
A-level HISTORY 7042/2N

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

Mark scheme

June 2021

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 © 2021 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 Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP).

[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 an article by Lenin, this source offers insight into the view of the State's leader and NEP proponent; since Lenin had enormous personal authority (and could scarcely be challenged after the 1921 ban on factions) this might be considered an official stance
- it is significant that Lenin felt (in 1923 – just 2 years after its launch) the need to justify the NEP to the people of the USSR through Pravda (this may be linked to the context of the political and wider public controversy over its impact)
- it is intended as an ideological justification for the NEP's continuance, supporting the 'advance' which Lenin claims it has brought; it may be interpreted as propagandist, but there is little doubting Lenin's own sincerity
- its tone is quite laboured and the emphasis is on the place of the NEP in the 'path to socialism'; it is largely theoretical – hammering home the ideological points in an authoritative manner; Lenin shows himself satisfied by the workings of the NEP and assumes his reasoning will dispel disquiet.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that the result of the NEP has been to bring the USSR closer to socialism. The source suggests that the NEP was (by 1923) achieving what Lenin had intended it to do (in 1921) – providing a 'base' from which socialism could develop; the NEP was developing the economy which Lenin – following Marxist principles – saw as essential for the development of a socialist society
- Lenin had always suggested that the NEP was a temporary measure – it had roused controversy, particularly in the Party, by reintroducing private ownership and capitalist competition into the economy. The reference to 'debating' suggests that controversy had not gone away and there was still a need to counter those who felt the communist future had been jeopardised. However, he emphasises that the NEP 'is adjustable'. Links to alternative views on the NEP, eg those of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev might be used to challenge Lenin's source statements
- Lenin sees the NEP as 'an advance' and this can be corroborated by increases in industrial production (particularly coal, electricity, steel and cotton) and workers' wages, as well as a reduction in urban unemployment and the end of rationing, 1923; the advance may be challenged by reference to over-production in agriculture and the scissors crisis
- Lenin admits that the NEP is a compromise but believes (i) the right balance has been found between private interest and state supervision (the 'commanding heights' of the economy were still under State control); (ii) educating workers and teaching them to 'work together through the NEP' will produce results; this implies a viable policy, compatible with the path to socialism – so expected to continue into the future. This is open to challenge but valuable as an indication of Lenin's views (often misinterpreted in subsequent debates).

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

- as a journalist, Walter Duranty is likely to have been a keen observer; he was a man whose job it was to investigate and interpret what was going on around him; he offers valuable insights but his very literacy and personal opinions ('must have seemed') detract from the source's 'absolute' value
- Duranty was living in Moscow at the height of the NEP but seeing developments as an 'outsider' (American); he did not record his observations for publication until 12 years later, when the NEP had been abandoned, but this doesn't appear to have unduly influenced what he writes and it could be that his image of Moscow in 1923 had been a particularly striking/unforgettable one and his journalistic reports would have built a strong awareness
- Duranty's western audience was likely to be sympathetic to capitalist development and this could have encouraged exaggeration in favour of the NEP, as in 'new energy and growth'
- Duranty adopts a familiar tone – almost conversational in his desire to communicate his impressions (with the danger that the reader is too easily persuaded of his views). His emphasis is on the positive benefits brought by the NEP (which might accord with a pro-capitalist writer), although there are hints of criticism, as in 'too good to be true' and 'quick and easy profit'.

Content and argument

- Duranty's argument that the NEP brought positive benefits, securing 'national recovery and development' can be readily corroborated: industrial production recovered, money replaced ration cards and barter; kulaks produced surplus grain. However, the problems of 1923 when food prices fell below those of industrial goods and the limits to national development – particularly in comparison with other developed countries – would challenge this point
- Duranty's reference to traders and 'quick and easy profit' can be supported by detail on the Nepmen, who controlled c75% of trade and managed everything from food supplies to large-scale building in 1923
- the source's argument that the NEP was universally welcomed and brought 'flourishing years' could be challenged with reference to those who lost out (mostly at the bottom of the skills ladder) and the political impact which brought increased repression and control
- Duranty sees the changed situation of 1921–23 in purely economic terms. He makes no reference to the fact that the lack of food and clothes pre-1921 was, at least in part, a result of political instability and civil war, whereas post-1921, it was not only the NEP but the advent of stability, order and security which improved conditions.

