AQA

AS
History

7041/2T-The Crisis of Communism: The USSR and the Soviet Empire, 1953–2000
Component 2T Crisis in the Soviet Union, 1953–2000
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

The Crisis of Communism: the USSR and the Soviet Empire, 1953–2000

Component 2T Crisis in the Soviet Union, 1953–2000

Section A

01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the ending of the Cold War? **[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 well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**

L3: The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**

L2: The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**

L1: The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**

Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

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

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

- the article is written from an American perspective and so may be subjective
- it may be seen as less valuable because it is based on a student's outlook who may be ill-informed; there is also no way of knowing how typical it was
- the tone of the source is hopeful but slightly dubious of the Soviet promise to withdraw.

Content and argument

- students will likely make reference to the significance of the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan due to the tension that the invasion had caused between the US and the Soviet Union
- Gorbachev's promise for non-intervention post withdrawal. Students may link this to Gorbachev's reforms of Glasnost and Demokratizatsiya – reforms that would have been supported by the West
- the United States, under Reagan, were willing to work with the Soviet Union despite the so-called Second Cold War. Students will likely comment that the promise to withdraw from Afghanistan encouraged Reagan to restore better relations. Students may refer to the various face to face summit meetings between Reagan and Gorbachev during the late 1980s, and the strong personal relationship that developed between the two leaders
- students may comment that the promise to reduce troops and withdraw from Afghanistan is not unique, that Gorbachev cut troop numbers across the USSR and cut Soviet funding to communist groups around the world. Students may link comments to the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine.

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

Provenance and tone

- Gorbachev's attempt to gain publicity with the intention to sell books worldwide. Students may make reference to Gorbachev's claim 'civilisation must survive' and provide the necessary context to depict that this was stated for effect, i.e. the flashpoints of tension during the nuclear arms race were in Japan in the 1940s, Korea in the early 1950s and Cuba in 1962 and not during the years of détente in the 1970s and 1980s
- Gorbachev's intention to enthuse/excite after years of stagnation under Brezhnev
- the USSR is internationally unpopular due to its involvement in Afghanistan.

Content and argument

- Gorbachev's call for peace and his desire for peaceful co-existence, his fear of nuclear warfare and efforts made to end the nuclear arms race
- whilst Gorbachev hoped for the superpowers to rise above ideological differences in order to attain peace, he had no intention of giving up on socialism and hoped that when the time came, those living in the USSR and throughout the satellite states would remain loyal to the Left
- in relation to the necessity for a new political model, students may refer to Perestroika, Glasnost and Demokratizatsiya to reflect Gorbachev's desire to end the Cold War. Students may refer to the contradictions within these reforms
- attempts made to maintain parity with the USA, particularly in relation to the nuclear arms race, was a significant drain on resources. In 1988, there were high levels of poverty in the Soviet Union and rationing was introduced.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students will likely comment that both hold considerable value. Both sources demonstrate significant reasons for why the Cold War ended, with Source A presenting the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and Source B depicting Gorbachev's desire to prevent nuclear war. However, Source A arguably holds more value, in that it alludes to various reasons for the Cold War ending.

Section B

02 'Khrushchev was successful in his policy of peaceful co-existence with the West.'

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 suggesting that Khrushchev was successful in his policy of peaceful co-existence with the West might include:

- the immediate consequences of the Cuban Missile Crisis, notably negotiations had to limit nuclear testing and the installation of a hotline to prevent further crises
- Khrushchev's attempts to lower the threat of war – relations with JFK and visits to the US
- Khrushchev's ambition to lower state military expenditure to allow for more investment in improving living conditions for the Soviet peoples
- Western reaction to strained Sino-Soviet relations.

Arguments challenging the view that Khrushchev was successful in his policy of peaceful co-existence with the West might include:

- the Berlin Crisis – Berlin and the FRG/GDR, the refugee problem and Khrushchev's ultimatum, the U-2 Incident and the Berlin Wall
- tensions with the West over Cuba – the reasons for locating nuclear missiles in Cuba, the October Crisis and the outcome for the USSR
- the Warsaw Pact
- the Space Programme – the launching of Sputnik, the world's first artificial satellite; Gagarin was the first man in space and Tereshkova the first woman; Space race with the US.

Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence had limited success. The Berlin and Cuban crises deeply antagonised the West and the Space Programme increased American paranoia, undermining any real hope for peaceful co-existence. Students may refer to how Khrushchev's resignation in 1964 was in part driven by the failings in his attempts made to achieve peaceful co-existence.

03 'The 10th Five Year Plan of 1976–81 failed to improve living standards in the USSR.'

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 suggesting that the 10th Five Year Plan of 1976–81 failed to improve living standards in the USSR might include:

- limits on cultural and intellectual freedoms – the lack of freedom of speech, the Helsinki Watch Groups, the squashing of dissidents by the KGB; limits on religious freedoms – increased Jewish emigration and increased Christian and Islamic Fundamentalism
- the impact of the black economy and the disparities in incomes and opportunities between different groups, i.e. the Nomeklatura and the Kolkhozniks; the disparities in living standards between different regions in the USSR
- high divorce rates caused by cramped housing conditions, dissatisfaction of women with their domestic role, and alcohol abuse
- poor health care, compounded by numerous factors – limited state funding due to the focus on military spending and achieving nuclear parity with the US, corrupt medical staff, poorly equipped hospitals, and increased rates of cancer and hepatitis.

Arguments challenging the view that the 10th Five Year Plan of 1976–81 failed to improve living standards in the USSR might include:

- the five day working week became the norm, and holidays were increased. The minimum wage was increased and real wages increased by 50% under Brezhnev
- the Five Year Plans in the Brezhnev era boosted the production of consumer goods
- there were educational advances – proportion of adults with secondary, further or higher education qualifications grew, and the education system produced many specialists, particularly engineers. Education was free, so too health care
- Golden Age of material satisfaction – under Brezhnev the consumption of meat, fish and vegetables increased by 50%. Televisions and cars were much more available than previously. By 1970, there were over a million private cars on the USSR's roads.

Brezhnev delivered on his promise to improve living standards, particularly in relation to the availability and affordability of consumer and luxury goods, full employment, and improved education. However, students should point out that cultural, intellectual and religious freedoms were restricted, and that there were distinct disparities between groups and regions in terms of opportunity and income.