



Examiners' Report **June 2023**

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 www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2023

Publications Code 9HI0_38_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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 very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated this summer. More significantly, examiners continue to comment on the fact that a minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Candidates are strongly reminded that examiners can only give credit for what they can read. Also, examiners commented this year on the increasing use of shorthand and abbreviations in answers, which sometimes hinders meaning and spoils the flow of an argument.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source relevant to both enquiries, also 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. This summer there was some evidence of more candidates using often extensive contextual knowledge to drive an answer to the enquiry, rather than using it to illuminate and discuss the source. This resulted in candidates not dealing with the source adequately.

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. Candidates should be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

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 .

In both Sections B and C when dealing with AO1, not all candidates demonstrated a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

Question 1

There were some very good responses to this question. Most candidates were able to make inferences from the source with regard to the changes introduced by the October Manifesto, e.g. its introduction of a law-making *duma* and the impact this had on Tsarist autocracy, and many identified the Tsar's reluctance to accept the implications of this. Some sound contextual knowledge was added to these inferences, with reference to the manner in which the new Fundamental Laws limited some of the reforms promised during 1905. When considering the use of the source to the enquiry, there were some convincing comments made about the Tsar's desire to be seen to fulfil the promises he had made, while at the same time seeking to persuade his ministers that they went too far.

On the other hand, weaker responses had a weaker understanding of the October Manifesto 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. A significant minority of candidates neglected to make any developed comment on the utility of the source, which lost them marks.

The source has some value for revealing the significance of the changes introduced by the October Manifesto. However, after being critically analysed arguably it is more valuable for revealing the attitude of Nicholas II towards these changes as it holds more weight to this topic and ultimately the ~~st~~ significance of the changes introduced is impacted by Nicholas II's attitude towards these changes.

The provenance of the source is particularly valuable as it is from the minutes of meetings of the Council of Ministers April 1906. This is valuable for the context of the source as the changes made by the October Manifesto would ^{have} ~~have~~ been in place for 6 months. As the source is ~~meetings~~ ~~from~~ minutes from a meeting it is also valuable as there is unlikely to be a strong political agenda, like there might be if Nicholas was addressing the masses.

The provenance of the source is also valuable as it is not just one man's opinion. By hearing from the other ministers we can infer a slightly wider view on the significance of the changes made and the attitude of Nicholas II towards these changes. However, the source's ^{provenance} ~~has~~ has some limitations. As the Tsar ~~he~~ is attempting to ~~plac~~ convince the ~~of~~ ministers that his powers should continue to be described as 'unlimited', he is likely to exaggerate and adapt his attitude towards these changes.

This tarnishes the weight held to these two enquiries to a certain extent, due to ~~Alexander~~ Nicholas' desire to have his power described as 'unlimited'.

The content of the source is also valuable for revealing the significance of these changes. The source writes "They thank me for the rights granted in October". In the October manifesto, which was influenced by Sergei Witte, ~~at~~ Nicholas allowed loosened censorship, more civil liberties and a duma, writing "no law was to be passed unless approved by

the Duma." Source This is valuable for an enquiry into revealing the significance of the changes as it demonstrates the reforms given. Source 1 also states that all social classes "plead that I should remain the autocrat of all Russians".

~~THIS IS~~ On 22nd Jan 1908 Father Capon ~~Laine~~ brought a petition to improve working conditions to the winter palace, and a peaceful protest who were chanting "Long live the tsar" and the national anthem. This is valuable as it demonstrates how there were people who believed the Tsar should remain an autocrat as they believed he was put there by God. However, this also causes some limitations as we know that "all social classes" did not want this. For example, the SRs wanted power to the peasants and the workers wanted improved ^{working} conditions. Therefore we can infer that the Tsar is exaggerating the amount of support he has ~~in order to convince~~ the and the significance of his reforms in order to convince the ministers ~~the~~ his powers can be described

as ~~limit~~ unlimited. Therefore when we read under the surface, the source is only valuable to a certain extent for revealing the significance of the changes introduced by the October manifesto, as ^{Nicholas} ~~Alexander~~ is likely to have exaggerated this in order to persuade the ministers.

~~It could also~~ One could argue the source is even more valuable for an enquiry into the attitude of Nicholas II towards these changes. ~~Source~~ The Tsar states "I have doubted whether I can agree to a limitation of the powers I received from my ancestors" This conveys the Tsar's attitude of reluctance to give up his power. In April 1906 when Nicholas did issue his Fundamental laws they assert the Tsar's power over the military and decrease the Duma's power. This suggests Nicholas' attitude towards the changes and we can infer that he was not inclined to reform. The source also states "I know that continuing to describe my ~~at~~ powers as unlimited will provoke some agitation", this suggests

Nicholas does not mind the opposition to his power, and therefore we can infer his attitude is that does not care for these reforms or value them. Ultimately, the source is more valuable for an enquiry into the attitude of Nicholas II to these changes as this impacts the significance of the changes. From the source we can infer that Nicholas attitude is that he is not inclined towards reform and does not care about the opposition to his power. Therefore it is unlikely the changes ~~will be~~ ^{were} significant if Nicholas does not want reforms. ~~There~~ Ultimately source 1 is more valuable for an enquiry into Nicholas II's attitudes towards the reforms.

In conclusion, the source is valuable for both enquiries. However, it is more valuable for an enquiry into Nicholas' attitude to reforms, as we can infer from the fundamental laws and his desire for his power to be described as 'unlimited' that he is not inclined to reform. The source is still valuable for an enquiry into the significance of the changes

made in the October manifesto, however the provenance of the source tarnishes the weight it holds to that topic to a certain extent. Therefore the source is more valuable for revealing the attitude of Nicholas II to these changes.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response makes several inferences from the source content with regard to both enquiries and adds some contextual knowledge to expand upon the points made. Knowledge is also used to challenge some of the claims made in the source. A valid attempt is made finally to examine the nature of the source when coming to a judgement on its utility. It was awarded a low L4 mark.

Question 2

This question was answered well on the whole. The stronger candidates made reasoned inferences with reference to the reasoning behind Japanese actions in Nanjing and used knowledge of the historical context to illuminate the content of the source. When considering the scale of the violence in the city, there were some very good, reasoned inferences with reference to the actions of the army even shocking Japanese diplomats in the city. Many noted the tone and language of the Tribunal's judgement in attempting to weigh the value of the source to the two enquiries.

