
AS
HISTORY

Paper 2T The Crisis of Communism: The USSR, 1953–2000

Mark scheme

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

AS History Paper 2 Mark Scheme

2T The Crisis of Communism: The USSR, 1953–2000

Section A

0	1	With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining Khrushchev's attitude to capitalism?	[25 marks]
----------	----------	--	-------------------

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5:	Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.	21-25
L4:	Answers will provide a range of relevant of well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context.	16-20
L3:	The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.	11-15
L2:	The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.	6-10
L1:	The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.	1-5
	Nothing worthy of credit.	0

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the type of comments which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- the source is from a conversation between Khrushchev and an Indian writer and gives Khrushchev's own words and opinions regarding capitalism
- the source is intended for publication and therefore gives the picture Khrushchev wants others to have
- the source comes from 1960, when Khrushchev is well-established in power, and has made big strides in de-Stalinisation, the Virgin Lands Scheme and the partial decentralisation of the economy. It is before the Cuban Missile Crisis
- the tone is bright and confident, suggesting the Soviet leader feels secure in his position and ready to advance new schemes.

Content and argument

- Khrushchev argues that peaceful coexistence with the capitalist West is not contrary to his ideological principles and that capitalism will easily be overcome because it is 'steadily receding into the past' anyway
- he emphasises how the capitalist system will be beaten by the superior Communist system (without recourse to war)
- he believes capitalism fails to give 'genuine freedom and benefits'.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the nature of peaceful co-existence and Khrushchev's ideology
- the state of capitalism
- the accuracy of Khrushchev's claims around the freedom and benefits of communism

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- the source is from the Chinese communist leader, Mao Zedong and was published in two official Chinese newspapers, making it a public statement
- coming from a fellow Communist leader it shows a division in the ranks of those claiming to speak on Communism and a totally differing view of capitalism
- the source comes from 1964, the year of Khrushchev's demise (he was forced from office in October – just a few months later) and after the Cuban Missile Crisis, so the circumstances may be deemed marginally different from those in Source A
- the tone is hectoring and assertive, with use of words such as, 'colluding', 'wrecking' and 'betraying'.

Content and argument

- Mao argues that Khrushchev has shown too much favour towards capitalism
- he has sought peaceful coexistence with capitalist USA (to advance USSR's great power status and betrayed Communist principles)
- he believes that Khrushchev is actually restoring capitalism in the USSR through his 'reckless schemes', a reference to his de-Stalinisation and decentralisation policies.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- Khrushchev's policies towards the West
- the accuracy of Zedong's claims in regard to the policies of Khrushchev
- the nature of de-Stalinisation and decentralisation

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source students may conclude that (e.g.) both sources have value in that they give both Khrushchev's own 'insider' view and Mao's 'outsider' view of Khrushchev's attitude to capitalism. Students may conclude that Source A is more valuable as it seeks to explain rather more fully, although by belief and assertion rather more than hard facts, whilst Source B merely condemns and similarly asserts a rather different viewpoint. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

0	2	'An era of positive social change.'
----------	----------	-------------------------------------

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view of social developments in Brezhnev's years of power in the USSR.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Students may cite some of the following in support of the idea that the Brezhnev years were an era of positive social change:

- rise in the standard of living – rate of consumer growth exceeded heavy industry for first time 1968; more TVs, cars, motorbikes, fridges
- minimum wage increased (and guaranteed monthly wage on collectives from 1967) and real wages increased approximately 50%; disparity urban/rural workers reduced
- subsidised food, heating, light and housing; fewer had to share living space
- growth in the urban population and growth in services
- reduction in working week and increase in holidays
- educational advances – proportion in secondary and higher education grew; more specialists and professionals
- improved diet – more meat, fish and vegetables
- evidence of broad satisfaction – job security, social security.

Students may cite some of the following in support of the idea that that the Brezhnev years were not an era of positive social change:

- life expectancy fell and there was a rise in infant mortality
- birth-rate fell in all but Muslim areas
- fall in life expectancy, associated with a chronic rise in alcohol consumption (and stress; life expectancy lower for men)
- problems of environmental pollution: untreated sewage, industrial waste and oil spillage contaminated the environment and affected food supplies and quality of life; increases in cancer, TB and emphysema
- decline in proportion of state budget spent on health care (more on defence); hospitals poorly equipped and badly run
- disparity between towns/countryside not fully healed and considerable disparity between regions; little labour mobility; continuing shortage of rural workers
- unreliable quality of consumer goods
- more well-qualified people than jobs available for them; blue-collar workers could earn more than the professionals
- continued queues for goods and periodic food shortages which lead to some demonstrations in cities
- high divorce rates (often linked to alcohol abuse)
- high illegitimacy rates and youth issues (hooliganism, vandalism)
- women represented 45% of the labour force but remained in less skilled jobs and earning less than men; few reached top positions.

In summary, students are likely to point to the difficulty of generalising about social conditions and changes. They will no doubt refer to the regional variation and see that, for some, life got better, whilst for others it remained harsh. They will probably also make comparison with the social improvements that had taken place in Western nations by the

1970s and suggest that the USSR still remained relatively under-developed socially.

0 3 'Gorbachev's domestic policies were a failure.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Students may offer some of the following in support of the view that Gorbachev's domestic policies failed:

- economic failures: perestroika (restructuring the economy) proved impossible without glasnost which brought its own problems; the economy got worse in the attempt to dismantle central control; there were falls in productivity and price rises; hoarding became an issue; strikes occurred; rationing had to be introduced and levels of poverty rose
- living standards: despite Gorbachev's promises, these did not rise; campaign against alcohol ineffective; continued Andropov's campaign in south, destroying viticulture; drop in oil and gas prices reduced government revenue and helped produce a negative balance between income and benefits
- initial measures had little effect (bureaucratic obstruction) and Gorbachev was forced to go further than he had wanted with economic reforms; plans for full market economy 1990 abandoned (proposed 50% price increase brought run on shops) and 'crash programme' was rejected. Economic issues remained unsolved
- Glasnost had a bad start with Chernobyl. It encouraged questioning and criticism and brought released political prisoners (e.g. Sakharov demanding human rights) into prominence; debate was bitter and went further than anticipated, e.g. challenging party privilege, promoting dangerous opposition and challenging Gorbachev's own power base
- Glasnost brought demands for independence from ethnic minority groups, ultimately leading to the 1991 coup and the break-up of the USSR.

Students may offer some of the following in support of the view that Gorbachev's domestic policies did not fail:

- Gorbachev provided the foundations for reform which was continued under Yeltsin
- basis for new market economy was in place by 1991; this was accompanied by emphasis on science and technology making for 'intensive' (quality) rather than 'extensive' (quantity) growth
- created a more accountable system of government and reduced levels of corruption and inefficiency
- reformed the Communist Party making it more open and less dictatorial and created new presidency (which is still in place)
- provided greater freedom for intellectuals and culture.

In summary, students may suggest that Gorbachev had always sought to promote a reformed Communist system and hold the USSR together; he failed in both respects. He might be accused of a hotchpotch of initiatives, in both the economic and political spheres, with his policies insufficiently thought through and too hesitant. However, students should also be aware of the context in which he operated (hard-line opposition and instability) which may have masked his attempts to make unprecedented changes which would, in the longer term prove highly successful. The more praising might refer to Gorbachev's pragmatism and success in laying important foundations for Russia's future.

