
AS

History

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

Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

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 Specimen 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 for explaining Soviet motives for invading Afghanistan. | [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 judgments 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 evaluation 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

- This is a speech by Carter to America. As this is an address to the nation, it is clear that Carter sees the Soviet actions as very serious.
- This gives the US government's perception of the invasion and Carter is also ensuring that he gets the support of the US public for his subsequent actions.
- The tone is very serious, putting emphasis on the danger the world faces as the result of Soviet actions. Words such as 'threatens', 'callous violation', 'subjugate', show the USSR as an aggressor.

Content and argument

- Soviet actions threaten world peace.
- Afghanistan has been illegally invaded and has faced violence with the assassination of the President.
- There is a danger of further Soviet expansion into neighbouring countries.

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

- US's attitude towards détente, that there is already suspicion that the Soviets are using détente as a cover for expansion due, for example, to their actions in Africa
- US's fear of the USSR gaining control of the Persian Gulf
- the actions that Carter took against the USSR after the invasion.

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

Provenance and tone

- This source comes directly from Brezhnev. He is talking to the Central Committee of the Communist Party so it is the official Soviet view on the invasion of Afghanistan.
- As it is in a private meeting, it is possible that this is an accurate view of how the Soviets saw their actions.
- Its tone is both aggressive towards the USA but also defensive as to the reasons for its invasion of Afghanistan.

Content and argument

- Brezhnev argues that the Soviets only went into Afghanistan in response to a request from the Afghan government.
- He maintains that the Soviets have no aims beyond helping out in Afghanistan; no 'greed'.
- He blames the USA for preventing the Afghans from building a new life.

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

- the situation in Afghanistan which led to the Soviets invading, the 1978 revolution and the growing opposition to Amin's rule
- how this action was interpreted by the West.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude, e.g. that taken together, the two sources are valuable for showing the different perceptions regarding the Soviet actions in Afghanistan. Students may conclude that Source B is more accurate for showing the reasons for Soviet actions as this is a private meeting whereas Source A reflects US suspicions of Soviet behaviour and is a call by Carter for harsher measures against the USSR. Any supported argument as to relative value should be supported.

Section B

0 2 'Khrushchev's economic policies were a total 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.

Arguments supporting the view that Khrushchev's economic policies were a total failure, might include:

- despite various attempts to reform the economy, economic growth declined from more than 10% per annum between 1950 and 1956 to about 5% between 1959 and 1963
- his great idea of the Virgin Land schemes ultimately failed
- he failed to solve the shortfalls in agricultural production which forced the USSR to import grain
- reorganising the planning and administration of industry did not significantly improve industrial progress.

Arguments challenging the view that Khrushchev's economic policies were a total failure, might include:

- foreign trade increased
- there was impressive industrial growth
- there were more consumer goods.

Good answers may show an awareness that although the failure of many of his reforms can be attributed to Khrushchev himself, e.g. lack of effective planning, they can also be attributed to the problems inherent in the Stalinist structure and the lack of support from Party members, bureaucrats and managers. Ultimately Khrushchev was trying to reform a structure without destroying its basic rationale which was impossible. His reputation as 'a failed reformer' was not helped by the fact that he raised expectations with promises of reform.

0 3 'It was Yeltsin who ensured the failure of the coup against Gorbachev in 1991.'

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.

Arguments supporting the view that Yeltsin ensured the failure of the coup in 1991, might include:

- Yeltsin led the opposition to the coup; he acted swiftly and decisively in condemning the coup and declaring it illegal
- he inspired the population to resist the plotters by his actions in standing on a tank outside the parliament building and calling for resistance
- Yeltsin was supported by important figures such as Shevardnadze and the Major of Leningrad, Anatoli Sobchak, who rallied support for him both in Russia and in the outside world
- Yeltsin gained the support of younger elements within the army and KGB; he persuaded the Russian military from storming the Russian parliament.

Arguments challenging the view that Yeltsin ensured the failure of the coup in 1991, might include:

- the coup leaders lacked sufficient conviction, initiative or a coherent policy; they also misjudged the mood of the population which was no longer prepared to put up with old style Soviet tactics by the Party and the KGB
- ordinary people came out onto the streets to show their support for Yeltsin and this helped to dissuade the military from storming the parliament
- due to the deterioration of central authority in the Soviet Union, there was very little for the coup leaders to take over
- the media was able to keep people informed about what was going on as the lines of communication had been left open
- attitude of the West could be considered influential in encouraging Soviet people to reject the coup.

Good students may conclude that the failure of the coup was a combination of the mistakes of the plotters and the actions of Yeltsin. However, by stopping the army from attacking the White House, Yeltsin's role was key in its failure.