Weaker responses often tended to paraphrase the source content and writing extensively about the background to the second Sino-Japanese War. 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.

Source 2 is valuable for a historian to identify the reasons for the actions of the Japanese army at Nanjing in 1937 and the scale of violence committed by the Japanese in the city as it identifies the Japanese army aimed to protect Japanese residents, demonstrate Japan's military power and its aim to capture Nanjing. The source also reveals the excessive violence committed by the Japanese in the city. As criteria, for the source to be useful it must clearly provide reasons and must be produced at a time nearby. As the source is the judgement of the Tribunal, it may be slightly biased and exaggerate the actions of the Japanese.

Source 2 is valuable to a historian for revealing the reason for the actions of the Japanese army at Nanjing in 1937 as ~~that~~ it reveals the Japanese mission was to 'protect Japanese residents and interests and, and to punish the Chinese people and their government in Nanjing.' This reveals to a historian that

The Japanese felt this massacre a necessary revenge against China. This further supported by the fact that China and Japan were clashing as Japan had embraced capitalist reforms to boost their economic growth successfully whereas China's economic growth was sluggish. Additionally, China felt embarrassed by Japan after Japan humiliated China in the Sino-Japanese war 1931 in which China was defeated. Furthermore the source also reveals that Japan wanted to demonstrate their military strength so the capture of Nanking was 'an event of international importance and that it should demonstrate Japan's military power to all of China.' This reveals to a historian that Japan was determined to portray itself as powerful on a global stage and by capturing China's capital, this would not only disgrace China but prove Japan. Lastly ~~source 1~~ source 2 is useful in revealing that Japan aimed to reform the East as General Matsui (Commander of the General forces) referred to the massacre as 'the rebirth of the East is just beginning'. This tells a historian that the Japanese aimed to reform the East, hence the attack on China, asserting its dominance. Overall, the

source is useful to reveal the reasons for the actions of the Japanese army at Nanjing in 1937 as it clearly reveals that the Japanese aimed to demonstrate their strength, protect its residents and mark the beginnings of the rebirth of the East.

Source 2 is also valuable in revealing the scale of violence committed by the Japanese in the city as it described the sweep in Nanjing as 'littered with bodies'. This tells a historian the great extent at which people died through the word 'littered' which implies that there were bodies carelessly everywhere. The source is also useful at giving a numerical value to reveal the scale of violence committed by the Japanese as it states 'over two hundred thousand Chinese civilians and captured soldiers were murdered in Nanjing.' This reveals to a historian the excessive amount of killings that occurred in 1937 clearly and suggest an extreme scale of violence. Lastly, the source is useful at revealing how the violence was committed which helps to reveal the scale to a historian. The source states that 'captured

Chinese soldiers were killed ~~by~~ in groups by machine gun fire along the banks of the Yangtze River.' This is supported by historical knowledge that the Chinese would brutally gather Chinese citizens to the Yangtze river and kill them. Also, the source reveals that 'Nanjing ~~was~~ used unlimited violence and these included 'rape and murder' which reveals how extreme the scale of violence was to a historian. Overall, source 2 is extremely useful in revealing the scale of violence as extreme.

Source 2 could be viewed as ineffective in revealing the reasons for the actions of the Japanese army at Nanjing ~~at~~ in 1937 and the scale of the violence committed by the Japanese in the city as the viewpoint may be biased as it is from the tribunals point of view which includes Britain, France and the USA. In this sense, the source could overexaggerate the extent of the massacre. Furthermore, the source fails to reveal the help of Western countries to defend China and their impact on Japan as well as damages. Lastly, the source is

not directly from Japan itself.

In conclusion, the source is ~~not~~ useful in revealing the reasons for actions of Japan and the scale of violence from Japan.



Here the candidate does address their answer to both enquiries and makes inferences from the content of the source, though these are not developed very far. Some contextual knowledge is added, but it tends to be general background rather than specifically chosen. An attempt is made to take into account the nature of the source when addressing its utility to the question, but this has limited justification. It received a high L3 mark.

Question 3

This was the less popular essay in Section B of Paper 38.1 Stronger answers were able to use sound knowledge to analyse the Provisional government's reasoning for continuing the war and the implications of this decision before examining a range of other factors for its failure, notably the opposition of the Bolsheviks. Weaker answers tended to describe the course of the war for Russia without direct reference to the events of 1917. It was clear that some candidates had a less than precise knowledge of the material and, rather than coming to a reasoned judgement, these tended to rely on assertion.

The failure of the Provisional government was to a large extent a consequence of its decision to continue Russia's participation in the First World War. The significance of this factor can be measured by assessing it against the criteria that it had the greatest social, political and economic impact compared to other factors. Other factors partly responsible were the strength of the Bolsheviks and the nature of the Provisional government's dual authority with the Petrograd Soviet. Ultimately it was a combination of these factors that resulted in the failure of the Provisional government.

It may be argued that the failure of the Provisional government was to a large extent ~~responsible for~~ a consequence of its decision to continue Russia's participation in the First World War. Prior to the February 1917 Revolution, the First World War was a

very significant source of discontent under the Tsar. In the years 1914-1916, 1.5 million Russian soldiers had been killed, and a further 1 million taken as prisoner.

This ~~also~~ Along with this deperation rates were very high (over 1 million soldiers deserted) and morale was very low. This problem did not disappear when the Provisional government, at first lead by Prince Lvov, took over. The significant size of human loss as well as low morale was a large cause of discontent, prompting calls for a peace treaty. Therefore the Provisional government, who did not want to pull out due to alliances with Britain and France as well as risk of losing land, was clearly a mistake due to the human cost. ~~Furthermore~~

~~There was~~ Whilst their decision shows consideration for the political aspects of war, less so was shown towards the socio-economic conditions in Russia. The strain of war put a huge burden on the economy. The provision of food to cities slipping down the list of priorities coupled with the militarisation ^{of} the railways saw significant food shortages. As a consequence, despite a 100% increase in wages, the price of basic necessities (also due to production being focused on military equipment) ~~result~~ rose by 300% demonstrating both a negative political and economic impact.

