



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2013**

**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 events which all examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 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 to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

## **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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students 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. Students 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 students 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 student 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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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 2013

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 the Terror. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
<b>L1:</b>	Answers will <b>either</b> briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources <b>or</b> identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
<b>L2:</b>	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
<b>L3:</b>	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences <b>and</b> similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
<b>L4:</b>	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 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 levels scheme.**

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

- **Source A** claims that all Soviet citizens are deprived of any rights under the Terror, whereas **Source B** distinguishes clearly between the innocent and the guilty
- **Source A** condemns Stalin's dictatorship during the Terror, whereas **Source B** fulsomely praises Stalin's leadership
- **Source A** paints a very negative, pessimistic view of the impact of Terror, whereas **Source B** is very optimistic, seeing the Terror as being the prelude to a glorious future.

---

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- the author of **Source A** had fled from the USSR and complains of being victimised by Stalin's regime – therefore his view is inevitably bitter and subjective. Nevertheless there is truth in his comment about the Party being under Stalin's control and the destruction of Lenin's Party, since by 1939 most of the 'Old Bolsheviks', who had been Stalin's colleagues and/or rivals, had been eliminated, often after Show Trials and often on very flimsy evidence. Stalin's rule by 1939 could in several respects be described as a personal dictatorship, since he ruled arbitrarily, even though he could not personally control everything that happened in the USSR. Those victimised included peasants, workers, various specialists, Party members, army officers, etc.
- **Source B** is from a speech by the chief Show Trial prosecutor, admired by Stalin and clearly given the job because he could eloquently denounce those whom Stalin wanted to portray as his enemies. But his comments are also very typical of Stalinist propaganda generally in the late 1930s. Also, the claims of contact with foreign intelligence were correct in some cases, even if this did not necessarily mean actual spying.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- **both sources** identify old Bolsheviks as amongst those suffering or under threat during the Terror
- **both** clearly recognise that Stalin is a controlling force in the Terror
- **both** recognise that the Terror is associated with considerable violence.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students will probably highlight the provenance of the sources, notably the subjective account by a Stalinist 'victim' in Source A, whereas Source B is from someone who is clearly Stalin's 'tool' and is full of propaganda, both aimed at 'the enemy' and also boosting the Stalin cult. The context of both sources is a major factor in identifying the differences in content.

---

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

How successful was the Terror in ensuring that the Soviet Union had achieved stability by 1941?  
(24 marks)

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

**Levels Mark Scheme**

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 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 should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources might include:

- **Source A** does not specifically talk about stability. Yet, there is a great emphasis on dictatorship, the punishment of large numbers of people, whether innocent or guilty, and on uncertainty and fear. This does not mean an unstable regime *per se*, despite the fact that some 'useful and necessary' groups had been 'beaten', and there might be a brutal dictatorship in place. This is not necessarily incompatible with a form of 'stability' and it does not mean that the regime was on the verge of dissolution. Nevertheless, it **might** be argued that a regime based on Terror implies at best a forced and uncertain stability
- **Source B** could be taken as implying instability or the threat of it, with the claim that important politicians are widely involved in treachery and spying for the 'enemy'. However, the source also implies that because the mass of ordinary people are determined to destroy the traitors and are backing a popular and resolute Government to deal with the issues and move forwards to a bright future, then stability is secure
- **Source C** could be taken as evidence either for or against 'stability'. The first part might imply stability, because whilst accepting that the regime did face dangerous opponents who were hostile to the regime's policies, and if successful, would have left the country without heavy industry, exposed to its enemies and weak, the source goes on to assert that these enemies were defeated. The later part of the source refers to unjust and cruel repression, including against the innocent, which like Source A, **could** imply either stability or the danger of instability, especially in the long run.

From students' own knowledge:

**Factors suggesting that the Terror did help the USSR achieve stability might include:**

- Stalin had faced opposition from within the Party before 1934 in particular, and by destroying it, it could be argued that the Party was more united by 1941, and despite his paranoia, Stalin's leadership was more secure and the USSR was in a better position to face the challenge of war
- there is evidence of contact between some influential figures in the USSR, including the military, with foreign powers, and those involved (plus the innocent!), had clearly been removed from the scene by 1941, which should have meant more stability
- it might be argued that the draconian nature of the purges had helped create a siege mentality amongst the population which led to a form of unity ('us against them'), and helped the regime in its policies such as forced industrialisation - which arguably strengthened both regime and the country as a whole, creating a form of stability which helped the USSR particularly when war came.



