



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level

In History(WHIO2) Paper 1C

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2022

Publications Code WHI02\_1C\_2206

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## **Examiner Report: WHIO2 1C Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin**

### **Introduction**

It was pleasing after the disruption of the pandemic to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHIO2 1C which covers the 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.

In common with previous series, candidates found Section A more challenging than Section B. Some candidates were still not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. Performance in Section A was also affected by the absence of the detailed knowledge base required to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources. There was a noticeable trend this summer for some candidates to use the structure of the generic mark scheme to write their answer. Whilst this meant that they addressed all three bullet points, it did mean that they did not integrate the ideas in their answer so that, in particular, knowledge was free standing and not used to develop and explain inferences. This technique would be best avoided for candidates who wish to access the higher levels of the mark scheme. 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 and/or the second order concept that was targeted. 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 establishment of government under Lenin in 1917. There were some well-focused responses that drew out inferences about Marxist ideology, the authority of Lenin and the temporary nature of the government. 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. Some candidates provided lengthy passages about the Tsarist system and the October Revolution without deploying their knowledge to the source content and inferences and therefore could not achieve above level 2 on bullet point 2. In other cases, candidates did not use any contextual knowledge at all and this did depress their achievement within the levels. Many candidates were able to use the attributes of the source effectively to develop their ideas about the value of the source from a Bolshevik decree. In this way many candidates were able to access the lower marks in level 3. Those candidates who discussed the limitations could not be rewarded for that part of their answer as it is not the focus of part a responses.

## 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 establishment of government under Lenin in 1917?

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

(10)

Source 1 is valuable to a historian for an enquiry into the establishment of government under Lenin in 1917, since it is a source that is dated to have been produced in on the 26<sup>th</sup> of October 1917, at which was the beginning of the October Revolution, ~~for~~ thus this source is useful to a historians since it shows the outline for the establishment of Lenin's government and how the structure and establishment should function and how the new government should be structured.

Source 1 is also valuable to the historian since it was produced during the Second Congress of Soviets ~~that~~ which the ~~same~~ Bolsheviks wanted to use for approving the October Revolution. The fact that the Decree forming a Soviet Government

was announced during the Second Congress of Soviets is valuable to a historian, <sup>because</sup> ~~since~~ ~~the establishment of the Soviet government~~ it shows that the establishment of the Soviet Government was successful. The source stating that "the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars is Vladimir Lenin" is further useful to the historian since it further shows the successful establishment of the Soviet ~~g~~ government.

The source also states that the government will work closely with ~~women~~ "men and women workers, sailors, soldiers, peasants and office employees" which is valuable for a historian since the establishment of Lenin's government aligns with the Communist ideology of the working classes to be the ~~most significant social group in the state.~~ forefront of the Communist government. This shows the source shows to a historian the beginnings of establishing a proletarian <sup>government</sup>.

~~given~~ The source is valuable to a historian since it shows the structure and the beginnings of centralization of the established government. By ~~stating~~ stating that "Commissions will ~~reorganize~~ reorganize the individual departments of the state, the historian is able to use this to see the structure of the new Soviet government.

The source also states that the Congress of Soviets will be in ~~the~~ ~~m~~ ~~is~~ ~~in~~ ~~con~~ ~~have~~ "control over the activities" of the Council of People's Commissars and that it will have the right to replace it. Making this valuable to ~~the~~ <sup>historian on the</sup> establishment of Lenin's government since it shows its structure and function. As a representative body the Congress of Soviets, a collective, has the right to change the people ~~within~~ within other bodies.



This is a level 3 entry response. It develops inferences about the beginnings of proletarian government and makes reference to communist ideology. Its comments on value are more assumptions and it is more level 2 than level 3 for bullet point 3 of the mark scheme.

