



Pearson

Examiners' Report
June 2017

GCE History 9HI0 1E

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_1E_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the first year of the reformed Advanced Level Paper 1E which deals with Russia, 1917-91: from Lenin to Yeltsin.

The paper is divided into three sections. Both Sections A and B comprise a choice of essays - from two in each - that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in Sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept(s) that were being targeted by the question. A minority of often knowledgeable candidates wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the depth of knowledge required. Section A questions targeted a shorter period and Section B questions covered a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter-argument within their answer. Some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and to ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views. Higher-scoring responses explored the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and the candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts, e.g. assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider-taught topic.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses offered an analysis of the similarities and differences between Lenin and Stalin's governments in the years 1917-53 and included an analysis of the relationships between the key issues and concepts required by the question. Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the similarities/differences between the two forms of government rule (e.g. lack of personality cult under Lenin, under Lenin the CPSU could still hold internal debates, greater ideological inflexibility of Stalin's government, both regimes centralised state power and resorted to brutal methods to remove opposition, both regimes used the mass media and the arts to control/indoctrinate the Soviet population) with a consistent focus on 'markedly different'. Judgements made about the differences and similarities were reasoned and based on clear criteria. High scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge of the nature of Lenin and Stalin's government, or a largely narrative account of the years 1917-53 with little focus on 'markedly different'. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or was offered only on one aspect of the question (e.g. both governments relied on coercion). Some low-scoring candidates dealt with one government at the expense of the other (often focusing disproportionately on Stalinist government in the 1930s). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The nature of government under ^{Lenin} ~~Stalin~~ and Stalin in some respects can be regarded as the same. The main goal of the Bolshevik party was to have state control, and this was effectively continued under Stalin. This said on the other hand it can be said that the nature of government differed widely, when considering how the two leaders came into power. This said other aspects of the government like the use of terror can be seen to have continued, however some historians would argue that Stalin used

terror to a ~~greater~~ extent compared to Lenin. Overall to say that the nature of government under Lenin and Stalin was markedly different can be regarded to be a false statement, as it did stay relatively the same.

One way in which the nature of government was markedly different was the

(Section A continued) leaders way of getting into the government and how this affected their position. Ultimately Lenin achieved power after the fall of the Tsar. This said a central committee was set-up in order to make the system more democratic. This said under this ~~the~~ ~~BO~~ system the Bolsheviks did not get the majority of the votes. Therefore as a result after only 1 meeting with the central committee Lenin dissolved it, establishing his own authoritarian dictatorship. As a result he banned all other factions such as the Workers party. On the other hand Stalin eliminated his opponents at the very start. His main opponent, was Trotsky who con

be considered to be ~~Trotsky's~~ Lenin's favoured successor. To 'eliminate' him Stalin ensured that Lenin's testament was not read out, ~~at~~ in which Lenin commended Trotsky. Furthermore he ensured that Trotsky did not attend Lenin's funeral, in doing so giving Trotsky a bad image. In a last att-

(Section A continued) ~~empt~~ to eliminate him, Stalin removed him from his position as commissar of War. Overall all of these actions mean't that Trotsky had lost his previous support and power. Stalin then went on to eliminate his rivals Kamanev and Zinoviev, who were strongly left. He distined the two as they were critical of his growing power. Therefore he blamed them for the murder of Kirov, at the trial of 16 in which they were denounced from their positions. Once denounced Stalin filled their positions with his cronies. He then went on to remove his opposition on the right this consisted of Trotsky, Bukharin and Rykov. ~~He removed~~ He removed them as they were critical of grain

requisitioning and felt that the NEP should have continued. During the grain crisis 1927 Bukharin strongly criticised Stalin. Therefore as a result Stalin removed them from their positions. When considering all of this it can be said that the nature of government was markedly different in terms of how the

(Section A continued) two obtained their power in government. However both leaders did remove any opposition, therefore perhaps it ~~wasn't~~ can be considered to have stayed relatively the same.

