



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel
In GCE History (9HI0/38)

Paper 3: Themes in breadth with aspects in depth

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia,
1855-1991

Option 38.2: The making of modern China,
1860-1997

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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.

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

Summer 2022

Question Paper Log Number P69348

Publications Code 9HI0_38_2206_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two enquiries may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interrogates the evidence of the source in relation to both enquiries with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Sections B and C

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. The overall judgement is missing or asserted. There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855-91

Question	Indicative content
1.	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source to consider its value for revealing the changes introduced in the USSR following the Twentieth Party Congress (1956) and the strength of the opposition to these changes in the Communist Party. The Twentieth Party Congress (1956) and resistance in the party to de-Stalinisation are named in the specification and candidates can be expected to be aware of them.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The source was issued by the Central Committee of the CPSU and therefore reflects party opinion at a senior level from across the USSR • Issued soon after attempts by leading members of the Communist Party to oust Khrushchev, the decree is seeking to restore his authority, and to discredit and destroy his opposition • The source is firm in its language and comprehensive in its condemnation of the 'anti-party group', as befits a document likely to be publicised widely in the USSR and across the world. <p>2. The following inferences and significant points of information could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <p>The changes introduced in the USSR following the Twentieth Party Congress (1956):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The source suggests that major changes in political culture have already occurred as a result of the Congress ('to eliminate abuses...law', 'to rectify errors...personality cult', 'enlarging the powers...republics') • The source provides evidence that reforms have been made to the economic system in the USSR following the Congress ('the reorganisation of industrial management...industry.') • The source suggests that a significant change in emphasis in the USSR's attitude to foreign powers has occurred ('to relax international tensions.', 'peaceful co-existence', 'build contacts...other countries.'). <p>The strength of the opposition to these changes in the Communist Party:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The source indicates that the opposition to change was led by very senior members of the party ('Molotov...Kaganovich') in prominent positions ('minister of foreign affairs') • The source implies that the 'anti-party group' was working against the tide of opinion in the USSR and that it lacked widespread support ('high-handed unconcern...masses', 'divorced from...Party and country.') • The source provides evidence that the anti-party group was decisively defeated within the Party in 1957 ('admitted the harmful nature...activities', 'unanimously...this group').

Question	Indicative content
	<p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the value of the source in revealing the changes introduced in the USSR following the Twentieth Party Congress (1956) and the strength of the opposition to these changes in the Communist Party. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Khrushchev's 'secret speech' at the Twentieth Party Congress roundly condemned the conduct of Soviet government under Stalin, causing both shock and deep fissures in the leadership of the CPSU • At a Presidium meeting on 18 June 1957, Khrushchev's enemies tried to force him to stand down as party leader, but he refused to go and, with the help of Zhukov, mobilised the wider party membership to fight back • Khrushchev's patronage over regional parties and their leaders was crucial to the outcome of a 6-day meeting of the Central Committee, starting on 22 June, at which the anti-party group was routed • The subsequent public humiliation and later expulsion from the CPSU of such powerful figures, confirmed both Khrushchev's undisputed leadership of the Party and the on-going de-Stalinisation of the USSR.

Option 38.2: The making of Modern China, 1860-1997

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source to consider its value for revealing China's policy regarding the return of Hong Kong to Chinese rule and the relationship between China and Britain in the mid-1980s. The return of Hong Kong to Chinese rule and Deng Xiaoping are named in the specification and candidates can be expected to have knowledge of the negotiations between China and Britain and their context.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As remarks made by Deng Xiaoping, China's leader, the source will reflect Chinese policy at the highest level • Made to visitors from Hong Kong, the remarks were likely intended to be reported in Hong Kong and the wider world • The tone of the remarks is friendly and avuncular, seeking to stress the leader's trustworthiness • The timing of the remarks, just after the agreement of the Sino-British Joint Declaration, was intended to reassure public opinion in Hong Kong and Britain about Chinese intentions. <p>2. The following inferences and significant points of information could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <p>China's policy regarding the return of Hong Kong to Chinese rule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The source indicates that China will not seek to change the way that Hong Kong is governed after its return to Chinese rule ('Hong Kong...change', 'They will not be imposed...Government.') • The source suggests that China is committed to the continuance of Hong Kong's existing economic order after 1997 ('maintain prosperity', 'safeguard the prosperity') • The source suggests that China is seeking to reassure the people of Hong Kong of its sincerity to help facilitate the smooth transfer of power ('China's policy...not change', 'good faith', 'we mean it'). <p>The relationship between China and Britain during the mid-1980s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The source suggests that the relationship between China and Britain is good enough to conclude an 'agreement' concerning the future of Hong Kong • It suggests that there is a degree of trust between China and Britain concerning the agreement ('we are also convinced that Britain will do the same.') • The source suggests that there is a constructive working relationship between Britain and China over Hong Kong ('I listed our concerns, and they expressed their willingness to cooperate with us on them.').

