



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

October 2017

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

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

June 2017

Publications Code

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

WHI02 1C Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Introduction

It was pleasing to see some 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 most candidates understood what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. Some candidates are still writing about limitations in question A which is not rewarded and often undermines the argument in the answer.

In Section B, most 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. In some cases candidates struggled to develop sufficient relevant material to address the question and some included material that did not relate to the question.

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

Most candidates demonstrated comprehension of the source on recruitment to women in the workplace in the 1930s and many were able to draw out inferences from the source. Candidates were able to add to the source material by reference to their contextual knowledge and this enabled most candidates to achieve at least level 2. The better focused responses achieved level 3 by selecting material from the source to support inferences and using their contextual knowledge to develop the explanation. Most candidates made relevant points regarding the value to be attached to the source either by reference to the inferences that could be drawn or considering the nature, origins and purpose of the source. There are still too many candidates who devote a substantial part of the answer to looking at limitations which do not address the question and cannot be rewarded.

This source is valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the recruitment of women into the workplace in the Soviet Union in the 1930s. This is because the source informs us ~~about the reasons of~~ ^{into the recruitment} of women into the workplace. It's a government publication in Moscow city whereas ~~Moscow~~ ^{Moscow} city was the centre of workforce. So it is an excellent place to use as explaining the recruitment of women into workplace.

To begin with, this source is valuable because in the lines 6-8 it states "...in a crystal-making factory night-time classes for children were opened so that mothers could leave their children during their time at work."

This highlights that opening classes for children helped women to get into work because now there was ~~someone~~ ^{a class} ~~who~~ that can look after their children so that the recruitment of women into workplace

would be easier. As evidence, creches were also opened in 1930s which helped women to get into jobs. ~~Because this~~ ~~policy,~~ ~~decre~~

~~As another~~ ~~secondly,~~ As another point to support the value of this source is in the lines ~~12-14~~ as it states " ~~the factories could~~ not ~~achieve~~ ^{fully} the planned measures. Instead of ~~23,000 pre-schools~~ " the work of the Commission will lead to great results when the District Soviet starts to provide better leadership. ... there needs to be a greater distribution of ~~women's~~ ^{women's} work in production. This indicates that ~~Soviets~~ ^{government} realised that there was a need to better ~~coordination~~ ^{coordination} to help women get into more jobs. For example, in ~~Second World War~~ ^{Five-year plans} Stalin realised the importance of women in ~~participation of meeting targets~~ ^{participation of meeting targets}, especially in textiles. This proves us evidence that there was more actions taken against the recruitment of women into the workplace.

Moreover, ~~thirdly,~~ this source is valuable because in the lines 16-17, it states "A list of ~~professions~~ professions and jobs accessible to women should be made. Men then need to be removed

from these jobs and transferred to jobs that are physically more difficult, while ~~as~~ women are sent to take their places." This implies that ~~the~~ the work that women would get into would be arranged ~~at their~~ ~~capacity~~ according to their potential, whereas ~~recruitment~~ ~~of~~ women would be more. As evidence in 1930s, textiles were dominated by women and ~~factor~~ factories which produce raw materials were dominated by men. This made it easier for the recruitment of women into the workforce ~~as the~~ ~~as~~ ~~as~~ ^{they} work in places that they would show their full potential.

Overall, source 1 is valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the ~~reasons~~ recruitment of women into the ~~work~~ workplace in the USSR in 1930s. As the source explains the recruitment of ~~work~~ ^{women}, it is valuable. Also, Moscow City was the best place to give evidences about the recruitment of ^{women} ~~people~~ into the workplace as it was the center of production and it was dominated by its workforce.

This is a level 3 response which develops several inferences, e.g. on pp.1-2 it draws out an inference about how the provision of crèches would make recruitment of women easier. The candidate has used knowledge to develop and explain inferences. For example, on p.4 the candidate uses knowledge of female labour in textile factories to explain the recruitment of women and men to different roles in the workplace. The candidate has made a valid point about the value of a source drawn from Moscow because of its importance in the development of industry.

