



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

AS History 1041

HIS2L

Unit 2L

**The Impact of Stalin's Leadership in the
USSR, 1924–1941**

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2010

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2L: The Impact of Stalin's Leadership in the USSR, 1924–1941

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to Stalin.
(12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4:	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the levels scheme.

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source A is very critical of Stalin's qualities and potential, by doubting whether Stalin is prudent enough to use his 'boundless' power sensibly. He is also described as 'crude', and lacking in the necessary tolerance, loyalty, politeness and considerateness to others. In contrast, Source B focuses on different qualities, seen as virtues: great intelligence, precision, concern for progress, sureness, having practical common sense, firmness, the ability to choose the right moment, thoughtfulness. He is positively presented as a great Revolutionary, indeed on a par with Lenin. Whilst some of these qualities are not direct opposites of those in Source A, the whole tone of Source B is

very positive, the tone of Source A negative, or at least 'doubtful'. It is unlikely that Lenin would have appreciated the comparison of Stalin with himself in Source B!

- despite the differences, it is possible to tease out some similarities: both imply considerable personal power; Lenin's concern about tolerance, loyalty and consideration are actually reflected in Source B, where there are comments about Stalin's 'firmness' and his reluctance to trust others – although in Source B it is implied that they are virtues, the opposite of the claim in Source A, where they are presented as negatives
- own knowledge should flesh out the sources, because the context and provenance are important. Source A was written by a dying man, conscious that he had allowed Stalin to get too much power: principally through controlling access to Lenin in his last months, through his control of the Party machine, and the strength gained from membership of key positions in the Orgburo, Secretariat, Politburo and Party machine. Lenin was also upset because Stalin had been rude to his wife. In contrast, Source B was written after Stalin had achieved power, and any Communist who knew what was good for him/her made sure that they praised Stalin, whether they were sincere or not – and the writer was a Communist. Many Communists were already full of praise for what they regarded as Stalin's successful policies in relation to the economy. The flattery is evident above all in the references to Lenin: the highest praise you could give any Communist was to compare them positively with the god-like Lenin.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far was Stalin's rise to power by 1929 due to his rivals underestimating him?

(24 marks)

Levels Mark Scheme*Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)*

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

- There is not much indication in Source A of underestimating Stalin. Lenin, although near to death, painted a fairly clear and accurate picture of Stalin. He was already very powerful, he did have a reputation of being a hard man, not particularly tolerant by nature (although he could be charming). What is surprising perhaps is that if Lenin recognised these qualities, Stalin's rivals continued to underestimate him. Source B highlights some of Stalin's strengths – some true, some just propaganda. Stalin certainly did have a form of intelligence or cunning. He certainly had a breadth of knowledge. He was intense, firm, and did not give much away. The fact that his rivals underestimated him until it was too late suggests that they did not recognise some of these qualities in him. Source C suggests an able and ruthless man: one who showed opportunism beneath a bland exterior, who used his Party power effectively, who was astute in 'reading...the times.'
- Stalin's rivals frequently did underestimate him. They tended to dismiss him as rather uncouth, a non-intellectual, a 'grey' character, not in the same league as themselves. Trotsky in particular, but also Kamenev and Zinoviev, were vain and snobbish about Stalin almost to the point of arrogance.
- Stalin's rivals were also too opportunistic in their making and breaking of alliances and manoeuvring for position. By the time they realised their mistake, it was too late, because Stalin already by the mid-1920s had a lot of power because of his Party base. His rivals also missed key opportunities to act against him, especially by not publishing Lenin's Testament.
- Stalin had particular qualities, partly reflected in the sources. He was very knowledgeable, in some ways more so than the intellectuals in the Party. He easily outmanoeuvred Trotsky. He was clever at presenting himself as a man of the centre. His economic policies made more sense than some (e.g. the policy of Socialism in One Country seemed to fit the bill at the time). Whether Stalin was very ambitious or not for personal power in the 1920s, there is certainly a lot of evidence that his colleagues did underestimate him, to the point of allowing themselves to be used by him – for example Bukharin supporting him against the Left until Stalin was in a position to turn against him also.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why, in the years 1936 to 1938, Stalin held show trials of leading Bolsheviks. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

- By 1936 the Terror was already under way, and there were various reasons for this, to do with Stalin's apparent paranoia about opposition; his desire to cement his power and eliminate possible rivals; the desire to find scapegoats for problems; to force people into a siege mentality in order to force through his economic policies etc.
- The show trials had a particular motive: it was a way of justifying Stalin's policies to the world and his own people and to intensify the population's vigilance and loyalty.
- The old Bolsheviks were picked out in particular. Although they were not a significant threat to Stalin by 1936, Stalin was vengeful, and he had not forgotten the opposition to himself in the 1920s of men like Zinoviev and Kamenev.
- Whilst credit will be given for information about causes of the Terror generally, a good answer should include specific information on the show trials.

Question 2

04 'The use of propaganda was the main reason for the strength of Stalin's regime in the 1930s.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

- Propaganda was an important part of Stalin's regime. It pervaded every aspect of life, and was used to glorify the cult of Stalin, to justify the regime's policies, to denounce enemies, to mobilise the population, and so on. It probably helped to reinforce the regime, although it is not always easy to assess its precise impact.

- Clearly Stalin's regime also rested on force. The Terror, the gulag, the fear of arrest etc, were all means of making sure that if propaganda did not convince people to behave or think as Stalin wanted, then force would prevent any independent thought or action.
- The regime also rested on other factors: idealists were genuinely enthused by the Communist vision and Stalin's leadership; there was support for some of the policies, for example industrialisation; Soviet citizens experienced some benefits in the later 1930s, with better economic conditions and education, for example; the regime played on fears of foreign opposition; there was no alternative party or point of view to take up.
- Candidates can evaluate other reasons for the survival of Stalin's regime – but they must also specifically consider the role of propaganda, even if to downplay its significance.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why Stalin launched a campaign to exterminate the kulaks from 1928. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

- Stalin had taken the decision to end NEP and collectivise agriculture by 1928.
- Stalin, and this was a popular view amongst contemporary Communists, had a particular reason for action against the kulaks. They were regarded as typical greedy beneficiaries of NEP, corrupted by the profit motive. They were class enemies, exploiting poorer peasants and capable of holding the regime to ransom as they had done earlier by withholding supplies.
- By stirring up hatred of the kulaks amongst other peasants, it was easier to get other peasants on board for collectivisation.
- Kulaks, as successful entrepreneurs, were seen as dangerous and likely to be more resistant to the regime's attempts to strengthen its control in the countryside.
- Supporting kulaks had been an important part of the Right's policies, and Stalin was anxious to discredit the Right, which wanted a more gradual approach to introducing socialism.

Question 3

- 06** 'Stalin's policies ensured that the USSR was well prepared for war in 1941.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

- In economic terms, although there were problems, Stalin did industrialise the USSR, with a particular focus on heavy industry and armaments. Agriculture was less successful, because production did not rise significantly, although the regime managed to feed the new towns and exported grain in return mainly for technology.
- Without the development of heavy industry, the USSR would not have survived WW2, even had it successfully survived the initial attack.

- Building industry in the East gave the USSR additional security.
- Weapons production was important in ensuring that the regime was well equipped for war.
- The method used by Stalin to industrialise, such as central planning and allocation of resources, was a good model for a country under threat, because it was relatively easy to change over to a war economy, and people were used to sacrifice.
- In other respects the USSR may not have been well prepared for war: the purges had probably weakened the army; parts of the population may still have been demoralised by previous treatment; fear of the regime stifled initiative.