



## Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE History (8HI0/1E)  
Advanced Subsidiary 2019

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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2019

Publications Code 8H10\_1E\_1906\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## 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"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
2	5–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
3	11–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
4	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## 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"> <li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
2	5–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.</li> </ul>
3	11–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li> <li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li> <li>• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.</li> </ul>
4	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised by comparison of them.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will <b>be credited according to candidates' deployment of material</b> 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 economic problems were the main reason for the difficulties faced by the Soviet governments in the years 1917-28.</p> <p>The role played by economic problems in the difficulties faced by the Soviet governments in the years 1917-28 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In 1917 workers' councils voted themselves huge pay rises and removed</b> experienced managers and technical specialists, which undermined Bolshevik efforts to maintain production and lower inflation</li> <li>• By 1918 the economy was in a state of almost total collapse, which forced the Bolsheviks to embark on drastic interventionist measures collectively known as War Communism</li> <li>• The economic impact of the civil war (e.g. lower industrial and food production, broken transport/distribution networks) seriously increased popular discontent, forcing the Bolsheviks to replace War Communism with the NEP</li> <li>• Under the NEP (1921-28), <b>the 'scissors crisis', the return of capitalist influences, and peasant hoarding of grain</b> threatened to undermine the Bolshevik regime and its plans for an industrialised socialist society.</li> </ul> <p>The role played by other factors in the difficulties faced by the Soviet governments in the years 1917-28 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political opposition to the Bolshevik coup in 1917, fuelled by outrage at the Brest Litovsk Treaty (1918), led to the civil war that directly challenged communist rule</li> <li>• Peace negotiations with Germany (1918) exposed Bolshevik military weakness and divisions among the senior communist leaders about how to leave the war</li> <li>• Resistance to the imposition of one-party rule contributed to serious revolts against the Bolshevik regime, e.g. the Kronstadt Mutiny (1921) and the Tambov Rising (1920-21)</li> <li>• The internal power struggle (1924-28) <b>following Lenin's death</b> intensified personal rivalries within the Soviet government.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited <b>according to candidates' deployment of material</b> 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 <b>Brezhnev's</b> leadership was the main reason for political stagnation in the USSR in the years 1964-82.</p> <p>The role played by <b>Brezhnev's leadership</b> in the political stagnation in the USSR in the years 1964-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On coming to power, Brezhnev encouraged political stagnation by reversing <b>several of Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation reforms</b>, e.g. time limits on office tenure were scrapped</li> <li>• <b>Brezhnev's</b> approach to government was cautious and conservative, which also fostered political stagnation. He had little grasp of policy-making detail and preferred to leave his senior colleagues to get on with their jobs</li> <li>• Brezhnev turned the communist leadership into an ageing oligarchy by promoting old colleagues from his former Ukraine power base and this encouraged a culture of cronyism that lacked dynamism</li> <li>• Brezhnev himself symbolised the corruption and nepotism that were hallmarks of the stagnating Soviet system, e.g. he awarded himself medals and prizes, and collected luxury Western cars.</li> </ul> <p>The role played by other factors/<b>Brezhnev's leadership</b> did not play a role in the political stagnation in the USSR in the years 1964-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rigid conservative political system that had developed under Stalin was so entrenched by the time Brezhnev became leader that Soviet government was very difficult to invigorate or reform</li> <li>• Under Brezhnev, communist membership increased to 17 million by 1980, suggesting that he was successful in widening mass participation in politics</li> <li>• <b>The Soviet Constitution of 1977, passed under Brezhnev's leadership</b>, guaranteed the right of citizens to criticise incompetent party officials, suggesting that he wanted a more responsive political system</li> <li>• Other senior communist leaders during this period, such as Suslov and Shelepin, controlled party networks with the clear aim of discouraging innovation and preserving the status quo.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
