

# Examiners' Report Summer 2007

GCE

GCE History (6526)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

Summer 2007

Publications Code UA 019227

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2007

## Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	Introduction	4
6A:	The Crisis of the Tudor State, 1547-58	7
6B:	The Quest for Settlement: Cromwell and the Protectorate, 1653-58	8
6C:	Radicalism and the British State: the Chartist Experience, 1838-50	9
6D:	Decline of the Liberal Party, c.1900-29	11
6E:	Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control, 1933-45	13
6F:	The Soviet Union after Lenin, 1924-41	15
6G:	The Origins of Early Development of the Cold War, 1945-62	17
	Statistics	19

## Introduction

This was the sixth Advanced Level examination of GCE History on this Specification. This particular Unit attracted an entry of over 21,000 candidates. Within this, there were wide variations in the number of candidates entering for different papers, with Paper 6E, '*Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control 1933-45*' attracting 8,434 candidates and, at the other end of the scale, Paper 6D, '*The Decline of the Liberal Party c.1900-29*' attracting 794 candidates.

All papers differentiated effectively and this produced a full range of marks. Whilst broad comparability across all papers was achieved by the range of questions asked, some adjustment to the grade boundaries was made where questions appeared to have created particular difficulties. The grade boundary marks published with this Report should be read with this in mind. A high grade boundary does not indicate that the paper was difficult, nor does a low one suggest that it was easy to attain high levels - indeed, the opposite may be the case. With these mechanisms available for fine-tuning, comparability of standards and demands across the different papers can be assured.

Examiners were required to take account of the quality of written communication displayed in candidates' responses. Whilst in most cases, the quality of written English was commensurate with candidates' quality of historical knowledge and understanding, there were far fewer candidates than last year experiencing problems in communicating effectively and within the normally accepted rules of English grammar.

This summer, all scripts were marked on-line. Because all scripts were scanned in for examiners to retrieve, using Edexcel's e-pen system, it was essential that candidates began writing their (a) response where indicated and began their response to the (b) question where indicated further on in the answer booklet. Far too many candidates commenced their (b) response immediately after completing their answer to (a) and this caused administrative problems.

Comments specific to each of the papers will be made later in this Report. There are, however, some comments that relate to the Unit as a whole and to all seven papers.

- Changes were made to this Unit as a whole and to two of the papers within the Unit. This unit is now the only place in A2 GCE History where source analysis is assessed and so the weighting of the assessment objectives was adjusted appropriately. The (a) response, marked out of 20, allocated 15 marks to A02 and 5 marks to A01. The (b) response, marked out of 40, allocated 30 marks to A02 and 10 marks to A01. As a consequence, examiners placed far greater emphasis than in previous years on the way in which candidates evaluated and contextualised the given source material than on straightforward own knowledge.
- Unit 6 is the synoptic Unit. It is synoptic principally in that it seeks to assess the full range of skills, ideas and concepts developed through the study of other AS and A2 units. Thus responses should be led by a careful analysis of the sources. Whilst it is not expected that candidates should rehearse, at this level, the sort of evaluation regarding bias, cross-referencing, utility and reliability seen in Unit 1, it is expected that candidates should internalise the skills developed from GCSE and AS source work and integrate these into their arguments. Whilst more candidates

than in previous years were able to do this with confidence, too many candidates are still using the content of the sources as part of an extended, or explained, narrative.

- The quality of knowledge displayed by the majority of candidates was, as last year, commented on favourably by all examiners. Examiners were impressed by the depth, detail and range of knowledge shown by candidates on their chosen topics. The best scripts were absolutely excellent.
- The sources provided for the (b) question are intended to give candidates pointers to the different sorts of interpretations that are possible on a particular topic, and the primary sources can be used to back or challenge these interpretations. More candidates than last year appreciated that the sources had been selected with this intention, although there were still a disappointingly large minority who used the sources as sources of information only.
- Both the questions on each of the papers involved both the use of sources and the candidates' own knowledge. However, the focus of the two questions was different. There were still candidates who seemed unaware of this.
  - The (a) question involves making and supporting a judgement on the key features of an historical movement, episode or issue. Candidates are expected to focus on three sources and contextualise them with the addition of some own knowledge where necessary to develop and/or support the judgement they are making about key features.
  - The (b) question focused on the making and supporting a judgement about an historical interpretation, with candidates being presented with an interpretation and invited to make and support a judgement about its truth or validity. A substantial minority of candidates did not seem aware of the fact that they were addressing an interpretation. Candidates are expected to focus on all the given sources, contextualise them appropriately and use their own knowledge where necessary in support or development.
- The key to the (b) question is to explain how two or more different arguments, drawn from two or more of the sources, can be sustained and developed using the other sources, appropriately contextualised. The aim is to show how different interpretations, identified from the sources, can be argued from both the content of the set sources and wider contextual knowledge, contrasting the emphases and evidence used in each point of view.
- Examiners reported that far fewer candidates than in previous years were dealing first with the sources and then going on to develop an answer using their own knowledge. However, there were still a disturbing number of formulaic answers, particularly in responses to the (b) question. Candidates adopting this approach dealt first with the interpretation given in the question and then moved on to discuss, in turn, 'other factors'. Whilst this approach might provide a 'safe' structure for less able candidates, it served to inhibit the more able, who struggled to fit what they wanted to say into a structure they had been taught to use.

- Relatively few candidates weighed the evidence they were presenting when reaching a conclusion. Presenting a supported case for two or more interpretations, candidates plumped for one, seemingly at whim, without giving any sort of logical judgement as to why they made this particular choice.
- The mark allocation is (a) 20 marks and (b) 40 marks, and this should work as a guide for candidates in their time allocation. As last year, too many candidates seemed not to appreciate this. Very full answers were seen to the (a) part question, leaving scant time to respond to the (b) part, which always requires more thought and developed argument.
- Careful planning is a key to success on this paper. It is pleasing to report that the majority of candidates are now having the confidence to spend time working out carefully constructed answers. This invariably paid dividends as these candidates were able to focus on the question asked and maintained that focus in their answers.

## 6A: The Crisis of the Tudor State 1547-58

### Part (a)

This question asked candidates to focus on the domestic problems facing Somerset and Northumberland as they ran the protectorate in the name of Edward VI. Whilst all candidates clearly had a workable understanding of the problems of the reign, the less able simply focused on the ways in which the two Dukes governed in the name of Edward VI. The more perceptive candidates were able to use the sources to explore the complexity of the problems they faced in wielding power during a minority, in tempering their own ambition with reality and in dealing with a young king who had ideas of his own as to what should be done. Candidates made reference to Ket's rebellion (Source 1) and to the role of Edward in precipitating the succession crisis (Source 2) and the good candidates were able to link these with the judgements on Somerset and Northumberland found in Source 3. From their own knowledge, many candidates were able appropriately to contextualise the given source material, providing additional factors such as the religious grievances that culminated in the Western Rebellion, social and economic grievances that resulted in Ket's rebellion, the attitude of the local gentry and the pressures put upon central government to deliver a peaceful realm.

### Part (b)

This question enabled candidates to address the issues surrounding the so-called mid-Tudor crisis and, by posing the hypothesis that the country was never, at any time, in danger of collapse, enable candidates to explore alternative interpretations of 'crisis'.

Nearly all candidates were able to compare the sources and link them with their own contextual knowledge, either in support or challenge of the quotation in Source 6. Those candidates supporting the claim tended to start with Source 6 and backed this up by reference to Sources 2 and 3. Candidates explained that Ket's rebellion was put down easily by government forces; good candidates utilised Source 2 to demonstrate that, although a monarch might seek to change the succession, ultimately the succession depended upon the agreement of parliament and that this demonstrated an underlying stability, particularly in the light of events involving Lady Jane Grey. Those candidates who sought to challenge the given interpretation tended to use Source 5 and backed this by using Sources 2 and 4. Interestingly, Source 2 was used to point to a monarch creating a document, with the connivance of his advisors, that was essentially illegal and which sought to overturn the will of the previous monarch (Henry VIII) as confirmed by parliament. Source 4 was used, along with candidates' contextual knowledge, to point up the explosiveness of the situation.

Better candidates, operating at Level 3 and above, produced developed explanations showing a clear understanding that they were dealing with different interpretations concerned with the mid-Tudor crisis. There were some excellent responses, where candidates presented a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations and showing an understanding that different historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and fully engaging with the different emphases contained in Sources 3, 5 and 6.

## 6B: The Quest for Settlement: Cromwell and the Protectorate 1653-58

### Part (a)

This question asked candidates to focus on the reasons why Cromwell refused the Crown of England. The majority of candidates were able to identify the demands of the question accurately and, although weaker responses were those that simply focused on the events surrounding Cromwell's refusal, using the sources as sources of information, the more perceptive candidates used the sources to explore the complexity of Cromwell's motives.

Candidates were able to make reference to opposition from the army (Source 3), Cromwell's religious beliefs (Source 1) and the rejection of the possibility of stability and continuity (Source 2). Better candidates reinforced their understanding of the sources by drawing on their own contextual knowledge and provided additional factors, such as the impossibility, in Cromwell's mind, of a regicide becoming king; the ways in which Cromwell's support within the army would be split, and the likelihood of various factions within English society accepting such a move.

### Part (b)

This question enabled candidates to address the issues surrounding the search for settled government and, by posing the hypothesis that the failure to establish it was because of Cromwell's failure to convert military rule into parliamentary government, enabled candidates to explore alternative interpretations of the reasons why settled government was not established during the Protectorate.

All candidates were demonstrated the ability to compare the sources, with varying degrees of success, and to link them with their own contextual knowledge. Support for the given interpretation can be found in Source 6, and many candidates found there, and developed, a range of different imperatives driving Cromwell that prevented his conversion of military rule to parliamentary government. Candidates used Source 4, too, to point up the ingrained nature of military rule with the implication that change would be virtually impossible. Challenge to the given interpretation was found in Source 5, which plays down the military element and implies that settled government was within easy reach. Candidates found support for this view in Source 3, with its emphasis on continuity and the underlying conservatism of the political nation.

Good responses (at Level 3 and above) demonstrated developed explanations that were infused with the recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the reasons why settled government was not found during the time of the protectorate. The very best responses came from those candidates who were able to present a sustained argument, not only recognising that there were different interpretations, but also showing an understanding of why historians presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the given sources. These responses fully engaged with the different emphases found in sources 5, 6 and 7. In coming to a conclusion, these high level responses marshalled the sources to support their own interpretation whilst at the same time recognising the existence of alternative views.

## 6C: Radicalism and the British State: the Chartist Experience 1838-50

### Part (a)

The question asked candidates to focus on the reasons why men and women became Chartists. Although many candidates - and certainly the weaker ones - focused simply on the desire for the vote and the 'bread-and-cheese' reasons, the question did give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of political and economic motivations and the ways in which these changed over time and place.

Most candidates were able, with varying degrees of success, to pick up on the economic imperatives in Source 1 and better responses explained why, in some circumstances and for some people, these took precedence over political imperatives. Source 2 enabled candidates to consider the ways in which the Charter was used as a focus for a range of social discontents. (Many candidates thought this source was written by a woman) By hinting at a mis-match between the reasons Lovett and his supporters became Chartists and the reasons people in the north joined the movement, enabled the more perceptive candidates to explore the ways in which motivation differed from place to place. Source 3, by bringing together social and economic imperatives enabled good candidates to explain that the intellectual core of Chartists were driving for political change so that social and economic ills could be righted. Some candidates deployed excellent contextual knowledge especially by Asa Briggs at a local level and Dorothy Thompson on Chartist women.

### Part (b)

This question enabled candidates to address the issues surrounding the leadership of the Chartist movement and, by posing the hypothesis that it was O'Connor who was its main inspiration and driving force, encouraged candidates to explore alternative interpretations of the role of O'Connor and of other Chartist leaders.

All candidates were able to compare the sources and to link the sources with their own contextual knowledge and were able either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Sources 5, 6 and 7 give very sharply differentiated interpretations of the role of O'Connor, and candidates were able to focus on these either in support or challenge of the given interpretation. Better responses from more perceptive candidates noted that Hovell (Source 6) was one of the earliest historians of Chartism and that his views, particularly about the role of O'Connor and the structure of the movement, have been countered by later historians of the movement such as Thompson (Source 7) Better candidates not only recognised that Source 3 was taken from O'Connor's Chartist newspaper but appreciated that it gave very clear exposition of the focus of his position and of what he wanted the movement to achieve. Candidates used this to support the interpretation given in Source 7. This is in many ways was challenged by Source 5, which provided high achieving candidates with the opportunity to explore the rich variety of Chartist activity that did not involve O'Connor and to give further in-depth consideration to his role within the movement. This led many to a consideration of Source 4, where O'Connor launches a blistering attack on Lovett and thus opened up for good candidates the whole issue of the nature of the leadership of the movement and the ways in which both Lovett and O'Connor tried to mould Chartism.

More able candidates provided a developed explanation that fully recognised that there are different interpretations concerning the role of O'Connor within the Chartist movement. At the highest levels were responses that presented a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the nature of the leadership of the Chartist movement and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, engaging with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 5, 6 and 7. In coming to a conclusion, candidates operating at this level marshalled the sources to support their own opinion, but also recognised the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present.

## 6D: Decline of the Liberal Party c.1900-29

### Part (a)

This question asked candidates to focus on the reasons why people supported the Liberal party in the years to 1914, and, whilst many will simply focused on the Liberal reforms, the question did give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of the changing nature of support for the Liberals at general elections and in the country at large throughout the period.

All candidates were able make reference to the positive effects of Old Age Pensions and to the general support for them in the country at large (Source 1) to the industrial unrest that occurred after 1910 (Source 2) and to the ways in which (Source 3) the Party weathered this.

Candidates own contextual knowledge included an appraisal of the level of support for the Liberal reforms, particularly the restricted nature of Old Age Pensions and problems over National Insurance; the two elections in 1910; the formal and informal alliances with Labour prior to elections and the potential problems of industrial unrest and the links between the trade unions and the Labour Party that were potentially damaging to Liberal support by the electorate.

Whilst the majority of candidates were able to refer, with varying degrees of success, to the challenges faced by the Liberal party and the ways in which the Party reacted to them, relatively few candidates were able effectively to relate this to the Liberals' ability to stay in power.

### Part (b)

This question enabled candidates to address the issues surrounding the decline of the Liberal Party and, by posing the hypothesis that the decline was due to the First World War, enabled candidates to explore alternative interpretations of the reasons for the decline of the Party.

All candidates were able to compare the sources, with varying degrees of success, and to link them with their own contextual knowledge and were able either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Those supporting the claim that the Liberal decline was caused by the First World War generally started with Wilson's 'rampant omnibus' interpretation and found support for this in Source 4, written during the War at the height of the leadership crisis. Challenge to the given interpretation was found in a combination of Source 5, with its view that the Liberal Party was finished as a political force in 1913, backed by Source 3, with its emphasis on unrest and the prospect of change. Better candidates appreciated that Source 6 posed an alternative, almost counter-factual, view that was used selectively to challenge or support the given interpretation.

Candidates used their own contextual knowledge to develop what they found in the sources. Many addressed the impact the War had on British society and (driven by Source 4) on the leadership struggle that split the Liberal Party. In considering alternative interpretations, better responses used the points made in Source 6 to reflect upon the whole process of decline.

Candidates made reference to the challenges faced by the Liberals prior to 1914 and to the general acceptability of Dangerfield's thesis, and most made mention of the fortunes of the Liberal Party post-1918, to the continued antagonism between Asquith and Lloyd George and better candidates to Lloyd George's increasing isolation in the years to 1929.

More able candidates were able to provide a developed explanation, fully recognising that there are different interpretations concerning the reasons why the Liberal Party declined. At the highest levels, candidates presented a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the Liberal decline and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and some fully engaged with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 5, 6 and 7. In coming to a conclusion, they marshalled the sources to support their own opinion, but also recognised the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present.

## 6E: Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control 1933-45

This was one of the papers where a change had been made to the content and therefore to the title, extending the end-date from 1939 to 1945. Almost all centres had clearly appreciated that this change was happening and had adjusted their teaching programme accordingly.

### Part (a)

This question asked candidates to focus on the role of propaganda in the Nazi state and, whilst many simply focussed on describing the different types of propaganda used, the question did give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of issues surrounding the purpose of propaganda and the ways in which the Nazis used it, for example, to create the charismatic image of Hitler (the Hitler myth) and to convince the German people that Volksgemeinschaft had been achieved.

Candidates made reference, with varying degrees of success, to the role played by the massed rallies (Source 1) in building a sense of unity and purpose as well as creating and developing Hitler's public image. Source 2 gave an insight into what Hitler saw as the function of propaganda. Source 3 gives an example of a specific use of propaganda - to prepare people for the elimination of the Jews from Germany. Here, a disappointing number of candidates claimed this was the only purpose of propaganda in Hitler's Germany.

The topic itself seemed well-known to most candidates, with many using their contextual knowledge to refer to, for example, exact percentages of state ownership of newspapers over the years, to the burning of books in May 1933 and to Leni Riefenstahl's films. Many had a detailed knowledge of additional factors such as sporting events like the Olympic games, posters, photographs as well as historians' arguments. Even so, there were candidates who could remember little beyond the films *Jud Sues* and 'Triumph of the Will'.

A pleasing number of candidates did understand that the purpose of propaganda changed over time, and evidenced this by a comparison of Source 2 with Source 3, appropriately contextualising the sources correctly, naming the Enabling Act and Kristallnacht as the events in the immediate context of the sources.

### Part (b)

This question enabled candidates to address the issues surrounding Nazi policies towards the Jews and, by posing the hypothesis that genocide was always the Nazi's long-term aim, enabled them to explore alternative interpretations.

All candidates were able to compare the sources and to link them with their own contextual knowledge either to challenge or support the given interpretation. Those supporting the claim used Source 4, from which the interpretation was taken, and developed this by using Source 6 selectively. More able students were able fully to engage with the complexity of Source 6, which offers the interpretation that the long term plan to exterminate the Jews was necessarily overlaid by shorter term imperatives.

Candidates found challenge to the claim in Source 5, which finds no such long-term plan and many used Source 6 to show that Goldhagen's admission that there were alternative goals and imperatives may well not have been masking a long-term aim of genocide but could be supportive of the interpretation given in Source 5.

Candidates made reference to the primary sources 2 and 3. Here, Source 2 was generally used to support the interpretation given in Source 6 by showing the many short and medium term goals that were occupying the Nazis, although some good candidates used it, because of its emphasis on blood, race and 'eternal values', long held ambitions of the Nazis to 'purify' the German race. Source 3, on the other hand, was seen to imply that a sudden decision to 'solve' the Jewish question 'once and for all' had been made by Hitler as late as November 1938.

Good candidates provided a developed explanation, clearly recognising that there are different interpretations concerning Nazi policies toward the Jews. At the highest levels, candidates presented a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about Nazi planning for genocide, and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and they engaged effectively with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 4, 5 and 6. In coming to a conclusion, these candidates marshalled the sources to support their own opinion, but also recognised the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present.

More able candidates were able to interlink the sources with their relevant own contextual knowledge and focused sharply on the key words 'plain' and 'unwavering', distinguishing between Hitler's intentions at the outset and the realities of the workings of Nazi government. Those candidates who referred back frequently to the key words in the question tended to score highly. A number of such candidates wrote well thought out conclusions and impressive answers often ended with the argument that although Hitler's intentions were 'plain', Nazi policies often 'wavered' according to circumstance.

## 6F: The Soviet Union after Lenin 1924-41

### Part (a)

This question asked candidates to focus on the process by which Stalin emerged as Lenin's successor. Many candidates made effective use of the sources. Responses that merely quoted the sources were few and far between this year; most candidates showed an awareness of the need to draw points out from the evidence of the sources and comment on the information. Weaker responses tended to use the information in the sources to tell the story; whereas better responses integrated their own contextual knowledge with the sources to discuss their validity as evidence. Source 1 was often used to discuss the methods Stalin used as General Secretary; Source 2 pointed candidates towards the techniques used by Stalin to align himself with the rank and file of the Bolshevik Party; Source 3 provided candidates with an opportunity to use their own knowledge to explain what Bukharin meant by "he changes his theories according to whom he needs to get rid of next". The most effective answers were those that really interrogated the sources as evidence and tried to evaluate them. Own contextual knowledge was used to challenge and/or support the views of the sources and the nature, origin and purpose of the sources was discussed and linked to the focus of the question. One weakness that appeared in a wide range of answers was a tendency to provide mechanical evaluation that was not linked to the focus of the question. One example of this relates to Source 2: many answers stated that Trotsky was an opponent of Stalin's in the struggle for power but better answers discussed how this might affect the perspective of the source towards the rise of Stalin. Better answers also made reference to the date of the source and to the fact that Trotsky seems to have been aware of the danger of Stalin as early as 1924 but seemed unable to do anything about it, which could be used to support the view of Source 1 about Trotsky's weaknesses.

### Part (b)

This question centred on a debate that the vast majority of candidates clearly felt comfortable with although some candidates struggled to sustain a relevant focus. Most candidates were able to use the sources and their own contextual knowledge to develop points that showed how the USSR and its population were obedient to Stalin. Many candidates were able to show an awareness that they were discussing an interpretation in a historical debate by using Source 6 as a prompt to also examine elements of disobedience and areas of policy where Stalin was not in control. Effective answers considered the relative merits of the Totalitarian and Revisionist approaches suggested by sources 5 and 6 and discussed how sources 3 and 4 could be used as evidence to support or reject these interpretations.

Evaluation of sources was often very limited with candidates preferring to use the sources to illustrate points. Better answers were able to place the sources within their wider historical context. Many candidates provided comment on Molotov's position as one of Stalin's cronies but seemed thrown by the date of the source (1986) thinking he was now likely to be telling "the truth" because it is after the beginning of Glasnost.

Another feature of the best answers was sustained relevance. Weaker answers often showed sound own knowledge but lost sight of the specific question asked.

The responsibility of Stalin for the Purges and for the specific murder of Kirov, as well as the success or failure of the Five Year Plans were fairly common diversions taken from the focus given in the question. Better answers integrated own knowledge with the sources in order to assess the validity of the evidence for each interpretation. Candidates were often able to make effective use of their knowledge of the Riutin Affair and “Dizzy with Success” to discuss the counter-arguments suggested by Sheila Fitzpatrick in Source 6. Most answers tended to agree with the interpretation given in the question, whilst acknowledging that there are other arguments that need to be discussed and evaluated. The common feature of the better answers, whatever their argument, was the quality of their reasoning, a real interrogation of the sources as evidence within their wider historical context and a real sense of debating the different facets of the question.

One weakness found in even very effective answers was a rather vague understanding of the meaning of “state” in the context of the question. Most candidates took it to mean the population of the USSR.

As in previous years some answers to part (b) were often too long. The result was that many responses had difficulty remaining focused and lost sight of the specific question. In some cases more time planning rather than writing answers might have produced tighter and more convincing arguments.

The weaknesses referred to here should not detract from the fact that many candidates were able to produce thoughtful, reasoned responses that showed real assurance in debating and arguing what was a complex issue. It was also pleasing to read responses from candidates of more modest ability who were nonetheless able to show real engagement with the historical issue under consideration. It is also pleasing to report an improvement in the overall quality of written communication.

## 6G: The Origins and Early Development of the Cold War 1945-62

This was one of the papers where a change had been made to the content and therefore to the title, shortening the timescale by moving the end date to 1962 and in doing so removing 'détente'. All centres had clearly appreciated that this change was happening and had adjusted their teaching programme accordingly.

### Part (a)

This question asked candidates to focus on the origins of the Cold War immediately after 1945 and, whilst many simply focused on the Marshall Plan itself and the ways in which it was perceived, the question did give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of the emerging Cold War and the ways in which the Marshall Plan intensified it.

Candidates were able to make reference to the motives of the USA (Source 1), to the reaction of the USSR (Source 3) and to an explanation of that reaction (Source 2). However, a number of candidates interpreted Source 3 rather literally. Furthermore, there was a real failure to understand or use appropriately the line dealing with 'reactionaries', a word that was tagged on meaninglessly by many candidates. Even more failed to appreciate the chronology of Source 2, seeing it as a comment on the Marshall Plan rather than pre-dating it. Candidates really should know the context of the Long Telegram.

From their own contextual knowledge, candidates were able to reinforce the sources and provide additional factors such as the change in US policy in 1945 resulting from the behaviour of the USSR in eastern and south-eastern Europe, the incompatibility of American and Soviet views about the re-building of Europe and the greater strength of the US political and economic system.

### Part (b)

This question enabled candidates to address the issues surrounding superpower relationships and, by posing the hypothesis that these were driven by individual superpower leaders, enabled candidates to explore alternative interpretations.

All candidates were able to compare the sources and link them with their own contextual knowledge either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Most candidates started with Source 6, from which the given interpretation was taken and found support for this in Source 4, with its emphasis on the change in US policy that occurred when Kennedy replaced Eisenhower. Support, too, was found in Source 3 where the Plan and Doctrine are linked to individuals. Candidates challenging the given view generally used Source 5 which, unpicked, gave a range of alternative interpretations of what drove superpower relationships. Candidates generally supported these by reference to Source 2, which provides an historical explanation (that is itself an interpretation) for the continuity of Russian attitudes to international relations. There were, however, some candidates who attempted to manipulate the source material inappropriately. Such candidates lifted quotes from the sources entirely out of context and used them to 'wallpaper' their answers with source references. For example, the Truman Doctrine was said to be a reaction to the 'fresh strategy of communist expansion', a quote lifted from Source 4 that

was referring to Kennedy in the 1960s. Other candidates have clearly been taught what particular historians have said, and were determined to use their learned quotations, come what may.

Candidates were able to use their own knowledge to develop what they found in the sources and many introduced the idea of alternative interpretations for what drove superpower relations. These included, for example, differing ideologies, contrasting economic systems and / or the existence of atomic weapons and the arms race. However, there were some errors and some chronological misunderstandings.

There was confusion over Berlin, with some candidates maintaining that the Wall was built as part of the Berlin blockade, and still other candidates managing to combine Truman with Khrushchev and bringing Kennedy and Khrushchev to power at the same time in 1953. Few candidates appreciated that Roosevelt could usefully have been included in their responses. The change of US leader to Truman is well known for its impact on super-power relations.

Good candidates provided developed explanations, clearly recognising that there are different interpretations concerning superpower relations. At the highest levels, candidates presented sustained arguments, recognising the existence of different interpretations about superpower relations and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and they engaged with the differences of emphases contained in Sources 4, 5 and 6. In coming to a conclusion, such candidates marshalled the sources to support their own opinion, but they also recognised the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present.

## Statistics

### Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
6A	60	34.8	6.8
6B	60	34.4	9.2
6C	60	34.8	8.8
6D	60	40.1	8.0
6E	60	36.9	9.0
6F	60	31.1	8.3
6G	60	32.6	10.0

#### Paper 6A (1777 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	39	36	33	30	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		28.4	46.9	66.9	80.9	90.3

#### Paper 6B (1038 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	35	31	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		30.6	52.2	67.2	78.7	87.9

#### Paper 6C (1553 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	37	33	30	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		26.8	42.2	60.1	72.1	83.4

#### Paper 6D (789 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	41	37	33	30
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		31.7	53.0	69.1	81.6	88.8

Paper 6E (8237 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	40	36	33	30
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		24.6	40.6	57.5	69.7	78.8

Paper 6F (3837 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	37	33	30	27	24
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		25.2	40.6	53.7	69.3	82.4

Paper 6G (3513 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	36	32	28	25
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		25.5	37.9	53.1	67.2	78.0

9264 A2 Cashin (20450 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Uniform boundary mark	600	480	420	360	300	240
% Candidates		23.9	50.5	74.2	91.1	98.2



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA 019227 Summer 2007

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)  
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at [www.edexcel.org.uk/ask](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/ask) or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH