

Mark scheme

International Advanced Subsidiary  
in History (WHI02/1C)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91:  
From Lenin to Yeltsin

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

### Section A: Question 1(a)

**Target: A02 (10 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.</li> </ul>

**Section A: Question 1(b)**

**Target: AO2 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li> <li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** 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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(a)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an inquiry into the reason for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that Stalin had long desired to launch an attack on the kulaks ('We could not have undertaken such an offensive against the kulaks some five years or three years ago')</li> <li>• Provides evidence that Stalin wanted to destroy the kulaks because he regarded them as class enemies ('to break their resistance, to eliminate them as a class')</li> <li>• Indicates that the Stalin could not attack the kulaks before 1929 because the Soviet Union relied on their grain production ('In 1927 the kulaks produced over 600 million poods of grain')</li> <li>• Claims that the collectivisation programme in the countryside had been a success ('in 1930 the gross grain output of the collective farms and state farms will amount to incomparably more than the kulaks supplied in 1927') and hence the kulaks were no longer needed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The following points could be made about the authorship or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stalin was making a speech to a Marxist audience who would be likely to support his attitude to the kulaks</li> <li>• The purpose of the source was to indicate that collectivisation was to enter a new phase of removing 'enemies' of the communist state</li> <li>• The propaganda nature of the source is evident from Stalin's claims about the success of collectivisation so far.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The richer peasants and any peasant who resisted Stalin's collectivisation programme were branded as kulaks and enemies of communism</li> <li>• The kulaks had prospered under the NEP and supported capitalist economic policies; Stalin was appealing to the many Bolsheviks who had been hostile to both the NEP and the 1917 Land Decrees that had permitted private land ownership</li> <li>• The collectivisation programme, which began in 1928, was an essential part of the securing sufficient food supplies to support industrialisation under the Five Year Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="395 239 1294 304">• Stalin wanted to be able to sell grain abroad to fund the purchase of machinery for industrialisation.</li></ul> Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(b)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The following points could be made the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trotsky had played a role in the government established in 1917 that had introduced reforms designed to revolutionise the role of women and is therefore not a disinterested witness</li> <li>• Trotsky was an opponent of Stalin's regime, and had been absent from the USSR since 1929, so it is not unexpected that he is critical of the direction of policy by 1936, which he claims 'is caused by the cultural bankruptcy of the state'</li> <li>• The book was written while Trotsky was in exile, allowing him to comment freely on Soviet policy without fear of censorship.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of resulted in a change in information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicates that the rights of women and their role in society were significantly improved by the Bolshevik government ('gave her all political and legal rights in equality with man, but, more importantly, did all that it could to secure her access to all forms of economic and cultural work')</li> <li>• Claims that the reforms in the 1920s had been successful in liberating women from family duties ('appreciated the advantages of the collective care of children as well as the socialisation of the whole family economy')</li> <li>• Indicated that the changes had had an impact across different groups of women ('working women and the more advanced peasants')</li> <li>• Claims that recent changes in policy reversed the progress made under Lenin ('the return of the workers' wives to their pots and pans that is, to the old slavery').</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laws introduced in 1917 granted new freedoms to women, for example social welfare laws that granted paid maternity leave; divorce law allowed either sex to terminate the marriage on ground of incompatibility</li> <li>• The role of the Zhenotodel in encouraging women into greater participation in economic and political life</li> <li>• The failure of policies in the 1920s to bring about the desired freedoms, for example shortage of funding prevented the establishment of crèches and public canteens to free women from household duties</li> <li>• 1936 Family Code introduced by Stalin restored traditional values, including making divorce harder and outlawing abortion.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether Stalin achieved absolute control over the Soviet Government in the years 1929-41.</p> <p>The evidence that Stalin achieved absolute control over the Soviet Government in the years 1929-41 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stalin emerged as leader in 1929 and proceeded to establish dominance over Party institutions in the next decade, for example control over the Politburo established during the 1930s</li> <li>• Power was focused in sub-groups set up outside the Politburo over which Stalin could exercise firm control, for example Stalin's practice of attending meetings and intimidating the members</li> <li>• Personal dictatorship developed and maintained through the use of terror to silence opposition including the show trials and the Great Terror</li> <li>• Evidence of support for Stalin's policies by the rank and file of the Communist Party.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence that Stalin did not have absolute control over the Soviet Government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In theory, the 1936 Constitution limited Stalin's control by enshrining the powers held by the Soviets</li> <li>• Challenges to Stalin's policy in the Politburo, for example Ryutin's criticisms of Stalin's policy in the Central Committee and the refusal of the Politburo to allow the execution of Ryutin in 1932; criticisms of the use of brutality</li> <li>• The popularity of Sergei Kirov in the 1934 Congress implied a challenge to Stalin's dominance. The 1934 Party Congress diluted Stalin's position of power as General Secretary by giving both Stalin and Kirov the title of Secretary of Equal Rank</li> <li>• Widespread Trotskyite influence in the army and the left opposition.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether dissidence was a problem for the Soviet state in the years 1965-82.</p> <p>The evidence that dissidence was a problem should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The power of Soviet ideology was weakened by criticism – the long-term impact of de-Stalinisation had meant it was no longer possible to suggest that everything done in the name of the party or state was beyond reproach</li> <li>• The Soviet government was concerned about the spread of dissidence, for example the arrest, trials and imprisonment of Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuri Daniel for anti-Soviet satirical writing in 1965-66</li> <li>• The establishment, as recommended by Andropov, Head of the KGB, of a new section committed to the struggle against 'ideological diversions' – the Fifth Directorate. The establishment of a register of all dissidents</li> <li>• Extreme measures taken against dissidence suggest the seriousness of the threat to the state – a network of psychiatric hospitals was established after 1969 to defend the 'Soviet Government and socialist order' from dissidents</li> <li>• Impact of dissidence on international relations – dissidents used the Helsinki Agreement, endorsed by the USSR in 1975, to demand greater freedom of expression, whilst evidence of ill treatment of dissidents in the Soviet Union led to international condemnation.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence that dissidence was not a problem should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dissidents did not, at any time, claim to be seeking the overthrow of the regime</li> <li>• Many people grumbled about everyday dissatisfactions but there was no evidence of widespread public political dissatisfaction</li> <li>• The regime was successful in presenting dissidents as troublemakers and, at worst, as unpatriotic traitors</li> <li>• By 1982 the regime had reduced the amount of dissident activity, the number of dissidents in prison had fallen and fewer of their publications were in circulation.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether resistance within the Communist Party was responsible for the failure of economic reform in the years 1982-91.</p> <p>The evidence that resistance within the Communist Party was responsible for the failure of economic reform in the years 1982-91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition from party organisations – Gosplan was resistant to reform, for example it told Andropov that economic experiments must proceed cautiously whilst Gorbachev’s plan for acceleration was submitted three times to Gosplan before it was approved</li> <li>• Opposition from within the party – Chernenko dropped Andropov’s anti-corruption programme to reassure the party that its privileges would not be eroded by reform</li> <li>• Vested interests within the ministries – bureaucratic obstructions to Gorbachev’s reforms, for example money was diverted into agriculture by powerful ministries with vested interests, rather than into machine building as Gorbachev had intended</li> <li>• Opposition by leading party members – failure of the Shatalin Plan in 1990, which was blocked by Gorbachev and Ryzhkov because it proposed decentralising economic power to the Republics and a rapid move to a market-based economy.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence that there were other reasons that explain the failure of economic reform should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reforms failed to tackle the deep-rooted problems in the economy, for example Andropov’s reforms focused on absenteeism by rounding up so-called ‘slackers’ rather than lack of resources, backward technology and corruption</li> <li>• Poor economic planning, for example Gorbachev was not an economist and his policies were a hotchpotch of initiatives that were not well thought through and were characterised by indecision</li> <li>• Nationalist tensions led to major disturbances, for example major coal miners’ strikes in 1989, 1990 and 1991, which impacted on production; devolving powers to the Republics led to the establishment of customs barriers between regions and prevented enterprises from getting vital raw materials</li> <li>• Economic reform was undermined by other priorities that prevented investment in reform, for example the cost of the Soviet Union’s foreign policy – cost of the war in Afghanistan, commitment to match US defence spending.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>