



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2022

Pearson Edexcel International A Level in
History (WHI02 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 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

January 2022

Publications Code WHI02_1C_2201_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a number of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates in this small entry for January 2022. IAS Paper WHI02 1C 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.

Candidates tend to find Section A more challenging than Section B with its requirement to deal with source material and to consider the value (1a) or weight (1b) of a source in relations to a specific enquiry in the light of the content of the source, its provenance, and candidates' contextual knowledge. Candidates are also reminded of the necessity to draw inferences from Sources 1 and 2 and not merely to describe their content selection and summary are evident. This approach, where can achieve Level 2 but not higher. A small number of candidates are still not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. It is important that candidates discuss these issues in the light of what can be drawn from the source material. Whilst most candidates tend to use contextual knowledge to confirm details in the source and to expand upon it, there were some very well-crafted responses where candidates displayed a secure understanding of the context and used it to interrogate the evidence in the source, demonstrating a genuine understanding of the values and concerns of the society from which the source had originated.

Most candidates did use their time effectively and, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions both sections. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Section B, most responses had an analytical focus and there were very few that were wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, 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, especially the time period identified and, in some responses, on the given factor in the question. This meant that some candidates wrote at length on topics that were only peripherally related to the question, or which did not cover the whole time period.

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 understood the question and were able to comprehend the source and comment on what it revealed about the reasons why Stalin introduced collectivisation. At Level 3, candidates were able to write effective responses, drawing out valid inferences from the source evidence with a particular focus on the grain shortages and the benefits of large-scale compared to small-scale farming. The best answers developed the inferences with well-selected context to establish their validity. Candidates would do well to remember that contextual knowledge does need to be used to explain and develop the inferences drawn from the source and not just to provide free-standing knowledge. This was more evident this year than in previous sessions, particularly where candidates wandered from the focus of the question and evidence in the source and discussed the impact of collectivisation, which was not relevant to this enquiry. Some candidates were able to use the attributes of the source effectively to develop their ideas about the value of the source from a speech by Stalin to university professors and students. Those candidates who discussed the limitations could not be rewarded for that part of their answer as it is not the focus.

SECTION A

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Source 1 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 (a) Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the reasons why Stalin introduced the collectivisation of agriculture?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

Source 1 is valuable for an enquiry into the reasons why Stalin introduced collectivisation, for a variety of reasons due to a variety of factors.

To begin with, the provenance of the source, a speech delivered by Stalin himself, means it gives us an informed, personal insight ^{directly} from the person responsible for implementing the collectivisation of agriculture. Furthermore, the source has greater value because it is a speech aimed at an educated audience of professors and students with the purpose of presenting clear reasons and justification for his adoption of the collectivisation policy.

The source suggests that collectivisation would be introduced due to a growing demand for grain, as it explains how "Industry is growing... number of workers is growing... rapid increase in the demand for grain." This is confirmed by the fact that in the same year, Stalin also launched plans for the first Five-Year Plan, aimed at boosting heavy industry, that would require full employment - therefore a magnanimous workforce that required significant food rations. Additionally, the source goes on to suggest that grain production was unable to keep up with this increasing demand.

as it was being produced at a 'disastrously slow rate'.

Therefore, he implies in his speech that collectivisation was introduced to end this gap between production of grain and demand. Indeed, by the end of the NEP in 1927, only 10.8 million tons of grain was procured from the peasants to feed the urban population. This rose to 20.8 million tons in 1931, after collectivisation of about 93% of the farms of the countryside.

The fact that the source dates about a year before collectivisation began in 1929, also adds value to the source as it gives an insight into Stalin's initial, original reasons for introducing collectivisation.

The source also goes on to suggest that this policy was introduced because large farms were more productive than smaller ones, as indicated by the source placing blame for the slow production due to the change from 'large-scale farming to small-scale' after the October Revolution. This carries credibility due to the fact that the peasants were able to initiate the 'kulak grain strike' in 1927 due to their individual ownership of farms, and therefore reduce production of grain.

Indeed, collectivisation led to the merging of between 20 to 150 families of small farms into sectors of large ones, with shared equipment amongst themselves.