The effects of inflation also decreased standards of

living and exacerbated inequalities by disproportionately affecting the poorest in society. Furthermore shortages lead to ~~in~~ long ^{open} queues ~~times~~ which ~~it~~ further added to the tensions. This is evident by the ~~1917~~ International Women's Day riot ~~which~~ caused by long queues that eventually resulted in a protest of over 100,000 workers. Therefore as a result of the worsening socioeconomic conditions and increased dissatisfaction caused by the decision to remain in the war by the Provisional government, to a large extent it was responsible for their failure.

Another factor that contributed to the failure of the Provisional Government was the strength of the Bolsheviks. The main strength of the Bolsheviks was their ability to capitalise of the struggles of the people as well as having a ~~ext~~ strong central leadership-Lenin. They used the slogan 'Peace, bread and land' in order to gain support from both the peasants (who made up 50% of the population) and workers (who were vital to the economy). As a consequence of their successful campaign, they were able to take advantage of the Russian people's grievances and increase dissatisfaction towards the Provisional Government, which would enable them to form a pro-Bolshevik climate in which they could take over. However, whilst their tactical

strength of the Bolsheviks ~~could~~ be was partly responsible for this, & the decision of the Provisional government to remain in the First World War must also be credited. The promise of both 'peace' and 'bread' could both be attributed to leaving the war. Therefore whilst the Bolsheviks played a role in increasing dissatisfaction against the Provisional government ^(clearly impacting social conditions) they ~~also~~ were enabled to do this by the Provisional government's own mistake. As a result the combination of these factors ~~that~~ was largely responsible for the failure of the Provisional government. Bolshevik strength alone is a reason for their failure is limited by the fact ^{that} in the November 1917 elections the Bolsheviks only won 23% of the vote compared to the social revolutionaries who won 54%. Therefore ~~together~~ it was rather the weakness of the Provisional government that was effectively exploited by the Bolsheviks that enabled them to take over in the October 1917 revolution, causing the downfall of the Provisional Government.

The nature of the Provisional government and dual authority relationship ~~is also~~ may also be seen as a significant cause of the failure of the Provisional Government. Due to the nature of the Provisional government's inheritance of the Russia during the middle of the war as well as their ~~disorganised~~ disorganisation proved

to be a large weakness of the Provisional government. It was mostly made up of elite Kadets, Mensheviks and members from other political groups. As not one party was in complete power, there was disunity amongst their aims. Effectively this meant they were inefficient at making decisions and their way disunity amongst their aims making them both weaker for the opposition to exploit. For example the Kadets wanted to continue the war to try increase prestige and gain land however the Soviets only wanted a defensive war. To a large extent, the importance of the Provisional Government's decision to remain in the war can be seen as elections to a Constituent Assembly were postponed due to war. Elections may have helped to stabilise the country and establish a clear policy which could have reduced disorganisation. Therefore the decision to stay in the war was largely linked to this factor. Furthermore the dual authority with the Petrograd Soviet may also be seen as a significant weakness. This is because order Soviet Order No. 1 meant both workers and military were obliged to follow the Petrograd Soviet rather than Provisional government. As a consequence they lacked both authority and support which can be seen as a social

and political cause of his demise. Therefore the nature of the Provisional government and Dual Authority may also be seen as a significant reason for their failure as it made them weak and allowed them to be easily exploited.

In conclusion, the failure of the Provisional government was largely a consequence of its decision to continue Russia's participation in the First World War. The decision to continue the war worsened socio-economic conditions in Russia and led to greater dissatisfaction. As a consequence the Bolsheviks were able to exploit this in order to gain more support and further weaken the Provisional government. The nature of the Provisional government also proved to be a significant weakness as well as dual authority however they were further weakened by the decision to postpone elections until after the war.



ResultsPlus
Examiners' Comments

This response sustains an analytical focus on the reasons for the failure of the Provisional government and examines the relationship between the various factors in coming to a judgement. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to respond fully to the demands of the question, and the argument is logical throughout, and communicated with clarity. It received a low L5 mark.

Question 4

This question was often done very well. The background to the introduction of Gorbachev's reform programme was often known in some detail, for example, long-term economic stagnation, the effects of the Afghanistan War, and the impact of alcoholism. Where some answers were weaker however, was in their ability to link these problems more closely to Gorbachev's policies of *perestroika* and *glasnost* and the pace at which they were introduced. Weaker answers frequently knew little that was precise and accurate about the USSR in the 1980s, and were unable to come to a reasoned judgement.

4. ~~Gorbachev~~ Having ascended to power and put an end to the years of gerontocracy in Russia, Gorbachev recognised the poor state of the nation, from the economy to the alcoholism, the explosion at Chernobyl and the impact of the Afghanistan War. The new Russian leader began a reform programme as a result of these factors. In my opinion, economic stagnation was the most significant reason for the introduction of

these reforms due to the fact the nation was unable to progress and each aforementioned factor had a large impact on the economy.

Some historians argue economic stagnation was the largest reason for reform due to the fact annual economic growth was at less than 1%. On top of this, the government had produced false reports regarding the rise in national income between 1923 and 1987. Experts claimed this had rose exponentially when in fact the average income had only risen 6.6 times during this period. As a result of this, Gorbachev aimed to reform wages and introduce glasnost to be more open with the Russian people. On top of this, economic stagnation resulted in an expansion of the Black Market or 2nd Economy. This was a problem due to the fact this did not contribute to the national economy. As a result, Gorbachev introduced two new economic policies: *uskorenije*, the advancement of

technology to boost industry, and perestroika, the restructuring of the economy to combine both capitalist (market economy) and communist (controlled economy) features. In this way, the stagnation of the economy prevented any form of progress and modernisation in Russia which encouraged Gorbachev to begin reform. Therefore, economic stagnation was the reason for these reforms to a large extent.

