-1999. In contrast, other events also had significant impacts on the development of agriculture throughout the period. ~~The~~ The emancipation of the serfs in 1861 ~~was~~ completely redefined Russia's feudal structure, railways had a lasting effect, ~~boosting~~ ^{from 1860s onwards} grain transportation and the supply of farm machinery and artificial fertilisers ~~throughout the period~~, and the new Economic Policy was ~~on~~ a notably ~~big~~ positive change for agriculture compared to its surrounding events. Therefore, Stalin's collectivisation was key, though not successful, ~~and~~ and other events also had notable consequences through the period.

Stalin's collectivisation scheme had huge repercussions through the peasantry, as he sought to ~~collectivise~~ ~~collectivise~~ collectivise vast amounts of land, and had collectivised 99% of farming land by 1939. Indeed, Stalin's scheme became a turning point as it influenced later regimes under Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and Gorbachev, all who utilised this collective framework. Stalin's drive to modernise was certainly largely unsuccessful, with 89% of collective farms having no tractors in 1937 and Lysenko's "Stalin - Branched wheat" and Vilyams's "monopolise system" both failing, but ~~the~~ echoes of it remained throughout the rest of the period. Indeed, although Khrushchev's reforms took a different direction, his Virgin Lands Scheme focused on cultivating the vast plains of Siberia, Kazakhstan,

the Volga region, and the Caucasus and Mairie Mania focused on the 'benefits' of growing corn, he did so within the collective framework. Kolkhoz and Molkhoz collective farms were widely used throughout Khrushchev's rule, despite his 'decollectivisation' policy, demonstrating the impacts of Stalin's drive to modernise.

Moreover, Brezhnev made notable alterations to the system, ~~both~~ promoting private plots by lowering taxes on them and increasing their size to 1.2 acres per household, but again did so within the ~~rather~~ collective framework. It was Gorbachev, after the stated period, who began to legalise private ownership of land, and Yeltsin who finally abolished collectivisation. Therefore, Stalin's drive to modernise, through collectivisation, clearly had significant impacts as his notion of collectivised farms remained throughout the era.

In contrast, the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 marked a huge change in the nature of Russian society, and thus, peasants' ~~off~~ lives. The Emancipation culminated in the release of 23 million serfs from serfdom, 34.4% of the total population, changing the Russian feudal system forever. With the emancipation came a 50% increase in population 1858-67, thus increasing the working population and boosting production, marking a change in Russian agriculture. Despite this, apart from the ~~serf~~ status of the peasantry, little change was made to the peasantry's agricultural techniques, limiting any significant agricultural development. The

power of the MIR retained remained strong over the peasantry, promoting the use of traditional tools and techniques, such as the sickle, sickle, and sledge, the horse and plough, and strip-farming. These tools and techniques were extremely inefficient, for example, the horse and plough team could only work for 170 x 8 metres before needing a break, and, due to the strip farming system, 33% of the time, all farmland was unused. Thus, although the emancipation of the serfs did mark a significant turning point in the status of the peasantry, with their increased rights, there was little change in agricultural practice, and it did not even particularly attempt to boost agricultural productivity in Russia.

Another key development from the 1860s was railways, which were used throughout the era to ~~transport~~^{import} farming machinery and artificial fertilisers to boost agricultural productivity and transport grain to cities. This development was key in experimenting with new farming machinery, ~~for example~~ like Stalin's drive for the use of tractors, facilitated by railways. For example, in 1909, 109 million tonnes of farm machinery was imported using railways. It was clearly significant in the development of later schemes as even Stalin's drive for modernisation using tractors and artificial fertilisers of Lyenko and Vilyams would ~~have~~ have been restricted without railways. Nevertheless, although they ~~or~~ may have accelerated agricultural productivity, they did not necessarily boost this in itself, they merely helped other schemes become more effective rather than having a direct impact on agriculture. Also, farms

near to railways were very much favoured, meaning railways' impact was not spread across Russia evenly.