---

**Factors suggesting that the Terror did not help the USSR achieve stability might include:**

- The Great Terror did lead to persecution of many valuable scientists, specialists etc, whose loss could not possibly help a country trying to modernise and move forward to political and economic stability
- Repression discouraged initiative, encouraged managers etc to falsify information and not take risks, prevented the free flow of valuable information, discouraged genuine cooperation – all of which did not encourage stability
- damage was done to the stability, efficiency and leadership of the armed services because of the purges
- enormous amounts of valuable resources were ‘wasted’ on the machinery of repression to be used against the regime’s own population.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the Great Terror had some very detrimental effects on the USSR, but leaving aside the human misery, possibly had some effects which did not harm stability or even enhanced it. Partly the overall judgement on the impact of the Terror will depend on the definition of stability, and which political, economic and social aspects are considered.

---

**Question 2**

**03** Explain why Trotsky did not become Soviet leader in 1924. (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 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.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Trotsky did not become Soviet leader in 1924.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- there was general uncertainty about the leadership, mainly because Lenin had not made a clear decision and there was no official 'post' or mechanism in place for electing a leader
- Trotsky did not have a strong Party base of support
- Trotsky had a reputation for arrogance
- some colleagues were suspicious of Trotsky because of his relatively recent Menshevik past
- some were wary of Trotsky because of his earlier role in commanding the Red Army
- Trotsky himself expressed doubts about his suitability, feeling that his Jewishness might be a stumbling block to universal acceptance

- 
- there were other rivals like Stalin, who had already fallen out with Trotsky, and who would not easily accept him as Lenin's successor.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, to what extent were ideological and personal factors linked? Students might, for example, consider the extent to which reservations about Trotsky were due to longer-term factors based on his pre-1917 existence and his role in the Civil War, and the extent to which any reservations were based on his activities since 1921. Students might consider the extent to which Trotsky's failure to become leader in 1924 was dependent on his own failings, and the extent to which it was due to the actions and attitudes of others.

## Question 2

- 04** 'The Left Opposition failed to achieve power in the USSR because its leaders underestimated Stalin.'

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 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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which either agree with the view that the Left Opposition failed to achieve power just because its leaders underestimated Stalin, or disagree by emphasising other factors responsible for their failure.

---

**Points which agree that the Left Opposition failed to achieve power in the USSR because its leaders underestimated Stalin might include:**

- Trotsky largely dismissed Stalin as a mediocrity, and certainly underestimated the potential threat opposed in the power struggle after Lenin's death, at least until it was too late
- Zinoviev and Kamenev also underestimated Stalin, and like a number of the Bolshevik Old Guard, regarded themselves as intellectuals, looking down on the supposedly inferior Stalin
- The Left's underestimation of Stalin was also evident in the way they agreed not to publish Lenin's Testament, even though that would probably have finished Stalin politically had it been carried out
- The Left was too bound up with its own internal rivalries – especially the changing alliances of Kamenev and Zinoviev, first with Stalin and then with Trotsky – to pay enough attention to Stalin's influence
- The Left, like others, appeared not to notice the emerging strength of Stalin, being a member as he was of all the key Party bodies and controlling the Party machine through the post of General Secretary - the Left did not cultivate a Party base anything like as effective as Stalin's
- The Left probably underestimated the attraction of the policy of Socialism in One Country, championed by Stalin
- generally, those on the Left simply did not appear to understand Stalin's cunning, tactical skill and ruthlessness until it was too late.

**Points which disagree that underestimation of Stalin by the Left Opposition was the chief factor in the Left's failure to achieve power might include:**

- several prominent Bolsheviks such as Molotov, Mikoyan, Voroshilov, Malenkov, Ordzhonikidze and Dzierzynski, who all attached themselves to Stalin in the 1920s, were not notable members of either Left or Right groups, since they attached themselves to Stalin not out of ideology but because they recognised him as a rising star and therefore the man to support, in order to further their own careers. This clearly helped Stalin
- Stalin's outmanoeuvring of the Left can also be explained by several factors, such as Stalin's personal strengths, his powerful position in the Party machine, his manipulation of the Right, and sheer luck
- it is clear that the Left Opposition had a number of other inherent weaknesses which were not directly connected to its underestimation of Stalin: including Trotsky's flawed character, his lack of a Party base, his over-confidence, suspicion of Trotsky within the Party, personal flaws of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

