



## Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel  
in GCE History (8HI0/1E)

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)

October 2020

Publications Code 8H10\_1E\_2010\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## 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:** 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	1-4	<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> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<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>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-10</b>	<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>
<b>3</b>	<b>11-16</b>	<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 on, 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>
<b>4</b>	<b>17-20</b>	<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 the 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 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 industrialisation programme was the main reason for the purges in the Soviet Union in the 1930s.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Stalin's industrialisation programme was the main reason for the purges in the Soviet Union in the 1930s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Soviet leadership resorted to the purges because they needed to find scapegoats for the failures of the Five-Year Plans and the economic downturn in the mid-1930s</li> <li>• The regime's determination to stifle workplace criticism of the Five-Year Plans and to control people so they continued to work on the industrialisation programme led to the purges and terror</li> <li>• The need to generate capital to buy Western technology meant the purges were used to expand the Gulag population, creating the slave labour force to undertake dangerous but lucrative work such as logging and gold mining</li> <li>• The growing pressure to increase armament production based on heavy industry due to external threats, notably Nazi Germany, also prompted the purges and use of terror to mobilise the workforce.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors were the main reason for the purges in the Soviet Union in the 1930s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stalin's personal characteristics including his narcissistic self-image as the 'hero of the revolution', his intense suspicion of others and his instinctive reliance on coercion all contributed to the purges of the 1930s</li> <li>• Stalin resorted to the purges because he faced real threats to his position in the 1930s, e.g. the Ryutin Platform (1932) and the 17th Party Congress (1934)</li> <li>• 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/delayed implementing central party edicts</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <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 failures of the Five-Year Plans were the main reason for the economic difficulties faced by the Soviet Union in the years 1928-53.</p> <p>The role played by the failures of the Five-Year Plans in the economic difficulties faced by the Soviet Union in the years 1928-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Five-Year Plans (particularly 1928-41) created difficulties by producing an unbalanced economy that was skewed in favour of heavy industry and neglected other sectors such as textiles and consumer goods</li> <li>• The emphasis on quantity during the Five-Year Plans created difficulties because Soviet products tended to be shoddily made, unreliable and inferior to Western goods</li> <li>• The state's rigid adoption of a command economy during the Five-Year Plans led to chaotic implementation, failure to plan effectively at local level and poor use of resources</li> <li>• The Fourth Five-Year Plan (1946-50) contributed to the USSR's economic difficulties by failing to embrace new technological developments in plastics and chemicals.</li> </ul> <p>The role played by other factors/the Five-Year Plans did not play a role in the economic difficulties faced by the Soviet Union in the years 1928-53 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dislocation due to the imposition of collectivisation had a disastrous economic impact on agricultural production levels, led to widespread rural famine, and removed the most efficient farmers</li> <li>• The purges of the 1930s had a negative impact by depriving the Soviet Union of much-needed skilled personnel, administrators and planners; this resulted in an economic slowdown</li> <li>• The Second World War had a devastating economic impact on the USSR, e.g. one quarter of Soviet industry and almost 100,000 collective farms were destroyed</li> <li>• The pre-war Five-Year Plans provided the USSR with an economic base strong enough to withstand the Nazi threat (1941-45) and the post-war</li> </ul>