Furthermore, the source implies that collectivisation was introduced as it would modernise and mechanise farming.

The explanation that large farms will 'use machines, scientific methods and fertiliser' adds value to the source as

it matches with the attempts at mechanisation once collectivisation was introduced. By 1932, machine tractor stations were set up throughout the Soviet farms with the availability of about 40,000 tractors, which indicates a sense of modernisation. Furthermore, central managing authorities seized farming equipment from rich farmers and distributed it to the poorer peasants. All in all, the source drives forth the point that collectivisation would result in 'maximum quantity of grain' as opposed to small yields from individual farming. The source sheds a generally positive light on the reasons for adopting this policy, while demonstrating the necessity to do so because of the failure of the previous agricultural system.

Indeed, collectivisation also led to an increase of grain exports from 0.1 million in 1927 to 5 million by 1933, demonstrating its usefulness.

In conclusion, Source 1 would be valuable to the historian due to its informed, relevant provenance and the alignment of its contents with historical facts.

This is a high scoring Level 3 response. It begins with a clear focus on the value of the sources based on its provenance and makes a number of good points about the authorship and why that gives it value. The response then proceeds to draw out a couple of inferences about the growing demand for grain and develops them effectively with well selected contextual knowledge related to Stalin's industrial policy. This level of analysis is sustained throughout the response. It reaches a brief conclusion at the end that outlines the reasons for value which have been developed earlier in the answer.

Question 1b

Most candidates understood the source material and were able to select from it to develop some explanations about the changes in the lives of women in Lenin's Russia. This enabled most candidates were able to access at least Level 2. Many students went beyond selection and explanation to draw out inferences from the source and achieved Level 3. Fewer candidates however produced responses that weighed up the strengths and limitations of the source and used this as a basis to reach a judgement about the weight that should be attached to the source for the enquiry, which is necessary for Level 4. Some candidates made effective comments about the nature of the source as an account written by a factory worker and mother who had worked under both the Tsarist and Bolshevik regimes and considered its reliability in the light of its obvious partiality as an instrument of Soviet propaganda. The best responses were able to interrogate the evidence in the light of their contextual knowledge and consider how the extent to which Filipenko's assessment was reliable. Most candidates were able to draw upon their knowledge of the life of women in Lenin's Russia and the most effective candidates used this to develop their evaluation, pointing out the propagandistic elements in the source that was wholly positive. However, there were some candidates who did not use any contextual knowledge to answer the question and consequently they were not rewarded in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. This has an impact in reducing overall achievement on this question.

Study Source 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

(b) How much weight do you give to the evidence of Source 2 for an enquiry into changes in the lives of women in Lenin's Russia?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

Source 2 can be seen as carrying a limited amount of weight, when launching an enquiry into the change in women's lives in Lenin's Russia. Some weight can be assigned to it due to a small number of factors, but it is a mostly unreliable source.

To begin with, it is the account of a woman, with a personal narration of her life in Lenin's Russia, so it can be viewed as a relevant origin to the subject being discussed. Furthermore, the fact that she experienced life before the Revolution in 1917 and after, suggests that she can compare her experiences under the Tsar's regime with that under Lenin, therefore providing an informed opinion.

Yet, this is outweighed by the fact that she does not represent the lives of all women, as she is a 'factory worker' therefore restricted to experience in urbanised and not rural or agricultural ideas. Furthermore, as this book was published in 1924 in the USSR, it is liable to censorship and provides a rather one-sided, positive account. Her support of communism and as a 'delegate... in the Zhenobdel', the female branch of the Communist Party, presents a biased view, favouring the Communist ideologies. The source goes on to suggest that women's lives improved after the communists came

into power, due to the introduction of increased facilities to cater to a woman's domestic needs. This is seen in the description of the 'nursery' and 'various hospitals, maternity homes, children's homes'. This is confirmed by the fact that Lenin did recognise abuse and injustice faced by women in the families, due to which he initiated the legalisation of abortion and contraception, with 'various hospitals' catering to these needs from 1918 onwards.