Question	Indicative content
	<p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the value of the source in revealing China's policy regarding the return of Hong Kong to Chinese rule and the relationship between China and Britain in the mid-1980s. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a tacit acceptance of Chinese strength and British impotence, the Joint Agreement of 1984 conceded China's claim to Hong Kong and agreed its handover to Chinese rule on 1 July 1997 • In the Declaration, China promised to allow Hong Kong to govern itself as a Special Administrative Region – it also agreed to maintain the existing economic order and legal system for at least 50 years • Though there was criticism in Britain of the agreement, Sino-British relations remained generally good until, at least, the Tiananmen Square protests in 1989, e.g. Elizabeth II visited the PRC in 1986.

Section B: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855-91

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the accuracy of the statement that the reforms of Alexander II did little to change the political system in Russia in the years 1855-70.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the reforms of Alexander II did little to change the political system in Russia in the years 1855-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexander did little to loosen his autocratic powers during these years and Russia remained a repressive state dominated by the rich and powerful • Alexander's reforms to local government did not weaken the control of the nobility in their localities, e.g. under the <i>zemstvo</i> statute of 1864, 70% of the members of the provincial <i>zemstvos</i> were nobles • The government repressed student criticism of Tsardom both before and after the University Statute of 1863, e.g. the reaction following the assassination attempt on Alexander by a former student in 1866 • The new press regulations of 1865 did not totally remove censorship and periodicals were still shut down for the barest criticism of the autocracy • The municipal statute of 1870 created city dumas that were dominated by the wealthiest taxpayers, while important powers, e.g. control of the police, remained with central government. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the reforms of Alexander II did little to change the political system in Russia in the years 1855-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexander fully understood the need for reform of Russia's political culture following the Crimean War • The <i>zemstvo</i> statute allowed former serfs to be represented and to speak freely – the schools and libraries set up by the <i>zemstvos</i> helped facilitate the growth of freer political expression • The relaxation of censorship in the University Statute, and new press regulations, allowed a greater critical examination of autocracy in Russia than ever before • Together with the <i>zemstvo</i> statute, the municipal statute fostered a wider degree of political engagement in Russia and provided evidence that active representative bodies could change people's lives for the better • Alexander's reforms helped create a spirit of political change in Russia, e.g. the 'generation of the 1860s', and the belief that further reform was possible, even the introduction of a national assembly • The reforms of 1855-70 laid the foundations for greater political change in the longer term rather than within his own lifetime, e.g. the emergence of both revolutionary and reformist political movements in the early 1900s. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which Boris Yeltsin was responsible for the failure of Gorbachev's attempts to modernise the USSR in the years 1985-91.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the view that Boris Yeltsin was responsible for the failure of Gorbachev's attempts to modernise the USSR in the years 1985-91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeltsin was able to establish himself as a more radical, and more popular, alternative to Gorbachev in the turmoil of the late 1980s • Gorbachev's hopes of being able to modernise the USSR gradually, and within the existing communist system, were severely hindered by Yeltsin's criticisms, starting at the Central Committee meeting in June 1987 • Gorbachev's strong personal dislike for Yeltsin distracted him from the modernisation programme - his attempts to discredit his rival backfired, further weakening his leadership and legitimacy as a reformer • Yeltsin's criticisms weakened Gorbachev in the eyes of communist hardliners unused to public attacks on Soviet leaders, and redoubled their commitment to end the reform programme and turn back the clock • By 1989, Yeltsin's electoral gains were such that Gorbachev no longer had credibility as a moderniser - he was widely viewed as trying to save himself and the tainted Soviet system instead • Yeltsin's role in the failure of the August coup in 1991 allowed him to fully eclipse Gorbachev, destroy the credibility of the CPSU and precipitate the dissolution of the USSR. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the view that Boris Yeltsin was responsible for the failure of Gorbachev's attempts to modernise the USSR in the years 1985-91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeltsin was himself a moderniser and was promoted through the CPSU by Gorbachev, who believed he was an ally – the major policy difference between them was over the pace and extent of reform, not reform itself • Gorbachev's attempts to modernise the USSR economically and politically at the same time, whilst retaining the existing Soviet system, were over-ambitious and unlikely to succeed • Gorbachev failed because he lacked the political skill to manage both the modernisers, demanding full market reforms and western freedoms, and the conservatives, who resisted any major changes to the existing system • The modernisation programme took place against a background of major problems in the USSR that made its success unlikely, e.g. economic stagnation, the aftermath of the Afghanistan war, the alcohol problem • Gorbachev's reforms failed because of their economic impact on the Soviet people (e.g. double-digit inflation, food rationing) and bad luck (e.g. the impact of the Chernobyl disaster)