Finally, the New Economic Policy of 1921 ~~marked~~ marked a significant boost in agricultural productivity, with levels rising by 19% from 1900. Peasants were allowed to sell surplus crops on the open market as grain requisitioning ended, and this incentivisation became key as ~~peasants~~ it was in the peasants' interest to boost agricultural productivity. Instead of state procurement of grain, they would purchase it from the peasants, also contributing to the rise in agricultural production. Therefore, agricultural production was boosted as conditions for the peasantry improved. ~~As~~ Despite this, there was a lack of innovation for the peasantry, with agricultural methods largely remaining the same and there was limited long-term impact as Stalin's drive for modernisation quickly followed, negating many of the concessions established by the NEP. Therefore, although the NEP was notably positive for the peasantry's condition and boosted agricultural productivity as a result, its lack of innovation meant it had ~~the~~ ~~little~~ few long-term effects, ~~meaning~~ meaning it cannot qualify as a turning point.

In conclusion, I largely agree that Stalin's drive for modernisation was the key turning point in ~~other~~ attempts to boost agricultural productivity in Russia. Other events such as the emancipation of the serfs, the development of railways, and the New Economic Policy

were significant events but cannot qualify as turning points as their lasting effects on agriculture ~~are largely negligible~~ ^{were} often insignificant. The development of the railways was ^{certainly} somewhat key in its contribution to later agricultural policies but it did not itself directly contribute to agricultural productivity, it instead boosted later policies. Also, its effects were largely favoured farms near railways, so was not widespread enough to qualify as a key turning point. In contrast, Stalin's policy of collectivisation became extremely important through the era, as leaders ~~maintained~~ retained the collective framework. Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and Gorbachev all utilised ~~the~~ collective farms within their policies, ~~extending~~ ~~not~~ limiting their success. Therefore, I largely agree that Stalin's drive for modernisation was the key turning point in attempts to boost agricultural productivity in Russia as its impact on later policies is undeniable.



Here, the candidate sustains an explicit focus on the key elements of the question throughout. It fully examines the idea of Stalin's reforms being a turning point in attempts to boost agricultural productivity and considers alternative turning points across the period specified in the question. It comes to a fully reasoned judgement based on valid criteria and was given full marks.

Question 9

This was, by some distance, the more popular of the two essays in Section C of Paper 38.2 and, in general, it was done very well with many top L4 and L5 answers. Most candidates addressed themselves clearly to the idea of the Great Leap Forward being a turning point in China's economic development, with some looking at a range of ways it could be viewed as such (for example, ideologically or methodologically). Most concluded that it was not the most significant turning point, if only because of its colossal failures and its abandonment after only a few years, and referred to other events, such as the Self-Strengthening Movement and/or, most commonly, Deng's reforms, as being more significant. Some answers wanted a little for planning, tending to lose focus or cohesion in places despite clearly being very well-informed. Weaker answers lacked precise understanding of the significance of the Great Leap Forward and/or had little chronological range.

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 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Question 9 ☒

Question 10 ☒

In 1860, China's economy was experiencing a major outflow of silver and a weakening currency due to the trade from foreign powers outcompeting the domestic 'cottage' industry, causing severely low levels of economic development. By 1997, China had become a mass global exporter and a growing economic power with living standards improving amongst their populations. Whilst, the Great Leapforward was seismic to the Chinese economy, its impact on development was extremely regressive, and whilst the self strengthening movement ~~caused~~ caused an improvement in absolute terms, relative to Japan, it failed to cause major development. However the economic liberalisation under Deng Xiaoping, allowed for China to globalise and develop.