Question 1b

Many candidates achieved level 3 in answering this question but there were no level 4 responses. Most candidates were able to show that they comprehended the source and some drew and supported inferences. A number of candidates lost focus on the question and whilst they considered the weight of the source in general terms, they did not consider it in the terms of an enquiry into the reasons for the coup of August 1991. A minority of candidates did not have a clear knowledge of the event and some were confused about Yeltsin's position with regards to the Communist Party and the Union Treaty. Weaker evaluation tended to say that the source was both value and limited without considering 'how much weight' could be attached to it and therefore judgements lacked substantiation.

Source 2 is a speech from Boris Yeltsin to the Russian citizens in 1991. The source will be valuable for an enquiry to an extent, because as the closest policy allowed people to have freedom of expression, Yeltsin will be able to express freely, however, we must take into account that Yeltsin wanted to forbid the communist government and appeal the people's nationalism, which means that it will actually be biased.

In this essay I am going to ~~assess~~ analyse the extent to which this source is valuable to a historian enquiry

Yeltsin is trying to show the masses how little serious were the communists on their policies, he does that by showing how did they changed of opinion ^{for} ~~on~~ their own benefit. "Every one of the coup organisers was going to ^{lose} ~~lose~~ at because of the New Union Treaty. That is the main motivation of the members of the coup". By stating that as we know, in 1991, eight senior communists tried to seize a coup in order to save the communist party from Gorbachev's liberal ideas like a market economy. Yeltsin then appeared as the great defender of Gorbachev and avoided the coup and demanded Gorbachev to stay in power. This quote is biased, as it ~~is~~ just tells the people how serious were the communists,

and he is appealing to the sense that people had that communists politicians were corrupt. In a sense, this quote would be valuable, as it was true that the so-called 'hardliners' communists were truly keen on enforcing conservative communist ideals again, as they were fearful that the communist party was banned and their benefits as party members ended, so, although this information is biased in favour of Yeltsin and against communists, he was actually telling the truth.

Yeltsin want to show the people that the communists were still anti democratic "The decrees they have passed have abolished all parties except the communist parties" This quote is absolutely ~~to~~ not useful for a historian, as it is completely manipulated to show people that the communists did not wanted a multi party election. ~~It~~ Indeed, ^{Gorbatchev's} ~~Gorbachev's~~ aim was to make Russia a democratic country in which they could choose their leader. It is true that they just wanted communist parties in the elections, but, actually, anti communist parties ~~like~~ ~~and~~ associations like the IADG (headed by Yeltsin) were still working. Moreover, Yeltsin takes into his advantage the fact that Gorbachev had to take full powers for 18 months because of the chaotic situation in Russia, which ~~was~~ as we see was then used by Yeltsin for his advantage. Consequently, this point could not have been used for a historian, as it is too biased.

~~age~~ Yeltsin again wants to emphasize the corruptness of the communist party on his favour. He does that by quoting firstly that "fight to preserve its privileges lies at the heart of heart of the communist party activities, and secondly ~~the~~ "A coup and that its leaders are no less than state criminals". Both statements are definitely used in favour of Yeltsin, as he wants to undermine the communist party and take advantage of the coup of 1991. ~~This will therefore be valuable~~ Nevertheless, this will be valuable ~~as I said~~ (to an extent) because, as I said, the more left wing communists and the ones that initiated the coup were keen on preserving their benefits as soviet leaders, as they got rich using communist resources and selling assets, however, it must be taken into account that again, Yeltsin is manipulating the information and omitting the fact that Gorbachev had begun a campaign anti corruption and he wanted to take these benefits from communist leaders. { Indeed, Yeltsin is saying that ~~all communists are criminals~~, however the coup leaders were state criminals and he is also ~~the~~ putting all communists as criminals, which is just a lie because Gorbachev and the radical communists were not in favour of the atrocities and corruption committed the past years. Therefore, ~~these points~~ in that sense, this is not valuable to a historian.

To conclude, although this source by Yeltsin shows many facts like the date of the coup 'A coup took place on 19 August - 109 days before signing the new Union Treaty', which are true facts and valuable to historians, the ~~majority~~ we must take into account the reasons for the speech, which was undermining the communist party in order to ban it, which means that he was taking into his advantage the success of the coup and blaming all communists as a consequence. Therefore, the speech of Yeltsin, the majority of it would not be valuable for a historian enquiry.

This response achieves level 3 for all three bullet points although it is more limited in addressing bullet point one; the inferences focus more on the nature of the source and less on the content. Relevant support from contextual knowledge is provided. Its focus is limited in places with some drift from the 'reasons for the coup'.

