



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Subsidiary

In History (WHI02) Paper 1C

Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

Russia, 1917- 91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2018

Publications Code WHI02_1C_pef_20180815

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHI02 1C which covers the option Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

It is pleasing to note that in Section A many candidates understood what was meant by 'value' in question 1a) in the context of source analysis this year. However, many still continue to write about limitations to the source and since this is not covered by 'value' and hence not rewarded in the mark scheme, means that candidates disadvantage themselves in terms of the time take to develop such arguments which impacts on the time they have to spend on the rest of the paper. Many candidates also struggle with the concept of 'weight' in question 1b). Candidates need to approach weight by considering the reliability of the source. This can be measured in terms of the trustworthiness of the provenance and/or the accuracy of the content. Hence candidates should explore the strengths and limitations of the source and on then, based upon their judgements ascribe weight to the source. Many candidates use the term 'weight' as interchangeable with 'value' and refer to 'adding' and 'subtracting weight' throughout their answers. This approach makes it difficult to develop judgements based upon valid criteria and hence reach a final evaluation based on weight. Finally candidates do need to consider the use of contextual knowledge. Most candidates used context to confirm or challenge matters of detail in the source and thus achieved level two. Candidates are advised to use their contextual knowledge to explain and develop inferences which will enable them to focus discussion on what can be gained from the sources and so access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

In Section B, some candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis, but more responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was targeted.

It remains important to realise that Section A topics are drawn from highlighted topics on the specification whereas Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important. There was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1a)

There were some good responses that achieved high Level 2 or beyond. These responses demonstrated an understanding of the source material and an ability to draw and develop inferences from the material using their contextual knowledge to explain inferences as well as expanding on matters in the source. Valid comments were made on the provenance of the source and value explained. Most candidates who failed to reach Level 3, did so because of description of the content of the source rather than using it to draw inferences and establish value. Many did try to use the source as in a (b) question by pointing out its limitations. There was a lot of paraphrasing rather than drawing inferences and quite a lot of misinterpretation of the material relating to Beria and Khrushchev's claim that the new Soviet government needed to 'show ourselves willing to take responsibility' but little additional knowledge that developed the implications of this material. A significant proportion of candidates did write at some length about Stalin's terror system.

Source 1 is valuable to a historian on reasons for ending the terror system established by Stalin under Khrushchev due to the significance of the provenance. Khrushchev reflecting and questioning the legitimacy and legality under Stalin's great terror provides a historian with primary evidence that even members of the communist elite that succeeded Stalin, questioned to what extent was Stalin's terror system enforced in order to sustain communist rule.

Moreover, this source would be deemed valuable as it created uncertainty, it questioned and emphasises that the sheer death total under Stalin of over 10 million could not be in favour of 'reinforcing socialism'. Khrushchev further questioning why the arrested were never released or acquitted plays into Stalin's fear of opposition, in which he sent 2 million prisoners into 'Gulags' and labor camps and denied them freedom in fear of opposing Stalin's growth in power and influence. It encompasses the idea that Stalin feared many of his enemies would undermine the appeal of his influence. As a result he doubt that ~~instilled~~ permeated Khrushchev further reflects the creation

of Stalin's personal dictatorship that would justify the use of the secret police KGB in order to convict and arrest opposition.

Additionally, ~~it~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ source provides historians with an insight as to why the use of terror decreased under Khrushchev. It is important to note the change in opposition as well as the truth that emerged through 'investigations'. Khrushchev's curiosity on the 'evidence' and 'interrogation' used during Stalinist time reflected the harsh terror of Beria and Yagoda's secret police: prisoners were ritually abused and interrogated until a false confession was made. Through threats and blackmail many political prisoners were forced to confess to crimes they had never committed. This fear fed into line with Stalin's ruthlessness, by implementing quotas on the number of arrests and executions, the secret police under Beria would arrest people ~~under~~ essentially, for nothing. As a result through Khrushchev's findings and interrogations it became evident that in order for the communist to justify remain in power in order to eventually instill communism, there would have to be an immediate reform to the terror and brutality of Stalin's regime in which people can no longer be arrested for 'nothing'. This is important as it parallels with Khrushchev's acknowledgement that the use of purging and executions would undermine the legitimacy of the communist government in governing the USSR.

