



**General Certificate of Education
January 2012**

AS History 1041

HIS2L

Unit 2L

**The Impact of Stalin's Leadership
on the USSR, 1924–1941**

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and 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 and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b): AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2012

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2L: The Impact of Stalin's Leadership in the USSR, 1924–1941

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to Stalin's Terror in the 1930s. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1: Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4: Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

Indicative content

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

Students will need to identify differences between the views (not simple content) of the two sources, for example:

- **Source A** claims that Stalin is 'destroying the country'; **Source B**, on the other hand, claims that Stalin's policies coped with the tasks confronting the country
- **Source A** claims that the Revolution has been 'betrayed' by Stalin's terror; **Source B**, on the other hand, claims that Stalin has saved the Revolution, continuing the process of destroying internal enemies of the Revolution

-
- **Source A** equates Stalin and Stalinism with Fascism through his use of terror; **Source B**, on the other hand, claims that Stalin's Terror, by implication, is protecting the country against enemy forces such as fascism
 - **Source A** implies that terror is unnecessary and criminal; **Source B**, on the other hand, asserts that terror was necessary
 - **Source A** implies that the Terror was very much Stalin's own policy, designed to preserve his own power; **Source B**, on the other hand, insinuates that Stalin was not necessarily all-powerful and that there were internal political factions and divisions which might have accounted for the violence – although unlike **Source A**, **Source B** denies that it was a 'bloody time', downplaying the extent of the Terror
 - The language in **Source A** is much more colourful and dramatic than the more measured approach of **Source B**.

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

- the fact that Molotov was a leading Party figure during the Terror and a close associate of Stalin, and might be inclined therefore to defend the regime's record, despite his recollections being made long after 'Destalinisation' in the USSR
- students should be aware of the massive scale of the purges in the 1930s, the role of the NKVD in the process and the fact that all this happened in the context of a perceived threat from fascist Germany, whatever interpretations are made of Stalin's own role.

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

- Both sources agree that there was violence, suffering and terror
- Both sources agree that innocent people did suffer
- Both sources assert or imply that Stalin was a harsh, no-nonsense leader, although unlike **Source A**, **Source B** sees this as a virtue.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that the type of criticism of Stalin in **Source A** was relatively rare at the time, particularly in a public form, given that any hint of opposition to the regime was very dangerous and likely to end in prison or death. Equally, students will probably recognise that Molotov's arguments in **Source B** about the necessity for violence against enemies of socialism were the Party line at the time of the Terror, although to continue this justification was less common in later years when it was much more acceptable to criticise Stalin's own excesses.

Students may be aware of the historiographical debate about the true extent of the Terror and the exact role of Stalin in its implementation, and such material can be rewarded if used well, but it is **not essential** for this answer.

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

How important was the Terror in strengthening Stalin's leadership within the USSR in the years 1934 to 1941? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)***Levels Mark Scheme**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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

Either

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which support the focus of the question against others which do not.

Or

Students may make a judgement by balancing points looking at two different sides of the question's focus. This is particularly true of 'How important' questions.

Factors supporting the focus might include:

- several leading Party members were purged, and therefore any potential rivals were removed from the scene; and very importantly, Stalin's own control of the Party was strengthened
- there is no evidence of significant or organised opposition to Stalin after the death of Kirov, suggesting the success of Stalin's policy
- Soviet policies, e.g. economic policies in the 1930s, bore Stalin's stamp of approval and do not appear to have been significantly harmed by the Terror
- the development of Stalin's personality cult and reputation appeared to strengthen as time went on, and any possible reservations about Terror and the whole system of state repression do not appear to have been attached to Stalin personally.