Question 2

There were several answers to this question. In some cases the focus on illiteracy was variable, with some candidates concentrating on education policy with some limited reference to illiteracy, but most candidates were able to draw out some key points and assess them in terms of success and failure.

Between the years 1917-41, there were various policies about illiteracy in the Soviet Union. The policy to reduce the illiteracy in the Soviet Union in the years 1917-41 was successful to some extent. For this claim, there are some evidences that supports it. These are; cultural war ~~by illiteracy~~ ~~by the~~ ~~the~~ ~~help of Komsomol volunteers~~, Lunacharsky's help to Lenin, "cultural war" towards illiteracy with the help of Komsomol volunteers, free primary education and improvements in higher education.

To begin with, Lunacharsky was the Commissioner of Enlightenment and he helped Lenin to improve ~~ill~~ literacy in the USSR. ~~They~~ arranged ~~classes for adults to learn~~ literacy. After the revolution Lenin realised the fact that the communist revolution would be fully achieved if the Soviet people were literate. So ~~they~~ ~~were~~ with the help of Lunacharsky they arranged classes for adults to learn literacy. This ~~education~~ ~~policy~~ educating adults policy really worked as ~~it~~ there was

a significant increase in the literate people in the USSR, which was a significant success.

Secondly, Stalin continued ~~to~~ ~~the~~ policies towards the illiteracy. ~~Komsomol~~ In Komsomol group, there was volunteers to ~~to~~ teach people literacy. ~~Volunteers~~ The amount of volunteers were 60 per cent of Komsomol. Stalin declared that these volunteers were "cultural soldiers" ~~who~~ who started a ~~war~~ "cultural war" towards illiteracy. ~~to~~

As evidence for the success of "cultural war" the amount of literate people reached up to 94 per cent of the population ^{in 1959}. This was an example of ~~the~~ ~~not~~ a successful policy ~~to~~ ~~to~~ ~~to~~ decline ~~the~~ illiteracy levels in the USSR.

Thirdly, Stalin realised the importance of ~~of~~ ~~primary~~ primary ^{school} education to ~~to~~ start growing literate young people at an early age. He made the primary school education fees free. Therefore, more and more ~~go~~ children could go to school and be literate. It did not matter the class of the society the children were into to go to

schools. Because previously only children who came from middle ~~to~~ class family or rich families could only get education and be literate. So Stalin's policy ensured that all children from all classes from the society can learn ~~literacy~~ ^{literacy} ~~by~~ ~~st~~ ~~literacy~~ ~~as~~ As a result, literacy rates boomed in the USSR. This provides us evidence that Stalin's policy of free charge of schools worked ^{and was successful} by raising up a generation that were already ~~to~~ literate at an early age.

Moreover, higher education had also improved in the USSR. Stalin had ~~improved~~ increased the number of universities which automatically increase the number of students. This policy was successful in two ways. One way ~~is~~ is that Stalin made sure that no illiterate people remained ~~in~~ the USSR and ~~to~~ improve their education. The ~~the~~ other way was that students could become teachers by ~~higher~~ ^{attending} education. ~~this would~~ ^{university} Improvement in higher ~~education~~ education means ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~more~~ ~~teachers~~ increase in the number of people in the teaching ~~prof~~ profession.

so they could teach more and more people literacy. This policy of Stalin had succeeded to reduce ~~the~~ illiteracy in the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, the policy to reduce the illiteracy in the Soviet Union in the years ~~1917~~ 1917-41 was not successful in some fields. ~~There~~ There are some evidences supporting this claim. These policies are, lack of resources and teachers in rural areas, and primary education under Lenin.

Initially, education and literacy was not emphasised in the rural areas, whereas peasant could not get benefits of the education policies. In rural areas ~~the~~ there was lack of resources such as heating, school meals and equipment needed to ~~learn~~ study as books and pencils. ~~So~~ * Also there was no ~~education~~ ^{attempts} ~~attempted~~ * to reduce ~~illiteracy~~ illiteracy rates. ~~Plan 2~~ ~~There~~ Also there was lack of teachers in rural areas. Because teachers have better working opportunities in

the cities. So no one wanted to go that ~~was~~ prone to break down school buildings to teach. ~~As a result~~ ~~in~~ With not enough teachers in the rural ~~areas~~, ~~the~~ areas, there would be no improvement in literacy rates as the policies of Lenin and Stalin was only in the cities, failed ~~to~~ ^{to} capture rural areas. This gives us evidence that in some fields Stalin's and Lenin's policy to reduce illiteracy ~~not~~ ~~did~~ led to a failure.

