



## Mark Scheme (Provisional)

Summer 2021

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in  
History (WHI02/1C)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

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

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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

Summer 2021

Question Paper Log Number 65831

Publications Code WHI02\_1C\_msc\_20210517

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## 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 for Paper 2

### Section A: Question 1(a)

**Target: AO2 (10 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.</li></ul>

## Section A: Question 1(b)

**Target: A02 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li><li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<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>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some 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 focus of the question.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but 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 support 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>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<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 some mainly 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 or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<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.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li><li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1C: Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
<b>1a</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>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 required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons why Lenin demanded Party unity in Soviet Russia in the early 1920s.</p> <p>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It suggests that Party unity was necessary at a time when the revolution was under threat ('particularly necessary at the present moment', 'if the dictatorship of the proletariat could be overthrown in Russia')</li><li>• It claims that a lack of unity will promote counter-revolution ('deepen the divisions and use them for purposes of counter-revolution')</li><li>• It claims that a lack of unity was behind the Kronstadt rebellion ('The recent Kronstadt uprising is clear evidence that the enemies of the proletariat will take advantage of any move away')</li><li>• It implies, in an almost paranoid way, that the Party has been infiltrated by Whites seeking to destroy it ('White Guards are pretending to be communists in order to weaken and overthrow the proletarian revolution').</li></ul> <p>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As head of the Bolshevik government Lenin was in charge of directing Party policy and the resolution clearly outlines his views</li><li>• The resolution was approved by the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party and thus represents the policy of the government</li><li>• The resolution is not only a response to a current crisis but represents the wider ideology of the Bolshevik leadership.</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The unrest in Tambov, Petrograd and Kronstadt demonstrated that the workers and peasants were deeply dissatisfied with the regime and represented a threat to its continued existence</li><li>• In 1921, Lenin faced opposition from the Workers' Opposition, who wanted to reintroduce workers' control of industry, and the Democratic Centralists, who wanted to make the Communist Party more democratic</li><li>• The ban on factions meant that members could be expelled from the Party. This strengthened Lenin's control of the Party.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<b>1b</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>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 required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the methods used to collectivise agriculture under Stalin.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The speech comes from member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and represents the official position of the Party on the methods to be used to achieve collectivisation</li> <li>• The purpose of the speech is to enthuse the twenty-five-thousanders to follow the Party line on collectivisation</li> <li>• The language and tone of the speech place emphasis on the threats to collectivisation and indicate that the twenty-five-thousanders are expected to brook no opposition in the task of collectivisation</li> <li>• The speech glorifies Stalin and his role in collectivisation.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that that the twenty-five-thousanders are to use brutal methods to achieve collectivisation ('assistance of Bolshevik determination', 'Beat down the kulak enemy', 'no time for squeamishness')</li> <li>• It suggests that there will be no punishment for excessive force ('better to do too much than not enough')</li> <li>• It instructs the twenty-five-thousanders to root out the kulaks who are a threat to collectivisation ('sabotaging the Party policy')</li> <li>• It indicates that the twenty-five-thousanders need to identify kulaks hidden on the collective farms ('The kulak enemies are disguising themselves and getting into the collective farms').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many peasants destroyed food rather than hand it over to the state. The regime sent in dekulakisation squads from the cities to organise collectivisation. The OGPU was used to round up opposition</li> <li>• Over 27 thousand workers volunteered to collectivise the countryside. After a two-week training course, they were sent to the countryside to offer technical support in using the new machinery</li> <li>• The twenty-five-thousanders were used to enforce dekulakisation by finding and confiscating secret stores of grain, rounding up 'kulaks' and organising their exile, and forcing the remaining peasants into collectives.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



## Section B: Indicative content

### Option 1C: Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their 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 treatment of religion in the Soviet Union changed in the years 1928-82.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the treatment of religion in the Soviet Union changed in the years 1928-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the 1930s Stalin persecuted the Orthodox and Islamic religions as opponents to collectivisation. In the 1940s religious worship was permitted as a necessary morale booster during the war</li><li>• Khrushchev's policy changed from Stalin's accommodation of religion to launch a major anti-religious campaign in 1958 and closed the churches that had been reopened by Stalin</li><li>• Brezhnev changed the approach to religion. He ended Khrushchev's overt attacks on churches. He preferred to encourage atheism than attack religious organisations or practices</li><li>• In the late 1960s, Brezhnev changed from the anti-Islamic policy pursued by Stalin and Khrushchev to declaring that Islam was compatible with socialism.</li></ul> <p>The arguments and evidence that the treatment of religion in the Soviet Union did not change in the years 1928-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The position that religion and its institutions were a threat to socialist ideology continued to be a key element of the Soviet approach to religion throughout the period</li><li>• Khrushchev continued Stalin's attacks on the physical fabric of the church by closing down churches</li><li>• Khrushchev's anti-Islamic campaign continued on the same lines as Stalin's attack on the Islamic religion in the 1930s</li><li>• Concern about the influence of Church personnel continued throughout the period. Priests who challenged socialist ideology were arrested and imprisoned under Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their 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 Khrushchev and Brezhnev failed to achieve a stable society in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-82.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that Khrushchev and Brezhnev failed to achieve a stable society in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stability was affected by a high turnover of labour that undermined the economy and threatened the living standards promised under the Social Contract</li> <li>• There was a significant rise in the number of single-parent families as a result of divorce, male deaths caused by accidents and alcoholism and a tolerant attitude to illegitimacy. This threatened social stability</li> <li>• High spending on defence led to a decrease in the proportion of the budget spent on healthcare; patients had to bribe hospitals to gain admission. This increased discontent with the Soviet system</li> <li>• The ageing population placed considerable strain on the pension system established by Khrushchev. By the 1980s, inadequate pension provision meant that many pensioners had to seek paid employment.</li> </ul> <p>The arguments and evidence that Khrushchev and Brezhnev succeeded in achieving a stable society in the Soviet Union in the years 1953-82 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards of living rose during this period, e.g. real wages increased by 50 per cent under Brezhnev. Wages differentials were limited and there were few complaints about economic inequalities</li> <li>• Khrushchev and Brezhnev both invested in social housing. By the 1980s, 85 per cent of families lived in non-shared accommodation, which reduced strains on family life and promoted stability</li> <li>• Employment policies focused on job security and Brezhnev's Social Contract provided for healthcare, pensions and subsidies for holidays. There were high levels of satisfaction that increased social stability</li> <li>• Both Khrushchev and Brezhnev focused on the expansion of consumer goods. A more plentiful supply of cheap goods encouraged greater satisfaction with the Soviet system.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to their 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, in the years 1982-91, the attempt to reform the economy was a complete failure.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1982-91, the attempt to reform the economy was a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chernenko lacked a coherent economic policy. He spoke of the need for economic reform, but was in office for too short a period to introduce any meaningful reforms</li> <li>• Gorbachev's policies pursued under the period of acceleration (1985-87) were a failure. Unrealistic targets were set in the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan and corrupt managers embezzled funds intended for use in joint enterprises</li> <li>• The 1987-89 attempt to reduce Party interference in the economy failed when central planning agencies starved new private enterprises of resources</li> <li>• By 1990, unprofitable enterprises had to be supported by government subsidies. This led to a massive increase in government spending and a growth in the budget deficit.</li> </ul> <p>The arguments and evidence that, in the years 1982-91, the attempt to reform the economy was not a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andropov's industrial reform programme, which paid workers by results, contributed to an improvement in industrial production in 1983 with the achievement of the highest productivity since 1978</li> <li>• Gorbachev was successful in restructuring the nature of the economy. Newly-established private enterprises were able to determine their own direction and to refuse government contracts in favour of private ones</li> <li>• Gorbachev was successful in addressing the massive expenditure on the military-industrial complex through his foreign policy that persuaded the West that the Soviet Union was not a military threat</li> <li>• The Soviet Joint Venture Law of 1987 allowed foreigners to invest in joint ventures in the Soviet Union. Foreign partners supplied capital, technology and entrepreneurial expertise.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>