However, the source leaves weight as it fails to mention the lack of support for women after the Civil War years.

in 1921 upto 1923, during the NEP period. Crèches were shut down, and funds for nurseries were cut as Lenin invested funds in rebuilding industry and reviving the economy.

The Zenshdel halted its assistance of women who experienced sexual abuse as well. Women were largely fired from industries, left jobless and homeless resulting in the flourishing of prostitution in the early 1920s, with about 39% of urban men using them.

Therefore, this information goes against the positive, sunny experience described in the source.

However, the source effectively compares facilities pre-Revolution and post-revolution. She suggests conditions were dire earlier, as she had to leave children in 'a locked room' but it was replaced by a nursery under Lenin, where they became 'clean and healthy'. Conditions for women did improve as compared to

the Tsar years, where women were offered no availability of services. Yet, the source has a propaganda purpose to it, which reduces its weight as it can be seen as a method of down-playing Tsarist rule in order to elevate Communism. This is evident in her urging women, "I call on all female workers and peasants to join..." to increase support for communist ideas.

Her position as a delegate and as a member of the Party prevents any negativity from slipping into her depictions.

Furthermore, the source mentions 'peasants' just once, showing how these benefits described were exclusively for workers in the cities. Indeed, rural women were restricted to home domesticities or had to lead a double shift life where they would have to work on the farms for low wages and then work at home to raise their children. They were restricted to poverty and manual labour, with little inclusion in the 'freedoms' of city life.

However, an aspect of the source that adds weight to it is that it was dated in 1924 - meaning she could consider the entirety of Lenin's regime and therefore demonstrate that improvements in Soviet women's lives were restricted to domestic life only, which insinuates a difference in roles of men and women based on a ~~stereotypical~~ stereotypical view. Indeed, under Lenin, women were seen as having the natural 'nurturing' role.

Her description of benefits in domestic areas like 'nursery' for children and 'maternity homes' suggests

a lack of improvement for women in status or political and work opportunities. For instance, the only positions dealt with by women in Lenin's government was related to Health and Education, not army or economy.

All in all, I would be inclined to assign only a limited amount of weight to the source due to its biased, one-sided positive views on the change under Lenin. The little weight it gets is in its perhaps unintended demonstration of problems for women in terms of equality by focusing on domestic policies only.

This is a high Level 4 response. This is an analytical response in which the content of the source is effectively weighed using both context and an understanding of the nature and purpose of the sources. The use of context is very effective in discussing what can be gleaned from the content of the source and its limitations. The response is very good at looking at change by considering the lives of women before and after Lenin. The candidate does come to a judgement on weight at the end of the response. The Level 4 qualities are really demonstrated by the clear appreciation shown of the values and concerns of the society from which the source has been drawn through the use of contextual knowledge to interrogate the source.

Question 2

About a third of candidates answered this question. While many candidates understood the second order concept and were able to carry out a comparison of Lenin's and Stalin's regimes, a significant number did not focus on the precise topic of 'approach to the arts'. This did significantly depress the achievement of these answers, particularly where a candidate made not mention of any feature that might be considered as part of the arts. It is very important that candidates read questions carefully and are completely aware of what they are being asked to do before they begin answering the question. The best responses were well informed on the policies and attitudes to the arts under both leaders and were able to explain key similarities and differences and reach a judgement on the extent to which they were similar.

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

Chosen question number: Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

The approach to the arts by Stalin's government was moderately
unsimilar to Lenin's approach to the arts under his government.

The three criteria used to evaluate this enquiry is: forms of art used;
vision for art's purpose and; ^{how art was received under their governments and;} ~~how art was received under their governments and;~~
level of control over arts. The final judgement is that while
Stalin and Lenin used similar forms of art, their purposes and level
of control over the arts differed, making their approaches moderately
unsimilar. The arts in this essay includes; paintings, sculptures, cinema and
literature.*

Discussing the purpose of art first under both governments. Under
Lenin, Lunacharsky advocated for proletarian art: art reflecting
proletarian struggles made by the working people. Lunacharsky
advocated against bourgeois art. However Lenin disagreed and
stated that art under his government should be universal to
everyone and should also include bourgeois arts as they established
many artistic techniques. The art under Lenin was to reflect
the human spirit in combination with celebration of the Revolution
and its success and liberation of the people. Lenin was not
concerned with the art being used as propaganda to establish his
own image. ~~However Stalin used art to establish himself as a~~
~~utopian leader~~ Generally, Lenin did oppose of the cult of Lenin
in the so. However, Stalin used art to establish himself as a
utopian leader over the use of great leaders and wisdom. For

example, he he was often painted in a white military uniform which he designed himself ~~to be painted~~ looking over Soviet fields to be painted not only in the Generalissimo, but also as the creator of utopian Soviet agricultural production through collectivization. In Stalin's Socialist Realism, he attacked the purpose of art to be 'true to reality' and to aid in the mass movement towards Socialism. Under Lenin, art was experimental to reflect the universal experience, however under Stalin, paintings were like photographs and often of workers in factories or agricultural fields to give support for the Socialist ideology. The key difference is that under Lenin, art was of individual creative expression with support for the Revolution intended; under Stalin art had the purpose of establishing government ideology and presenting himself as a utopian leader.

Considering forms of art used, both Lenin and Stalin used similar forms of art but with different intentions, and contents. For example, with abstract sculptures under Lenin, the poster of 'the Red Wedge beat the Whites' by Lissitzky was turned into a ~~sculpture~~ sculpture and unveiled on Oct 1918 to celebrate the anniversary of the October Revolution success. In addition, a large monument of 3m ~~was made~~ was made of geometric shapes that continually shifted to reflect the momentous shift from Marxist rule to Bolshevism as well as the constant evolution of the Revolution. However under Stalin, sculptures were mainly ~~the~~ large statues of Stalin across many cities to remind the Soviet people of his "generance" and to portray him

as the slightly utopian leader of the USSR. In literature, under Lenin, books were to be of Communist approval largely centring around the Revolution and its success, however under Stalin literature was to consist of plots of the lives of ordinary people that worked towards building socialism. For example the novel 'Cement' was of cement workers, once in their glory in 1912, now making a cement factory. A difference in form of art between Lenin and Stalin was Lenin's use of cinema, and Stalin's use of Ballet. Lenin believed cinema to be the most important medium of art; while Stalin had cinema and films that reflected the 2 victory he did not use it so heavily as Lenin did. Under Lenin Eisenstein was a prominent film-maker of agitational films that reflected the successes of the Revolution, although often peculiar in their design. Stalin however imposed Ballet. Before ballet was designed to reflect successes of industrialisation under Lenin, but Stalin used ballet to tell epic stories such as 'Romeo and Juliet' to increase the Soviet Union's national prestige in ballet. With this criteria, it is evident that both leaders used similar art forms generally, however each had different purposes in their execution: Lenin it was to glorify the Revolution and Stalin it was to build socialism and glorify his efforts.

Another criteria, is both leaders' approaches to controlling the arts under Terror and legislation. Lenin was the ~~right person~~ did not agree with the Proletkult and its abstract art, especially since 54,000 artists were members in 300 studios, all of which were

free from Communist Party control. In addition, the avant-garde art produced by the Proletkult was too difficult for peasants and workers to understand. Therefore, in working with Congress ~~of~~ the Proletkult merged with the Commissariat of Education to ~~to~~ dissolve the organization. Any dissenting artists were expelled from the profession. ~~In addition, Lenin created~~ During the Civil War however, control on art was limited by Lenin as most focus was on winning the war. However, after the Civil War, Lenin increased control on the arts to protect the reputation of the Revolution, closing down many institutions such as the Petrograd Institute of ~~Art and Culture~~, and dissenting artists were ~~also~~ exiled. In addition, in literature, Lenin created the Goslit, and also used the GPO to censor books or place undesirable books in 'book cages' in order to protect the integrity of the Revolution. Similarly, Stalin censored literature but often edited literature to enhance his image. For Stalin would edit novels that contained mention of his opponents such as ~~the~~ Trotsky, and even edit novels about himself that had insinuation of his involvement in the purges of the 1930s. In cinema, Stalin had a similar approach, editing Eisenstein's 'Towards the Dictatorship of the Proletariat' film series to remove mention of Trotsky. In the 1930s purges, Stalin executed 7000 - 8000 artists for being dissidents after more exiling than as Lenin had done. For Stalin, this use of Terror and censorship was to protect his own image to establish his authority. He often as well set production targets for artists to ensure enough of the arts can be produced to create his propagandistic image in the USSR. Stalin was more severe in his

