



A-level HISTORY 7042/2N

Component 2N Revolution and dictatorship: Russia, 1917–1953

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 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 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 from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

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.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

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 impact of the Great Patriotic War on the Soviet people.

[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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- taken from a book written by a former Red Army captain, this passage will be based on first-hand experience of life in the USSR during the war years. However, as the writer held a military post, he might be a less valuable authority on the civilian experience
- as the source is written by a defector, after his emigration from the USSR, (and the title of his book, 'I chose Freedom' is significant here) it is necessarily one-sided. This source has been written with the purpose of expressing and sharing the writer's own views, presumably to a sympathetic western audience, and therefore seeks to downplay Stalin's role in motivating the Soviet people
- the piece is strongly opinionated and expresses personal views ('I know from my own emotions'); it is limited on actual factual detail, however, it does go to some lengths to explain Russian attitudes logically
- the tone is dismissive of the Stalinist state – 'the Germans did a magnificent job for Stalin' but also conveys the passion of the Soviet people with their 'burning hatred' and intense patriotism.

Content and argument

- there is good picture here of conditions in the occupied zones, where German atrocities (including torture and rape) bred resentments that produced guerrilla resistance; reference could be made to the partisans who worked behind the lines and risked vicious reprisals in the interest of serving their Motherland
- the passage refers to refugees and escaped prisoners of war – further examples of the impact of the war on civilians and soldiers in the border/occupied regions; many lost their homes in the fighting and even those that didn't struggled for fuel and food; captured Soviet soldiers were abysmally treated and few returned home
- above all the passage gives weight to the view that the Germans might have been welcomed had their behaviour not proved worse than that of the Stalinist regime. Whether the swelling of patriotism and determination to defend their country arose out of the Soviet people's sheer hatred of the invaders, rather than Stalinist propaganda or 'the cult of Stalin', might be questioned and mention of the welcome given to the Germans in the Baltic States and parts of Ukraine could also be cited as a limitation of the source content.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- this source provides a detailed account of life in Leningrad during the wartime siege from one who experienced conditions at first hand. As a civilian and a nurse, the writer would have seen the devastating effects of the siege, and as an academic she is able to convey its horrors in a powerful and convincing manner without over-pandering to emotion
- the writer expresses herself in a private letter to her (educated) cousin after the war when her correspondence would no longer be censored and she could therefore be able to write honestly
- her 'audience' – Pasternak (the 1956 author of *Dr Zhivago*) is a writer, so it may be suggested that he was unsympathetic to Stalin and likely to be receptive to such tales of horror and duplicity; similarly, the writer herself is Jewish and clearly hostile to Stalin; what is reported, therefore, needs further referencing
- the tone of the extract is chilling and direct. The writer does not mince words but speaks of streets 'littered' with corpses, 'starving ghosts' and doorkeepers so immune to loss of life that they swept out the bodies 'like rubbish'. The writer is outspoken with an emphasis on the deceitfulness of the Stalinist authorities in the face of the suffering endured by the people.

Content and argument

- the source provides a vivid picture of Leningrad under siege (which took place between autumn 1941 and spring 1944) and, in particular, the high mortality rate of the ordinary citizens; deaths were largely the result of cold (no electricity and few means of heat) and hunger (coupled with no running water), as the German armies surrounded the city – save for the Lake Lagoda route used at night
- the source conveys how war hardened attitudes – the acceptance of death in the community is particularly striking; some may suggest that Soviet citizens had been inured to such hardship and death by their experience in the Terror of the 1930s, or they might criticise this somewhat callous view by pointing to the ways in which citizens helped one another – for example the human chains across Lake Lagoda
- the writer comments on how the authorities went to great lengths to keep the horrors of the siege secret by their censorship of letters, constraints on speech and misleading press articles; this may be explained by reference to Stalin's wartime propaganda machine with its emphasis on sacrifice for the greater good and Stalin's natural distaste for Leningrad (base of Kirov in the early 1930s); the similarity between the peoples' suffering in Leningrad and that elsewhere, eg during the battle for Stalingrad, might also be developed
- the writer suggests that the Stalin was as responsible as Hitler for what happened during the siege; it might be suggested that Stalin deliberately failed to provide resources to relieve Leningrad because he was happy for the city to be destroyed – rather in the same way that he failed to relieve Warsaw in 1944.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- these telegrams have been sent by Beria, the People's Commissar for Internal Affairs and chief of Soviet security (NKVD). Beria is at the top of the Stalinist regime – second only to Stalin himself and he is therefore privy to, and instrumental in, carrying through policies that are highly secretive; his evidence is particularly valuable as it is unique
- writing in 1944, it is significant that Beria is keen to report (by means of swift telegrams) his success in carrying out deportations of ethnic groups even as the end of war is in sight; this suggests some urgency in carrying through this policy before peace returns
- Beria communicates, in secret, with Stalin himself; the direction of the telegrams would imply Stalin's approval of Beria's actions and could also suggest that Stalin used the war as an excuse to carry out policies against non-Russian ethnic groups in the USSR
- Beria's tone is one of cold efficiency; the telegrams are mostly factual and precise, but he allows some comment, for example on the Crimean Tatars' 'treacherous activities', which leaves no doubt as to his political views. Phrases such as 'we consider it expedient to...' suggest a callous disregard for the lives of those affected.