### **Question 1b)**

Most candidates understood the source material and were able to select from it to consider the impact of Gorbachev's policy to allow greater freedoms in the arts. Some candidates did struggle with comprehending the source and, not reading the caption carefully, attributed the article to Gorbachev himself. Many candidates were able to draw some inferences, for example, considering Glazunov's rejection of Gorbachev's policy and, in some well-crafted responses, using this inference to justify judgements about weight based on Glazunov's anti-democratic views. Candidates tended to be stronger on evaluation of the provenance than on drawing inferences and/or drawing upon contextual knowledge to develop their judgements. In this way many responses did achieve the lower marks in level 3. However, many candidates do still approach the consideration of weight by writing about adding and subtracting weight rather than considering the strengths and weaknesses of the source material and then reaching a judgement about the weight that the source would bear in an enquiry. These candidates tend to achieve level 2 for bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. One particular weakness demonstrated by a significant number of candidates in addressing this question was the complete absence of any contextual knowledge to answer the question and consequently they were not rewarded in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. This topic has been on the paper on several occasions now. Centres may consider that examples from previous sources could be utilised to develop candidates' knowledge and for use in addressing 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 the impact of Gorbachev's policy to allow greater freedoms in the arts? against

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

(15)

Firstly, the source was written after the policy of Glasnost and Perestroika giving some weight to the source as it could assess the change in attitude to the arts and how these policies of greater freedoms in the arts influenced the changes in <sup>what type of art people had wanted</sup> ~~the changes in art~~ ~~at the time~~ ~~in the 1920s? <sup>"was it not a warning trend to return to the 1920s?"</sup> ~~creativity~~. On the other hand however, the source was written by Glasnost and was "well known for his anti-democratic views" giving little weight to the source as Gorbachev's policy of Glasnost & Perestroika gave more freedom and made the USSR more democratic something which he would oppose. These ~~policy of Glasnost~~ ~~policy~~ <sup>policy of Glasnost</sup> made by Gorbachev, encouraged people to criticise <sup>the government</sup> and report on corrupt and unequal systems. This is because meant that there was a lot of criticism of the Communist Party, and as the source was published by Pravda which is the official newspaper of the Communist Party, it is likely that the policy of freedom in the arts would be portrayed in a negative light.~~

This gives little weight to the source as it  
was a Communist Party leaflet, and the  
policy was actually being well-received  
across the population who, <sup>and years of experience,</sup> were happy to  
welcome the government opening Gibraltar.  
Due to this policy, had also faced opposition  
in the government, who had started to  
oppose him as people began to create a lot  
of anti-Communist art which had even-  
tually been strictly censored and banned.  
and criticised the Communist regime & <sup>its</sup> leaders.  
~~Another reason for why the source is has  
little weight is due to the author being  
an anti-Communist socialist.~~

On the other hand, the source can be given  
more weight as unlike Chazumov does not  
consider ~~the~~ how well-received the policy  
was across the population, he does give  
an insight into how <sup>not</sup> well-received the  
policy was in the government. Because  
it was published in Pravda, this highly  
critical piece shows how determined the  
Communist government was to show ~~the~~ Gibraltar's  
policy of freedom in the ~~best~~ <sup>a</sup>  
negative light, therefore, while a,

little weight can be given to the source as the author  
~~was clearly writing the book as only source -~~  
their ~~own~~ <sup>some</sup> viewpoint, ~~it is a source~~  
can be given to it as it shows the  
impact the policy had on  
~~Communist Party~~ the Communist  
Party, and that the policy of Glasnost posed  
a significant threat to them as anti-co-  
munist air was being leaked.

The source also carries little weight as the  
author clearly wants a return to <sup>more realist</sup> socialist  
Realism prevalent under Stalin. This  
is evident in the sentence "my aim  
was to achieve a high level of realism"  
and to "create art that "reflects the man-  
entous world in which we are living".  
This proves that the author wants art  
to show truth through realism and  
not art not to contain hidden meanings.  
Abstract and avant-garde art, unlike in  
the 1920s, it was often difficult to interpret  
and had hidden anti-communist me-  
anings. Socialist realism on the other hand  
praised the government in a positive  
view and ~~often~~ showed criticism in an  
oblique-idealized way. Therefore, by  
promoting realism, the source can be



given limited weight as it <sup>gives more</sup> ~~does not~~  
on the part of ~~consider~~ how the policy of greater  
freedom in the arts <sup>meant that realism</sup> ~~was not~~  
was less, rather than focusing on the  
positive  
impact of the policy on other forms of  
arts. The author uses the source to  
present his conservative and anti-  
democratic views rather than show-  
ing the impact the policy had on, for  
example, <sup>ordinary</sup> people or people who favoured  
abstract over realist art.