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other individuals contributed to the failure of modernisation, e.g. Sakharov, a radical reformer, and Ligachev, a hard-line opponent of reform. |
|--|---|

Other relevant material must be credited.

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860-1997

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the accuracy of the statement that the most important consequence of the Treaty of Tianjin, in the years 1860-70, was the growth of British influence in Shanghai and the Yangtze valley.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the most important consequence of the Treaty of Tianjin, in the years 1860-70, was the growth of British influence in Shanghai and the Yangtze valley should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Treaty allowed the establishment of four treaty ports on the Yangtze, e.g. at Nanjing and Hankou, the first in the Chinese interior – the British were the first to exploit these • Lower customs duties levied on traded goods in the interior, as a result of the Treaty, enabled the British to expand trade, using steam shipping on the Yangtze to buy tea and porcelain in return for manufactured goods • By cutting out the role of domestic merchants, going more directly to the source of trade, British merchants were able to cut the costs of exports from China and expand the markets available to them • The Treaty stimulated the growth of Shanghai and spawned a significant British population - the city's commercial and industrial infrastructure developed quickly in the 1860s. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that that the most important consequence of the Treaty of Tianjin, in the years 1860-70, was the growth of British influence in Shanghai and the Yangtze valley should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opening up of the Yangtze valley to the British was not an immediate consequence of the Treaty, e.g. in the 1860s, the volume of trade was limited by the inability of the Chinese to afford manufactured goods • Britain had already established a major presence in Shanghai after its opening as a treaty port in 1842, and a British population was already firmly established • A major consequence of the Treaty was the further weakening of the idea of Chinese exceptionalism, and the consequent growth of the Self-Strengthening Movement • The Treaty led to the establishment of the permanent diplomatic presence in Beijing of the western powers, and their consequent ability to influence the Chinese government • The Treaty led to an increase in western exploitation of China more generally, e.g. Russia took advantage of the Treaty to expand in Korea and seize Vladivostok • An important consequence of the Treaty was the introduction of western culture more widely within China, e.g. new trading routes in the interior were well trodden by Christian missionaries • Paradoxically, the Treaty strengthened the Qing – reliant on them to fulfil its terms, the western powers moved to prop up the dynasty against its internal enemies, e.g. the defence of Shanghai against the Taiping in 1860.

	Other relevant material must be credited.
Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the relationship between China and the Soviet Union changed in the years 1958-69.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the view that the relationship between China and the Soviet Union changed in the years 1958-69 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China no longer looked upon the Soviet model of communism as inviolate by the late 1960s, e.g. the Cultural Revolution was a conscious rejection of Soviet leadership • China and the USSR divorced economically in this period - the Great Leap Forward greatly reduced the PRC's reliance on Soviet finance and technical expertise, while Khrushchev stopped all economic aid to China in 1960 • China and the USSR increasingly clashed over their views of the outside world during the 1960s, leading to a freeze in relations, e.g. China's harder line with regard to the USA and the Cold War • From messages of fraternal unity in the 1950s, Mao and the Soviet leaders were conducting very public and very personal slanging matches by the mid-late 1960s, accusing each other of major ideological errors • A clear lack of trust developed in the relationship during this period, e.g. Mao was deeply upset by Khrushchev's unwillingness to share nuclear secrets and by the implications of the Brezhnev Doctrine • The degree to which relations had deteriorated was illustrated by the increasing number of border incidents, which escalated into war in 1969. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the view that the relationship between China and the Soviet Union changed in the years 1958-69 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China's relationship with Russia was mistrustful, dating back to the Unequal Treaties, e.g. border tensions between the two in Xinjiang and Manchuria, and this did not change markedly after 1958 • Mao's relationship with Soviet leaders was already poor before 1958 due to Khrushchev's condemnation of Stalin in 1956 and the launch of 'peaceful coexistence', and this remained the case throughout the years 1958-69 • There were clear economic differences between the PRC and USSR before 1958, e.g. over the cost of Soviet technologies supplied during the First Five-Year Plan - this did not change greatly during the 1960s • Both China and the USSR continued to condemn the USA's escalating involvement in Indo-China, in the same style and for the same reasons, throughout the years 1958-69 • The war in 1969 was brief, and diplomatic relations and Sino-Soviet trade were swiftly re-established - this suggests that Sino-Soviet relations had not changed disastrously during the 1960s. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section C: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855-1991

Question	Indicative content
7	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the significance of the concession of peasant plots (1932) in attempts to improve the condition of the peasantry in the years 1855-1991.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the view that the concession of peasant plots (1932) was significant in attempts to improve the condition of the peasantry in the years 1855-1991 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concession of private plots enabled peasants to supplement their diet, being unwaged following collectivisation and reliant on the rations allotted by their collective farms • The private plots gave the peasants an incentive to work and, as restrictions were relaxed, to sell produce at market to improve their standard of living • Under the Charter of 1935, peasant plots were allowed to grow in size and the range of livestock permitted was extended, both helping to improve the condition of the peasantry • The role of peasant plots increased during the Second World War, eventually making up almost 5% of cultivated land in the USSR, and was essential to maintaining the condition of many peasants • Khrushchev's reduction in taxes on peasant plots in 1953 was an implicit admission of their vital role in the USSR – they continued to be important to the condition of the peasantry until communism's fall in 1991. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the view that the concession of peasant plots (1932) was significant in attempts to improve the condition of the peasantry in the years 1855-1991 and/or that other developments were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private plots were always an embarrassment for the government and they were subject to periods of strong discouragement (e.g. post-1945, in the early 1960s) that temporarily stunted the condition of the peasantry • The abolition of serfdom in 1861 was highly significant in raising the condition of the peasantry, freeing them to own property and build up family farms • Stolypin's reforms after 1906 improved peasant conditions by allowing them to opt out of the <i>mir</i> and consolidate their land holdings into more efficient units • In the early Bolshevik years, the Land Decree of 1917 sanctioned the widespread peasant ownership of land, while the NEP created the conditions in which many peasants were able to prosper • The Khrushchev reforms of the mid 1950s, e.g. the reduction in taxes and other costs on the collectives, were significant in raising the standard of living of the peasantry • Changes under Brezhnev, e.g. allowing the peasants access to social security and pensions, helped improve the condition of the peasantry. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
8	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the statement that the import of western grain (1972-79) was the most important turning point in attempts by Russian governments to feed the people in the years 1861-1991.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the import of western grain (1972-79) was the most important turning point in attempts by Russian governments to feed the people in the years 1861-1991 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brezhnev's decision to import grain from the USA in the 1970s was a major turning point as it implicitly conceded the failure of the Soviet system to feed the Russian population, despite many attempts at reform • The import of grain, which rose steadily in the 1970s, was an important turning point because it helped convince younger and upcoming Soviet leaders of the need for fundamental agricultural change, e.g. Gorbachev • Brezhnev's decision was significant because its rising cost affected the wider Soviet economy, e.g. revenue from the sale of oil to pay for the grain was lost to other reform programmes intended to help feed the people. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the import of western grain (1972-79) was the most important turning point in attempts by Russian governments to feed the people in the years 1861-1991 and/or that there were other more important turning points should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The import of grain from abroad, including the US, was not new and had not marked a turning point in the past, e.g. in the early 1960s when Khrushchev had cut the military budget to pay for it • The import of grain by Brezhnev did not lead immediately to reform of Soviet agriculture – not until the late 1980s did Gorbachev propose changes to the collective system and these remained unfulfilled in 1991 • The Emancipation Decree (1861) was a major turning point in attempts to feed the people by incentivising the peasantry and encouraging the growth of commercial farming in Russia • Stolypin's attempt to increase agricultural productivity through his reforms of 1906-11 was an important turning point, especially in their encouragement of a '<i>kulak</i>' class of prosperous peasants • The NEP (1921) was a turning point by re-introducing market reforms into Russian agriculture in an attempt to produce more food for the Russian people after the privations of War Communism • Collectivisation was a major turning point – it was a genuine attempt to increase production by modernising Russian agriculture, organisationally and technologically, within a generation • Khrushchev's creditable attempt to boost production during the 1950s was a turning point in attempts to reform the collective system, e.g. by expanding into the Virgin Lands, experimenting with maize. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860-1997

Question	Indicative content
9	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that Chinese mining and manufacturing developed steadily throughout the years 1860-1997.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that Chinese mining and manufacturing developed steadily throughout the years 1860-1997 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial production grew throughout the later Qing Empire, owing a great deal to foreign investment and the adoption of western technology in treaty ports like Shanghai • The establishment of the National Resources Commission, under Chiang Kai-shek, successfully encouraged the growth of mining and manufacturing in the years 1932-49 • The boost given to manufacturing by the Japanese in occupied Manchuria after 1931 was significant, e.g. the investment of billions of dollars in industry and infrastructure • The first Five-Year Plan (1953-57) gave an enormous boost to Chinese mining and manufacturing, e.g. almost 600 new factories were built, enabling electric power production to triple and steel to quadruple • The market reforms introduced after 1978 significantly boosted mining and manufacturing in China - tax incentives and subsidies in the Special Economic Zones attracted high levels of foreign investment • The Town and Village Enterprises scheme proved particularly successful in encouraging light industry and the production of consumer goods during the 1990s. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that Chinese mining and manufacturing developed steadily throughout the years 1860-1997 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For most of the late nineteenth century, industrial development was faltering and patchy in China, and often subject to official disapproval, e.g. the years between 1885 and 1895 • For much of the early twentieth century, the development of mining and manufacturing was stymied by internal political instability and foreign threat, and much of China remained industrially undeveloped • As late as the 1930s, over 70% of Chinese manufacturing output was still traditional, i.e. small-scale and crafts based, in sharp contrast to the modern, cotton-producing mills of Shanghai • The Great Leap Forward (1958) badly disrupted the progress of mining and manufacturing made during the first Five-Year Plan, e.g. the failure of the backyard furnaces, the disruption of the food supply to the cities • The Cultural Revolution brought an end to the economic reforms of the early 1960s and distracted the Chinese people from the importance of economic development for over a decade

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deng's reforms proceeded only gradually until the mid-1980s, due to fear of potential political opposition, and the pace of development only picked up thereafter. |
|--|--|

Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
10	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the significance of the role of Sung Tzu-wen (TV Soong) in the promotion of economic growth in China in the years 1860-1997.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the view that the role of Sung Tzu-wen (TV Soong) was significant in the promotion of economic growth in China in the years 1860-1997 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a leading government minister under Chiang Kai-shek, and governor of the Bank of China, Soong undertook many reforms to encourage economic growth in China, e.g. the abolition of the internal tariff, the <i>Likin</i>, in 1931 • Soong was educated in the USA, experienced in international finance and committed to the introduction of western capitalism across China – as the brother-in-law of Chiang Kai-shek, he had influence at the highest level • Soong helped create a modern financial infrastructure in China giving confidence to domestic savers and foreign investors, e.g. the regulation of the banking system, the creation of bond and stock markets in Shanghai • Soong was instrumental in the creation of a number of national bodies that channelled capital to business in the promotion of economic growth in China, e.g. the China Development Finance Corporation (1934) • As Finance Minister, Soong boosted government revenue through anti-corruption and tax avoidance programmes and was able to balance the budget – this gave further confidence to business investors. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the view that the role of Sung Tzu-wen (TV Soong) was significant in the promotion of economic growth in China in the years 1860-1997 and/or that other ideologies and individuals were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soong's influence in national economic affairs was relatively brief (1928-33) and his measures did not noticeably improve the performance of China's economy, e.g. rates of growth remained sluggish • Soong was unable to tackle fundamental problems that prevented economic growth in China, e.g. the enormous burden of military spending, massive corruption, the underdevelopment of education and healthcare • The western-inspired reforms introduced by the Self-Strengthening Movement in the Qing dynasty, e.g. Sheng Xuanhuai's foundation of a modern banking system, were a significant boost to economic growth • The Marxist model introduced by Mao in the early 1950s was significant in promoting China's economic growth, e.g. under the first Five-Year Plan China's economy grew at a hitherto unprecedented rate • Deng's adoption of 'capitalism with Chinese characteristics' following Mao's death, was greatly significant to China's economic growth – this was the foundation of China's transformation in the 1980s and 90s. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>