Content and argument

- the telegrams refer to the 'resettlement' of peoples of non-Russian ethnicity; the Stalinist regime had long been suspicious of its non-Russian races and these peoples had suffered persecution in the 1930s, it was, perhaps, not unreasonable to suppose that they might collaborate with the Germans (for which there is some evidence, eg in Ukraine); the source makes reference to concern for the 'borderlands' although this Stalinist reaction may be deemed extreme and morally unjustifiable
- the telegrams reveal the wholesale deportation of peoples such as the Chechens, Ingush and the Crimean Tatars; they lived in formerly-occupied territory and had separate national identities – hence Beria's concern for the removal of their 'leaders and religious authorities'. However, many Tatars served in the Red Army during the Great Patriotic War, but such service was clearly ignored in a policy involving the entire Tatar population
- the telegrams speak of the need for special trains and suggest the scale of the movement of peoples from their homelands to central Asia; the detail is particularly striking given the economic costs of the war for the USSR; this is a picture of bureaucratised horror – Stalin must have regarded this policy as a high priority to have allocated men, money and resources to it at such a time
- these telegrams show how Stalin's own people suffered in war – not simply as a result of enemy action but through policies implemented by Stalin himself; excuses are found for the deportations in 'treacherous activities', but the way in which the deported are 'to be used' in agriculture, industry and transport smacks of callousness and punishment; it is also the case that many died on the long journeys, as a result of the brutality with which they were treated, or in the early days of their exile, when required to build their own homes; although this source deals only with the experience of some minority ethnic groups, it says much of Stalin's attitude towards his people in wartime.

Section B

- 0 2** How significant was Lenin's leadership in bringing about the October/November 1917 revolution in Russia?

[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 Lenin's leadership was significant in bringing about the October/November 1917 revolution in Russia might include:

- Lenin had led the Bolsheviks from 1903; he was respected for his intellect and retained his authority and prestige throughout his exile; he assumed practical leadership after his return in April 1917 and was responsible for the Bolshevik change in strategy, persuading followers not to cooperate with the Provisional Government
- Lenin was responsible for the Bolsheviks' huge increase in membership after April 1917; he spoke at party and factory meetings (in a cloth cap) creating a mass workers' party through his speeches and propaganda, eg his April Theses and by claiming the credit for peasants' land seizures and anti-war demonstrations
- Lenin planned carefully in the interests of success; he was hostile to uncontrolled action, eg the premature July days, after which he preserved his authority by fleeing to Finland
- Lenin maintained correspondence with Central Committee whilst in exile and provided direction; after the Kornilov coup and Provisional Government breakdown, he judged the right moment for action
- Lenin was the supreme force behind the Bolshevik action in October/November; he bombarded the Central Committee with letters from mid-September, returned on 10 October and was responsible for the resolution to seize power; he refused to wait for wider endorsement from a Constituent Assembly or the all-Russian Congress meeting; he took charge on the night of 25 October.