Under Lenin there was the Civil War against the Whites and the Reds, therefore to aid this 'battle' he set up War Communism. This economic plan focused on the centralisation of politics, economy and military. However it was very unpopular amongst the peasants and caused great famine. So as a result in 1921 at the 10th party congress Lenin introduced the New Economic Policy (NEP). This policy was a compromise between capitalism. This policy arguably did

save agriculture as it did allow for growth. However it did leave the party divided. The left felt as if it was bringing back capitalist corruption, whereas the right felt as if it was necessary to ensure stability. As a result when Stalin came into power he got rid of the NEP and introduced

(Section A continued) the first five year plan and collectivisation. The first five year plans focus was on heavy industry and quantity not quality. Collectivisation required farmers to pool land and tools. This was unpopular amongst the peasants and in retaliation they slaughtered their animals, 17 million horses for example. In some sense this change of economic planning can be seen as a markedly different nature of government. However it is unsure as to whether or not the NEP was only a temporary measure put ~~made~~ in place by Lenin. Overall there is a clear change in the nature of government in terms of running the economy, however it is perhaps still

a continuation of what Lenin did.

Lastly the terror used by the government has to be recognised. Under Lenin he set up the ~~the~~ Red Guards and Cheka to deal with counter-revolutionaries. This use of terror can be seen in the riots in the region of Tombo, over War Communism. Over 50,000 individuals

(Section A continued) rebelled so Lenin sent the Red Guard to stop this. During the NEP Lenin utilised the Red Guard to crush NEPmen (rich traders), as the government considered them to be parasites. On the other hand Stalin used terror to a much greater extent. In 1938 he had a 'chistka', cleaning of the party. Where he set quotas to remove members he felt were going against him, as a result 20% of the party was removed. Furthermore he overall used terror to frighten his opponents. In the whole it can be said that the use of terror under the government was not widely different, however Stalin did use it to a greater extent.

In conclusion, the nature of government under Lenin and Stalin was not markedly different. Both leaders used terror and removed any opponents in the government - This said it can be argued that the nature of economy was markedly different. Overall it can be said that Stalin used Lenin's gover-

(Section A continued) nment as a blueprint for his own.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers. (1) It offers limited analysis of the differences/similarities between Lenin and Stalin's governments. (2) It drifts away from the focus of the question to consider (in a largely descriptive way) how Lenin and Stalin achieved power. (3) The candidate's own knowledge lacks range and depth. (4) An overall judgement is given but because of the limitations noted above it lacks proper substantiation.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant analytical response.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted the benefits/costs of Stalin's economic policies in the years 1928-50 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Such responses offered reasonable chronological coverage, and a sufficient range of benefits/costs for discussion (e.g. created an industrial base strong enough to withstand Nazi invasion, benefited some workers such as Stakhanovites, produced a distorted economy based on quantity not quality and favouring heavy industry at the expense of the consumer sector, the human cost of Soviet industrialisation and collectivisation). Judgements made about the benefits/costs of Stalin's economic policies in the years 1928-50 were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge of Stalin's economic policies in the years 1928-50 and often took the form of a patchy economic narrative of the period. Alternatively, lower-scoring candidates provided a limited analysis of the benefits/costs of Stalin's economic policies that offered little development on the focus of the question. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or only offered one aspect related to the demands of the question (e.g. the benefits/costs of one or more of the Five Year Plans of the 1930s). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

PLAN	BENEFITS	COSTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">→ Industrialization→ Ready for war→ 1935 Moscow memo→ 1945-50 $\sqrt{80\% \uparrow}$ industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none">→ Famine-1932→ Inefficiency→ 1932 canal ^{Volga} canal→ 1928 purge murals - lack of experts

Between the years 1928-1950, Stalin managed to transform the Russian economy from a backwards agricultural economy with 80% of the population being made up of peasants, to a nuclear superpower. However, this came at

the ~~costs~~ human cost of 20 million lives. So, if we judge 'costs' in the number of human lives lost, then ~~the~~ Stalin economic policies were not worth the benefits. However, his economic policy brought ~~the~~ the USSR into the 20th century, meaning they could defeat Nazi Germany's world war 2, perhaps saving more lives than it cost.

(Section A continued)

In 1928, when Stalin came to power, the Soviet economy was backwards, with 5 million wooden ploughs still in use. By 1950, however, the USSR had defeated the then European hegemon; Germany. The first 5 year plan (~~1928~~ 1928-1932) focused on building up industry. By 1932, Magnitogorsk had gone from a non-descript settlement of 25 people to a steel superpower of 250,000 people. ~~Significantly~~ This meant that by the ~~end~~ of ~~the~~ time the USSR went to war in 1941, steel production had increased 5 fold, as well as electricity increasing 10 fold. ~~the~~

Thousands of tanks and ammunition were made here during the war, meaning that the Soviet Union could defeat the battle hardened Germans, despite Stalin's purging of the army in the mid 1930s. This must've saved many lives, as ~~the~~ the USSR would've been annihilated had Hitler won the war. Therefore, Stalin's economic policies (Section A continued) benefitted the USSR more than it cost, in terms of saving the scourge of war. Stalin himself said in 1941 that without this rapid industrialisation, the USSR would "be crushed".

However, there was a huge human ~~and cultural~~ cost. An example of this can be seen in the 1932 construction of the white sea-Baltic canal. Of the 250,000 gulag prisoners who worked on it, 16,000 died. The canal was too shallow to be of use and froze solid half the year. There was no benefit to this huge loss of life.

and this type of waste points us to the conclusion that ^{the costs of} Stalin's ruthless economic policy were not outweighed by the benefits of ~~the~~ industrialisation as more people died than had to to fulfill his economic aims.

Similarly, the 1929 dekulakisation campaign shows that Stalin's ruthless policy caused more devastation than **(Section A continued)** economic gain. An estimated 1-2 million of the most experienced farmers were killed or arrested during Stalin's vicious campaign against kulaks as a class. This was in retaliation to the 1928 grain procurement crisis, ~~to~~ however Stalin's economic policy of killing the best farmers in retaliation was more of a personal attack than a pragmatic economic policy. It, in part, led to the man made famine which killed about 10-12 million - particularly in the most fertile areas of the Ukraine. The cost of this, both in terms of the destruction of agriculture and in terms of human life, was

outweighed any benefits. The peasants only started to recover and produce grain which surpassed 1913 levels after Stalin's death in 1953. His agricultural economic policy was more vicious than pragmatic. It destroyed the peasantry with ~~little~~^{little} benefit.

Nevertheless, it has to be said that
(Section A continued) this style of ruthlessly centralised economic policy did bring benefits to the USSR. Because the economy was not run on demand and supply, but on quotas, factories ~~and~~ could not afford to be complacent. When Stalin wanted more steel, more steel was produced. This was shown in the 4th 5 year plan after World War 2. Despite the ~~country's~~^{nation's} state of ruin, the ~~the~~ level of industrial output rose by 80% between 1945 and 1950. The Soviet Union was producing nuclear weapons. This could not have happened as quickly if the market was left to recover at its own pace. Therefore, despite

the huge costs of Stalin's economic policy. ~~That is~~ it allowed Russia to power ahead with 7.5% growth per annum ~~at~~ despite the state of the nation and its people.

Nonetheless, Stalin's economy was only set up for heavy industry - which, although
* and technology

(Section A continued) he was very successful in this area, did not benefit workers who were living in shared apartments. Consumer goods were severely neglected during 1928-1950. Although there was some attempt to make shoes and ice-cream in the second five year plan, this was quickly abandoned in 1937 as war approached. The result of this was a military-industrial economy and a severe deficit of consumer goods*. This caused huge problems for the successive leaders as the Soviet economy fell far behind the west. There was ~~not~~ no incentive to be productive, other than to avoid being arrested, ~~knowing~~ as there was

nothing to buy. The economy was severely asymmetric by 1950, however it may be true that this^e was due to World War 2 which accentuated the importance of industry. The result was, however, an old-fashioned industrial-revolution style economy which held back (Section A continued) the USSR until its fall in 1991.