3	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the role of the Soviet secret police changed in the years 1917-85.</p> <p>The extent to which the role of the Soviet secret police changed in the years 1917-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under Yezhov, the NKVD implemented the Great Terror (1936-38), which <b>accelerated the 'arrest to imprisonment' process, increased executions and widened surveillance</b> of the Soviet population</li> <li>• The NKVD under Beria presided over the expansion and running of the Gulag system in order to harness forced labour in support of industrialisation and greater economic productivity</li> <li>• <b>After Stalin's death, although official surveillance continued, the level of secret police terror declined considerably</b> suggesting that from the 1950s the secret police had a less important role in social control</li> <li>• <b>Under Andropov's direction (1967-82)</b>, the KGB employed more sophisticated techniques (including surveillance, hospitalisation and internal exile) to keep dissident groups small, divided and suspicious of each other.</li> </ul> <p>The extent to which the role of the Soviet secret police did not change in the years 1917-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout the period 1917-85, the essential role of the Soviet secret police remained constant: to protect the communist regime and neutralise internal opposition</li> <li>• Until 1953, the secret police (Cheka, GPU, OGPU and NKVD) performed a particularly coercive role as the regime faced serious pressures associated with consolidation, forced modernisation, war and post-war recovery</li> <li>• The Soviet secret police quickly became and remained a powerful institution in the communist system, giving its chief considerable influence within the system, e.g. Beria and Andropov.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be <b>credited according to candidates' deployment of material</b> 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 significance of the attempts of the Soviet regime to promote a stable society in the years 1953-85.</p> <p>The significance of the attempts of the Soviet regime to promote a stable society in the years 1953-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The terms and conditions of employment for Soviet workers encouraged stability, e.g. job security, a minimum wage (1956), a shorter working week (1957) and real wage increases (50 per cent between 1967-77)</li> <li>• The extension of healthcare provision from the 1950s also had a stabilising effect since medical services were now readily available to the Soviet population, e.g. the spread of polyclinics and sanatoria</li> <li>• Soviet society was also stabilised by <b>Khrushchev's extensive housing</b> programme, which increased the number of modern dwellings and offered better living conditions for many people</li> <li>• Between 1950 and 1980 state welfare spending increased by 500 per cent and this helped to stabilise society by addressing the issue of poverty.</li> </ul> <p>The limited significance of the attempts of the Soviet regime to promote a stable society in the years 1953-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full employment was no guarantee of contentment in the Soviet Union since many had undemanding, repetitive or essentially pointless jobs, e.g. annual labour turnover often reached 30 per cent</li> <li>• Government '<b>stabilising' measures could not prevent serious worker</b> unrest in Temirtau (1959), protests over food prices (1962), and strikes and riots over food shortages in Sverdlovsk (1969) and Gorki (1980)</li> <li>• Social problems persisted, which had a detrimental effect on social cohesion, e.g. alcohol consumption increased by 600 per cent in the years 1940-80 and, in 1979, 34 per cent of marriages ended in divorce.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
5	<p><b>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.</b></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 impact of the nationalist resurgence in the Soviet republics in the late 1980s.</p> <p>Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may <b>consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.</b> 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"> <li>• <b>Gorbachev's reform policies seemed to assume more national self-government</b> but he failed to grasp the state of national feeling in many Soviet republics</li> <li>• Serious nationalist tension in the Baltic states, Nagorno-Karabakh and Georgia threatened the integrity of the USSR</li> <li>• Developments in the Russian Federation (the 1990 Congress elections, Yeltsin becoming head of the Russian government, and the Russian Federation declaration of sovereignty) effectively finished off the USSR.</li> </ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gorbachev attempted to reform the Soviet system but by 1990 an ideological, economic and nationalist crisis had developed in the USSR</li> <li>• The decision to end the one-party state created an ideological crisis for communism and produced a political vacuum</li> <li>• At the same time the Soviet economy contracted and independence and separatist movements gathered momentum.</li> </ul> <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 impact of the nationalist resurgence in the Soviet republics in the late 1980s. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The growth, and damaging impact, of nationalist sentiment in key parts of the USSR e.g. in the Baltic republics, 1988-91</li> <li>• <b>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)</b></li> <li>• Prompted by Yeltsin, 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</li> <li>• <b>Yeltsin's encouragement of the nationalist movements of the non-Russian republics was deliberately designed to undermine the authority of Gorbachev and the central Soviet government.</b></li> </ul> <p>Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues related to the debate to</p>

address other conditional and/or contingent reasons which explain the collapse of the Soviet Union. Relevant points may include:

- Economic *perestroika* and the introduction of market mechanisms (1987) undermined the unity of the USSR by failing to produce adequate supplies of food and consumer goods for the Soviet population
- **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 amendment of Article 6** effectively ended the communist one-party state and permitted other parties to be set up and contest elections – a process that rendered the CPSU powerless by the end of 1990
- By 1985 the Soviet economy was effectively stagnant (e.g. an annual growth rate of 1-2 per cent and the cost of the Soviet empire drained the **USSR's economy**), which led to mounting discontent.

Other relevant material must be credited.