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

- as a revolutionary Bolshevik, friend of Zinoviev (on the left of the party, ie more faithful to 'true' Marxism than Lenin) and a subsequent exile under Stalin, Victor Serge may be regarded as having an entrenched position. He is an ideological critic of the NEP whose account should be used with caution
- Serge was a party man and therefore familiar with the debate and political wrangling in 1923; he was also able to observe at first hand and knew people, such as Plyatsky who were at the heart of operations
- although a contemporary, by the time Serge wrote his reminiscences, he had essentially been proved right; Serge's account reflects well on his own foresight which begs the question as to whether he was writing for a wide audience to provide an honest picture of events or whether he was trying to justify his own position (to be revealed after his death); nevertheless, contextual knowledge may be used in support of his observations
- Serge's tone is opinionated, dramatic and extreme and his emphasis is on the negative impact of the NEP. He makes no attempt to provide a balanced view, talking of 'an immense and demoralising

blunder', 'the most corrupt kind of business imaginable' and 'a flock of vultures'. Plyatsky is described as a 'shabby little character' epitomising a very personal view of Nepmen.

Content and argument

- the main argument focuses on the corruption that came as a result of the NEP; there is plentiful reference to the activities of the Nepmen and further context may be used to support this, including the flaunting of new-made wealth in the cities where the rise in prostitution and gambling were further evidence of decadence; however, the degree of corruption could be challenged as over-stated and its importance exaggerated since private trade is what got the economy moving again
- Serge also refers to the political disillusionment and the demoralisation wrought by the NEP; this could be corroborated with reference to the 'old Bolsheviks' and the ethos of the revolution and civil war, but challenged as a major impact, by an awareness that for most Russians, ideology mattered less than food and jobs
- Serge acknowledges the NEP brought 'some impressive results' (which can be corroborated by evidence of industrial recovery, new trading links with the West and projects such as electrification) and that 'business livens up society' (which can be corroborated with reference to the spread of restaurants and shops and improvements in standards of living, particularly in the cities)
- evidence would suggest the NEP was not the 'unquestionable setback' that Serge makes it out to be – nor would analysis of Lenin's motives suggest it was 'one big confidence-trick'. Serge ignores the fact that transport and large-scale industry was still in state hands (ie it was a mixed economy, not an entirely private one).

Section B

- 0 2** 'From the revolution of October/November 1917 to the new constitution of July 1918, Lenin's only aim was to establish a one-party state.'

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 from the revolution of October/November 1917 to the new constitution of July 1918, Lenin's only aim was to establish a one-party state might include:

- Lenin forced the Bolshevik coup without waiting for endorsement by the Congress of Soviets; he persuaded Congress to accept an executive committee dominated by Bolsheviks; the walk-out by Mensheviks and right-wing SRs played into Lenin's hands; Lenin refused any compromise – hence left-wing SRs forced out, March 1918
- Lenin immediately set up an exclusively-Bolshevik Sovnarkom, using it to sideline the Petrograd Soviet and rule by decree; he ensured local Soviets were brought into a centralised Bolshevik power-structure
- Lenin showed his aim for Bolshevik dominance by seizing the machinery of government and infrastructure (used threats/arrests to take the State Bank; purge civil servants, give workers control of railways; force used to establish Bolshevik authority outside Petrograd, eg 10-day battle in Moscow; Bolshevik Red Army set up March 1918)
- determined to weaken/eliminate political opponents: anti-Bolshevik newspapers closed (Press Decree Oct 1917); Kadets, right-wing SRs and Mensheviks rounded up and imprisoned (Dec 1917); the Constituent Assembly forcibly closed down (Jan 1918)
- aim for Bolshevik one-party rule seen through sham constitution of 1918; Sovnarkom still chosen by the Bolshevik Party's central committee (although theoretically appointed by the All-Russian Congress); Sovnarkom retained executive authority (the Congress only met at intervals); by July 1918, using propaganda which argued he was fulfilling the 'dictatorship of the proletariat', Lenin had established one-party rule by the Bolshevik Party.

Arguments challenging the view that from the revolution of October/November 1917 to the new constitution of July 1918, Lenin's only aim was to establish a one-party state might include:

- Lenin's main aim was to act in the interests of the working class and carry through Marxist change – hence his first decrees on peace and land and subsequent spate of reforming legislation; he issued decrees to improve social welfare (eg 8-hour day, women's equality) and reduce the power of the Church (nationalisation of Church land)
- Lenin's aim was to strengthen Russia and develop the Russian economy – launching 'State Capitalism' in 1917 and War Communism from June 1918
- a major aim of Lenin was to bring peace – hence his insistence on continued negotiation, leading to peace at Brest-Litovsk (March 1918); Russia only became a one-party state by default since the left-wing SRs walked out on this
- Lenin did not set out to establish 'one-party' rule. He claimed the revolution had been endorsed by the Congress of Soviets (which voted in favour of his government); he allowed 7 left-wing SRs to join his government in November 1917; dissenting parties chose to walk out of their own accord in 1917 (as did the left-wing SRs in March 1918); he permitted elections for a Constituent Assembly (to him, the results suggested that the populace was insufficiently educated to understand what was best for them)
- Lenin worked to establish a democratic system which would oversee the transition to socialism – rather than a narrow one-party state. The July 1918 constitution placed supreme power in the hands of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, with deputies from elected Soviets across Russia. Workers and peasants had a vote; non-Russian nationalities were included.

Students may argue either way. Some will see all of Lenin's actions as over-shadowed by the need to establish one-party Bolshevik control. Such may suggest that the whole basis of the Bolshevik movement lay in a belief that the Bolsheviks knew better than anyone else as to what the people needed. Others will argue that Lenin had other priorities – peace or the economic regeneration of Russia, perhaps. Alternatively, some students may provide balance by arguing that the move towards single-party Bolshevik control was more coincidental than Lenin's overwhelming intention.

- 0 3** To what extent were the purges and terror of 1937–38 due to Stalin's determination to eliminate potential political rivals?

[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 the purges and terror of 1937–38 were due to Stalin's determination to eliminate potential political rivals might include:

- they were inspired by the 1934 murder of Kirov – a popular political figure, seen by Stalin as a potential rival and probably murdered by his agents; even if Stalin was not implicated, the murder fed Stalin's suspicion of rivals and potential plots
- those removed were men of authority who had challenged Stalin in the leadership struggle: Kamenev and Zinoviev plus Trotsky in absentia (1936); so-called 'Trotskyites', including Piatakov and Sokolnikov (1937) and Bukharin, Rykov (1938)
- any individual with a personal following, ambition and potential power was vulnerable, eg Yagoda, demoted 1936 and executed 1938; the downfall of Yezhov in 1938
- Stalin wanted to ensure that he was recognised as Lenin's sole heir by removing all the 'Old Bolsheviks' who worked with Lenin 1917–1924 ; since Stalin couldn't be sure who, individually, was an actual threat, he chose to remove them all
- the terror beyond the capital was designed to reinforce Stalin's authority and remove those who might support Stalin's political rivals.