Alternatively, various historians argue the Afghanistan War was the reason for Gorbachev's reforms. Having entered under ~~Gorbachev~~ Brezhnev in 1979, Gorbachev ordered the withdrawal of 115,000 troops from Afghanistan in 1985. This is due to the huge financial endeavour of the war using funds which would be more beneficial elsewhere domestically. The war cost Russia \$8.2 billion per year which had a significant impact on the economy and contributed to its stagnation. Thus, Gorbachev was urged to end Russian involvement in the war and reform the economy. Furthermore, this

decision made the satellite states and republics perceive Russia as weak and began pushing for independence. ~~The~~ Gorbachev responded by replacing the Brezhnev Doctrine with the Sinatra Doctrine to remove Soviet influence from the satellite states. Therefore, the Afghanistan War did contribute to Gorbachev's initiation of his reform programme. However, the Afghanistan War had a significant effect on the economy and reinforced its stagnation which is why economic stagnation was the ~~not~~ reason for Gorbachev's reforms to a large extent.

Moreover, alcoholism was a significant problem in Russia and a reason which led Gorbachev to reform. The ~~ban on~~ ~~alcohol~~ Dry laws of 1985 raised the legal drinking age to 21 and tripled the price of vodka. ~~§~~ This earned Gorbachev the satirical name "Captain Orange Juice" due to these reforms. Gorbachev also established 30 sobering up stations in Moscow, used by 17

million people in 1979. This is because drunk workers were affecting industrial production and harming the economy. The media blamed empty building sites on Russia's alcoholism which subsequently contributed to the economic stagnation. The ban of vodka cost the economy ~~700~~ 700 million rubels which spurred Gorbachev into action to address ~~the~~ Russia's ~~alcohol~~ alcohol problem as well as reform the economy. Overall, economic stagnation was the reason for Gorbachev's reform program to a large extent.

Lastly, other historians use the Chernobyl nuclear explosion of 1986 as a reason which pushed Gorbachev to reform. The explosion of the 4th reactor happened due to a combination of mismanagement and ~~poor~~ technological failure. The disaster cost Russia 1 million lives and \$18 million in clean-up, with 500,000 workers and emergency responders at the scene. However, the explosion was concealed by the Russian media until

2 weeks later when a Swedish nuclear plant picked up radiation from the explosion. The Russian people were unhappy with the government secrecy which led to Gorbachev's glasnost reform. Gorbachev subsequently claimed "we need glasnost like we need air." On top of this, the \$18 million cost of the disaster had a heavy impact on the already stagnated economy. Thus, Gorbachev was ~~was~~ pushed towards economic reform.

In conclusion, economic stagnation was a major issue in Russia which hindered all modernisation and progression. This was exacerbated by the ~~cost~~ cost of the Afghanistan War, that of the Chernobyl disaster as well as the financial impact of the alcohol restrictions. If Gorbachev hoped to catch up with the West, the economy needed to be addressed through reforms such as perestroika, uskorenje and glasnost. Overall, economic stagnation in the USSR was

the reason for the introduction of Gorbachev's reform programme to a large extent.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer clearly identifies various key factors that convinced Gorbachev to introduce his reform programme, including economic stagnation. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to meet most of the demands of the question and valid criteria are identified and applied in coming to a judgement. It was given a high L4 mark.

Question 5

Many of the candidates who answered this question knew a range of reasons for the Boxer Rebellion, notably the encroachment of foreigners into Chinese life since the 1860s. The better answers were also able to effectively examine the impact Empress Cixi had on the course of the rebellion, for example, her continued opposition to reform or her refusal to order action against the Boxers, a factor with which some struggled. The weaker responses often lacked depth and accuracy, and judgements were asserted rather than being based on valid criteria.

On one hand, the attitude of Cixi can be seen as a major reason for the development of the Boxers' Rebellion. When the Boxers began to attack cities with foreigners, Cixi faced pressure from foreigners to send in the army and condemn Boxers. However, Cixi chose not to condemn the Boxers as she believed the foreigners were trying to get her off the throne and bring back her nephew Guangxu who was a reformist and tried to modernise China with the Hundred Days Reform, much to the annoyance of the conservative. Cixi's Empress Cixi refused to condemn the Boxers, which implied that she supported them due to their shared anti-foreigner belief. This implied support incentivised the Boxers to carry on with their uprisings, destroying infrastructure and attacking foreign ideas, all the while Cixi fled to Xian, far away from realising the true dangers of the Boxers. Cixi's detachment from the situation through location, fleeing the capital, and understanding, believing that it would end with Guangxu on the throne, resulted in the Boxers freely causing chaos as a lack of intervention from Cixi implied the full support of the empress for the Boxers.

The actions of foreigners can also be seen playing a role in the development of the Boxers' Rebellion. For decades, foreigners had been seen as 'yi' (alien) in China, their differing appearance and

ideas opened them up to attacks, however their ignorance and aggressiveness also led to Chinese attacks. The German ambassador Baron von Ketteler had felt threatened by the Boxers' attacks on foreign embassies, likely feeling abandoned by Cixi's refusal to condemn the Boxers, von Ketteler ordered German troops to attack any Chinese person they suspected as a Boxer. This order angered the Boxers, a Boxer would end up assassinating Baron von Ketteler on the 20th of June ~~1900~~¹⁹⁰⁰. This assassination demonstrates how the rebellion developed in both anti-foreign actions and foreign intervention, as this event angered European powers, an anger so deep it remained during the negotiations of the Boxer Protocol in 1901. von Ketteler's death can be seen developing the Boxer's Rebellion as von Ketteler's death created foreign anger, while von Ketteler's ignorant orders created Boxer anger.

Looking at a long-term reason, Chinese modernisations by ~~1900~~¹⁹⁰⁰ also played a role in the Boxers Rebellion. By ~~1900~~¹⁹⁰⁰, the effects of Li Hongzhang's Self-Strengthening Movement could be felt across China: railroads, telegraphs, banks, arsenals etc. However, these modernisations angered the Boxers, they were made of foreign ideas and thus they were seen as disrupting the *feng shui*. The Boxers began attacking anything with foreign influence, railroads were torn up, stations of the Imperial Telegraph Association were attacked, two branches of the Imperial Bank of China were destroyed, and over 100,000 Christian Chinese Christians were killed by Boxers throughout the 1890s. These attacks display the Boxers' contempt for institutions with

foreign influence and how their rebellion developed as their attacks on foreign ideas became larger by going from individuals to entire institutions.