Other factors might include:

- the achievements of the Five-Year Plans boosted Stalin's image
- Stalin's leadership was also strengthened by the massive propaganda campaigns glorifying all aspects of his life, policies and achievements

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** asserts that Stalin's use of Terror was very important not just in strengthening his position but was actually part of a 'coup' to preserve his power. Terror had been used to arrest millions of defenceless, innocent people with no evident motive other than a desire to impose a 'fascist' dictatorship. However, it also asserted that this strategy is only proving successful because the genuine working class is disorganised, whereas were it organised, it is capable of successfully resisting the Terror
- **Source B** asserts that the Terror was effective in strengthening Stalin's leadership. Indeed, Molotov insists that Stalin's measures were necessary to avoid the hesitation and lack of resolution shown by other leading figures, to ensure that 'good' was achieved (although it is not made clear what this is), and that the fascist menace was successfully dealt with. Even if there were 'mistakes', the Terror was necessary, and by implication Molotov is asserting that the strength of Stalin's leadership and the security of the USSR were synonymous
- **Source C** acknowledges that Stalin was a strong leader, and that this was bolstered by a personality cult. The achievements of other people were ignored, to boost Stalin's prestige. Stalin's leadership was not just due to his personal actions, but because other adventurists (not identified) used terror not just to strengthen Stalin's position but also to enforce their own agendas and repress other leading figures. The source does not actually clarify Stalin's own role in the Terror.

From own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that the Terror did strengthen Stalin's leadership might include:

- the lack of overt opposition to Stalin
- the Party was even more under Stalin's control than before
- the country appeared, at least on the surface, to be united behind the Party and Stalin.

Factors suggesting that the Terror did not strengthen Stalin's leadership might include:

- it could be argued that the impact of the Terror on groups such as army officers, peasants etc, weakened rather than strengthened the USSR in crucial areas such as defence capacity and economic efficiency – so that Soviet strengths demonstrated later during the war were in spite of, rather than because of, the Terror
- despite the savagery and scale of the purges, Stalin continued to appear insecure and exhibited signs of paranoia
- if Stalin's leadership is equated with the health of the USSR, the stifling of initiative, the fear of many people, the unwillingness of people to challenge what might appear to be major flaws in Stalinism, the atmosphere of fear and paranoia – none of these was helpful in driving the USSR forward to a better future as promised by the Party's propaganda.

Good answers may conclude that Terror was a significant factor in buttressing Stalin's leadership of the Party and the USSR as a whole, although how good that was for the Soviet economy, society and political health can certainly be debated.

Question 2

03 Explain why there was no agreed successor to Lenin in 1924. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

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

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why there was no agreed successor to Lenin after his death in 1924.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- there was no 'official' post of leader or agreed mechanism for appointing or electing a new 'leader'
- Lenin's Testament had criticised all the other prominent Bolsheviks and had not come down clearly on the side of one or another, nor had the Party made any preparations for a 'succession'
- Lenin's reputation had been so great, and his death such a shock, that there was no-one ready or willing to seize the reins
- all possible contenders for power – Stalin, Bukharin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev – had their own strengths and weaknesses, and none could be sure of garnering sufficient support on their own, whilst 'factionalism' had been banned in 1921.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might conclude that the reason there was no agreed successor was a combination of the fact that there were several important personalities among the Bolsheviks who were not likely to easily agree with the fact that there was no mechanism in place to make a leadership transition a smooth process.

Question 2

- 04** 'Stalin became leader of the USSR by 1929 because neither the Right nor the Left in the Communist Party had shown themselves capable of winning power.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

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

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that neither the Right nor the Left showed themselves capable of achieving power against others which do not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- the Left of the Party exhibited several weaknesses after 1924: the changing alliances involving Kamenev, Zinoviev and Trotsky opened them to the charges of inconsistency, opportunism and irresolution
- Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev exhibited a variety of personal weaknesses/flaws and had limited power bases which detracted from their attempts to build influence or win power
- some of the policies of the Left, such as Permanent Revolution, did not seem to many to be the best alternatives for the USSR to follow in the mid 1920s
- Bukharin was popular and admired as a theoretician, but he and the other Right leaders lacked a strong power base, their ideas on a more moderate path to socialism were not popular with many Communists, and they showed a certain naivety in allowing themselves to be used by Stalin in attacking the Left and then becoming isolated themselves.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- it is possible to argue that it was not so much the weaknesses of the Left and Right, but rather the skills and qualities of Stalin that enabled him to succeed in the power struggles of the 1920s to become leader of the USSR, for example his ability to pose as a centrist and moderate when it was opportune to do so
- Stalin had much more influence in the Party machine than other leading Party members
- it was not just the qualities, organisation etc. of particular factions that decided the power struggles, but other factors such as 'luck' played an important part: for example the fact that Lenin's Testament was not published after his death.