Good answers may conclude that the outcome of the power struggle was a combination of several factors, one of which almost certainly was the Left Opposition's underestimation of Stalin – but it is open to informed debate as to what was the relative importance of all the other relevant factors.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why the kulaks had become unpopular in the USSR by 1929. (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 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.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why kulaks were unpopular by 1929.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the existence of kulaks had always been unpopular with many in the Party, because they were seen as representatives of capitalism and perpetuating class warfare, e.g. kulaks in the mid 1920s made up about 3% of the peasantry but marketed 25% of the grain
- ideologically, the regime could not move forwards to socialism whilst such a class existed
- kulaks were seen as holding the country to ransom by their reluctance to sell grain to the Government during the middle and late 1920s, leading to the Procurements crisis, and the regime saw them as threatening economic stability
- kulaks' unpopularity was increased as they became the target of vicious propaganda, which made them a scapegoat for many of the country's ills

- the regime was conscious of the fact that there was a lot of dissatisfaction with Communist rule in the countryside by the late 1920s, and that the Party did not securely control the rural population - and kulaks were widely blamed for fomenting this dissatisfaction
- the regime was anxious to eliminate the kulaks, because if they were allowed into the new collectives, they might become centres of peasant resistance to the new agricultural system.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, opposition to the kulaks was partly ideological (to do with class warfare between socialism and capitalism), partly economic (seen as standing in the way of agricultural reforms which were needed to accompany industrialisation), partly political (to do with enforcing control and compliance in the countryside). Higher level answers are likely to explain these strands and link them.

---

**Question 3**

- 06** 'Agriculture was making a much stronger contribution to the Soviet economy by 1941 than it had done in 1928.'  
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 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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.



---

**Evidence which agree with the assertion that agriculture was making a stronger contribution to the Soviet economy by 1941 might include:**

- in 1928 the regime could not be certain of stable food supplies reaching the towns from the countryside; by 1941 Collectivisation had ensured that the industrial towns and the army were fed reasonably regularly
- the successes of the industrialisation under the Five-Year Plans were only possible because of the guaranteed food supplies and the transfer of agricultural labour from the countryside to the new factories
- from the mid-1930s, once Collectivisation was complete, agricultural production recovered from the trauma of the Collectivisation process and was making a substantial contribution to overall economic progress
- collectivisation had brought some benefits – the advantages of larger-scale farming, more mechanisation, improved communications and transport, better education in rural areas
- the sale of agricultural produce abroad enabled the USSR to import necessary technology.

**Evidence which disagrees with the assertion that agriculture made a much stronger contribution to the Soviet economy by 1941 compared to 1928 might include:**

- although food production had risen during the 1930s, by 1941 it was scarcely better than it had been in 1928. The economy never really recovered from the massive slaughter of livestock
- although the worst features of the famines were over by the mid 1930s, the country as a whole was not particularly well-fed by 1941
- in several respects agriculture was still backwards compared to more advanced economies – e.g. mechanisation was very partial
- many of the best and most successful farmers had been purged during Collectivisation, causing the death of millions, and the most productive workers had moved to cities, where their skills were of less value to the economy
- many peasants appear to have been disillusioned, for example clearly putting more effort into working their small private plots than on the Collectives and state farms
- most historians believe that the economic justification for Collectivisation, that there would be a surplus of goods flowing from the countryside to the towns over the flow of industrial goods from the towns to the countryside, was never achieved; and this would suggest that agriculture was not making the expected contribution to the national economy.

Good answers are likely to conclude that there had been both gains and losses economically from developments in agriculture since 1928. There had been enormous human costs, which must have affected the economy; and agriculture was very much the poor relation of industry in 1941. On the other hand, the country had been industrialised and in some ways strengthened. One interpretation could be that the overall economic gains in the USSR could have been equally achieved or bettered by a different approach to agriculture; other interpretations, including Soviet ones, were often that the regime's drastic approach to agriculture had been an essential part of 'creating socialism', even when acknowledging that not all was right in the countryside.

### **Converting marks into UMS marks**

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

**UMS conversion calculator:** [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)