In conclusion, source 1 is valuable to a historian as it shed light on the differing attitudes and approaches towards capitalism.

which in essence ended the terror that was a key feature of Stalin's regime.

This is a secure level 3 response achieving level 3 in all the bullet points in the mark scheme. It has good contextual knowledge and is effective in drawing inferences. The evaluation is substantiated.

Question 1b)

The best responses were written by candidates who successfully made reasoned inferences, evaluating the weight of the source in relation to the enquiry and using contextual knowledge to illuminate limitations of what could be gained. Most candidates who did not achieve Level 4 failed to do so due to making inferences that were not fully developed or reasoned. Many candidates used accurate contextual knowledge but this was usually only included to confirm/challenge details rather than going the step further to illuminate what could therefore be gained from the source. Many candidates took the source at face value and/or tried to turn it into an essay on the role of women in the USSR and/or did not read the question closely enough and thereby missed the focus. Some candidates focused on the gaps in the information and used this as their main tool for analysis. It should be noted that sources are not intended to be fully comprehensive, and the more focused answers deal with what the historian could draw from the source as it is presented. Some candidates made good use of the authorship of the source and its implications to develop an evaluation and judgement that was based on valid criteria.

DOC ID: 0444000782280

The source is ~~not~~ accurate to a certain extent into the enquiry of the changes in the status of women under Lenin. In 1918 the Women's Department of Zhenobol the Bolsheviks, commonly known as Zhenobol, was created to see the increase of the emancipation of women under Lenin. This included like stated in the source the "women providing for herself, playing part in work production" ~~and~~. This was heavily implemented when the Decree of the lives of Women were published. Now women did not have to rely on her husband for income, ~~and~~ in addition she was able to leave the house before marriage and attend workplaces, vocational education institutes without the consent of her husband. Throughout the ~~Civil War~~ ~~women end of the~~ ~~for~~ Great ~~War~~ Patriotic War, commonly known as the First World War ~~the~~, there was a significant decrease in the number of men working in ~~industry~~ the employment sector thus ~~and~~ women had to take their place. ~~As a result~~ Here they were able to be employed ~~and~~ to see how the society differed and social values of women differed. ~~On~~ return many. Again, this is stated in the source, ~~as~~ "The direct financial dependence of the majority of women and men were firmly established". Indicating that women were to ~~be~~ revive and support Russia internally and the Men were able to defend and expand Russian externally.

However, source 2 is also not reliable for historians that wish to enquire on the changes of the status of women under the reign of Lenin. Zhenkova, the Women's Department in the Bolshevik government, came up against a lot of backfire when women rights were issued, they ~~stated~~ that this was due to the fact that the party was male-dominated ~~and~~, with little sympathy towards their female counterparts and well as their age also meant that there was severe opposition due to their ~~previ~~ ^{pre} instilled ~~st~~, previous generation of the ~~instill~~ socialist values of women. This opposition is not stated in the source to extent at which it should have been developed. "Some people are still bound by the old ideas" does not replicate the fact that the ~~rest~~ majority of the resistance was from the party itself. Also "Relations between the sexes are being transformed" was also a statement for the source that is highly optimistic of ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{opposition} ~~resistance~~ that the ~~decrees~~ new decrees faced. Even when it stated in the law, ~~men and~~ politicians and the many other of the male gender took a significantly large period of time ~~to~~ come to terms that ~~both~~ their counterparts had the same and equal rights to them. "In a workers' republic the ~~stratification~~

situation has changed" ~~was also~~ is also unachievable. After a series of decrees where indeed the ~~the~~ Bolshevik party had decided to shut down the Zhenitso as they stated that the women's status had been revived.

This is incorrect as we know that women's wages were still ~~was~~ ultimately lower than men's. Also women were more likely to be declined by industries and thus had to work in agriculture that was significantly ~~of~~ harsher work.

In conclusion, I believe that this source is reliable to ~~an~~ ^{the} extent ~~of~~ that if the historian would like a brief overview on the ~~to~~ changes of status in women as it was a speech written by Alexandra Kollantai who was the party ^{and was able to} advocate for the women in Lenin's era. ~~However,~~ ~~Kollantai~~ ~~was~~ dictate the topics of change for the emancipation of women. However, Kollantai could have simply been pleasing the party in fear that she might lose her political voice and status in the male dominated party, which had less than 10% of women politicians by 1932, if she was ~~to~~ keep out of line and ~~publish~~ the lack of reform & development, criticizing the Bolsheviks. She could initiate the withdrawal of such decrees as we see the status of women ~~is~~ ~~to~~ underdevelop.

This is a level 4 response. It draws out a number of valid inferences that re developed by reasoned explanation and explored with contextual knowledge. It does attempt to consider the weight of the source.

Question 2

This was the most popular essay question. The best answers were underpinned by a depth of knowledge on a range of relevant issues relating to Stalin's economic policy and criteria for judgement established according to whether the policy could be judged as a success or failure. Candidates examined the Five Year Plans, collectivisation, the consumer economy and the impact on soviet citizens. At the lower end, some candidates provided wholly descriptive accounts of Stalin's economic policy without consideration of the focus of the question. Many candidates did not take sufficient notice of the time period set in the question and focused only on the 1930s. This restricted their achievement in the levels.

How successful was Stalin's economic policy in the years 1928-53?

Stalin's economic ^{Policy} policies in the years 1928-53 were successful to an extent. His economic policy included several 5-year plans which were mostly focused on heavy industry so neglected consumer goods. In addition there was low productivity and high wast. In agriculture he started collectivisation which resulted in an initial slump in food production.

Stalin introduced the first 5-year Plan in 1928, it lasted until 1932. The aim was to replace the NEP, and rapidly industrialise the Soviet economy. Most investment went into heavy industry such as coal, iron and steel. ~~Large~~ scale production in these rapidly increased, however the ~~the~~ high targets set by Stalin and Glavit were seldomly reached and if they were quality was usually very poor. This was a factor throughout

Stalin's regime and continued on until 1991. The high targets in combination with Stalin's ~~excess~~ excess terror led to much corruption, such as fake numbers and stealing resources from other factories. This would suggest that his economic policies were not very successful. However, production still increased massively.

This was not the fact for consumer goods, which were mostly neglected in all of Stalin's five year plans. This caused resentment among the workers as there was very little material benefit to working hard which in turn resulted in absenteeism and poor low productivity. Showing the disadvantages and flaws of Stalin's economic policies.

The ~~3rd and 4th~~ 2nd and 3rd 5 year plans were very similar to the first. They also focused on heavy industry. However they were more successful as Glavlit allowed for more realistic, yet still high, targets. As an incentive there were model workers which showed that if you work hard you would get better housing, better rations and some social

benefits. This worked to an extent, however living standards were ~~still~~ extremely low compared to western countries. This was mostly due to a lack of material benefits ~~and~~, poor housing and massive food shortages. Most workers lived in huge camps near big ~~factory~~ factory complexes and housing was often overcrowded and in very poor conditions.

The ~~4th and 5th~~ 4th and 5th 5 year Plan came after world war 2, they focused on reconstructing the soviet economy as it was devastated after the war. Production was nearly as low as in 1918. Here also Stalin's economic policies show success in increasing the heavy industry ^{and military} but completely neglecting the consumer goods.

Stalin's economic policies in industry were to an extent successful however they led to much corruption, low worker productivity and poor quality goods.

Stalin's policies on agriculture also showed some successes but mostly failures. He introduced collectivisation in 1928. This started out slow as many of the farmers ~~most~~ would lose their money and power. Kulaks were ~~successful~~ farmers that profited from the mixed economy of the NEP. Initially, collectivisation resulted in a huge slump in livestock and grain because the kulaks burned the grain and killed the ~~finest~~ livestock instead of giving it up. This resulted in a massive famine that killed millions ~~as a result~~ especially in the Ukraine. Hence, ~~agri~~ Stalin's economic reforms in agriculture were not very successful. However, he did manage to collectivise 90% of the farm by mid 1930's, which was a huge success.

The collectives were extremely labour intensive due to a lack of tractors and other machineries. This was made harder as many men left the country side to work in the cities, hence women had to pull ploughs. This made agriculture very inefficient, because it was ~~harder~~ harder

to ~~a~~ form larger farms manually than smaller. This all shows that Stalin's economic policies were not very successful in the years 1928-53. Because despite the reform agricultural production only increased slightly in the 1930's and ~~never~~ was never able to feed entire Russian population. The ~~a~~ majority of the grain had to be imported. There were also very little incentives ~~to~~ to work hard in agriculture as farmers get the least food. Rations were distributed according to rank, meaning that most went to party members. And wages never exceeded those of factory workers. *

In conclusion, Stalin's economic policy in the years 1928 - 53 showed some success in industry and did to a large extent industrialise the Soviet economy. However, living standards remained extremely low due to limited consumer goods, poor housing, strict rationing, famine and little to no social benefits. Therefore, the historians can argue that Stalin's economic policy was only successful to a small extent.

* Agriculture never really recovered from ~~the~~ after Stalin.

This is a level 4 response. It examines both industrial and agricultural policy and covers the time period. The knowledge is well developed and is focused on addressing the question. Clear criteria for judgement are established and its conclusion is supported.

Question 3

This was the least popular question with a much smaller number of answers compared to Questions 2 and 4. Although some candidates were well informed on Stalin and Khrushchev's religious policies, many struggled to focus on the second order concept – similarity and difference and tended to produce descriptive responses which treated each leader individually. This restricted their achievement in the levels.

Under the Soviet rule, religion tended to be suppressed in order to take easier control of the people. As Karl Marx once stated "Religion is the opium of the masses."

Stalin closely followed this ideology and wanted everyone in the Soviet Union to be atheist. This continued throughout the whole Soviet leadership, although there were some differences between leaders' policies and approaches towards religion. For instance, some of those differences can be observed between Stalin's policies and those of Khrushchev's.

For instance, Stalin closed down the Churches within the USSR and turned them into storages for grain coming from collectivised farms so that they wouldn't be running out of space. He had no tolerance towards any activity that was held in a Church and strongly frowned upon people who went to Churches on Sundays to pray. By closing down Churches, he also did not allow any religious clothing to be worn in public, especially priests who walked around wearing their robes.

This was quite similar under Khrushchev, we closed down any Churches that remained open and made sure that there were absolutely no religious ceremonies held.

Marriage ceremonies were done as a civil ceremony rather than a religious one.

Another similarity can be observed in education. Stalin changed the curriculums completely and based them ~~on~~ solely on Marxist and communist ideology. With that, he also underlined the importance of being atheist and pushed everyone to leave their religion behind. Stalin tended to see religion as a distraction and he was against any sorts of distraction within the USSR borders as in schools, teachers mainly taught young students to be very hard-working and respectful towards their country. By excluding religion from the schools, Stalin was able to ensure that the new generation would grow up with the love of ~~atheism~~ atheism.

~~that~~ Even though Khrushchev did reform a couple of things in the education system, the curriculum remained untouched, maintaining the education the same way Stalin pursued it his whole reign.

One last similarity can be seen in the treatment of other religious groups.

Stalin did not just target the Christians, although they were the majority of the country. He made sure to extend his policies to religious groups such as Muslims and Jews as well. With the extended religious policy, both religious groups were unable to do pilgrimages to their holy sites. Muslims were also banned from wearing religious clothing. This meant that muslim women were unable to wear a headscarf. While the muslims could not go to Mecca to pray once a year, the jews were also not able to leave the country. ^{Also, their synagogues were shut down so they couldn't participate in any religious activity.}

By extending his policies this far, Stalin proves that he is very careful towards his approach to people. Muslims and Jews combined did not even make up 10% of the population but were still targeted due to Stalin's totalitarian views. Once again, the targeting of minority groups remained stable under Khrushchev's regime, though it is particularly stated that he targeted Islamic groups within the USSR more than the Jews. This may be caused by the fact that the Jewish people made up only 2% of the whole population.

Although these facts ~~show~~ show us that the policies of these two leaders are significantly similar, there are indeed some differences in views that should not be ignored.

Under Stalin, after the Churches were closed down, ^{some} they were reopened during the era of the Second World War. This was in order to get support against the Nazis. ~~414~~ 414 Churches in total were reopened again, in exchange that those people who go to the Church support the war effort and conduct propaganda against the rivals in the war. This approach from Stalin turned out to be very moderate and was seen as some allowance of freedom in the society - of course, that came with a price. As soon as Khrushchev came into power after Stalin, he closed down every single Church that was reopened during the Second World War.

Moreover, Stalin's infamous use of Terror was also extended to religion. After banning any religious activity, most of the priests went underground and maintained their ac-

tivities there, however Stalin used his secret police to locate anyone who was illegally participating in religion, especially priests. In total, about 10,000 priests in total were sent to gulags for either opposing Stalin's rule or participating in any kind of ritual. Under Khrushchev, use of violence was not seen as something that could possibly solve an issue so there has not been any records of violence against religious people after Stalin's rule.

In conclusion, we could say that both Stalin and Khrushchev's policies targeted the same goals in terms of religion and were therefore significantly similar.

One reason for that, I believe, is that Khrushchev inherited Stalin's rule and it was up to him, which policy to dismiss and which one to keep.

It is therefore very logical that Khrushchev maintained almost all policies of Stalin in this area since they approached the case very similarly except from using violence and terror to assert power, which Khrushchev was strictly against to.

This is a high level 3 response. It draws out some similarities e.g. the closure of churches and the targeting of a range of religious groups as well as differences including Stalin's decision to reopen the churches during the war. The analysis however is under-developed and criteria for judgement not established and hence this does not enter level 4.

Question 4

This was a popular question. The best responses explored the impact of Gorbachev's reforms and contrasted this with alternative factors such as the long term stagnation of the economy, the rise of Boris Yeltsin and the collapses of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and used this as the basis for establishing the most significant factor in weakening Communist government. Some candidates lost focus on the question and examined the reasons for Gorbachev's fall and this did impact on their achievement in the levels. Lower scoring responses tended to describe events during this time period rather than debate significance.

- Gorbachev reforms:
 - Glasnost ~ economic reform
 - Perestroika ~ political restructuring/reform
 - ↳ happened at the same time
- ALSO:
- August Coup ~ 1990 ~ weakness within party
- Yeltsin ~ stating that laws passed in Russian Congress greater ~~than~~ status than those passed by USSR.
 - ↳ constant rivalry
- Resistant to reform, end of Brezhnev Doctrine = nationalism in Eastern European Countries.
 - ↳ Confusion: Romania ~ Caucasus + Armenia + Naborska
 - ↳ But Poland + Czechoslovakia okay
 - ↳ Communist gov ~~didn't~~ had to wait for Gorbachev's casual

It is accurate to a certain extent to state the impact of Gorbachev's reforms was ~~the most~~ ^{one of the} significant factor that contributing to the weakening of the Communist government in the USSR in the years 1982-91², however there were ^{also} other factors.

~~Once in power, Gorbachev was~~ Gorbachev was one of the leaders of the USSR that had made his way up the system. Thus when finally reaching the top he understood that ~~reform and~~ change was needed, especially economically and politically, in order for the Communist USSR to survive. This resulted in the implementation of Perestroika, known as the political & restructuring/reform of the Communist party, which was accompanied by Glasnost, which was essentially economic reform. This was to be seen as one of the most chaotic and ~~unstable~~ unstable periods of the USSR government after the power struggle of Lenin. This saw ~~weakness~~ weakness in the government as it was filled with politicians that were part of Brezhnev's Stagnation period that completely resisted the idea of power change as it would affect their position and power over the party. In addition the elders in the party were unlikely to listen to the initiative of the young politicians that had entered the party recently as they

felt as if they were more superior and had more experience. The political ~~refor~~ and economic reforms that were happening at the same time were ~~was~~ unsuccessful as it let political voices such as those from Yeltsin, to ~~to~~ have a platform to criticize Gorbachev's reforms and allow many others to support such criticism. ~~This contributed~~ Glasnost, like seen in Communist China at the time who have been successful in Russia if that was the only political reform that was to be occurring. In addition, Gorbachev had no real long term solution for the economic and political crisis that they ahead of him. This resulted in him liberating to other members of the communist party, ~~to~~ portraying an image to his political rivals ~~that~~ and public that he was ~~not~~ incapable of dealing ~~at the~~ with the task ~~off~~ at hand. This was ^{the most} significant factor that contributed to the weakening of the Communist government as the political outrage and resistance the Gorbachev had faced within his own party had merely chipped away the ~~first~~ unconsolidated cement that would have placed to consolidate the ~~state~~ continuing success of the USSR in the near future. If Gorbachev's reforms had been ~~passed~~ implemented successfully then there would have been a rise in the living standards, ~~that saw~~ to which have probably decreased the need for many Eastern European countries

to have a constant outcry for nationalism

However, there were other factors which contributed to the weakening of the communist government that were possibly to the same significance as the Gorbachev's reforms.

One of Gorbachev's main opposition when implementing reforms and stating ideas to the party leaders was ~~the~~ Boris Yel'tin. ~~After~~ After ~~the~~ resigning from the Communist party in May, ¹⁹⁸⁹ he was able to recuperate and gain ~~access to~~ ~~the~~ visit industries, ~~and~~ ~~visit~~ work sites ~~and~~ to gain support for his opinions. - that would consequently criticise Gorbachev's evermore. To the public, it showed that even ~~in~~ within the ~~party~~ already crumbling party there was resistance to Gorbachev's ways. This possibly indicated ~~that~~ to many that ~~if~~ Gorbachev should have taken the hint, that when your own party goes against your reforms it would be time to resign. However Gorbachev prolonged this ~~so~~ until the August Coup of 1991 which caused many Russians to be a fear of terror and confusion, that would see their own army attack them. After ~~winning~~ the success of gaining votes from the people, Yel'tin was able to return to power when he became the Mayor of Moscow and then the party leader of the

Anti-Communist Group ^{and head of the Russian congress} ~~After~~. This again caused his political voice and entym to now spread through both the public and party. As head of the Russian congress he stated that the laws passed in Russian government were ~~to be more successful~~ to be of more significance to laws that were placed by the Communist USSR government. This ~~is~~ was of the factor which ~~was significant~~ contributed to the significant weakening of the Communist government: as many of the Eastern European countries felt as if there were being neglected and exploited for their resources with ~~many~~ in those in Russian living a better life than themselves. In addition, ~~the~~ many change of power ~~and~~ shift of power believed that the change and shift in power saw, that ~~it~~ had not been stated by Gorbachev, ~~with~~ perceived that Gorbachev no longer had the ~~per~~ ear of the people and politicians and due to the unsuccessful reforms of Perestroika and Glasnost. he was able to be walked across with his rivals dictating the foreign and internal laws of Russian.

The August Coup of 1990 was a factor which contributed to ~~the~~ the weakening of the Communist government in the USSR as it again portrayed that Gorbachev ~~was~~ ~~with~~ very unfavorable. It consisted of 4 men or ~~of~~ taking control of the USSR while Gorbachev.

was 'supposably ill', however, was under house arrest. ~~He~~ Yanov stated that he would the USSR, Russian included in these tough periods of instability. However, what was to confuse both the public and politicians was ^{Yelstin} Gorbachev's move to condone the coup and state that Gorbachev ~~was~~ was the return to power. Yelstin had always been a ~~let~~ a component of the opposition that Gorbachev faced through his period as both General Secretary and President of the USSR. Thus, like seen in the reality today, when formal or private support given in a period of crisis it ~~must~~ most likely indicates that all hope has been lost in both the USSR and Russian government. Thus contributing to the weakness of the weakening of the Communist government in the USSR during during the years 1982-91.

~~One~~ The ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine further ^{main factor that} contributed to weakening of the Communist government in the USSR during the years 1982-91. The Brezhnev Doctrine stated that in times of which the communist run countries of Eastern Europe were in political instability, with the threat of ~~the~~ jeopardizing the Communist rule, neighboring communist parties should intervene on behalf of this. At Malenkov's funeral Gorbachev had stated his ~~for~~ policy of ending

at the Doctrine as to hope that there would be a better control of economy if each of 15 states were ~~have~~ able to have ~~the~~ the influence to dictate reforms, spending and profits. This led to a ~~series~~ series of outbreaks which consequently saw the weakening and collapse of the communist government in the USSR. In ~~poland~~ Poland, the leading solidarity figure Lech Walesa, gained the ~~political~~ government due to ending of Article 6 which saw ~~the~~ the ending of ~~of~~ the communist party being the only party in the USSR. Lech Walesa saw this opportunity to ~~enter~~ get the ~~major~~ over 65% of the ~~polish~~ to agree to remove the communist from power and ~~where~~ ~~cause~~ ~~be~~ ~~to~~ become nationalised. Here the communist lost to a landslide victory which saw the Poles being free of communist intervention. This had a knock on effect in Czechoslovakia, where Vaclav Havel was the politician that had ~~an~~ anti-communist beliefs ~~for~~ becoming the ~~leader~~ of the ~~USSR~~ president - This saw no intervention of the communist government ~~that~~ ~~indicating~~ ~~it~~ ~~weakness~~ ~~as~~ ~~it~~ ~~was~~ due to the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine. However this was not the case in Armenia and Romania where the communist government felt that they had to intervene due to the ~~of~~ violent uproar against communism. This significantly contributed the weakening of the

Communist government in the USSR during the years 1982-91 as they no longer had control of the Eastern European countries that were in their sphere of influence, ~~in addition~~ due to abandonment of both Article 6 and the Brezhnev Doctrine. In addition, there was also confusion in the Communist gov which also weakened it due to ~~the~~ the interference in the Affairs of Armenia and Romania however not in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Thus the government ~~it~~ did not actually have a say in their actions instead they had to wait for authorization and approval for Gorbachev, this ~~was~~ further represented weakness in the Communist government of the USSR.

In conclusion, I believe that Gorbachev's reforms and the end of the Brezhnev Doctrine and abandonment of article 6 ~~and the~~ were the most significant factors which contributed to weakening of the communist government in the USSR. This was because they were ~~at~~ all 'back to back' catastrophes which had significantly effected the government. If the reforms had been successful, the Brezhnev Doctrine would have not intruded nationalization of the Eastern European countries. In addition, tension ~~is~~ further over

with the role of Yeltsin which continuously undermined and criticized Gorbachev, ^{especially his reforms,} at every possible opportunity ^{that caused} ~~opportunities~~. This ultimately saw the collapse of the weakening of the Communist government in the USSR as it merely was chipping away at the possible foundation of what could have the most successful period of the USSR but instead resulted in its fragility and consequently its collapse.

This is a level 4 response. It examines long term stagnation, the impact of Glasnost and the end of the Brezhnev Doctrine and the decline of Communism in Russia and Eastern Europe. It establishes valid criteria and reaches a supported judgement.

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

Section A

- Make sure you are aware of the topics highlighted for the source question and have prepared for them
- A careful reading of the sources is needed so that the issues raised are clearly identified
- You must ensure that you draw out inferences, but these should always be directly linked to the source and not driven by contextual knowledge
- You should consider the nature, origin and purpose of the source
- Do not merely restate what the provenance says – think about how it can be used to address the question. In a, this requires a consideration of how it adds value and in b, this requires considering value and limitations
- Do not deal with the 'bullet points' separately – value and weight are established by a more holistic approach that uses context and consideration of provenance to evaluate the source
- Contextual knowledge should be used to support the answer, not to drive it, and should be made relevant to the enquiry
- Question 1a does not require a consideration of the limitations of sources
- It is unlikely that weight can be assessed by listing all the things that a source does not deal with.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Essay questions are set over a period of at least ten years; candidates need to address the whole time period set in the question
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

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