To conclude, I would give Source 2  
limited weight as it ~~is~~ was a strong  
Communist bias and ~~is~~ only des-  
cribes the effect the policy had on an  
individual rather than considering  
different viewpoints and the impact  
the policy of greater freedom had  
on other members of the artistic  
population.

This response achieved a high level 4. It demonstrates secure evaluation and uses context effectively to show an awareness of the different values and concerns of that Communist Party and the people in Russia in the late 1980s. It is very effective on assessing weight.

## **Question 2**

This was the second most popular essay question. Some candidates produced very effective answers, considering the relative achievements of Lenin's Decree on Illiteracy, the illiteracy liquidation campaign and Trotsky's work in eradicating illiteracy in the Red Army. Candidates made use of Stalin's attempt to improve illiteracy during the Five Year plans and the work of the Zhenotdel to improve the literacy of women throughout the period. Some candidates legitimately drew upon the expansion of free primary education to discuss improving literacy in children. However, those candidates who focused on the expansion of higher education were not well focused on successes and limitations in tackling illiteracy. Some candidates did not take note of the date range in the question and wrote about literacy during Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's regimes which could not be credited in answering this question.

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

During the years of government under Lenin and Stalin ~~which~~ many changes and policies were adopted inside and outside the ~~the~~ educational system to help combat illiteracy. Through programmes such as the "Illiteracy liquidation" ~~in the 1920s~~ ~~the Soviet~~ ~~of~~ and educational reforms, it was easier to create a more educated and literate Soviet society. This essay will argue that the attempts made to reduce illiteracy in the Soviet Union ~~to~~ did not have limited success and actually were able to ~~to~~ create ~~to~~ higher numbers ~~of~~ of literacy in children and in adults.

The main programme that bred success with ~~the~~ combatting illiteracy was the "Illiteracy liquidation"

programme that was created under Lenin's government in the early 1920's. Prior to this programme the rates of illiteracy were ~~extrem~~ high. In, 1913 less than half of the population was literate, and most the ones who were literate were mainly concentrated in large cities rather than the rural areas of the USSR - Soviet Russia. The ~~po~~ programme was very ~~st~~successful and at the ~~big~~ height of its ~~course~~ <sup>existence</sup> 5 five million people attended the courses. Together with this programme, incentive was given to actually attend ~~this~~ these courses and become literate. ~~The programme~~ Lenin's government ~~was~~ only allowed literate individuals to join the ~~the~~ Army, thus giving ~~some kin.~~ incentive to actually learn to be read and write. The Illiterate diquifiation programme was so successful that the literacy rates ~~&~~ increased. ~~in 1954~~ Roughly 94% of

people in cities were literate ~~more~~ and around 85% of the people in the countryside were literate, showing the positive impact of this programme. However, the result did take a very long time to achieve, ~~at~~ therefore ~~the~~ ~~pro~~ showing a flaw ~~in~~ within the programme, ~~but~~ It can be also argued that the sheer size of the country and distribution of the population, were <sup>also</sup> major ~~fact~~ factors in the ~~long~~ making the effects of the ~~the~~ Illiterate dejection programme only visible in the 1930s.

Reforms in the education system could also contribute to the decrease of illiteracy within the Soviet peoples. Lunacharsky being the Commissar of Education established a ~~system~~ of more stable education system in 1923, which created options and opportunities for ~~young~~ children to learn basic skills, which includes reading and writing.