Arguments challenging the view that the purges and terror of 1937–38 were due to Stalin's determination to eliminate potential political rivals might include:

- the purges and terror had begun before Kirov's murder and may be seen as part of the 'Communist system' as established by Lenin; it was not just political rivals who had to be eliminated but 'class enemies' and those who stood in the way of policy decisions; Stalin simply extended the policy (musicians, artists, scientists, writers and administrators and national minorities were all targeted)
- purges also affected the army; Tukhachevsky (1937) and deputy Commissars for Defence, members of Supreme Military Council and navy admirals; these were not political rivals although they may have been critical of foreign policy and/or been in contact with Nazis
- many ordinary and non-political individuals were subject to purges; c300 000 executed and 7 million to labour camps; purges were the result of local vendettas and zeal stimulated by quotas; terror and purges went beyond Stalin's intentions as local authorities took leadership of the movement; fear bred fear and the Terror became self-escalating
- the purges and terror were the product of Stalin's own personality; he was naturally brutal, vindictive, paranoid; revenge may have been a stronger motive than concern for the present or future; he possibly wanted to show his heroism – rescuing the people from 'a nest of vipers' and increasing his own cult status
- the purges and terror were economically motivated and designed to remove those resisting Stalin's schemes for economic transformation, particularly at a time of tensions between managers and Stakhanovites; gulags needed to be kept full for slave labour; terror was part of drive for modernisation and helped provide scapegoats for failures.

Although there is clearly much evidence to suggest that Stalin pursued the purges and terror in order to eliminate political rivals, good answers will appreciate that the development of the purges and terror owed much to other factors also. Reward any well-balanced argument which evaluates the key issue within the context of an argument about the causes of the purges and terror.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------|
| 0 | 4 | How successful were attempts to rebuild the Soviet economy in the years 1945 to 1953? | [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 attempts to rebuild the Soviet economy in the years 1945 to 1953 were successful might include:

- the 4th Five-Year plan set ambitious targets for the revival of industry, most of which were met or exceeded by 1950, eg huge increases 1945–50 in coal, iron, steel, cement, electricity, exceeding pre-war levels; this drive continued to 1953
- the Soviet economy received capital injections from war reparations; the wholesale removal of factories, machinery and rolling stock from occupied countries (particularly from the Soviet sector of East Germany) to USSR boosted heavy industry and, for example, car manufacture; also use of prisoners of war and gulag labour ensured increases in output
- the production of consumer goods (eg clothing, furniture, radios) was improved, relative to the scarcity of the war years, under the Five-Year Plan, bringing a rise in living standards, which in turn increased demand, so making the economy less reliant on exports
- there was some revival and improvement in agriculture, eg cotton growing increased, rationing ceased and collectives rebuilt after widespread devastation of the countryside
- overall statistics would support the view that the economy displayed rapid growth and there was considerable improvement on pre-war performance.

Arguments challenging the view that attempts to rebuild the Soviet economy in the years 1945 to 1953 were successful might include:

- there were few signs of revival in the 1945/46 years, because of USSR's extensively damaged infrastructure, its exhausted workforce and the dislocation caused by the ending of foreign aid through lend-lease; after this there were improvements but speed of revival produced bottlenecks (eg shortages of component parts) in the highly-centralised system
- the revival of the economy was hampered by excessive military expenditure which was made worse by onset of Cold War (18% total expenditure in 1950 – 25% by 1952)
- wartime damage had left an acute housing shortage that was not addressed; light industry and the food industry did not develop as significantly as heavy goods continued to be prioritised; some consumer goods remained scarce, eg phones, fridges and cars
- the agricultural revival was slow after the war (uncultivated land and livestock slaughter); this was made worse by rural labour shortages and lack of agricultural machinery; drought brought famine 1946–7 (possibly made worse by the export of grain abroad); Stalin was hostile to agricultural innovation and held on to out-dated theories, eg Lysenkoism; agriculture continued to take 2nd place to industry; Khrushchev's proposals for 'agrorods' were ignored
- while USSR's overall economic growth rates look impressive, growth was slower than in Western Europe and also imbalanced (in favour of industry) making it less self-sustaining.

Students should be able to analyse the degree of the USSR's economic success in the reconstruction of the post-war years, by balancing their knowledge and understanding of areas of impressive industrial growth against the economic limitations and important Soviet agricultural weaknesses. A well-balanced judgement on the extent of success will probably err on the side of caution, but any well-argued and supported view should be appropriately rewarded.