

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2T The Crisis of Communism: The USSR and the Soviet Empire,
1953–2000

Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version: 1.0

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

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2T The Crisis of Communism: The USSR and the Soviet Empire, 1953–2000

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the Polish revolution, 1980-1982. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |
| | 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 respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- This is a record of a meeting between the chief protagonists in the crisis of 1980; it is a word for word account of what happened.
- The date indicates that this meeting took place at the start of the crisis in the summer of 1980 when there were many strikes and shipyard workers in Gdansk had occupied the Lenin shipyard.

Content and argument

- The workers and government are in the process of negotiating.
- Walesa is at pains to point out that the cause of the strikers is just and that the workers can rule themselves in an orderly manner.
- The government representative says that he wants to resolve the demands of the workers.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone of both men is calm and measured.
- There is politeness on both sides.
- The emphasis is on resolving the crisis and ending the strike.

Source B: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- This is a private letter so we can expect it to accurately reflect Brezhnev's views.
- It is written by the Soviet leader himself, so gives a clear indication of Soviet policy towards Poland.
- It is written in November 1980 before repression of Solidarity has taken place.

Content and argument

- Brezhnev sees Solidarity as 'counter-revolution'.
- He is putting pressure on the Polish government to stop the revolution.
- He is concerned that the economic situation in Poland is making the situation worse and plans to help out with loans and goods.
- He worried about the revolution spreading.

Tone and Emphasis

- As a private letter, it is informal in its tone.
- It is also vehement in its condemnation of the events in Poland with 'counter-revolution', 'seized the party by the throat', 'catastrophe'.
- There is also a feeling of panic that events could spiral out of control; 'close to catastrophe', 'threatens to inflict enormous damage'.

Source C: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- This is a public announcement to Americans by Reagan. As an 'Address to the Nation', it would have been given a high profile in the USA as being an important statement.
- As it comes from the President, it indicates the American position on events in Poland and represents Reagan making a forceful stand against Poland, but this is also against the Soviets as part of Cold War politics.
- The date is 1982 and so is at a later date than the previous sources showing that events have now turned against the Polish workers. This is also the height of the Second Cold War when Reagan is taking a strong stand against the Soviets.

Content and argument

- Reagan states the fact that Solidarity has now been declared illegal
- he points out that this is of concern to the whole world
- he states that belonging to a trade union is a basic human right which has been violated by the Polish authorities
- he says that America will take action

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone is dramatic as he wants to condemn Poland (and thereby the Soviet Union) and also get public support for US actions.
- He stresses America's support for freedoms and human rights (free world, elemental human rights, free trade union) and contrasts these against the repression of the Soviet bloc using words such as 'military dictatorship', 'illegal', 'brutally imposed', 'repression'.

Section B

- | | | |
|----------|----------|--|
| 0 | 2 | 'Despite his apparent readiness to negotiate with the USA, Khrushchev was never committed to a policy of peaceful co-existence.' |
|----------|----------|--|

[25 marks]

Assess the validity of this statement.

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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Khrushchev was not committed to a policy of ‘peaceful co-existence’, might include:

- Khrushchev’s determination to keep competing in the space/arms race
- the nature of anti US propaganda that continued
- Khrushchev’s need for a foreign policy victory over the USA and his attempts to intimidate the USA particularly over Berlin, with ultimatums to the West to leave
- his aggressive rhetoric towards the USA, particularly seen at the Vienna summit when he tried to bully Kennedy over Berlin
- Khrushchev’s actions over Cuba; placing missiles in Cuba when he knew that this could not be tolerated by the USA.

Arguments challenging the view that Khrushchev was not committed to a policy of ‘peaceful co-existence’, might include:

- Geneva Summit; various proposals and agreements
- agreement to the Austrian State Treaty
- visit of Khrushchev to the USA and Camp David.

Good answers may conclude that ‘peaceful co-existence’ certainly helped lead to a reduction of tension initially in Cold War relations, but that was hard to achieve while suspicions and distrust remained on both sides. However, Khrushchev’s character and his actions over Berlin and Cuba were key to its ultimate failure.

0 3 'Although his regime was threatened by many different groups within the USSR, Brezhnev managed to deal with all opposition effectively.'

Assess the validity of this statement.

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Brezhnev’s regime was successful in dealing with opposition, might include:

- the KGB could be seen as successful in harassment of dissidents and using a range of threats/actions that could end up with dissidents in labour camps or psychiatric wards
- prominent dissidents were put into prison or sent into exile
- the regime was generally successful in presenting dissidents as troublemakers so this prevented wider support from the population developing for dissidents
- the amount of dissident activity had decreased by 1982 and there were fewer dissidents in prison
- potential opposition among nationalities was dealt with by Russification and putting more investment into less developed Republics. At other times, concessions were given to keep down unrest.

Arguments challenging the view that Brezhnev’s regime was successful in dealing with opposition, might include:

- under Brezhnev, there was much more evidence of dissident activity compared to previous years covering a wide range of issues; creative freedoms, the nationalities, human rights, religious toleration and workers’ rights
- there was much more communication between dissidents and writers using *samizdat* or *tamizdat*
- the Helsinki Accords gave a platform for dissident groups to be set up
- the prominence of some dissidents such as Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn, along with the signing of Basket 3 of the Helsinki agreement meant that the USSR also faced international condemnation for treatment of dissidents
- Nationalist unrest was not dealt with and would become an explosive issue in later years.

Students may conclude that although dissidence was a bigger threat for the Soviet authorities under Brezhnev than previously, its importance can be overstated and it was dealt with effectively enough to prevent it from weakening the regime.

0 4	How significant was Dubcek in the escalation of the crisis in Czechoslovakia in 1968?	[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement.	21-25
L4:	Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated.	16-20
L3:	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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist.	11-15
L2:	The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist.	6-10
L1:	The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment.	1-5
	Nothing worthy of credit.	0

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Dubcek's actions were significant for creating the crisis of 1968, might include:

- Dubcek wanted a wholesale reform of the country, he had a plan for a fully democratic socialist state
- although he made it clear that economic reforms should be in line with market socialism and that the alliance with the USSR would continue, his reforms allowed political tension to rise to the surface, particularly as he got rid of censorship
- his reforms encouraged more criticisms and calls for radical reforms
- the power and influence of the Communist Party was threatened as a result of the above factors. Alternative political organisations developed and there was a call for political parties to be allowed which was not acceptable to the USSR
- Dubcek made contact with the West regarding joining the IMF, viewed with suspicion by the USSR
- Dubcek miscalculated on how far he thought reform could go before the USSR intervened.

Arguments challenging the view that Dubcek's actions were significant for creating the crisis of 1968, might include:

- from 1962, Czechoslovakia had entered a period of economic crisis due to the introduction of 'market socialism'
- the break-down in Sino-Soviet relations had also severely disrupted trade with China and the USSR was unable to provide support as it faced economic problems of its own
- some reforms had taken place in education and censorship had been relaxed, but there was growing frustration at failure to introduce more reforms
- Czechoslovakia had a large body of intellectuals and students who were pushing for more reforms
- student demonstrations were already taking place before 1968
- there were growing tensions between the Czechs and the Slovaks before 1968 contributing to the sense of crisis.

Good students may conclude that Dubcek played a role in sparking the crisis of the Prague Spring; however it could be argued that he was only responding (sometimes unwillingly) to popular pressure and the economic crisis that already existed.