



A-level History

7042/2N-Component 2N Revolution and dictatorship: Russia, 1917–1953
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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 Assessment Writer.

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

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, i.e. 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.

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

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying state terror in the USSR in the 1930s.

[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

- Nicolaevski was a Menshevik – and a disillusioned one since he had emigrated to USA, reports the views of Bukharin (a leading Communist but who was himself executed by Stalin, 1938) second-hand, although the two had held a private conversation in 1936
- the length of time between the conversation (at the time of the first major show trial, when Bukharin still felt secure) and the publication would suggest the words are unlikely to be an accurate recall
- the publication of the conversation in the West, suggests a desire to impart a particular view – one hostile to Stalin
- the tone is critical – Stalin’s ‘morbid mistrust’; ‘how naive were all these hopes’; ‘bitterness and hostility’ and the sources emphasises Stalin’s own hand in intensifying the terror in USSR.

Content and argument

- the overall argument contests that Kirov’s murder led to an escalation of mistrust by Stalin which led him to execute anyone considered a potential opponent or contender for power. This came about in the show trials of 1936–1938 and the execution of Trotsky, 1940
- further argument claims that the purges stemmed from Stalin’s realisation that the ‘Old Bolsheviks’ were hostile towards him. The purges saw the elimination of such Old Bolsheviks, e.g. Zinoviev and Kamenev, Bukharin and Rykov (although the source does not mention other victims in the army or Yezhov, Stalin’s head of secret police)
- the murder of Kirov (1934) is seen as a turning point but appears accepted as a real plot; there is no mention of the conspiracy theory that Stalin was himself implicated, which seems surprising
- the reference to the need to pander to Stalin – ‘the loyalty of the Party to its present leadership must be stressed as often as possible’ – gives a good insight into the workings of Stalinist rule, and can be corroborated by reference to propaganda and the cult of personality.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Nadezhda Mandelstam is bound to feel embittered, since her husband, the poet, Osip Mandelstam, was one of Stalin’s victims
- Osip had died in 1938 at the height of the purges and Nadezhda had first-hand experience of the time – although she wrote from the comparative safety of later years
- her decision to publish in 1970 suggests a desire to explain and re-evaluate attitudes in the 1930s

- the tone is despairing, tinged with bitterness and suggests a heartfelt appreciation of what it was like to live through the terror with an emphasis on the futility of human reasoning at such a time.

Content and argument

- the source argues that people tried to make sense of the Terror, although it was totally irrational; certainly the situation got out of hand as local officials tried to fulfil quotas of 'state enemies' and petty quarrels were played out by informers, leading to denunciations of the innocent
- it suggests that Akhmatova, another poet, became exasperated by the prevailing incomprehension; Anna Akhmatova was herself a famous poet who suffered persecution and she, like Nadezhda, is indicative of the more educated intellectuals who opposed Stalinist oppression
- the observed 'arrests for nothing' were threatening the stability of the state by 1938 and, whilst Stalin never admitted mistakes, the terror was reined in from 1939
- the source emphasises the futility of 'thinking'; the whole thrust of the Stalinist state was towards conformity and acceptance, as seen in education, propaganda and the values established in the community and workplace.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as US ambassador to the USSR, 1936–1938, Joseph E Davies, would have been well-placed to observe events and would have had contacts that should have enabled him to make a sound judgement; that he accepts arguments at face-value suggests how effectively Stalinist propaganda worked
- Davies' attendance at the show trial gave him first-hand opportunities to hear arguments; his own training, status and American origin might have been expected to make him a critical listener
- Davies writes to his daughter, presumably a private letter (although later published) so would be expected to be telling the truth
- his tone shows his interest, even excitement, at what is going on: the trial 'is terrific'. He is pleased to be able to make sense of events he formerly misunderstood (or so he believes) and he therefore writes with some relief. The emphasis is on excusing official Soviet behaviour.

Content and argument

- Davies' argument is that the exposure of a plot against the government, involving men 'at the top' excuses the trials and the anti-foreigner attitudes in the USSR; this was the story put about by the Stalinist government; the accused in 1938 were claimed to have been involved in a plot to kill Lenin in 1918 and reference to the previous spring and summer concern suggested conspiracies involving espionage, German agents, Trotskyists and the military which had led to the deaths of Marshal Tukachevsky, navy admirals, junior army officers, Radek and Sokolnikov
- reference to involvement with Germany and Japan refers to accusations that the accused were planning to partition the USSR and restore capitalism; Bukharin's opposition to Stalin in the power struggle had been largely based on attitudes to economic policy and the trial might be seen to be playing out this old rivalry
- Davies' reference to the 'extraordinary testimony of Bukharin' alludes to Bukharin's failure to defend himself and, apparently to accept crimes (which we now know he had not committed)
- the argument that the government should be excused for acting as they did shows how effective the Soviet government was in conveying its messages; torture and possibly drugs ensured compliant defendants in the trials but the case put forward must have been convincing to persuade a potential sceptical high-standing American.

Section B

02 'Trotsky's contribution to the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917 was greater than that of Lenin.'

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/factors suggesting that Trotsky's contribution to the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917 was greater than that of Lenin might include:

- Trotsky was unfailingly active: had more direct experience or leadership than Lenin, e.g. in the 1905 Soviet; was respected for intellect and commitment; dominated the All-Russian Congress of Soviets (June 1917), following return to Russia (May); so involved, was arrested in July Days; became Chairman of Petrograd Soviet (September) turning it into the instrument of the Bolsheviks
- expert strategist: won the loyalty of the capital's troops and created the 'Military Revolutionary Committee' (9 October) – necessary for the takeover
- maintained cause whilst Lenin in hiding in Finland; took Lenin's side against Kamenev and Zinoviev to stage Revolution
- was chief organiser of revolution: personally supervised the MRC; gathered troops at Smolny institute; sent commissars to win over other troops; seized key point of the capital
- Lenin only emerged to take charge on night of 25 October, after Trotsky's Red Guards had taken control.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Trotsky's contribution to the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917 was greater than that of Lenin might include:

- Lenin showed leadership: returned to Russia sooner than Trotsky (April 1917) and it was he who persuaded followers not to cooperate with Provisional Government and to pursue revolutionary path; won a mass following through his speeches and propaganda (e.g. April Theses)
- Lenin showed understanding: took careful steps and hostile to uncontrolled action, e.g. premature July days; preserved his authority by fleeing to Finland
- Lenin showed authority: maintained correspondence with Central Committee and provided direction; knew when time was ripe for Revolution (after Kornilov coup and Provisional Government breakdown); urged the Second revolution
- Lenin supplied drive: returned at personal risk to force Committee into action in October; less hesitant than Trotsky who initially wanted to wait for planned all-Russian Congress meeting; Lenin had a programme for the political takeover, essential for power beyond the actual military action led by Trotsky on 24/5 October.

Students are likely to suggest that both leaders played crucial and complementary roles. Which they choose to emphasise as the more important will depend on the relative weight given to organisational as opposed to inspirational factors. Reward any well-argued and convincing response which shows supported judgement.

- 03** How important were unity and organisation to the Red victory in the Civil War in the years 1918 to 1921? **[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/factors suggesting that unity and organisation were important to the Red victory in the Civil War in the years 1918 to 1921 might include:

- the Reds dominated unified territory, representing the most heavily-populated and industrially developed area of central Russia; the hub of the railway network, centred on Moscow, they had one (long) border area to defend; this contrasted with White physical disunity
- the Reds were united in fighting for the survival of Bolshevism; early decrees plus use of repression helped maintain unity of forces and loyalty of those living in the Bolshevik-dominated territory; this contrasted with the multiplicity of causes for which the Whites fought
- Trotsky supplied a unified command structure; he travelled by train around the front line; he used former tsarist officers and war commissars; troops were well-trained and imbued with Bolshevik propaganda; used Cheka and harsh measures to deter mutineers; this contrasted with the divergence and contradictory orders of White leaders who never trusted each other
- Lenin directed from the capital (moved to Moscow) and provided overall organisation, including the harnessing of the economy; this contrasted with the White's absence of a single leader and lack of political direction.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that unity and organisation were important to the Red victory in the Civil War in the years 1918 to 1921 might include:

- policies and promises were important to Red success – particularly among peasants who feared the loss of their newly-acquired land and ethnic minorities who were frightened by the White slogan of 'Russia, one and indivisible'
- the intervention of foreign forces helped the Reds more than the Whites: the foreigners made only a half-hearted contribution; they could be used as propaganda to suggest the Whites were in the pay of the West
- military success was dependent on the actual campaigning; the Reds were placed under a great deal of pressure; rather than unity, the Bolsheviks won through by ruthless measures – harsh discipline of troops including the death penalty; war communism to supply the army; more effective propaganda than the Whites.
- there was not always 'unity and organisation': Lenin and Trotsky disagreed over strategies; armies in the front lines acted on their own initiative.

Students are likely to argue that unity and organisation were highly important to the Red success. They should, however, be aware of other 'important' factors and the best may also analyse the interaction of factors. Leadership and support, for example, can be seen as examples of unity and organisation as well as factors in their own right. Reward any well-argued response showing differentiation between factors and a supported overall judgement.

- 04** To what extent was the destruction of the kulaks the most important outcome of Stalin's campaign of forced collectivisation? **[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/factors suggesting the destruction of the kulaks was the most important outcome of Stalin's campaign of forced collectivisation might include:

- the destruction of the kulaks removed the most successful, ambitious and generally hard-working element of the rural community; it deprived agriculture of those who had striven to modernise it and improve output
- destruction began the path of repression, showed the regime placed little value on human life; encouraged 'informing'; disrupted relations in countryside
- boosted gulags where ex-kulak labour used for industrialisation projects – building canals, roads, new industrial centres
- gave peasants a new equality; kulaks had benefited at the expense of others; poorer peasants benefited and their destruction (backed by a propaganda campaign) was popular in some areas harnessing peasant support.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the destruction of the kulaks was the most important outcome of Stalin's campaign of forced collectivisation might include:

- most important was that the main ideological purpose was achieved: collectivisation created socialism in the countryside; it ensured fairer distribution of wealth and permitted the emergence of the 'socialist man' in rural areas; the Party gained control of villages
- most important success was in providing resources needed for industrialisation: the state collected grain to feed workforce and export for industrial equipment; forced dispossessed peasants to move to towns to add to labour force
- the agricultural impact was key; 25-30% of farm animals were slaughtered in campaigns and agricultural production was severely disrupted; economic disaster in 1930s
- most important outcome was the famine of 1932–34; left permanent legacy of bitterness, e.g. in Ukraine (suffered millions of deaths) and turned areas against Stalinist system
- most important result was to condemn the agricultural system to a rigidity that meant growth only became possible through central control: it removed personal incentives (save private plots); created conditions of 'second serfdom'.

Students should be able to identify and evaluate a number of outcomes of the collectivisation campaigns, looking at a range of areas including, human, agricultural and ideological. Some may differentiate between the short and long-term outcomes. Reward any well-argued essay that provides a judgement on the 'most important outcome'.