Propaganda also played a role in developing the Boxer Rebellion. During their formation in rural areas, the boxing clubs that the rebellion began in began to spread propaganda. Some was anti-foreign, some was about the Boxers themselves. Propaganda began to spread about how Boxers were invincible to bullets, demonstrations would be shown where a Boxer is shot by a bullet and is fine, another false idea spread was that female Boxers (known as Red Lanterns) were able to fly. False propaganda about Boxers being superhuman is what was needed to convince people to begin the large-scale attacks of the rebellion. Even though the propaganda was false, it convinced people to take up the cause.

In conclusion, Cixi's refusal to condemn the Boxers can be seen as the main reason why the Boxers Rebellion developed as it came across as support for the Boxers, incentivising them to continue their attacks, and leading to foreigners like Baron von Ketteler to put up drastic resistance. While ^{foreigners} foreign ideas and propaganda played a role in the rebellion, they were more involved in the start, the actual course of the Boxers Rebellion was influenced by the attitude of the Empress Cixi.



Key issues relevant to the development of the Boxer Rebellion are analysed in this response, although consideration of the role of Cixi is a little undeveloped. Overall however, sufficient knowledge is deployed to meet most of the demands of the question and the overall judgement is supported, even if some of the evaluations are only partially substantiated. It was given a mid L4 mark.

Question 6

This was the more popular question in Section B of Paper 38.2 and was often done very well indeed. Many good answers were able to chart the fluctuations in the relationship between China and the USA throughout the period in question, and often against a range of different criteria, e.g. economic or diplomatic. Some concluded with some conviction that the relationship by the 1990s had improved sufficiently to transcend US reservations about China's human rights record, though others did note the difficulties surrounding Jiang Zemin's visit to the USA in 1997. Weaker answers often knew something of the improvement in trade and the impact of the Tiananmen protests but a lack of depth of knowledge, and accuracy, was often a serious impediment.

For China's relationship with the USA to have improved, ^{to a large extent} there would need to be closer trade links ~~that~~ with China as an equal partner. While there were still areas of tension in the relationship such as Tiananmen Square & Taiwan, diplomatic missions meant that their trade links became closer & their involvement in international bodies together allowed China to exert itself independently. Therefore, overall, China's relationship with the USA improved to a large extent 1979-97.

China's relationship with the USA improved through their diplomatic efforts which enabled closer trade links. Deng's visit to the USA impressed the Americans with his willingness to be flexible on

certain matters as long as Chinese sovereignty was not threatened, with his capitalist reforms appealing to the USA whose businesses saw the potential in the Chinese market. Many American companies such as Coca-Cola & Hertz set up factories in China to take advantage of the low-wage workforce, while China gained knowledge of developed technology. Deng came back from his USA visit saying he had been dreaming of China reaching the level of development evident in the USA. The growth in relations can be seen by the USA giving China the status of 'Most Favoured Nation', allowing designating China as an ally & allowing China to begin to import some advanced military technology. Thus, closer trade links ensured an improved relationship to a large

extent.

China's relationship with the USA also improved because of their involvement in international bodies together, which allowed China to integrate itself into global politics with the USA's blessing approval. The assistance China received from the IMF & World Bank, guiding China in liberalising its economy & becoming more transparent, with China becoming the largest recipient of the largest World Bank loans by the 1990s, would only have been possible with the US ^{tact} approval, demonstrating their improved relationships. Their involvement in the UN together also saw their relationship improved as China engaged more, involving itself in subsidiary bodies & dropping its opposition to military interventions.

A key improvement for China in its relationship with the US was it acting independently, even against the USA, demonstrating their relationship as equals. China cooperated with the USA only when they had shared interests, as China backed a Tanzanian candidate instead of the US-sponsored candidate for UN Secretary-General. Thus, China's relationship with the USA improved as it was able to ~~event~~ be an equal partner in the relationship.

However, to an extent, the relationship did not improve because of the US' condemnation of China's human rights records. The USA was one of China's loudest critics of its suppression of the Tiananmen Square protest, placing partial trade & arms embargoes, which does seem to have prevented even closer

trade links to an extent. Jiang's visit to the USA in 1997 was accompanied by protests by the American public on Tibetan independence. He was followed by pro-democracy protestors, demonstrating that there were areas of tension which prevented further improvement. However, this argument is only convincing to a certain extent because China & the US' trade links were already sufficiently close for the US' condemnation to not overly impact ^{the relationship} it. A White Clinton suggested making 'Most Favoured Nation' conditional on human rights. As American businesses were finding the massive Chinese market too profitable for him to follow through with it. This indicates that purposefully isolating China was no longer an option to the USA because their trade relationship was too important, demonstrating that

Overall the relationship had improved significantly to a large extent.

However, ~~Fai~~ China & the USA's disagreement over Taiwan prevented an even closer relationship. The USA continued to have unofficial links with Taiwan supporting it against China. This was demonstrated in the context that when China made provocative actions ~~between~~ towards Taiwan, practicing ^{an} invasion, American ships were sent into the Taiwan Straits. This indicates both the disagreement & also that China was not completely equal to the USA because ~~it~~ had to back down ~~in the face of it~~ due to the USA's military might, with Jiang's visit to the USA partly being a conciliatory gesture. However, this argument is only convincing to an extent because the US did

recognise Taiwan as part of China, & the PRC as the government of China, meaning that diplomatically it did support China: both the USA & China were willing to make compromises, with China agreeing not to enforce its might militarily, in order to strengthen trade links & overall improve their relationship.

Therefore, while China's human rights records & the issue with Taiwan prevented China's relationship with the USA improving to the greatest extent, diplomatic visits improved trade links & their involvement in international bodies allowed China to ~~demans~~ show itself as an independent, if not equal, partner in the relationship. Therefore, overall, China's relationship with the USA did improve to a large extent.



Here, the candidate sustains an analysis on China's relationship with the USA throughout the essay. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to respond fully to the demands of the question, and valid criteria are established in coming to a judgement on the extent to which this relationship improved. The argument is communicated with clarity. This answer was awarded a low L5 mark.