During the first five year plan, coal and steel production levels exceeded targets with a GDP growth rate of 9.6% a year. However, Mao's commitment to using communes during the great leap forward and a distorted perception of grain production levels, directed diverted labour away from food production - enabling the famine. This had severe impacts on

Chinese development as gross manufacturing output levels became severely damaged and collapsed in the 1950s. Therefore, whilst this suggests that the Great Leap Forward was a watershed moment, it was undoubtedly a turning point away from economic development. Moreover, when considering the scale from 1860 - 1997, the economic policy and philosophy that it was the driving force behind the Great Leap Forward did not persist in the long term. For example by 1983, 98% of the communes had been broken up and the philosophy of production for profit caused surplus food production, allowing for China to become a major food exporter. Therefore, whilst the Great Leap Forward was a turning point for its time and was detrimental to economic development, it was largely offset in the long term by the economic policy of Deng Xiaoping, dampening the extent to which we can consider it a turning point.

Given the 1860s outflow of silver and decimation of domestic industry, it could be argued that the self-strengthening movement, championed by Li Hongzhang, acted as a watershed moment. For example, it caused a shift in China away from confucianism and towards the embracement of western technology, shown through the Tongueless schools in 1860s China. As a result of this movement, it encouraged the growth of the Chinese Steam

Merchant Company, which had 33 ships by 1883 to rival western competitors, and also led to the Tianjin arsenal, increasing employment in manufacturing industries. However, whilst this was an absolute improvement, it did not amount to a relative improvement. This because, conservative opposition to the educational reforms led to China economically developing at a slower rate than Japan. As a result, it provided Japan with the capacity to defeat China in the first Sino-Japanese War, resulting in further economic exploitation from the foreigners in the Treaty of Shimonoseki and the Triple Convention. Therefore in the long term, it did not create economic independence for China which makes it difficult to consider as being a major long term turning point.

In 1978, China began to shift its economy from being centralised to being planned by consensus and firm through the adoption of a socialist market economy. Consequently, China was able to join the World Bank in 1980 and this led to an exponential growth in Chinese economic development. For example, China received a \$700million loan for university education, making a turning point away from the brain drain from the cultural revolution and China received a \$30bn loan for industrialisation, allowing for mass production which enabled for China to become a

major global exporter. In 1985, China obtained a trade surplus with the USA which allowed for greater injections into China's national income, allowing for economic growth to average at 9% a year. Whilst the 9% figure during this time period is below the 9.6% figure during the first five year plan, it is imperative to understand that economic development needs to consider a greater range of factors such as living standards as opposed to pure GDP. This exponential improvement in living standards can be shown through the increase in Chinese consumption as in 1980, 1.5% of Chinese individuals had a TV television which compares with 97.5% in 1997. Therefore, as China had developed economic independence through trade surpluses, the development from 1978 was able to persist and when considering its impact - it is a clear and is the most seismic turning point in Chinese economic development.

Whilst the Great Leap Forward was a magnitudinal shift for its time, its lack of persistence in the long term due to the commune break ups make it difficult to view as a long term turning point. On absolute terms, the self strengthening movement led to some development, but failed to create long term economic dependence in China. However, the economic liberalization of China has not only persisted in the long term, but also created exponential development; therefore the statement presents

an inaccurate view of Chinese economic development
from 1860-1997.



In this answer, the candidate sustains an explicit focus on the key elements of the question throughout. It fully examines the idea of the Great Leap Forward being a turning point in attempts in China's economic development during the period and considers alternative turning points in addition, from the Self-Strengthening Movement to Deng's reforms, providing a full chronological range. It comes to a fully reasoned judgement based on valid criteria and was given a safe L5 mark.

Question 10

This question was answered by only a small number of candidates. There were some good answers that addressed themselves specifically to the application of western technologies to Chinese industry across the period, but often the link to Chinese industry was overlooked in favour of a more general consideration of the influence of western ideas in China.

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 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Question 9 ☒

Question 10 ☒

China's industry began as a cottage textile industry in 1860 but by 1947, China was the world's fastest growing economy due to its largest scale modern industry. This was due to many factors, one of which being western technology, this essay will analyse and evaluate the importance of western technology in Chinese industry between 1860-1947 and will conclude in ^{full} ~~complete~~ agreement with the statement.

During the 1870's, due to defeat at the hands of British, China had been subject to foreign rule and influence. This led to the introduction and implementation of western technologies. For example, the British revolutionised China's canal and shipping system which facilitated increased movement of resources and goods. One example of this is the Fuzhou Shipyard which house military and industrial use ships. This set up an increase in trade and production for China which shows the importance of western technology during the self-strengthening movement. Britain also introduced the first industrial textile factories which had machinery to produce textiles.

at a scale far above that of the cottage industry. This shows how western ~~techno~~ technology was behind the start and initial growth of china's industry that moved beyond cottage scale trade.

Telegraphs set up by sun yatsen and Chiang-kai-shek also allowed china's industry to expand and lead to better ~~trans~~ organisation due to better communication. Telegraphs were introduced by the west as an initial way to communicate across colonies. This shows that western technology was important to the growth and interconnection of Chinese industry.

Under Mao, western technologies importance dwindled after the Sino-soviet split in 1960. However, before this between 1948 and 1960, Mao's china was heavily supported the soviet technology, especially china's industry. For example, 10,000 soviet advisors were sent to china to help bring china's industry up to standard. These advisors brought ~~modern~~ western technology that improved machinery and transportation. A major role of western technology was hydro-electric dams which were constructed on the Yangtze river. This powered thousands of factories

which shows how important western technology to china's industry as it brought it up to date with standards seen in the west.

The importance of western technology is also shown by China's lack of growth when using its own ideas. Mao began communes as part of his 'cultural revolution'. This led to the creation of homemade steel, which was incredibly low quality and unusable in construction of large infrastructure. This shows how western technology was imp important to the Chinese industry as china struggled without it being used applied.

A weakness to the argument is that of Mao's 5 year plans which saw China's industry skyrocket without the introduction of new western technology. The production of goods grew massively with between 1960-65, the production of bicycles was ~~one~~ 1.5 million which tripled expectations. This shows that Chinese industry didn't always need western technology as it could grow independently. However, the factories still contained western technology which strengthens the idea that it was always important.

Finally, Under Deng xiaping China's industry increased to become ~~a~~ similar to its modern day counterpart. This was due to Deng's opening up to the west which increased ~~commercial~~ commercialisation as brands like Coke and Ford moved production facilities to china. This ~~came~~ came with modern, new western technology which china implemented in its own factories, which led to an increase of ~~growth~~ production and exports. China became major exporters to the US, with it becoming a most favoured nation in 1991. This shows that western technology was very important ~~to~~ ^{to} china's industry in the later stages of the 20th century as it displays the technologies involvement in China's industrial boom.

To conclude, China's role in its own industry was still the majority of its reason for growth but due to its ability to facilitate, this essay ~~agrees~~ ^{fully agrees} with the statement that western technology was always important to China's industry. ~~Also~~ Also, China's own technological advancements were adaptations of western tech, which highlights its importance up to 1997.



Although treatment of the issues is somewhat uneven, this answer does analyse key issues relevant to the question. Similarly, although in places its focus on industry is slightly loose, sufficient knowledge is displayed to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. Criteria for judgement are established though the conclusion is only partly substantiated. It received a mid-L4 mark.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both enquiries
- Candidates should not simply paraphrase the content of the source; they should develop valid inferences with reference to the question, supported by material contained in the source
- Candidates should avoid generic evaluation, e.g. 'it was written for publication so it may be sensationalised to sell more copies'
- There is no requirement to argue that the source is better suited to one enquiry than the other; any comments made in relation to this will be rewarded according to how they fit with the three strands of the mark scheme.

Sections B and C

- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach—this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Planning of essays will help candidates develop an analytical approach
- Candidates must be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, so that they can address questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions
- Subject-specific terminology should be used precisely and accurately.

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>