By experimenting with various styles of education and limiting the authorities of the teachers ~~on~~ as well as decreasing ~~the~~ increasing the autonomy of the headmasters the schools were able to pick what type of education they wanted to pursue. Democratic schools were tried out, however most stuck with teaching ~~that~~ traditional subjects and expanding literacy in the new and younger generations. However, education may still pose some problems, since rural areas had less access to educational facilities and education in general, making it a ~~to~~ harder to implement literacy from a young age in these areas of Soviet Russia.

Towards the end of the 1930s and the early 1940s <sup>combined with</sup> ~~and~~ the growing threat of war, education and focus ~~and~~ <sup>on</sup> eradicating illiteracy was not that strong. The country's efforts shifted towards arms production and the industries surrounding that. However, as stated previously the

effects of the illiterate liquefaction policy was already visible in the ~~193~~ 1934. Major improvements have been already made, therefore putting less pressure on eradicating illiteracy was not a concern of the government.

In summary, the attempts to reduce illiteracy in the Soviet Union had ~~did~~ not have limited success. The country in the ~~span~~ span of 20 ~~twenty five~~ years was able to create a highly literate society through programmes ~~such~~ such as the ~~liquefaction~~ illiteracy liquefaction programme and education reform ~~reformed~~ education systems.

Even though challenges came during the late 1930s and early 1940s, illiteracy was eliminated to a high enough standard to not create worry in the government.



This response achieved low level 4. It has good focus on the liquidation of illiteracy programme and considers successes and failures in order to reach a judgement. It does make some relevant use of the expansion of literacy in schools. It is weaker on addressing limitations but it does try to address this.

### **Question 3**

This question was the most popular essay question on the paper. Most candidates had knowledge of the suppression of opposition to Stalin and were able to look at a range of individuals and methods to develop arguments and draw judgements. The best responses considered the role of Beria and were able to contrast this with the roles of Yagoda and Yezhov as well as the party members responsible for the suppression of opposition to collectivisation and the role of Stalin himself. Those that achieved level 4 had a clear focus on significance and were able to develop clear criteria for judgement. Candidates with less secure knowledge tended to attribute any actions taken by NKVD chiefs to Beria and therefore claimed much of the activities of Yagoda and Yezhov to have been carried out by Beria. Candidates do need to be aware of the differing roles played by each leader and to develop their knowledge precisely.

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

Although it is without a doubt that Beria did conduct <sup>actions and</sup> repression in order to consolidate power around Stalin, his actions if taken into comparison with previous NKVD leaders such as Yagoda and Yezhov remain to seem at least somewhat limited.

To begin with, Beria came into power at the increasingly deteriorating health conditions of Yezhov, Yezhov being dismissed by Stalin due to concerns about his ~~teach~~ inability to carry out his duties. The introduction of Beria as head of the secret police marking a significant decline in the ruthlessness of the Soviet political system. Firstly, to properly analyze the impact Beria had, it is valuable to compare him with previous administrators and heads of the NKVD, to do this in a more ~~also~~ orderly manner, chronologically their actions will be compared. Yagoda, the first NKVD leader put into power by Stalin was remarkably ruthless and

his actions resulting in a major spillover of secret police violence into the civilian world. Under Stalin's command Yagoda began to purge the soviet government of any dissent, many anarchists, ~~so~~ social revolutionaries and other <sup>right wing</sup> elements being purged under his rule. <sup>high duty needed called "chistka" was used at height of Yagoda's reign.</sup> The major events being the elimination of the Kamenev-Zenovievite block from the party structure. The two left wing counterweights to Stalin having been labelled as bourgeois revivalists and Trotskyites for their disagreements on Stalin's proposals of "socialism in one country" as the two wanted to export the revolution to other countries while Stalin wanted to focus on developing the USSR. Yagoda's secret police provided Stalin with valuable information and private files on the leaders the information gathered proving valuable in court and mock trials <sup>where</sup> the leaders were berated and then arrested. Yagoda here depicted as greatly assisting Stalin in these purges and operating in the interests of Stalin. Solidifying his actions as significant in suppressing Stalin's opposition.