Question 7

This was by far the less popular of the Section C questions for paper 38.1. Candidates who attempted it often knew something of the impact of government policies on peasants in Russia during this period that may have encouraged them to leave the land, e.g. the impact of redemption payments or Land Captains under the Tsars, or of war communism under the communists. Fewer were able to evidence other factors behind the movement of peasants to urban areas, however, such as climatic conditions, famine or the general pull of industrialisation. Weaker answers tended to use a chronological approach which often didn't help evaluation of the question. Also, some candidates failed to make sufficient distinction with regard to 'leaving the land'. For example, while Khrushchev's policies did encourage many to move to Kazakhstan, they were not necessarily leaving the land.

When exploring the statement, various time periods can be used, most usefully 1906-11 and Stolypin's reforms, the 1917 land decree, and 1928-32 and collectivisation. Overall, although the Russian government introduced various reforms to encourage peasants to leave the land, for the most part they encouraged them to stay. However, these poorly implemented reforms often led to unrest with the peasants, who decided they wanted to leave regardless; therefore proving the statement correct often they would not be allowed.

* The first period which can be explored when investigating the statement is Stolypin's reforms in 1906-11. A key factor in his reforms was allowing the peasantry to leave the mir without consent. This was a significant reform as many peasants had become tied

to the mir, building a strong community which they were reluctant to leave, but in the following years millions of peasants migrated to new lands. Arguably, Stolypin was ~~was~~ attempting to undo the strength of the mir created after Alexander II's emancipation of the serfs. The reform also largely failed as peasants returned to the mir during the fears of WWI. Therefore, it could be said that when analysing this time period the Russian government was the most significant cause for peasants leaving the land, but was not a widely effective one.

Another period which can be explored when investigating the statement is the 1917 land decree. This factor disagrees with the statement as it was a decree implemented by the Bolsheviks to encourage peasant support for the party. It was significant because it removed all privately owned land, encouraging peasants who had worked on tiny patches of unarable land to stay in Russia and support the Bolsheviks. It could be further argued that the whole of the Bolshevik's ~~reign~~ stint in government was full of policies to encourage peasants to stay largely due to a lack of support. After the treaty made with Germany after WWI, the Russian people were furious with Lenin, leading to the NEP. This was significant as it allowed some aspects of private trade and the re-opening of shops, keeping peasants incentivised to stay through access to goods and new profits. Overall, this period of Russian government would evidence a complete disagreement to the statement.

The final period which can be explored is the 1928-32 collectivisation. Stalin introduced a five year plan which forced millions into kolkhozes. This was significant as it led to thousands of ~~peasants~~ ^{Peasants} ~~to leave~~ ^{leaving the} the land, often to cities with higher wages and less labour demands. However, Stalin put factors in place to ensure they wouldn't leave, such as internal passports, ~~which permitted~~ and violence and oppression to those who tried to leave. It wasn't until over 20 years on, when Khrushchev assumed power in 1956 that conditions for peasantry improved and there was an actual desire to stay. He increased state payments for grain and reduced taxes, more than doubling the wage of a farm worker in just several years. However, throughout both tenures, there was a desire to keep people in collectivised farms and the most peasants which left were the kulaks who were exiled or executed by Stalin.

Overall, when exploring several factors across the years 1855-1972, it can be concluded that the most significant cause for peasants leaving the land was not actions taken by the government. Stolypin's reforms were the only real attempt to encourage peasants to leave the land of the mir, whilst other factors showed the Russian government introducing reform to encourage peasants to stay or forcing them through oppressive methods.



Key issues relevant to the question are analysed here, for example, the impact of Stolypin's reforms and the Land Decree in encouraging peasants to leave the land or to stay. However, the knowledge deployed lacks depth and chronological range, and the judgement is weakly substantiated. It achieved a low L4 mark.

Question 8

There were some very impressive responses to this question that examined the impact of collectivisation on agricultural production throughout its life, from the 1920s through to the grain imports of the 1960s 70s and 80s, and were able to justify its lack of success against other policies, notably Stolypin's reforms or Khrushchev's Maize Mania. Though some candidates did address collectivisation, many appeared to argue that it was a process that ended in the 1930s, and many did not link it sufficiently to the focus of the question, which was agricultural production. Weaker answers again, tended to use a chronological approach to the question, starting in the 1860s but often running out of steam by the 1950s. There was some lack of precision in some answers also, for example, with regard to the purpose of policies like war communism.

Of all the initiatives taken by Russian governments to improve agricultural production in the years 1861 - 1991 collectivisation was the greatest failure. Despite many obstacles being in the way of the Russian leaders in terms of improving agricultural production such as the backwards ~~mir~~ and traditional mindset of the serfs and the Mir and the many hostile farming conditions in Russia, ~~such as fallow land and some~~ initiatives such as the NEP and to some extent early mechanisation under ~~the~~ Tsar Nicholas II managed to overcome these issues and significantly increase crop yields and incentivise the peasants. In order to successfully answer this question "agricultural production" must be defined. It can be ~~de~~ defined as the process of improving grain yields and ~~successfully~~ incentivising or expanding the amount of suitable farming land.

Firstly, collectivisation was a scheme undertaken by Stalin's government between 1928 and ~~1956~~¹⁹⁵⁶ in order to make Russia more ideologically compatible with Communism by abolishing private ownership, to avoid the importing of foreign grain which would not only diminish Russia's

image as a great world power but ^{also} they realistically couldn't afford to and finally Stalin felt requisitioning of grain would be easier if farms were collectivised as there would be fewer collection points making it harder for peasants to refuse to comply. On the surface, collectivisation appeared to be the successful way forward however there were ~~two~~ ^{two} main aspects that prevented it from working and therefore increasing agricultural production. Firstly lack of mechanisation, or rather the lack of infrastructure in place to maintain the tractors. It is estimated that in ~~1933~~ ¹⁹³¹ alone, 7500 hours were spent driving tractors to and from the farms, furthermore American brands such as John Deere were imported into Russia but due to poor quality oil and a general lack of available labour to maintain the tractors meaning they often only lasted for $\frac{1}{3}$ of their expected lifetime meaning not only was money being wasted to import the tractors in the first place but it also meant that time was being wasted in an attempt to maintain the tractors effectiveness. Furthermore, there was a lack of incentivisation for the peasants. A peasant working for 500 days would only earn 3 sacks of potatoes or 1 sack of grain and to earn just one kilogram of

butter a peasant had to work for 60 days. Hence the peasants had no motivation to increase agricultural production, not least because the State would forcibly requisition any surplus grain. It is estimated that around 6.8 million people died under Stalin due to starvation or use of terror, this was an enormous chunk of the available working population killed. Annual grain production fell by around 4 million tonnes and there was no large expansion into successful farming land. Hence collectivisation was the biggest failure of the initiatives taken by Russian governments to improve agricultural production.

~~However there are other initiatives taken that need to be ~~not~~ analysed. Under ^{Tsar} Alexander II the Emancipation edict was passed in 1861. With this ~~came~~ many reforms such as the growing usage of railways and the peasant Land Bank. However the edict itself had a very insignificant~~

Under Alexander II, a number of reforms were put in place in order to improve agricultural production. For example, the Emancipation Edict of 1861. Despite this reform creating a new Kulak class and it bringing new freedom from the nobility and

hence fundamentally changing the status of the peasantry it had an, overall, negligible effect on farming and agricultural production as there was an overall loss of land, a higher tax burden due to the 49 year redemption payments and the fact that the power to change lay in the hands of the Mir who vetoed any innovation 'detrimental' to the traditional way of life. However the peasant land banks did increase the amount of land farmed as 18.5 million hectares were bought by the peasants at low interest rates between 1881 and 1905. Furthermore the expansion of the railways caused an increase in the transportation of resources and brought about new export opportunities increasing from 3 million tonnes of freight traffic in 1866 to 158 million in 1913. Therefore, despite Alexander II's failed emancipation edict, his other reforms such as the expansion of the railways and the peasant land banks were successful in increasing the amount of land farmed and the transportation of grain and hence improved agricultural production to a certain extent and therefore weren't a complete failure.

Finally, Urushev's Virgin Lands Scheme which

took place from 1954 until 1963 was an initiative devised by Khrushchev to increase the amount of land farmed in Russia and therefore increase grain yields. Khrushchev's first year of the scheme saw 30 million hectares ploughed and 15 million tonnes of excess grain produced. This was hugely significant as it was one of the first times that Russia had surplus grain. Furthermore, in 1956 the scheme produced 90% more grain than it had done in 1954 and accounted for 50% of the USSR's total production. However it is also necessary to examine the failures of the Virgin Lands Scheme, firstly 5.3 billion rubles were spent and certain years saw bad weather which had detrimental effects such as in 1963 where only 7 out of 37 million hectares could be harvested, meaning that at times significant amounts of money and resources were wasted however overall the Virgin Lands scheme was a success in terms of improving agricultural production as it increased grain yields and expanded farming land into suitable and successful areas.



This answer ends abruptly, however, the argument is clear throughout. Key issues relevant to the attempts made to improve agricultural production in Russia between the 1860s and 1960s are addressed, deploying knowledge sufficient to respond fully to the demands of the question. Judgements concerning the success, or lack of success, of the various policies are made in the course of the discussion. This response was awarded a low L5 mark.

Question 9

There were few answers to this question. Stronger responses were able to identify improvements made by the Chinese government across this period with regard to road building and the development of a rail network. Against this, most noted the overall failure of the Qing Dynasty to prioritise internal communications during the nineteenth century, the setbacks suffered with regard to the telegraph network under Jiang Jieshi and some argued, with some acuity, that many improvements that were made were made not by Chinese governments but by foreigners, for example, the Japanese in Manchuria.

plan: Boats: China Steamship Navigation (??) no economic support,
Ships broken down
boost national
pride (failed)
 post office → success but was overwhelmed by the Boxers.
 telegraph: → could talk to colleagues + across borders. failed.
 Roads → success, failed.
 Electrification → (billion more had electricity) trains. Success.
 not interested in air transport - too expensive.
 Air transport → success right for jets

~~Overall~~ ^{however} ~~it is somewhat~~ ^{highly} accurate to say that, in the years 1960-1978, Chinese governments largely failed in their attempts to improve internal connections. This is due to the ~~reason of~~ ^{fact} attempted improvement of boats and water navigation being a failure, as well as the attempt to improve the telegraph. However, the attempt to improve ~~the~~ internal communications in regards to roads, electrification and trains can be said to be a success. I define 'improve' here as ~~developments~~ ^{developments} made that resulted in long term and sustainable change, and could survive without foreign assistance. exploitable

It can be said that Chinese governments largely failed in their attempts to improve internal communications in regards to water navigation and boats. In 1872, the 'China Navigation Steam

Company was established. It aimed to improve communications along the river and to compete with the western boats. However, the attempt to improve communications was ~~frustrated~~ ^{stunted} by the fact that the steam navigation company was financed by the Qing, and thus had to suit down unprofitable lines in order to boost national pride. This resulted in the company failing to make a profit and thus, the boats started to get run down. Eventually 30 boats became too old and broken to be put into use, the company could not afford to repair them. Thus, this ~~company's~~ attempt at improving the communication ~~network~~ can indeed be said to be a failure as it did not result in a long lasting improvement, the company eventually went bankrupt.

Similarly, the attempt at improving communications through the telegraph cannot be argued to be largely a failure. Initially introduced by the British in the 1870's, the telegraph was used to connect China with London, but also improved internal communication as ^{the} Chinese population could contact each other over the wide ~~large~~ country. By the 1930's, the CIA had helped to fund more telegraph lines the country as well as connecting the coast with California. However, internal communication cannot be said to have been improved as in the 1930's, the CIA was under pressure by the Chinese conservatives to withdraw. Without external assistance and funding, the telegraphs became run down and eventually fell out of use by the 1940's. A further factor that

made this attempt at improving communications a failure, was the Japanese troops seizing the telegraph during the second sino ^{- Japanese} war. Thus, this attempt at improving internal communications can be said to be largely a failure as the Chinese government could not maintain the telegraphs without foreign assistance.

However, one may argue that the Chinese government's attempts to improve internal communications were in fact a success in regards to the development of trains. In ~~1881~~ 1881, there was only 50 miles of track but by 1900 there were ~~4~~ 9000 miles of track, 70 of which belonged to the Chinese. Initially, the Chinese were unable to maintain the railways without external (foreign) economic assistance. This was because the population were not wealthy enough and they did not know how to operate trains. However, under Mao, 700 miles of track were laid every year for 15 years, without ~~even~~ foreign assistance. And although, some of these trains and tracks were made with poor steel, and soon would sometimes collapse under the weight of the trains, it still holds true that by 1978, China had a somewhat efficient train system. Thus, this ~~can~~ ^{only} attempt at improving communications can be said to in fact be a success as it operated for many years and can continue / operate without foreign assistance.