~~For finally, however~~

To conclude ~~however~~, I think that the human costs of Stalin's economic policy from 1928 to 1950 was higher than the benefit. Although it was important to rapidly industrialise the backwards economy in order to win the war, Stalin could have achieved this without wasting so the human lives he did. Therefore, despite the benefits of his economic policy, the unnecessary costs made it a failure.

and thus the costs outweigh the benefits.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it targets the benefits/costs of Stalin's economic policies in the years 1928-50 and clearly focuses on the issue of 'outweigh', (2) detailed own knowledge and statistics are brought in to support the arguments made and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

You will be expected to offer detailed knowledge to support your arguments. Check the specification so you know what is required.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of changes to the status of women under Soviet rule in the years 1917-85. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Such responses had a solid grasp of relevant issues regarding 'transformed' (e.g. Soviet ideology committed to raising status of women, greater female participation in higher education in the 1930s, women consistently underrepresented at all levels within the communist party, most women continued to work in low paid, low skilled jobs). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity concerning the status of women were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of how far the status of women changed under Soviet rule in the years 1917-85. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of women's lives during the Soviet period up to 1985. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments on increasing female participation in higher education in the 1930s). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

STATUS
TRANSFORMED SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

The emancipation ~~test~~ of women had been a common goal for many before the 1917 revolution, when the Bolsheviks took power Lenin declared men and women were equal in legal footing, and changes were implemented.

However, different leaders had different ideas and the improvement of status was not constant, it was perceived differently in countryside to the cities and the attitudes of many were slow to change, there is no doubt there was improvement but no

~~the~~ complete transformation.

Lenin gave women the vote in 1917 as men and women now equal in legal status, improving their position. However, they were underrepresented in the party with the only ^{female} Commissioner being Alexandra Kollontai from 1918-1919. It gave women a ~~voice~~ choice but no clear voice.

With Lenin's introduction of the marriage law in 1918, divorce made easier and abortion legalised, this gave women improved status as they could free themselves ~~from~~ from the burden

(Section B continued) of children and free themselves from abusive relationships. However, this did ~~not~~ help women with children as ~~many of the~~ ^{70% of} divorce requests came from men who had got their wives pregnant. Showing that the ~~direction~~ ^{intention} was clear but ~~did~~ it did not actually help improve the status of women. Overall, women's legal status had improved under Lenin but despite Zhenskdel and Alexandra Kollontai, women's status could not be improved if they were not represented enough. The marriage had the right intention but ~~back~~ tried to leave a large percentage of women single mothers.

~~It~~ ~~from~~ status continued with Lenin's policies,

but when birth rate was falling it worried him.

This led to the ~~great retreat of 1926,~~

1927, came with the attempt to increase party control of outlying regions by attempts to better lives of Islamic women who were often shielded from public and denied an education. The 1927 campaign of unveiling led to some success, but other women were disowned by families and even killed. Proving that the emancipation of women ^{and improvement of status} could not benefit all. The result of this and falling birth rate

(Section B continued) led to Stalin into the ⁶great retreat of 1936, where divorce ~~is~~ was introduced from 4 to ~~50~~⁵⁰ rubles and a tax on single people were introduced. This left women trapped in abusive relationships or forced into ones they did not want to be, banning abortion again meant women could not advance their career but resulted to bringing up children.

It was not until 1941 ~~of~~ and world war II that the status of women began to improve again, women played in army with 89 winning highest military award as well as gaining jobs in factories. However, women only needed in army after the loss of men and many in nursing roles, ~~other~~ women

who had jobs were likely to lose them to men after war, ~~but~~ but, the line between 'men's work' and 'women's work' had been blurred. Stalin's retreat did little to improve the status of women, and people's attitudes were slow to change meaning men remained dominant in both cities and countryside.

Khrushchev's helped improve ~~ed~~ status of women through education, but expelling them

(Section B continued) to look after children and hold down a job was unrealistic. ~~Through~~ Through ~~the~~ growth of higher education under Khrushchev many women could go to university, so more places were reserved for them, meaning they could join the party and improve their status, but this was only ~~re~~ a reality for women in towns, as those in countryside had a more entrenched approach to women and education, meaning the improvement in status of women had a greater impact in cities.

~~that~~ Khrushchev also freed up women ~~from~~ from burden of childcare through re-regulation of abortion that allowed women to pursue improvement ~~of~~ of life through greater

education and ~~not~~ jobs. However, Brezhnev reversed this meaning women were only helped for a short while, ~~however~~. On the other hand, Brezhnev enforced that men should pay for children which helped women but did not do much to improve their status.

Overall, women had greater availability of jobs to improve their status in society and were often free from abusive relations with no choice of whether to have a baby or not. However,

(Section B continued) The frequent reverse of policies did not transform the status of women for the long term and it did not help change attitudes especially of those in the countryside. The improved status was unbalanced, cities saw improved status but more in ~~the countryside~~ side or in outlying Muslim regions saw lack of change. The status of women was improved but it was not a transformation as it was unbalanced and inconsistent.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response secured Level 4 because it (1) attempts to focus on the extent to which the status of Soviet women was transformed in and across the designated time frame (1917-85), (2) considers both change and continuity across the period (e.g. impact of reforms under Lenin) and (3) reaches a judgement in the conclusion related to the criteria developed in the analysis.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Higher level responses are often based on brief plans that offer a logical structure for the analysis. They identify three or four themes and points for and against the proposition. Take a minute or two at the beginning to plan before you start writing your response. That way, you are more likely to produce a relevant, logical and well-structured response.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the significance of the secret police in maintaining communist control in the years 1917-85 and weighed this factor (e.g. the Cheka was instrumental in securing Bolshevik rule in the years 1918-22, the NKVD implemented the Great Terror and presided over the Gulag system, from the late 1960s the KGB used more sophisticated techniques to marginalise dissident groups) against others (e.g. the role of the Soviet mass media, government control over the arts and culture, ingrained culture of apathy and disengagement among the Soviet population, declining importance of secret police terror and coercion after the 1940s). These responses included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. Judgements made about the relative significance of the secret police were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to describe aspects or features of the role of the secret police in the years 1917-85 with limited focus on significance in maintaining communist control. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the NKVD's role in the Great Terror). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

Throughout the years 1917-85 the role of the secret police was to protect the Communist regime from its opponents, this which highlighted under Stalin in the Great Terror of the 1930s and continued under Brezhnev. This essay will assess the significance in the role of the secret police in maintaining Communist control in the years 1917-85 over other factors. We will need to consider Lenin's use of the Cheka in the Civil War and Stalin's use of terror in the Purges through the radicalisation of the NKVD, and the role of the

Sent Police (KGB) under Breznev to suppress dissidents.
On the other hand, we will need to ~~consider~~^{analyse} how the
role of the secret police has not significant
for maintaining Communist control in the years 1917-85.
We will need to consider the use of
media and propaganda and control of the economy,
in order to determine the ~~importance~~^{significance}
in the role of the secret police. Overall, the
essay will focus how the role of the secret
police has most significant for maintaining control
in the years 1917-85, due to the role of

(Section B continued) The ^(Lenin) NKVD is the Great Terror,
which influenced the increased role of the secret
police under Breznev by 1985.

One reason why the role of the secret
police has most significant in maintaining
Communist control ^{would be how in} the years 1917-~~85~~⁸⁵
the known ~~use~~^{the} use of the Cheka in the Civil
war and the radicalism of the NKVD in the
Great Terror under Stalin's pages of the 1930s.
This means how in the period 1917-20, Lenin
used the Cheka to attack opponents of the
regime ^{during} the Civil war, which control through the
NEP. This included ^{the Cheka} closing down newspapers under
the decree of press and attorney by Lenin

Maintaining Communist Control as in the period 1964-85, the role of the KGB under Andropov attacked dissidents, who undermined the regime which ended Brezhnev's period of stability by 1985.

On the other hand, the role of the Secret Police was not most significant in maintaining Communist Control ~~in the period 1917-85~~ due to other factors, such as Control of media and Propaganda in the period of 1917-64 under Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev, which maintained →

(Section B continued) ^(continued →) Communist Control over the population of the USSR. This means how Lenin ~~and~~ ~~Stalin~~ both controlled the media through the decree on press ^(and book rulings under the NEP) which ~~led to a~~ ~~complete~~ complete censorship and the abolition of over 4000 newspapers by 1929. ~~Also~~ Moreover, Stalin used the media and Propaganda to maintain control through ~~increasing~~ increasing media censorship of economic matters under the Glavlit and 're-writes' history to glorify Stalin's role in the ^{Revolution} ~~revolution~~. This created Stalin's 'cult of personality' as the 'vozhd', which allowed the dictator to transform the USSR into a totalitarian state by 1953. Control, all aspects of Soviet life. Additionally, Khrushchev ~~was~~ used both the media and

Propaganda to return Communist Control ~~through~~ through broadcasting the success of his regime, like the space race, which established Khrushchev's 'Cult' based on his reforms in the Virgin Lands Scheme ~~and~~ and industry by 1964. However, Khrushchev's ~~and~~ ~~and~~ and Propaganda became fit as many of his reforms failed, such as the Corn Campaign and panic selling. Therefore, the role of the Secret Police was ~~not~~ ^{not} most significant in maintaining Communist Control since in the period 1917-64 Secret Police used repress and Propaganda to gain Control over people's freedoms, which maintained Communist Control by 1964.

(Section B continued)

Additionally, the role of the Secret Police was not most significant in maintaining Control ~~and~~ ~~and~~ since in the period 1964-85 Khrushchev and Brezhnev's Control of the economy maintained Control due to the increase of living standards from the economy of Stalin in the 1930s. This means how both Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's reform of the economy to provide on Consumer ~~and~~ production and invest in agriculture, led to the USSR to maintain Control. The successes included an ~~and~~ 60 per cent increase in Consumer goods and ~~the~~ 35 per cent in crop production under the Virgin Lands Scheme led to ~~and~~ higher living standards for farmers and Secret Police by 1985. Therefore, the role

of the secret police was not most significant in maintaining control since the ~~economic~~ transformation of the economy under Khrushchev and Brezhnev met their aims to increase the standard of living for Soviet citizens and ^{achieve} ~~maintain~~ high levels of production ~~by 1985~~ ^{which was popular} ~~by 1985~~. However, ^{overall} the role of the secret police was most significant due to the decline of economic growth ~~by 1985~~ ^{only grew at} ~~by 1985~~ ^{2 percent} ~~by 1985~~ ^{and which} ~~by 1985~~ the role of the secret police ^(KGB) under Brezhnev ~~was~~ ^{was} to maintain control ~~by 1985~~ over the USSR. by 1985

(Section B continued)

In conclusion, the role of the secret police was most significant in maintaining Communist control as through the period 1917-85 Soviet leaders ^(consistently) relied on the secret police to silence and ~~attract~~ ^{attract} opposition to the regime, which began ~~by~~ ^{by} using modern Stalin during the Great Terror of the 1930s and returned under Brezhnev, who increased the power of the KGB to attract dissidents, ~~by 1985~~. which stabilised the power of the USSR over its citizens by 1985.

9HI0_1E_Q04_1620197_0429_002450758_017.png

9HI0_1E_Q04_1620197_0429_002450758_018.png

9HI0_1E_Q04_1620197_0429_002450758_019.png



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response secured Level 4 because it (1) attempts to analyse the significance of the secret police in maintaining communist control (e.g. in terms of the use of terror, control of dissidents), (2) considers the significance of other factors in communist control (e.g. government control of the media and the economy) and (3) reaches a judgement in the conclusion related to the criteria developed in the analysis.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When planning your answer to a support/challenge question make sure you have a good balance of key points on either side of the argument, or be prepared to argue support and challenge within each key point.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses developed a clear extract-based analysis of the extent to which the USSR collapsed in 1991 because Gorbachev's confidence in his reform policies 'proved gravely misplaced'. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts (e.g. the consequences of Gorbachev's loosening of political and economic constraints in the USSR, the growth of popular nationalism that undermined the Soviet Union, the impact of 'people power' in eastern Europe, and the weaknesses of the Soviet economy). Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views put forward in the extracts (e.g. how Gorbachev's foreign policy undermined the eastern bloc, the consequences of his pursuit of economic perestroika/market mechanisms and glasnost, the growth and damaging impact of nationalist sentiment in parts of the USSR such as the Baltic republics). Stronger responses were also clearly focused on the precise terms of the question (the USSR collapsed in 1991 because Gorbachev's confidence in his reform policies 'proved gravely misplaced') and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts.

Weaker responses showed some understanding of the extracts but tended to select quotations, paraphrase or describe, without proper reasoning. At this level, material from the extracts was used simply to illustrate (e.g. Gorbachev's political and economic reforms failed to revitalise the USSR (extract 1), or the Soviet economy was too weak to prop up the USSR (extract 2)). Such responses often revealed limited recognition of the differences between the two extracts and sometimes drifted from the specific question to the wider controversy surrounding the collapse of the USSR in 1991. Low-scoring candidates also relied heavily on the extracts as sources of information. Alternatively they made limited use of the sources, attempting instead to answer the question, relying almost exclusively on their own knowledge. Here, too, candidates' own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. 'tacked on' to points from sources) or drifted on to less relevant points. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because Gorbachev's confidence in his reform policies 'proved gravely misplaced' (Extract 1, line 9)?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

Ever since the collapse of the USSR in 1991, there has been much debate about what the key factors were in causing the decline of this state. The interpretation that the

USSR collapsed because Gorbachev's confidence in his reform policies 'proved gravely misplaced' is supported by extract one, which attributes Gorbachev's policies to causing the collapse of the Soviet Union because they undermined his power base. Alternatively, extract two suggests that it was the simultaneous failure of Gorbachev's policies and nationalism that caused the collapse of the USSR. However, perhaps these two interpretations can be reconciled.

The ~~the~~ interpretation that Gorbachev's policies caused the collapse of the Soviet Union because they undermined his power base can find support in both extracts one and two. Acton and Stableford argue that Gorbachev's political reforms undermined his power base, as they 'radically loosened the rigour of censorship and the scope for questioning the certainties of Marxism-Leninism'. This refers to how Gorbachev's policy of glasnost

allowed writers and intellectuals to openly criticise the Party: Gorbachev introduced this policy in the hope that it would discredit conservative elements of the Party, who stood against his more radical policies. In actuality, Glasnost discredited the entire Soviet regime: for example, environmental groups published information to show how a government irrigation scheme which used water diverted from the Aral Sea had led to the drying up of this body of water, and negative climate change for the surrounding region.

While this caused people to question the authority of the Communist Party, Gorbachev's simultaneous economic policies led to economic chaos, as Gorbachev 'began to dismantle the structures of the command economy' (extract 1), while also trying to retain aspects of the 'sprawling, outdated and dysfunctional economy' (extract 2). For example, in 1988, Gorbachev legalised co-operatives, stimulating a market

economy, but did not abolish Gosplan, the state planning apparatus for the economy until 1990. Thus, both extract 1 and 2 can be well supported in their interpretations that Gorbachev's ~~failure~~ failed economic and political policies undermined his power base, as they showed the weaknesses of the Party and exacerbated economic decline

by arguing that it was instead the context in which Gorbachev's reforms occurred in; namely, that they ~~occur~~ 'nationalist pressure' and 'Soviet imperial withdrawal' occurred simultaneously. Pearson's concept of 'Soviet imperial withdrawal' refers to how Gorbachev introduced policies which lessened the Party's control over nationalist republics; as extract 1 notes, Gorbachev introduced 'competitive elections'. This refers to how Gorbachev's policy of Democratisation entailed allowing genuine elections: for example, in March 1989, there were the multi-candidate elections for the

Congress of People's Deputies. This directly led to the rise of nationalism, as Yeltsin won 89% of the vote in this election. When he resigned from the Communist Party in July 1990, this firmly set the Russian Congress as an alternative power base to the Soviet government. This was further exacerbated when Gorbachev repealed article 6, which secured the dominance of the Communist Party. After this, Yeltsin announced the sovereignty of the Russian Congress over Soviet laws: this culminated in the series of events which led to Gorbachev no longer having a Soviet Union to be president of by December 1991. Thus, while extract 2 challenges extract 1 to suggest that greater importance needs to be placed on how Gorbachev's political policies caused 'Soviet imperial withdrawal' which directly allowed for the rise of nationalist groups, which eventually overthrew the Soviet Union.

However, it could be argued that, despite ostensible differences, the arguments of extract 1 and 2 can very easily be reconciled by suggesting that, instead of the collapse of the USSR being the result of the simultaneous issues of 'nationalist pressure' and 'Soviet withdrawal' (extract 2), Gorbachev's policies directly

led to the rise of nationalism in the USSR. Thus, the argument that the USSR collapsed because of Gorbachev's failed reforms is essentially correct.

While extract 2 argues that Gorbachev's policies entailed 'Soviet imperial withdrawal', it ~~also~~ fails to acknowledge how ~~the~~ Gorbachev's policies also directly led to nationalist discontent by attempting to increase control in localities. For example, Gorbachev's policy of cadre change to remove the corruption of local officials under Brezhnev entailed the removal of national First Secretaries and replacement with Russian officials. For example, in

Kazakhstan, Kolbin replaced Kunder as First Secretary of the local Soviet, leading to nationalist rebellion against the Soviet state. Extract 2 also references how the Soviet Empire could no longer 'deliver the welfare state by fulfilling the economic and social expectations of its population'. This refers to how Gorbachev's failed economic policies meant that he could no longer uphold the government's side of the 'social contract' implemented by Brezhnev in the Soviet Constitution of 1977.

As a result, nationalist groups no longer had to remain loyal to the state, and so could rebel against it. This interpretation counters Pearson's key argument to show that it was not just the simultaneous contexts of Gorbachev's policies and nationalist discontent that led to the collapse of the USSR, but rather Gorbachev's policies directly led to the rise of nationalist discontent, which eventually caused

the collapse of the USSR. Thus, it also extends Acton and Stobleford's interpretation to suggest that the USSR collapsed, not just as a result of Gorbachev's failed policies, but how these policies directly allowed for the growth of nationalism - the final straw in causing the collapse of the Soviet State.

In conclusion, the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because Gorbachev's confidence in his reform policies 'proved gravely misplaced' can be well supported. Both extract 1 and 2 are essentially shades of this same interpretation; however, while extract 1 puts a greater focus on Gorbachev's failed policies, extract 2 puts a greater focus on the growth of nationalism. The most convincing interpretation arises out of a combination of these two arguments: the USSR fell as a result of how Gorbachev's policies directly allowed for the growth of nationalism. Thus, while Gorbachev's policies already significantly undermined

his power base, nationalism was the final straw that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the rise of Yeltsin as the new president of Russia.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on the two competing views, (2) it uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views and (3) it is focused on the precise issue (the USSR collapsed because Gorbachev's confidence in his reform policies 'proved gravely misplaced') rather than the general controversy surrounding the downfall of the Soviet Union, and (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Acton/Stableford and Pearson extracts.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Good responses often use the introduction to set up the debate by identifying the main arguments offered by the two interpretations. This is then followed by an exploration of these arguments in the main analysis.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept(s) targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each response
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions
- With regards to the level and quality of knowledge, candidates and centres should recognise the expectation of Advanced Level. In short, it is a combination of the knowledge candidates are able to bring to the essay, allied with their ability to effectively marshal this material towards the analytical demands of the question. It is fair to say that on Paper 1, where candidates study a range of themes across a broad chronological period, the expectations regarding depth of knowledge will not necessarily be as great as in the more in-depth periods studied. As well as offering more depth of knowledge, candidates who have engaged in wider reading tend to be more successful as they are able to select and deploy the most appropriate examples to support analysis and evaluation.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answering a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to the issue, factor given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Failure to consider the date range as specified in the question e.g. when a candidate discusses the correct issue, but for a timespan which differs from that in the question
- Assertion of change, causation etc. often with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, relating to the issue within the question

- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail
- Across the units, there was some evidence to suggest that, as might be expected, candidates were somewhat less confident when dealing with topics that were new to the reformed

Advanced Level Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within them were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or an attempt to reconcile their arguments
- Confident handling of the extracts, seemingly from experience in reading and examining excerpts (and no doubt whole books), allied to a sharp focus on the arguments given, recognising the distinct skills demanded by A03

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited or uneven use of the extracts, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or the lifting of detail out of context from the extract

- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