Good answers are likely to conclude that it was a combination of all the above factors that determined the result of the power struggle to become leader of the USSR. The struggle was partly about the personalities and ambitions of men on the Left, Centre and Right; it was also a genuine struggle of ideas, about which direction the USSR should take on the path to socialism; it was also bound to be some sort of 'struggle', because there was no set procedure or template for determining how issues of the succession should be resolved after Lenin's death.

Question 3

05 Explain why many peasants resisted the collectivisation of agriculture. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

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

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why many peasants resisted Collectivisation.

Students might include some of the following long-term factors:

- although many peasants had welcomed the opportunity to own land after the Revolution, they were not natural supporters of the Bolsheviks
- the Communists had limited influence in the countryside during NEP
- the peasants were very unhappy at Communist attempts to interfere in their lives, and reluctant to follow Communist dictates.

And some of the following short-term/immediate factors

- peasants were very unhappy at the heavy handed 'Urals-Siberian' requisitioning policy of the Soviet Government in 1928
- many peasants strongly resisted Collectivisation because it made them 'workers' instead of independent landowners or potential landowners; and took away their opportunity for

personal advancement. Kulaks were likely to be particularly hostile because they had most to lose

- peasants found the actual Collectivisation process brutal
- as well as taking away their land, Collectivisation threatened a complete change to peasant lives, with Soviet control of the countryside and of their everyday lives.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link the desire of many peasants to exploit the opportunities for economic success presented by NEP with the traditional peasant apathy or hostility to 'socialism' and what was seen as an urban-based, interfering political movement represented by the Communists. Students might also point out that some peasants, particularly the poorer ones, welcomed Collectivisation, either won over by propaganda or because they genuinely had less to lose.

Question 3

- 06** 'By 1941, collectivisation had greatly strengthened the USSR.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

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

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that Collectivisation strengthened the USSR by 1941, against others which suggest that it did not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- the regime achieved its aim of securing regular supplies of grain necessary to feed the growing industrial towns under the Five-Year Plans and to provide exports which helped to pay for imports of technology etc
- the regime achieved its aim (through Collectivisation) of securing political control of the countryside for the first time
- although the countryside was poor, there were some social benefits from Collectivisation such as the provision of schools and basic health services
- without Collectivisation, it might have been impossible to sustain the drive to industrialise the USSR and strengthen it to the extent that it could survive the 1941–1945 war.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- economically, Collectivisation might appear to have been a disaster for agriculture. Grain and livestock production dropped dramatically in the early 1930s. By 1941, after a recovery, agricultural production was still at similar levels to 1928
- the impact of mechanisation and the supposed advantages of large-scale production proved limited. Agriculture was still inefficient and one of the most backward parts of the economy
- millions of skilled farmers, including kulaks, were persecuted, imprisoned, killed, transported, or became unskilled industrial labourers, meaning a loss of agricultural enterprise and skill
- man-made disasters such as the Ukraine famine, killed millions, wasted resources, demoralised the peasants and weakened the economy and society.

Good answers may conclude that the arguments about Collectivisation depend partly on which perspective is adopted. Soviet commentators believed that Collectivisation ultimately strengthened the USSR by supporting industrialisation, unifying the country and strengthening Party control. Others would argue that the enormous human cost and the continuing weaknesses in the rural economy only weakened the USSR, when a different approach might have produced more positive results for everybody. Some students may be aware of ‘revisionist’ interpretations which challenge some often accepted views: e.g. the evidence that far from boosting the industrial economy, Collectivisation actually directed valuable resources into the countryside, e.g. in building tractors, without much return; whilst a depression in world grain prices reduced the return which the USSR received for its grain exports.

Converting marks into UMS marks

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

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion