



Pearson

Mark scheme

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel
GCE History (8HI0/1E)
Advanced Subsidiary 2018

Paper 1: Breadth study with
interpretations

Option 1E: Russia, 1917–91: from
Lenin to Yeltsin

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 2018

Publications Code 8H10_1E_1806_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

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: Sections A and B

Target: A01: 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	1–4	<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	5–10	<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 question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it 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	11–16	<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	17–20	<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. • 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.

Section C

Target: AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
2	5–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
3	11–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
4	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised by comparison of them. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. • Discusses evidence in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.

Section A: Indicative content

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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Stalin's personality was the main reason for the purges of the 1930s in the Soviet Union.</p> <p>The role played by Stalin's personality in the purges of the 1930s in the Soviet Union should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stalin was driven by intense suspicion of others, which reinforces claims that his personality was a key reason for the purges of the 1930s; as he admitted to Khrushchev 'I trust nobody, not even myself' • Vindictive and vengeful, Stalin used the purges to settle scores with Old Bolsheviks who had apparently crossed or belittled him in earlier years, e.g. the show trials of the 1930s • The unleashing of brutal purges fits with Stalin's instinctive reliance on violence and coercion to solve the Soviet Union's perceived problems (such as forcible collectivisation), e.g. the wider party purge from 1937 • Stalin's narcissistic self-image as the 'hero of the revolution' and the builder of Russian socialism could only be maintained by purging the 'traitors' who did not share his grandiose beliefs about himself. <p>The role played by other factors in the purges of the 1930s in the Soviet Union should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The central party administration in Moscow used the purges to impose greater control and discipline over the regions, e.g. local party organisations regularly ignored or delayed implementing central party edicts • The purges were used to provide scapegoats ('saboteurs' and 'wreckers') for the failures of the Five Year Plans and to encourage worker criticism of managers and administrators in order to raise productivity • The NKVD's vigorous pursuit of the purges was designed to prove the value of the secret police to the regime and to enhance its power within the Soviet system, e.g. the NKVD's target fulfilment mentality in the 1930s • Stalin resorted to the purges because he faced real threats in the 1930s, e.g. the Ryutin Platform (1932), the 17th Party Congress (1934), and the growing Nazi menace raised the fear of overthrow in war. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the failure of central planning was the main reason for the decline of the Soviet economy in the years 1964–85.</p> <p>The role played by the failure of central planning in the decline of the Soviet economy in the years 1964–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stalin's centralised system of planning left a legacy of bureaucratic conservatism and inaccurate statistics, which hampered any initiatives to improve economic efficiency and product quality • Continued central control after 1964 stifled initiative and creativity in the economic system, e.g. new methods or techniques employed at local level were regarded as threats to the power of the central planners • The use of government-set prices and costs when planning and measuring economic performance did not help identify or solve issues of inefficiency • Production of everything from coal to shoes was decided by central planners who could not cope with changes in circumstances or trends in fashion. <p>The role played by other factors in the decline of the Soviet economy in the years 1964–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regime-worker 'social contract' made the authorities unwilling to countenance factory closures or unemployment; this led to low levels of worker productivity • Although Khrushchev and Brezhnev increased agricultural investment, the sector remained seriously short of storage facilities, transport and reliable machinery during this period • The Soviet empire acted as an economic drain on the USSR, e.g. by the 1980s the Warsaw Pact countries received an annual subsidy of some \$3 billion from the Soviet Union • The continued dominance of the military-industrial complex during this period ensured that around 25 per cent of Soviet GDP was spent on defence, depriving consumer industries and agriculture of resources. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section B: Indicative content

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 about how accurate it is to say that Soviet leaders, in the years 1953–85, pursued similar policies on religion.</p> <p>The extent to which Soviet leaders, in the years 1953–85, pursued similar policies on religion should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Khrushchev was deeply anti-religious and pursued a policy of active repression continued by subsequent leaders, e.g. 10,000 churches were closed within four years • Brezhnev and later leaders restricted the activities of religious groups such as Jews and Baptists • Under Andropov and Chernenko, the Soviet regime continued to keep religious groups (defined as dissidents) under surveillance to limit their influence. <p>The extent to which Soviet leaders, in the years 1953–85, did not pursue similar policies on religion should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Khrushchev's anti-religious policies were markedly more severe than those of his successors, e.g. destruction of religious buildings and imprisonment of thousands of religious activists • Brezhnev was prepared to make limited concessions to religious groups, e.g. he permitted formal Orthodox church services and welfare work, and, in 1972, allowed the New Testament to be published in Lithuania • Andropov used more sophisticated techniques, including technological eavesdropping, to monitor and control 'anti-Soviet' groups, including religious dissidents. <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 whether government educational policy improved the lives of the Soviet population in the years 1917–85.</p> <p>The ways in which government educational policy improved the lives of the Soviet population in the years 1917–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compulsory education led to the almost complete eradication of illiteracy during this period, e.g. universal compulsory education by the 1930s with literacy levels raised to 98–99 per cent by 1959 • The development of adult education (rabfaki) as a 'second chance' provision from the 1950s enabled millions of Soviet citizens to study part-time for self-improvement and to enhance their job prospects • The expansion of Soviet higher education improved opportunities (in terms of promotion prospects and upward social mobility) for students from working-class backgrounds and women. <p>The ways in which government educational policy did not improve the lives of the Soviet population in the years 1917–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of resources hindered the government's plans for a universal programme of compulsory education until the 1950s, e.g. limited state spending on education and low wages for teachers • Traditional rural, ethnic and cultural attitudes towards education were ingrained and ensured that some groups remained disadvantaged, e.g. rural children and Muslim females • The Soviet education system, at all levels, contained compulsory ideological content that to some extent reduced schools and universities to propaganda agencies, e.g. Stalin's 'Short Course' • The main route to high status jobs in the USSR – academic secondary education – continued to be dominated by the children of the Soviet white-collar and managerial elite. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section C: Indicative content

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. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that the collapse of the Soviet Union came about because of the role played by Boris Yeltsin.</p> <p>Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their discussion of various views to reach a reasoned conclusion.</p> <p>In considering the given view, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeltsin persuaded the parliament of the Russian Republic to declare sovereignty, which undermined Soviet authority and encouraged other republics to do the same • Yeltsin was <i>the</i> high profile opponent of the failed August 1991 coup attempt to reinstate a hard-line Soviet regime • Afterwards, Yeltsin suspended communist activity in the Russian Republic and encouraged the republics to weaken further central Soviet authority. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gorbachev's reforms were meant to renew the Soviet system but they undermined key features of the communist regime • In reality, <i>perestroika</i> meant the complete transformation of the Soviet Union but Gorbachev's communist background prevented him from seeing this clearly • Gorbachev thought that the extent of economic change and the growth of nationalism within the Soviet Union could be limited. <p>Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues to address the view that the collapse of the Soviet Union came about because of the role played by Boris Yeltsin. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With Yeltsin's approval and backing, the parliament of the Russian Republic declared that its sovereignty took precedence over that of the Soviet Union – in short, it stood above the authority of the USSR • Yeltsin's encouragement of the nationalist movements of the non-Russian Republics was deliberately designed to undermine the authority of the central Soviet government • Yeltsin played a key role in foiling the August 1991 attempted coup; led by communist hard-liners this represented a last-gasp attempt to maintain the Soviet Union intact and preserve one party communist rule • Yeltsin undermined the new Union Treaty (1991) and organised the Commonwealth of Independent States, a decentralised structure with no Soviet government, which was implemented in December 1991.

Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues related to the debate to address other conditional and/or contingent reasons that explain the collapse of the Soviet Union. Relevant points may include:

- Most of **Gorbachev's** policies had unintended results and indicated that he had not fully thought through the consequences of his actions, e.g. *glasnost* led to mounting public criticism of communist rule
- **Gorbachev's reforms raised people's expectations, both materially and politically**, but failed to satisfy them, e.g. *perestroika* and market mechanisms failed to deliver adequate food supplies and consumer goods
- In ending the Brezhnev Doctrine, Gorbachev had not anticipated the rapid collapse of communist states in the Eastern bloc in 1989, nor the impact this would have on nationalist groups within the USSR
- **Gorbachev's** handling of issues concerning the national minorities was insensitive and undermined central government-republic relations, e.g. Nagorno-Karabakh (1988) and the Baltic republics (1990–91).

Other relevant material must be credited.