Furthermore, the murder of Kirov by an allegedly NKVD trained operative, Kirov ~~was~~ being a ~~opposition~~ force in the party able to match Stalin's, as he received standing ovations for his speeches, solidified Yagoda as a ally of sorts. Yet Stalin disprised this occurance as he stated that he saw Kirov as a close ally and mourned his death. The murder giving Stalin an excuse to depose Yagoda and blame him for the terror that was plaguing soviet society all of the excesses being blamed on Yagoda as a scape goat, <sup>even though it is popular that the NKVD still remains a fact that Yagoda's leadership in the NKVD which had started early, him even being around to expell</sup> <sup>becoming too powerful and had no allies</sup> Stalin's main competitor to succeed Lenin Trotsky, him being eventually exiled from the Soviet Union; did greatly aid Stalin, arguably so much so that ~~it~~ ~~can~~ it not for Yagoda's collaboration it could be argued that Stalin could have not even come to power or have been deposed by the congress earlier in his career. Moving on, Yagoda's successor Vozhov was also quite violent and was directly appointed

by Stalin, Yezhov engaging in practices such as taking away opposition members party identity cards effectively blocking them from participating in politics, solidifying his place as a close ally to Stalin, furthermore the onset of world war two making it so that Yezhov had to organize the Gulags, arrest and eliminate fascist-Axis-collaborators and military personell suspected of treason. The terror arguably coming to a rise under his rule, yet is somewhat ~~enough~~ justified due to wartime conditions. Yezhov also continued to eliminate leaders, <sup>however,</sup> even assassinating Leon Trotsky abroad, but his operations did not necessarily ~~lead to~~ help Stalin depose political contenders as other worries were at hand, solidifying the fact that he was indeed very much so allied to Stalin but had no opportunity to prove it, his reign being focused on less the party and more on state affairs.

This brings us to Beria who inherited the position as head of the secret police, Him now in charge of protecting Stalin and managing the expansive ~~Soviet~~ newly found ~~at the Soviet Union~~ ~~in~~ <sup>allies</sup> <sub>in</sub>



eastern Europe, Germany and the Baltic States, ~~the~~ Beria conducting many missions in the name of state security but similar to Yezhov had no room to depose of Stalin's political opponents as Stalin's power by now had largely been consolidated. Beria however aiding Stalin in ~~the~~ elimination of foreign opponents to Soviet rule even attempts on fellow socialist partisan Joseph Broz Tito's life.

~~Now these events show~~ Beria <sup>however</sup> ~~can~~ post Stalin's death contending with Khrushchev releasing an estimate of 3 million political prisoners from gulags showing that he <sup>operated on a level of accuracy,</sup>

The reasoning as to why Beria had not accomplished as much as Yezhov or Yezhov also being that the socio-political circumstances were different for the three. Yezhov having to erase multi-polarity, oversaw lots of action and had many opportunities to purge Stalin's enemies and help consolidate power, Yezhov dealing with the world war and remnants of resistance groups within the Soviet Union having a harder time to directly affect Stalin's political dominance, and Beria <sup>\*But still</sup> provided close aid to Stalin



Inheriting post war patriotism and general assimilation of people into Soviet rule had little to do than otherwise monitor local administration of the five year plans and deal with foreign threats, managing the satellite states.

~~to~~ Conclusively, Beria inherited a somewhat stable political situation with Stalin being a praised leader who won <sup>a major war</sup> ~~the war~~ <sup>with respect to</sup> ~~his~~ ~~little~~ opposition meaning that it is dishonest to say that he played the most significant role in suppressing Stalin's opposition, as other leaders previous to him, conducted more substantial and larger roles in aiding Stalin, Yagoda and Kozlov being present to aid Stalin in key victories and get him on a path to political conformity. Therefore, Beria was not ~~did not~~ play the most significant role in suppressing opposition to Stalin.

This is a mid level 4 response. It is focus on the question and supported by detailed knowledge. The approach is rather chronological and as such it takes some time to address Beria and hence his relative significance. It has a secure judgement in the conclusion.

#### **Question 4**

This was the least popular question on the paper and performance tended to be patchy. Whilst a small number of candidates engaged with the question and developed secure knowledge to address it, there were significantly more who tended to address a past question rather than the one set and this did impact on achievement. The question required candidates to look at the changing priorities for industry under Brezhnev, Andropov and Chernenko. At the top end, candidates looked at their continuing focus on the military industrial sector and the changing priorities for consumer goods, and the need to deal with corruption and alcoholism after Brezhnev's death. It was legitimate for candidates to begin with a consideration of the priorities at the end of Khrushchev's regime. However, a significant number of candidates approached this as a similarity and difference question on Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's priorities and even wrote at length about changes under Gorbachev. These responses did not focus effectively on the demands of the question. Candidates should make sure they read the question carefully and plan it before writing. This should avoid making mistakes on the focus and demands of the question.

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

In the years 1964-75 there could be seen a degree of change between approaches to industry of Brezhnev and Khrushchev. Primarily, this may would argue that Brezhnev increased the military spending despite persistent emphasis on consumer goods, he also attempted to reverse Khrushchev's decentralisation measures and productivity was additionally brought up, such as in the case of Kengirov reforms. Nonetheless, the biggest similarity between Brezhnev's approach and previous management of industry was mainly in the inefficiency of the planned economy and the way government still chose to stick to its methods. Hence, it could be suggested that the change in the industrial priorities under Brezhnev was relatively superficial because the fundamental structure of economy was left unchanged. Thus, the extent of this difference between industry under Brezhnev and industry under Khrushchev could be seen as limited in its depth.

Firstly, it would be reasonable to highlight the increase in military spending under Brezhnev and his approach to the consumer goods. According to the 5-Year Plan in the years 1971-1975 the consumer goods were still considered a priority for the industry in the Soviet Union. This could be viewed as a degree of continuity between Khrushchev and Brezhnev, since it was largely Khrushchev who for the first time after Stalin's death and Stoenin with industrialisation decided to shift the focus of industry from producer goods and heavy industry to the satisfaction of the people's needs. Brezhnev pursued this focus at least partially in line with the idea of developed socialism in which all the people's basic needs are satisfied. Hence, the consumption under Brezhnev grew up to 70% and there could be seen increase

in the availability of such goods as TV sets or washing machines. Around 85% of people in the Union owned TV sets in the late 1970s, as well as around 70% could benefit from the washing machines. Nonetheless the expenditures on consumer goods under Brezhnev were significantly undermined by the growing influence of military industrial complex and subsequent spending on the military. Importantly, military expenditures were already increasing in early 1970s under Khrushchev due to volatile political environment, tensions around Berlin Wall and Cuban Missile Crisis, however, this was still constrained by Khrushchev's strong belief in communism in two decades and populist approaches to economy. Overall, he was a more people-centered ruler than Brezhnev. In Brezhnev's case this initial trend with military expenditures only grew and reached an extent of 18% of all resources and 20% of workers being involved in military industry by the end of 1970s. Under Brezhnev's rule USSR engaged in proxy wars with the West and marked its presence in the Vietnam War which lasted until 1975, in Congo war in the local region in 1967 and most importantly in the proxy intervention in Afghanistan in 1979 which lasted for 10 years on. All these ventures put Soviet economy under significant strain and as a result despite the formal commitment to provide Soviet citizens with enough consumer goods, the quality of them was often very poor e.g. TV sets could have been expensive. This inability to provide for the people properly was even reflected in Brezhnev's ideological underpinnings for the Soviet political project. Instead of Khrushchev's ambitious plans to reach communism in 1980s and satisfy the needs of all there came a much more modest goal of providing the people with basics alone. Thus, it could be suggested that one of the industrial priorities were still the consumer goods, however, under Brezhnev's rule the military spending and development

of ordinary industrial complex relaxed this initial focus and therefore signified a growing difference between industry under Brezhnev and previous industrial developments.

Additionally, it could be claimed that Brezhnev significantly reversed Khrushchev's attempts to decentralise the economy and thus this return to the old and tested methods of economic management became a change in how the industry was run in the years 1964-1983. Under Khrushchev as far as in 1962 there were established *zornarchoi* - regional departments that would be tasked to oversee the implementation of Gosplan in the USSR various regions. These aimed to make the Gosplan more flexible and responsive to the local needs, advantages and limitations and consequently improve the economy. On top of that in 1962 due to the influence of Liebermann Plan Khrushchev decided to split the industrial and agricultural ministries on two separate sides, hence it led to even further decentralisation. Brezhnev, in turn, acted precisely in reverse and abolished all 103 *zornarchoi*, as well as repealed the division of ministries on agricultural and industrial ones. This marked the renewed emphasis on centralising measures and reasserted the role of the Gosplan in the management of industry. Plus, Brezhnev reinforced the role of the central budget and from now on the regional departments that oversee the achievement of targets could no longer manage the profits themselves. Consequently it could be suggested that one of the changed priorities in the industry under Brezhnev was return to the centralisation and belief that this would secure the economic efficiency. This clearly differed from Khrushchev's approach and could therefore be considered a clear change of focus.

Last but not least, there was evidently a degree of similarity between

The industry under Brezhnev and Khrushchev was mainly the centrally planned economy and its prioritizing of output rather than productivity, quantity instead of quality. Indeed, under Brezhnev and potentially due to some of the Khrushchev's shortcomings there were initiated some steps to shift the focus from output to the productivity. In 1965 Prime Minister Kossygin developed a tactic that would be based on cost and profit analysis and the margin between the profit from outcomes and the cost of production. Initially, this was adopted by the factories across USSR, however, Brezhnev himself intervened in order to eliminate Kossygin politically. Hence, the factories were encouraged to disregard the emphasis on productivity and calculations of profit. Moreover, there were introduced two targets - for the output alongside the productivity. Overall, this led to the failure of Kossygin's reforms as they resulted into more inconsistent and mutually exclusive targets in the factories. Importantly, this also led to the slowdown of the industrial mechanization because producers encouraged by targets aimed in quantity were more keen to prioritize short-term gains over long-term investment thus producing more old-type machinery rather than renewed, more developed technology. Directly, Brezhnev attempted to improve this lack of innovation by ordering the research institutes to cooperate with the factories in 1973, however, this proved to be ineffective, since the technological advancements continued to be slow and superficial. Hence, the shortcomings of the centrally planned economy that persisted and did not allow the factories to focus on the productivity, instead of output, quality instead of quantity and innovative experimentation instead of the old methods were still in place under Brezhnev despite some attempts to renew the industry. This inefficiency certainly adds continuity to the picture because similar problems could be seen under



Khrushchev. Therefore, in this regard industry in the years 1945-1956 failed to match its focus and move on to a more advanced functioning.

In conclusion, this essay would state again that the industry's priorities under Brezhnev changed but not fundamentally. For certain, the production of consumer goods persisted but it was labor eclipsed by a dramatic increase in military spending. Khrushchev's decentralising measures were repealed and the industry under Brezhnev was largely focused on increasing the role of complex. At the same time the roots of the economic stagnation under Brezhnev were left unchanged - it was the centrally planned economy with its priority on output and quantity that continued to poison country's industry even further. Therefore, it could be claimed that the extent to which the priorities for industry changed under Brezhnev in the years 1945-1956 was limited in its depth although nevertheless present.

This is a low level 4 response. It considers a range of priorities for industry under Brezhnev and uses the situation left by Khrushchev to draw out the changes. It demonstrates secure knowledge which is applied to the question. It does not consider priorities under Andropov and Chernenko and sometimes wanders from change into similarity and 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.