~~It~~ Furthermore, fees were required ^{for schools.} under the ~~the~~ policies of Lenin. This was especially the case in primary school education. Only children of middle class and rich classes can attend ~~the~~ primary school. Other ~~children's families~~ families could not afford to send their children to schools. So, most of the children ~~was~~ could not get a primary education which means they would be illiterate. ~~It~~ This shows us that in some fields Lenin's policies did not work to reduce illiteracy, and his policies ~~did not~~ was not successful.

All things considered, the policy to reduce the illiteracy in the Soviet Union in the years 1917-41 was successful ~~to~~ at some fields and to some ~~extent~~ extent. This was because, Lunacharsky's policies for education to ~~decrease~~ decrease illiteracy with Lenin, ^{the work of} Komsomol volunteers who started a "cultural war" against illiteracy, ~~and~~ ~~free~~ ~~fees~~ ~~free~~ ~~in~~ ~~primary~~ making ~~fees~~ ~~free~~ in primary education under Stalin and ~~an~~ improvement in higher education. But, one should keep in mind that there were some policies that did not lead to a success in declining illiteracy rates in the USSR in some fields. Evidences for this claim were lack of resources in rural areas that the policies only worked in cities and school fees under Lenin that some children could not attend to primary ^{school} education and become illiterate.

This is a level 4 response. It is focused on illiteracy and uses educational policy as the means to explore the achievements of the Soviet state. It is focussed on assessing successes and failures and reaches a supported judgement. The knowledge is secure and provides precise examples to support the argument.

Question 3

There were several responses to this question. Most candidates had a very good knowledge of the economic policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev. In level three candidates tended to focus mainly on differences and explore the two leaders individually. At level four, however, there were examples of well-crafted comparison drawing out differences and similarities in relation to different aspects of the economy.

~~the~~ Khrushchev and Brezhnev in the years ~~1953-82~~
1953-82 implemented very different policies in the management
of the economy, as Khrushchev was more liberal than Brezhnev.
Some historians differ on the extent of their different
measures. Some say that Brezhnev's measures were more
successful. I agree with them to an extent. In order to
reach a final conclusion of this essay, I am going to
analyse: The agricultural ~~conditions~~, ~~and~~ the industry and
industrial ~~measures~~, the living conditions of the
people under both communist leaders, ~~and~~ ^{and} the ~~changes in~~
~~the government itself~~ and other issues like centralisation of the
government.

§ In the past years, the communist government system
~~was~~ had always been ~~as~~ highly centralised, however,
Khrushchev wanted to make a sudden turn in order to avoid
Stalinism and make ^{the government:} the ~~government~~ ~~factories~~ less centralised,
ultimately leading to ~~the increase~~ unnecessary bureaucracy
and economic chaos. ~~On the other hand,~~ Brezhnev, in
~~was more~~ agriculture, Khrushchev allowed the peasant farms
to grow any crops that they wanted, ^{giving} and ~~giving~~ them more
freedom and ~~moreover~~ by charging a fee. Moreover, he
abolished the MTS tractor maintenance, which led to the
hoarding of materials and therefore a fall in production. Some

historians argue that this completely differed from Brezhnev's agricultural measures, because, ~~the~~ instead of letting production go on decline like Khrushchev did, he allowed imports from western powers to enter the country in order to keep food prices low. This led to a better quantity of food and less dependence of bread and potatoes, which Khrushchev could not achieve.

Moreover, we must also take into account the different agricultural policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev. Khrushchev began the virgin land scheme, leading to disaster from 1958 to 1964, and therefore allowed maize to grow, as it had been a success in the past years and the creation of fertilisers. ~~Indeed~~ Indeed, only 1 in 6 crops of maize grew, leading to huge wastage and shortage of food, which meant that Khrushchev was not in fact an agricultural expert and consequently had to face the humiliation of importing grain from the west. This extremely differed from Brezhnev, as I said before, he was the one who allowed imports from the west, as he wanted to keep prices down. ~~More~~ What's more, Brezhnev, in contrast with Khrushchev succeeded in buying huge quantities of oil, and when the oil crisis in the 1970s came and oil was more expensive, he then took the opportunity of selling it to other countries, in order to be able to continue ~~to~~ buying grain. This therefore led to a

better manage of the economy and people conformation with the Government.

Although it seems that Brezhnev was more successful than Khrushchev, their management of the economy was different to an extent, as neither of them could solve the problem of productivity workforce, which meant that under both leaders, the productivity was awful and highly differed from the Western powers, as the people was just motivated on producing food for themselves and under Khrushchev, although the private plots were just a 4% of the farmland, they produced the majority of the food, leading to shortages in the countryside. This does not differ much from Brezhnev's policies of food production, as the people working on agriculture were a 40% of the population and in the USSR were a 6% and they still produced much more food. This meant that both leaders failed in the motivation of workers.

Regarding on industry and living conditions, ~~both presidents~~ ~~different~~ although it seems that Khrushchev and Brezhnev's measures were quite similar, historians claim that in fact, their policies lead to different outcomes. Khrushchev was keen on focusing on light industry, which meant consumer goods (as he wanted to create a truly socialist economy and ~~are~~ chemical fertilisers. On the service sector, he

quadrupled the pensions and expanded ~~social~~ other social benefits like medical welfare. Similarly, Brezhnev's measures were about a 'Social contract' in which the government gave people ~~social~~ good conditions of living and the population did not oppose the government.

We must bear in mind that Khrushchev's policies did not succeed, ~~and~~ and although they seemed ~~as~~ similar to Brezhnev's, ~~they led~~ his policies led to government approval, whereas Khrushchev's led ultimately to his resignation. An example is that consumer goods and fertilisers under Khrushchev lagged ~~back~~ far behind from the actual targets that he put. Historians ~~some~~ think this was due to poor communication and inefficiency because of the decentralised system.

In contrast, Brezhnev's policies actually succeeded, ~~and~~ indeed, historians agree that the quality of living conditions under Brezhnev was the best in the years of communist rule. For example, the number of ~~house~~ cars per ~~family~~ increased and everyone had a proper apartment, ~~and~~ also almost everyone had washing machines and refrigerators, which differed from Khrushchev's attempts to modernise the economy, as although he wanted to merge the use of refrigerators

more widely available among people in order to avoid daily shopping, long ~~space~~ queues for basic needs were still ~~every~~ a daily issue, leading to discontent and Brezhnev's measures leading to a lack of opposition.

~~In that sense, both Brezhnev~~ ~~Howe~~ on the other hand, regarding on armament, both Khrushchev and Brezhnev's policies were similar. This was due to the beginning and continuation of the cold war with the USA and western powers, which consequently made it extremely important to continue prioritising armament on the production factories. In fact, a ~~big~~ big amount of the GDP was ~~is~~ invested in the cold war. Moreover, both Brezhnev and Khrushchev were unable to tackle a quality problem ~~to that end~~. That historians claim that remained all along the Communist history, and was that the Russian command economy was good at creating ~~is~~ vast quantities of products but failed to make high tech products successfully. This in part led to a stagnation of the economy which remained from Khrushchev until the end of the USSR in 1991.

However, some historians claim that Brezhnev was actually more successful on the ~~is~~ armament and command economy, as he faced the ~~same~~ most decisive years of the cold war and he was able to combine it

with good living conditions. Nonetheless it is undeniable that neither Khrushchev nor Brezhnev were able to end up the stagnation of the economy, leading up to economic chaos.

To conclude, I agree with historians that claim that Brezhnev and Khrushchev implemented very different economic management styles, as I think that Brezhnev was more successful. Moreover, Khrushchev used a more liberal and decentralized approach towards the government and focused on the virgin land schemes and other agricultural measures, whereas Brezhnev was more conservative and used a centralized system ~~however~~ and used different methods of agriculture which led to success. However, ~~if~~ we must take into account that any of them was able to tackle economic issues which led to the stagnation of the economy itself and both of them ~~to~~ gave importance to the creation of consumer goods. So, to an extent, I do agree that both implemented different economic policies as, ~~to~~ although in some things they had the same aims like consumer goods, they used different methods to make them possible, leading to the social approval of Brezhnev and the resignation from the charge of Khrushchev.

This is an excellent level 4 response. There is very secure development of the differences. The argument is supported by a good range of precise knowledge. The discussion of similarities is developed in a little less depth but it is developed with sufficient knowledge. The judgement is supported.

Question 4

There were several answers to this question. While some candidates struggled to focus on 'political stability' and drifted into discussion on a stable society, there were some well-focused responses who used their knowledge of the 'stability of cadres', the emerging gerontocracy and development of corruption to develop their arguments effectively.

In the years 1964-82, ~~under~~ Brezhnev, introduced a series of policies that brought ^{about} political stability. However, we must see to what extent Brezhnev's policy 'stability of cadres' ~~bro~~ meant that there was political stability in the short-term as members of the Party enjoyed job security, however ~~it~~ is we must see whether this stability was maintained in the long-term. We must also examine whether Brezhnev's other policies such as his cultural policies, brought political stability, and whether this was created in the long-term.

Firstly, when Brezhnev came to power in 1964, he introduced a series of policies which reversed those introduced by Khrushchev. One of them was 'stability of cadres'. This policy discouraged movements within the Communist Party and his members. This meant that the same people would stay in their position for many years. This created job security for the members and therefore, political stability, as the

members of the Communist Party thanked Brezhnev for their job and granted him their loyalty. Sachings were rare and terror within the Communist Party had completely stopped. So, it could be argued, that Brezhnev through his policy of 'stability of cadres' created political stability. However, as years went by many problems started to emerge with Brezhnev's policies which led to political instability in the long-term.

With 'stability of cadres' a 'gerontocracy' was created. This occurred because as members remained in their positions throughout many years, ~~they~~ the Communist Party became increasingly old. The result of this 'gerontocracy' was inefficiency.

Members of the Party were inefficient as they were old and promotions were very rare which meant that they did not have incentives to work hard.

This also led to corruption as members used their power in the Communist Party to get all that they wanted, including money or ~~not~~ valuable objects.

This meant that a ~~the~~ 'second economy' was created. Brezhnev also took part in it and accepted it. Finally, inefficiency and corruption led to moral decline as when Brezhnev claimed that the Soviet economy was advancing, the people saw how the government was becoming increasingly inefficient and corrupt which led to political ~~to~~ instability. So, it could be argued that while Brezhnev's policy 'stability of cadres' did lead to political stability in the short term, as members were satisfied, it brought instability in the long-term.

Moving on, Brezhnev also introduced a number of cultural policies that were intended to create stability, and more specifically political stability. Brezhnev stopped Khrushchev's 'cultural thaws' which had destabilised the government in the 1950s. It could be said that Brezhnev's cultural ^{stability} ~~stabilities~~ began with the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial, in which two authors

who ~~that~~ had risen to fame under Khrushchev were ridiculed and then sent to labor camps. This was a show trial. From then on there was to be cultural stability, with ~~books~~ art and literature focusing on the victories of the Second World War and ~~it was~~ ^{they were} quite nostalgic. This cultural stability also created political stability, as if the artists were relaxed, the government would also be stable.

Although, stability was achieved in the short-term with Brezhnev's cultural policies, there were still clashes between ~~the~~ artists and the government to 1985.

Artists and actors continued to do shows in secret and not all of them were discovered by the Secret Police. Also, the restrictions on artists and writers meant that a dissidence movement emerged.

These things continued to destabilise the government in the period 1964-85. So, through his ~~of~~ cultural policies, Brezhnev never fully achieved political stability.

In addition, under Brezhnev there was centralisation of the power. This meant that the industry and the agriculture remained highly inefficient as fertilisers did not reach the right place at the right time, there was a waste of products as there were too many spare parts, and there was inefficient planning of the economy. All of these problems finally brought political instability.

To conclude, Brezhnev's policies brought about political stability to an extent in the years 1964-82. Through his policy of 'stability of cadres' political stability was created in the short-term as members of the Communist Party were satisfied. However, this policy led to instability in the long-term as inefficiency and corruption were created. Moving on, Brezhnev's cultural policies never fully achieved political stability. So, we could say that Brezhnev's policies did not bring about total political stability, however it improved from previous years.

This is a level 4 response. It has explicit focus on the question with good supporting knowledge. It develops a relevant argument about the importance of cultural stability in facilitating political stability.