control of the arts, eliminating any dissidence while Lenin strictly
insisting on total representation of the Revolution in less
savage methods.

Looking at how this approach was received: Lenin had
markedly antagonised art in his *Agitation* of ^{creative} ~~creative~~ expression,
often using geometric shapes. However, this mode of art was
too difficult for majority of the peasant population to understand
so the art used bourgeois techniques. This meant ~~Lenin's~~
art under Lenin was generally unpopular or ridiculed by the Party.
For example, Eisenstein's films were labelled as 'laughable' and
'insane' by the ~~Party~~ ^{Pravda} due to his complex use of cinematic.
It was the failure of Lenin to establish understandable art that
made his use of the arts largely ineffective in their propagandistic
purpose. However, Stalin's *Socialist Realism* by the ^{USSR} ~~USSR~~ was well
received since it looked so realistic, they were more able to
photograph. This meant that Stalin's use of the arts was
effective as it was easily ~~understandable~~ understandable for the peasant
population, and thus his utopian image was expanded and
internalised. A large part of hostility under Lenin had to
be closed down such as the ~~Proletkult~~ ^{Proletkult} as the mediums
of art could not be understood. Therefore in Lenin's control of
the arts, he lost many mediums of art and artists in favour
of the Revolution because they were too complicated, decreasing
his approach's effectiveness. Yet Stalin only had to control artworks
that was anti-Communist or anti-Stalin because the rest of his

arts were easy to understand, claiming his approach to the arts was more effective than Lenin in its design and in the way it was received.

In conclusion, considering the four criteria again: form, purpose, acceptance and control - Lenin and Stalin had moderately or fairly different approaches to the arts. Lenin and Stalin showed similar forms of art, largely because one can be ~~control~~ confined to only so many forms of arts in 1917-53, however their forms of art differed in design and purpose. Lenin used ~~artistic~~ ~~any~~ ~~kind~~ ~~of~~ ~~artistic~~ ~~expression~~ and in favour of the Revolution, while Stalin used Socialist Realism to enhance his depiction, images and ~~more~~ ~~towards~~ ~~building~~ ~~Socialism~~. Lenin's arts were largely unaccepted and ineffective ~~whereas~~ as they were less complex while Stalin's arts were praised and easy to understand. Both leaders used control over the arts in their government to protect their purposes of art, however Stalin was more severe in his restrictions than Lenin as he only had to remove dissident artists, not having the issue of having to remove complex art like Lenin did. It is therefore apparent, that Stalin's government had a different approach to the arts than Lenin's government in 1917-53.

This response achieved a top Level 4. It begins with an analytical focus, outlining a judgement that is then explored in the main body of the answer. The response is fully focused on comparison with the candidate having selected a number of types of art, e.g. paintings, literature and approaches, e.g. censorship, terror, which are then explored via comparison of the approaches to the arts by the two regimes. It has a secure judgement in the conclusion supported by the argument developed throughout the answer. This achieves Level 4 in all four bullet points.

Question 3

This was the most popular essay question on the paper with about half of the candidates selecting it. Candidates understood the question and were able to make valid points about the success and/or failures of Khrushchev's policies towards agriculture and industry. The best candidates were well informed and could draw on a range of evidence from both industry and agriculture to weigh up Khrushchev's achievements. Some answers were unbalanced but most candidates did look at both aspects and there were many responses that achieved Level 4.

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

Chosen question number: Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Plan

1953 - 64: Khrushchev

How successful was reform of industry & agriculture?

V. succ.?

Not succ.?

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| • Corn Campaign - fail | • consumer industry ^{high} |
| • VLS - success at 1 st , then fail targets | • goods |
| • split party - confusion etc. | • lack of prod. - command eco. |
| • fertiliser - chem prod - boost | • TVs, radio, fridge |
| | • too exp. ^{scope} |
| | 7 yr Plan |

Answer

Between 1953 to 1964, after Khrushchev came into power, extensive reform of industry and agriculture took place.

How successful these reforms were, remains open to debate.

There was considerable success in some aspects, but a lack of it in another. Below, I will be evaluating these successful aspects alongside the failures, to determine my view on how successful it was overall.

To begin with, agricultural reforms were largely met with mixed results. Khrushchev recognised the extent of problems created by Stalin's collectivisation, which

therefore assisted in his choice of reform to target these.

One of the most significant changes was brought by the Virgin Lands Scheme in 1954, which was actually quite successful at first. It largely increased amount of land farmed, by making use of lands in Western Siberia, Northern Caucasus and so on, resulting in over a 50% increase of farmed land. This led to the employment of farm workers rising from 8 million to 13 million, and he also increased labour productivity by offering higher prices for farmers. Additionally, he reduced quotas, rewarding those who managed to exceed it. Therefore, by 1959, farmers' incomes rose by 200% and productivity rose as a consequence.

Additionally, the first harvests were very successful, rising from 93 million tons in 1953 to about 128 million tons ~~tons~~ by 1960. All of this, demonstrates the initial ~~big~~ success of reforming agriculture.

Yet, this had its downside too. After the initial success, Khrushchev became increasingly ~~at~~ ambitious, setting targets to overtake USA's food production by 1960 - and failed badly. USSR's agriculture was very labour intensive, with over half the population working in agriculture. Khrushchev's reforms failed to increase modernisation of the agriculture, therefore being unable to achieve the 200% growth required to meet targets. Furthermore, his reforms created administrative confusion.

He split the party into the agricultural and industrial sections, which reduced its efficiency. His reforms of economic ministries shifted from decentralising in 1959 to centralising again, making management ineffective. This is shown by how the Virgin Land Scheme's success declined increasing by only 15% in 1962, from the 1958 rates. Additionally, Khrushchev failed to reform the command economy and its problematic system of collectivisation. For instance, ministries in charge of agriculture did not deliver fertilisers at the right time or delivered the wrong type. Storage was also limited, so tons of grain went into waste.

The Corn Campaign of 1958 was also largely a failure. His reforms directed production of maize in ~~the~~ traditional Ukrainian farms to feed cattle and get more meat, whereas wheat would be produced in the Virgin Lands. This failed as productivity was low due to unsuitability of climate, and cattle feed dropped by 40% actually.

All in all, Khrushchev's agricultural reforms were met with initial success that waned over the years.

Moving on, his industrial reforms can be perhaps viewed as more successful, though it was also riddled with failures. Khrushchev launched the Seven Year Plan, through which he invested much more in light industry and prioritised production of consumer goods. He ended the heavy-industry drive under Stalin, and addressed issues of lack of consumer goods and light industrial materials.

He went on to cut investments in military from 12.3% of the GDP to just 3% in order to direct investment into the light industry. Indeed, over 60% of industrial investment was directed into light industry, and this had its success. The ~~costs~~ availability of consumer goods such as TVs, radios, washing machines and fridges increased. The number of cars also increased, to 5 per 1000 people. Yet, a failure can be seen in how it lagged behind other European nations like Germany, which had over 200 cars per thousand.

Furthermore, the negative effects of command economy was brought to light in industrial production too. The government was too focused on production rather than consumption since the 1930s, and Khrushchev failed to reform this fundamental problem. So, though the availability of some consumer goods increased, their quality declined, usually cheap and not lasting. The industry was largely designed to meet targets and produce simple goods like blocks of concrete or sheets of steel or so on. It was not re-designed to produce sophisticated goods like cars, therefore ~~still~~ leading to faulty productions.

The Seven-Year Plan focused on investing in chemical production to boost both, consumer goods and agriculture. Chemicals would lead to more fertilisers, leading to more crops and in turn producing synthetic fibres for clothes and other consumer goods. This reform failed.

to take into account the inefficiencies of the command economy. Once more, many resources were wasted as a result, and prices were often high. For instance, to produce lamps, the industry had to manufacture thin sheets of steel but it produced thick ones because the target was set in weight. This led to an inefficient industry, unable to cater to the needs of the consumer economy that industrial reform was aimed at rejuvenating.

Furthermore, sometimes the goods were unaffordable and undesirable. Targets were needed to be met, for instance, in prices. So it made sense for an industry to produce a small number of sofas at high prices, instead of a large number for cheap prices. This was another sign of failure, hinting at the setbacks within Khrushchev's reforms.

All in all, I believe reform of industry and agriculture in the USSR between 1953 to 1964 was in fact, not very successful. There were only initial successes and improvements, but Khrushchev's ^{increasingly} ambitious reforms, mixed with his indecisiveness and failure to reform the command economy, meant that it was an overall failure.

This is a top-scoring Level 4 response. It is fully focused on the second order concepts – consequence and is supported with a wide range of excellent knowledge that is used effectively to construct an answer that considers both the successes and failures of Khrushchev's economic policies and reaches a supported judgement.

Question 4

This was the least popular question on the paper. All candidates who answered this question were able to access Level 3 and nearly half achieved in Level 4. Most candidates organised their comparison in a chronological framework, drawing out the comparisons as they developed their answers. There were a number of candidates who found it difficult to focus on the nature of government and focused instead on comparing economic policies. In these responses there was often material that could be at least implicitly linked to the question, but the better responses did focus on government and compared, for example, Brezhnev's gerontocracy with Gorbachev's decision to bring in younger, more dynamic reformers into government. Again, careful reading of the question and planning of responses does help to ensure a clear focus.

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

Chosen question number: Question 2 Question 3 Question 4

The nature of Government under Gorbachev (1985-91) was very different from the nature of government under Brezhnev.

Brezhnev's Government can be defined as an era of stagnation ruled by Brezhnev and his cadre of oligarchs. The government was characterised by ^{an} over-bearing sense of self preservation. Unlike the Bourgeois idealist Nikita Khrushchev who introduced radical new reforms left and right or Mikhail Gorbachev who's reforms alienated both the hardline conservatives and liberals, Gorbachev's government was very keen on maintaining the established power paradigm. And as such policies were implemented in an overly cautious manner in order to appease the "Gerontocracy" who were Brezhnev's cabinet of colleagues.

This nature of stagnation and self preservation was reflected ~~back~~ into the party where there was no way for upward mobility in party positions so that high ranking officials could maintain their power and thus there was no way for upward or downward mobility in employment. Employers could not demote or fire someone based on their productivity and "fairness" and employees could not hope to advance in their careers. Thus reducing the incentive for both to be productive as it was a "gerontocracy" and

and not a meritocracy. Thus the quality of products were low as all they cared about was the quantity of the products and not the quality.

Political oppression did happen but it was concert unlike Khrushchev's era and unlike either Khrushchev or Brezhnev oppression was not ~~supported~~ ^{spurred} by the ~~dissidents~~ but rather government ~~politicians~~ ^{as} the secret police was far too effective and crushed any dissent movement before it happened unlike Gorbachev's era where a coup ~~was~~ ^{was} against him. Instead oppression of religious minorities such as muslims were carried out by forced hospitalizations in psychiatric systems. There were no political dissidents as ~~the~~ ^{the} nature of government was self preservation and as such Brezhnev worked to please party members and introduced little to no reforms without careful delegation. Politically it was more stable than Gorbachev's regime as Brezhnev's era lasted for ^{much} 20 years due to its stagnant nature of preservation.

^{However} ~~the~~ The nature of government under Gorbachev was very different as one of Gorbachev's aim was to address the ~~political~~ stagnation caused by the gerontocratic and self ^{preservationist} ~~preservationist~~ nature of the party. The Soviet union for a long time needed major political reforms and unlike Brezhnev, Gorbachev was not ~~been~~ on pleasing party members or maintaining the established order. Gorbachev's government was characterized by radical political reforms and disrupting the power paradigm. Perestroika "restructure" and "Glasnost" ("openness") and the end of the Brezhnev are some of the notable reforms under ~~the~~ Gorbachev.

Perestroika "Restructure" was based upon restructuring the party and the government and to implement some capitalist aspects to the economy in order to address the stagnation caused by Brezhnev's government. Factories were allowed to use their budget as they saw fit and this created mobility in career advancement. Furthermore, small shops and businesses were allowed to flourish. These capitalist aspects alienated the conservative members of the party who ^{supported} the old Stalinist policies of Brezhnev and argued that it was not communist. Very different of Brezhnev's government that wanted to preserve itself by pleasing everyone. Furthermore, Gorbachev gave more autonomy to the press and media, which in turn ^{caused} ~~attained~~ the rising of dissidents as people ~~realized~~ about the acts of genocide and tyranny caused and perpetrated by the party which in turn caused tensions in the liberal side of the party, Gorbachev's policies backfired and caused both wings of the government and party to rebel against him.

This was very ^{different} ~~different~~ ~~the~~ from ~~the~~ Brezhnev's party which only introduced policies after careful ~~a~~ deliberation and if it pleased party members. Furthermore, Gorbachev elected new members to high posts within the party and fired people, one infamous case is when he fired Boris Yeltsin, this would be something that would have ~~never~~ happened under Brezhnev's government and would be something that would come to haunt him later on as Boris Yeltsin ended the Soviet regime and became the president in 1991. And also unlike Brezhnev's government which was characterized by political stability and no successful and or no uprisings, Gorbachev's government had many

When the Government ended the Brezhnev doctrine this was met with a surge of nationalism within the western asserting their independence after the withdrawal of the red army, and they succeeded (Austria, Hungary and other Baltic states succeeded in independence). Furthermore whilst Brezhnev's Government had no uprisings or demonstrations, Gorbachev's government had many, see ^{notable} uprisings could include the coup orchestrated by the orthodox, this event was used by Yeltsin who after leading a demonstration of 200,000 people asserted Russia's independence from the union this significantly weakened his authority and forcing him to resign.

In conclusion Brezhnev's government was characterized by its stagnant and self preservation nature but with no political opponents or dissident movement, this characterizing it as "strong" which was the complete opposite of the nature of government under Gorbachev which was characterized by radical new changes and a willingness to overturn the stagnation caused by the Brezhnev government but was met with political instability caused by dissident movement from many factors both within and out of the party ^{this} characterizing it as "weak".

This is a low Level 4 response. The response does try to focus on the nature of government and considers the gerontocracy, the used of repression by government and Glasnost under Gorbachev. It does sometimes wander into economic policy rather than the nature of government but is able to use that material to refocus on government. It does have a good focus on the second order concept of comparison for similarity/difference.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

Value of Source Question (1(a))

- Candidates must be more prepared to make valid inferences rather than to paraphrase the source
- Be prepared to back up inferences by adding additional contextual knowledge from beyond the source
- Move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source e.g. look at the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value to the enquiry.

Weight of Source Question (1(b)/2(b))

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to use contextual knowledge to support/challenge statements and claims made in the source
- Try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using your contextual knowledge of the period
- Knowledge should be integrated with the source evidence, to discuss the inferences drawn and their validity in the light of the contextual understanding of the period
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/purpose of the source, take account of the weight you may be able to give to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/or purpose
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to assess reliability by considering what has been perhaps deliberately omitted from the source. However, simply stating that a source is limited because it does not cover certain events or developments does not establish weight since no source can be comprehensive.

Section B

Essay questions

- Candidates must provide more factual details as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Take a few minutes to plan your answer before you begin to write your response
- Pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each
- Pay more careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts
- Pay careful attention to the date range in the question. Plan the answer with a focus on this range and avoid lengthy exploration of events outside of the time period set
- Try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated.