Similarly, the attempt to improve the internal communications can be said to have improved in regards to electrification. In the 1960's, until ~~1949~~ 1949, most of China was without electricity. However in 1949,

There were only 53 hydroelectric power stations. However, under Mao, he ~~regularly~~ mobilised a large amount of the population to build dams and to produce electricity. Some may argue that the improvement to internal communications was undermined by the fact that some dams were built in the wrong place and thus produced no electricity. However, mistakes like this do not take away from the fact that 1 billion Mao Chinese people had access to electricity by the end of the period. Furthermore, this change was long-lasting and was done independently of foreign exploitation. ~~Moreover~~, while some Soviet economic assistance was needed, they loaned Mao 2 billion roubles, but assistance was not exploitative as it was done in good faith, due to Stalin attempting to improve relations within the communist bloc. Thus, it is not accurate to say that the Chinese government failed in their attempt to improve internal communication.

Finally, one area that cannot be said that the Chinese government focused on that cannot be said to have largely failed in their attempt to improve communications ~~was~~ roads. In the 1860's, most of China was connected via air routes which became useless in poor weather. However, Jiang Jieshi highlighted roads as being of great strategic importance. In his fight against the communists, Jiang eventually built 70,000 miles of roads - Jiang even built 1000 miles of roads in his enclosures of the Communists in the early 1930s. Furthermore, this development can be said to be a great success as it was done independently of foreign investment.

as most foreign investors were uninterested in the chaos of China. Furthermore, more ~~roads~~ roads were built upon over the 30's to 70's, as most Chinese governments recognised roads in being crucial in ~~the~~ unifying China. Thus, the ~~the~~ attempt by Chinese governments to improve internal communications through roads cannot be said to be a ~~failure~~ largely a failure.

Overall, it is ~~hardly~~ ^{slightly} accurate to say that the attempts of the Chinese government to improve internal communications were largely a failure. As, ~~indeed~~ indeed, the attempt to improve communications through the means of naval navigation and telegraph were a failure. Although, it is only slightly accurate to say that these attempts were largely a failure, as many ~~great~~ attempts to improve communications, such as roads, trains and electrification were a success.



Here, the candidate maintains a focus on attempts made in China to improve internal communications throughout their answer. Knowledge sufficient to respond fully to the demands of the question is used, and valid criteria for judgement are established in the process of coming to a conclusion. It was awarded a low L5 mark.

Question 10

This was by far the most popular of the Section C questions for Paper 38.2, and a variety of approaches was offered with regard to the phrase 'Chinese adaptations of western ideologies'. Some candidates interpreted this to mean largely 'adoption' of western ideologies, and argued that economic growth was stronger when Chinese governments used capitalist methods based upon western, liberal norms. Also, different candidates offered different approaches to the interpretation of Soviet Marxism – some argued it was a western ideology while others argued otherwise. All valid approaches were rewarded.

Those who attempted this question often had a secure knowledge and understanding of the pattern of economic growth in China in the period and of government approaches from the Qing to Deng. Many argued that Deng's blend of western capitalism and Chinese communism was by far the most successful policy of the period. Many also argued that Mao's attempts to adapt Marxism during the Great Leap Forward was one of the least successful. Some also knew, and were able to discuss convincingly, the contribution of TV Soong. Weaker answers were less sure in their grasp of this but many still did score well, reaching high L3 and L4 marks.

It can be argued that a greater extent of economic growth in the years 1860-1997 was caused by Chinese adaptations of western ideologies. For example empress Cixi imposed the Canton system for trade. This meant that the ~~Qing~~ ^{Qing} could control where the foreigners where ~~to~~ within China, it also meant ~~the Qing~~ ^{the Qing} could set prices and collect tariffs of the goods being sold in the area. Although the Qing set prices the government did not control the goods movement, which created small amounts of economic prosperity at the time.

↗ ↘ * meant to be same paragraph *

However, Li Hongzhang's encouragement of the Self Strengthening movement and to adopt and adapt to western technologies was wildly unpopular from the peasants. As a result of this it encouraged anti-foreign feeling and uprising, like the Boxer uprising (who burned down modernised infrastructure). This therefore any and all economic growth and prosperity. This then demonstrates how small amounts of controlled

adaptation of western ideas can be beneficial however larger movements can impact and halt economic development before the 20th Century.

Mao's creation of the first 5 year plan had huge amounts of economic growth and development, using Stalin-Leninist ideas. This demonstrated that the need for Chinese to adapt western ideas in order to ~~be~~ gain economic growth had ~~been~~ become redundant. However following the failure of the second five year plan or 'the great leap forward' which resulted in the death of 30 million peasants from famine, Deng Xiaoping introduced small amounts of capitalism to help stabilise the economy. This demonstrates that socialist ideas help economic growth initially, however in the long term the introduction of small amounts of western ideas into China help to encourage economic growth.

Finally by the 1980s to a great extent it had become clear that in order for China to achieve their own economic growth and prosperity they would need to introduce small amounts of western economics. ~~in order~~ This is demonstrated when Deng Xiaoping creates Special Economic Zones

~~1980s~~ (SEZ), which is where ¹³ ~~3~~ areas across China had small amounts of Capitalism introduced into them. As a result of this there was huge amounts of economic growth and prosperity during the 1980s and 90s.

In conclusion it is clear that to large degree Chinese economies and growth are most successful when they adopt and adapt western ideas. Although there have been some case where there is short term economic growth from eastern ideas, overall it is clear for long term successful economic prosperity the best outcomes is when China adopts western ideas.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response offers some analysis of relevant key features and deploys some knowledge to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the question. However, the answer lacks depth and consequently, its judgement lacks substantiation. It 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 ensure that they deal with both enquiries
- Candidates should not simply paraphrase the content of the source; they should develop valid inferences relevant to the enquiries from the source material
- Candidates should avoid stock evaluation, for example, that it is a newspaper report so it is exaggerated because it is designed to sell papers
- 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.

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>