Arguments challenging the view that Lenin's leadership was significant in bringing about the October/November 1917 revolution in Russia might include:

- Lenin was primarily an intellectual and although a good speaker, he did not lead 'on the ground', commanding troops and had to work through the Central Committee
- Lenin was absent between early July and mid-October; it was others who kept the cause alive during these months; the task of organising workers was carried out by party workers and officials
- Trotsky had a significant role to play: respected for his experience in the 1905 Soviet, he returned to Russia in May and immediately provoked action – leading to his arrest in the July Days; he remained at the helm whilst Lenin was hiding in Finland, became Chairman of Petrograd Soviet in September, created the 'Military Revolutionary Committee' on 9 October; and was chief organiser of revolution seizing control with his Red Guards
- the revolution was about the power vacuum after the abdication of the Tsar in March, the failures of the Provisional government and, in particular, the pressures resulting from the continuation of war; Lenin did not create the deteriorating economic situation, the resentments of soldiers, peasants and workers and mass radicalism; the ingredients for (socialist) revolution were already present so Lenin's part was more in making the revolution Bolshevik and shaping what followed.
- Kerensky made some key mistakes, not least in appointing Kornilov as commander-in-chief, which led to the attempted Kornilov Coup and the release of Bolshevik prisoners, who were then hailed as the true defenders of the revolution. Kerensky's attempts to shut down Bolshevik newspapers and raise bridges in Petrograd also backfired and inflamed opposition towards the Provisional Government.

Lenin's role in the October/November 1917 revolution needs to be examined in context. Students are likely to emphasise Lenin's part in inspiring the masses and in securing the resolution to proceed with a second revolution. However, many will question Lenin's significance in the actual process of revolution, probably pointing to the leadership of Trotsky and the Military Revolutionary Committee. Better answers may question what constitutes 'leadership' and some may try to downplay Lenin's significance by looking at broader factors. Judgements are likely to depend on the relative weight given to the many reasons

behind the October/November revolution and any well-argued and effectively-supported response should be rewarded.

0 3 'In the years 1918 to 1924 Communist Russia was completely isolated in Europe.'

Assess the validity of 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 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 in the years 1918 to 1924 Communist Russia was completely isolated in Europe might include:

- the Communist revolution, the subsequent armistice of November 1917 leading to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in which Russia deserted its wartime allies and made peace with Germany, made Lenin's Russia an outcast in Europe
- the Communist belief in 'World Revolution', the Bolsheviks' brazen confiscation of foreigners' property and businesses and the cancellation of debt-repayments and the murder of the royal Romanov family added to Russia's isolation as European states regarded Russia with a mixture of ignorance (with respect to its ideology), fear and contempt; the division was both political and cultural and after failing to destroy Bolshevism in the Civil War, other nations preferred to remain aloof
- Communist Russia was not officially recognised in 1918/19 and was not represented at the 1919/20 peace conferences nor invited to join the League of Nations; this left it isolated in all diplomatic exchanges
- the Communist state failed to spread revolution and build its own communist allies: the hopes of the Comintern were dashed when uprisings, eg Spartacists in Germany and the Hungarian Republic, were crushed and Russia was defeated in the Russo-Polish War
- there was strong mutual suspicion; Lenin's Russia despised and feared the capitalist powers as much as they despised and feared Communist Russia; such suspicion, is exemplified in the 'Zinoviev letter' – a forgery produced to keep Labour out of power in Britain in 1924.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1918 to 1924 Communist Russia was completely isolated in Europe might include:

- as Europe became more settled in the 1920s, the threat from Communist coups faded and the NEP was developed in Russia from 1921, there was some attempt to rehabilitate Communist Russia in Europe, beginning with border states – the Baltic provinces established diplomatic relations, 1920 and Finland, 1921, following Treaty of Riga
- the Soviet Union needed to export to earn foreign currency and to import modern machinery, so Chicherin, (Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs) negotiated deals, eg 1921 trade treaty with Britain whereby Britain gave de facto recognition to the Soviet state (formalised, 1924, by the Labour government); Chicherin was invited to an international economic conference in Genoa, 1922 – a sign of involvement in Europe
- Russia was able to break her isolation by entering into a mutually beneficial deal with the other European 'outcast', Germany. The Treaty of Rapallo, April 1922, opened diplomatic and economic relations between the two countries
- Some Westerners – mainly socialists – visited Russia, eg British Trade Union delegations in 1920 and 1924 and the visits of Tom Mann, co-founder of the British Communist Party in 1920. There was contact between Communists from the USSR and from many other European countries through the Comintern.
- after the establishment of the USSR in December 1922, European powers gradually came to accept that they could gain more from mutual cooperation with the Communist state, particularly in terms of trade deals, than through hostility; by 1924, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, Austria, Hungary, and France had all formally recognised the country.