	<p>Fourth and Fifth Five-Year Plans successfully restored the Soviet economy.</p> <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 the extent to which the personality cults of Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev were different.</p> <p>The extent to which the personality cults of Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev were different should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stalin's personality cult was more developed and on a far larger scale than those of his successors, partly due to the pathological and narcissistic nature of his character and length of time he was in power</li> <li>• Stalin's personality cult inspired fear and respect among the Soviet population but Khrushchev and Brezhnev's personality cults did not have the same effect</li> <li>• To build up his own personality cult, Khrushchev condemned Stalin's personality cult; neither Stalin nor Brezhnev attacked their predecessor in this way to build up their own personality cults</li> <li>• Whereas Stalin and Khrushchev used their personality cults to mobilise popular support for their favoured policies, Brezhnev's personality cult gave him the trappings of power without having to exercise it.</li> </ul> <p>The extent to which the personality cults of Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev were similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The personality cults of Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev all venerated and linked themselves to Lenin in order to legitimise their authority, power and status</li> <li>• All three personality cults helped to stabilise the Soviet regime during difficult periods (e.g. the Five-Year Plans, the Second World War and the Cold War) by making the leader the focus for unity and loyalty</li> <li>• All three personality cults drew on and exploited traditional Russian culture by emulating the autocratic tradition of Tsarism and creating a secular 'religion' to replace the Orthodox faith</li> <li>• All three personality cults were used to reinforce the power of individual leaders and raise them above the collective leadership of the Politburo.</li> </ul> <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 view that Soviet government attitudes towards the family did not change in the years 1917-85.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Soviet government attitudes towards the family 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>• For much of this period, the Soviet government continued to adopt a traditional/socially conservative view of the family unit as central to society</li> <li>• Soviet government attitudes to the family, in practice, continued to impose the 'double burden' on women (domestic responsibilities and paid work) so that by 1960 49 per cent of the workforce was female</li> <li>• Although the Brezhnev regime showed greater awareness of the social problems weakening the family unit, it essentially followed the pro-family social policies of the Khrushchev government.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Soviet government attitudes towards the family did change in the years 1917-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Family Code of 1918 attempted to undermine the 'bourgeois' idea of the family unit by making divorce easier and offering abortions; in 1927 the regime also acknowledged unregistered marriages</li> <li>• The social problems and family break-ups that followed the 1918 Family Code led to the 'Great Retreat' (1936) under Stalin, which aimed to restore the importance of the traditional family and the status of marriage</li> <li>• Under Khrushchev, government attitudes became more supportive, promoting improved conditions for families, e.g. increased provision of social benefits, including healthcare, housing and childcare</li> <li>• The Brezhnev regime showed a greater awareness of the social problems weakening the family unit and attempted to tackle some of them, e.g. the 1968 Family Code tried to address the high divorce rate.</li> </ul> <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 Gorbachev's failure to reform the political system.</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"> <li>• The collapse of the USSR was due to Gorbachev's removal of the Communist Party and Soviet system of government</li> <li>• As the pace of change quickened, Gorbachev, instead of seeking to reform communism, attempted to introduce a new 'democratic socialist' system</li> <li>• The ability of the state to direct affairs was undermined since the old Soviet system was weakened and a new system failed to develop, resulting in the collapse of the Soviet order.</li> </ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Soviet Union fell because of Gorbachev's failed triple revolution – namely abandoning the command economy, removing the communist monopoly of power and establishing a democratic multinational federation</li> <li>• Gorbachev's reform programme was undermined by economic problems and powerful nationalist forces within the USSR</li> <li>• The rise of nationalism was a response to the centralised and bureaucratic nature of the old Soviet political and economic system.</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 Gorbachev's failure to reform the political system. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

- Gorbachev's political reforms weakened the Communist Party by dividing it into factions with hardliners and moderates fearing and resisting change such as perestroika, and radicals demanding faster reform
- The consequences of glasnost discredited the Soviet system of government in the public's eyes, e.g. revelations about the state of the economy and the extent of the Stalinist terror
- Gorbachev's 'democratisation' programme from 1988 undermined the Soviet Union with the formation of the Inter-Regional Deputies' Group, the rise of nationalism and the emergence of Boris Yeltsin as a serious rival.

Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues related to the debate to 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
- 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
- The growth, and damaging impact, of nationalist sentiment in key parts of the USSR, which undermined central Soviet authority, e.g. the Baltic republics, Georgia and Nagorno-Karabakh
- The role of Yeltsin in the collapse of the Soviet Union, e.g. undermining Gorbachev's and the central Soviet government's position and encouraging the demands of the non-Russian republics for independence.

Other relevant material must be credited.