Although it can certainly be argued that Communist Russia was, because of its ideology, isolated in Europe in the years 1918 to 1924, students may take issue with the word 'completely'. If the advent of talks and trade deals, and particularly the signing of the Treaty of Rapallo, are taken into account, the

Communist state was much less isolated in 1924 than it had been when Lenin first came to power. Students do not need to include the cultural dimension, but this could also be used to suggest that Communist Russia was not entirely cut off from mainstream European developments. However, good answers will be aware that the USSR was still excluded from the League of Nations, and the collective security this was designed to uphold, and it might be suggested that, as long as this was the case, Communist Russia was as much isolated as ever.

0 4 How extensively did Stalinism change Soviet society and culture in the 1930s?

[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 Stalinism changed Soviet society and culture in the 1930s extensively might include:

- Stalinism brought more direct attacks on the Orthodox Church: religious schools were closed, teaching of creeds forbidden, worship restricted to registered congregations and many churches physically destroyed; the holy day of Sunday was abolished, publication of religious 'propaganda' criminalised, priests persecuted in the purges; also attacks on Muslims, Jews, Buddhists and members of the Armenian and Georgian Churches
- in the 'Great Retreat' Stalin turned away from Lenin's more liberal policies: 'the family' was emphasised, divorce and abortion made more difficult, women encouraged to leave work on marriage, a new family code rewarded large families; selection was restored in schools; teachers were pushed into becoming party activists; Komsomol became more significant for inculcating communist values
- there was an emphasis on the ideal socialist man and woman through propaganda; this included the development of the Stakhanovite movement, but society was also affected by the harsh working/living conditions brought about by the drive to industrialisation; the way of life of the peasants was changed by the control of the collective farms
- there was more active control of all aspects of life through state organisations; reporting on workers and communities was encouraged; there were purges of those from 'bourgeois' backgrounds; many lived in fear during the Terror
- there was a greater drive towards 'proletarian culture': and the avant-garde was damned; socialist realism was extolled; writers, artists etc were controlled through unions; the Stalinist cult of personality dominated; many were silenced, eg Pasternak, and Shostakovich who suffered for his opera, 'Lady Macbeth of Minsk'.

Arguments challenging the view that Stalinism changed Soviet society and culture in the 1930s extensively might include:

- many of the developments driven by Stalinism in the 1930s were already present in the 1920s, eg hostility towards the Churches, the disregard for life in the greater interests of the Marxist state, censorship and the purge of the bourgeois
- Lenin had established the Cheka and employed the 'Red Terror' to control the people and destroy both real and potential enemies; this continued under the NKVD the only difference being the intensity of the purges
- Stalinism never became as all-embracing as the leader would have wished: not all young people joined Komsomol and still fewer were involved in activism; Stalinism did not destroy religious belief and observance; women continued to work in factories and farms; divorce rates remained high; few workers qualified as Stakhanovites
- despite the decrees, attempts to impose new cultural values were limited; Hollywood movies were the most popular in cinemas and much preferred to Soviet propaganda films; Stalinism had a limited affect on high cultural figures like Shostakovich.

Stalinism certainly affected Soviet society and culture in the 1930s as attempts to control every aspect of life reached new extremes. Different groups were affected in different ways and while some thrived others suffered. Whilst students may argue that the changes of the 1930s were largely foreshadowed by earlier developments (although in the case of women and education, there was some reversion to more traditional practices), most will point to the greater intensity of Stalinist control in the 1930s, which affected both private and working lives. Not all the aspects of society and culture mentioned here are

necessary for a strong answer, but a convincing response will be well-supported and reach a clear conclusion on the extent of change.