



AS History

7041/2N-Revolution and dictatorship: Russia, 1917–1953

Component 2N The Russian Revolution and the Rise of Stalin, 1917–1929

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.

Revolution and dictatorship: Russia, 1917–1953**Component 2N The Russian Revolution and the Rise of Stalin, 1917–1929****Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the disorder in Petrograd in February 1917?

[25 marks]

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- from the chief of the Petrograd Okhrana, a man privy (through legal and illegal channels of informers) to specific detail of events in the capital at the time of the disorder
- an official report which should have no reason to lie about the facts – although maybe an element of ‘excusing’ behaviour of Okhrana
- tone is direct, accusatory towards the crowds and defensive towards the behaviour of the authorities (reaffirming the one-sidedness of the author).

Content and argument

- Globachev argues that the crowd action has been spontaneous and provocative, with the crowds only dispersing in response to ‘live rounds’; this accords with the circumstances at the time when fears of bread-rationing coupled with angry workers suffering strikes and lock-outs produced apparently spontaneous rioting on the streets
- Globachev suggests that the soldiers were retaining order in adverse circumstances and that two bodies in soldiers’ uniforms, killed when demonstrators were fired on, were in fact only demonstrators dressed up; this ignores the fact that Nicholas’ order for troops to fire on the crowds (issued 26 February) provoked some soldiers to mutiny
- Globachev suggests that the soldiers tried to avoid firing into the crowds; this conflicts with other reports of high-handed behaviour by government forces, although corroborates the picture of confusion and uncoordinated action on both sides.

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

Provenance and tone

- Trotsky was a leading revolutionary, privy to details of the history of the Bolsheviks (even though he did not commit to Bolshevism until mid-1917) and an organiser of the October 1917 Bolshevik revolution; his writing is affected by his ideological commitment and he was not present to witness the events he describes
- Trotsky's 'History' was written at a time when he was under persecution by Stalin and reflects his loyalty to Lenin and the early idealism of his party
- his tone is authoritative, self-justificatory and dogmatic. He is mocking of alternative explanations – 'a petticoat rebellion' and sets out a 'definite' answer to explain the disorder in February 1917 with no qualifications.

Content and argument

- Trotsky argues that the February revolution was led by workers educated by the 'party of Lenin' and it was a true political 'revolution', i.e. not spontaneous; it is true that there were radical agitators who took advantage of the circumstances of February 1917 in Petrograd, but neither Trotsky nor Lenin were present and there is no evidence that Bolsheviks planned nor led the disorder
- Trotsky claims it was the 'peasants and workers' who created the revolution; there is certainly evidence of worker involvement, but little of peasants – and certainly not in the disorder in Petrograd at the time
- Trotsky suggests that those who speak of a 'a women's protest', backed by a later soldiers' mutiny speak falsely and only because they represent the middle class which was damaged by the revolution; the petticoat rebellion refers to the international women's day March (23 February) which first provoked the disorder and the soldiers' mutiny to events from 26 February and it would be wrong to dismiss them; furthermore, the middle classes were not immediately damaged by the revolution – lawyers dominated the subsequent Provisional Government and the Soviet
- reference to the failure of the proletariat to gain immediate advantage refers to the eventual Bolshevik takeover in October 1917; although Trotsky states this, he does not explain why leadership was 'inadequate' and so partially undermines his own argument.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might suggest that Globachev's first-hand account has greater value than Trotsky's second-hand reflection which was much coloured by his ideological commitments. On the other hand, Trotsky did attempt an overall appraisal as opposed to Globachev's more limited explanation of a single day's events. Reward any supported judgement.

Section B

02 'Red victory in the Civil War was due to the weaknesses of the Bolsheviks' opponents.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Red victory in the Civil War was due to the weaknesses of the Bolsheviks' opponents might include:

- the Whites were divided and included Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, moderate liberals and right-wing tsarists; these groups quarrelled among themselves; there was no unifying rallying cry; the execution of the Tsar, 1918 removed a potential focus of future government
- the White armies were scattered around the perimeters of Russia and suffered poor communications, scattered populations and limited industrial resources and armaments
- the Whites relied on foreign armies that proved unreliable – and mostly withdrew on the conclusion of war in 1918
- the Whites had different commanders and lacked a coordinated military strategy; e.g. other generals very suspicious of Kolchak and suffered internal corruption.

Arguments challenging the view that Red victory in the Civil War was due to the weaknesses of the Bolsheviks' opponents might include:

- Whites had the numerical advantage overall and foreign intervention brought additional supplies and weapons; they very nearly succeeded in the early stages of war (late 1918/early 1919)
- Reds benefited from commanding unified territory with considerable geographical advantages (e.g. armament factories, railways and population density)
- Reds had strong leadership from Lenin (war communism policies supported the armies) and Trotsky (as strategist and disciplinarian who improved army training and maintained discipline through war commissars)
- Reds had a single purpose (to preserve Bolshevik rule) and one which, on the whole, won support from peasants, fearful of losing their land and urban workers anxious to preserve revolutionary gains.

Victory in the Civil War is likely to be seen as a mixture of Red strengths and White weaknesses but reward any argument that makes a clear judgement and provides a convincing argument in support. Students should be able to refer to a range of factors on each side and the best answers will identify the interrelationship of these factors.

- 03** 'It was because his opponents significantly underestimated him that Stalin was able to win the power struggle in the years 1924 to 1929.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that it was because his opponents significantly underestimated him that Stalin was able to win the power struggle in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- Stalin's opponents felt secure because Stalin remained an unimpressive figure in the background (comrade card-index) with none of the extroversion of former revolutionary leaders nor the intellectualism of Trotsky
- Stalin's hidden manoeuvring to assume control of the party machine through his key positions in the Politburo, Orgburo and as General Secretary as 'the grey blur' was regarded as unimportant as Stalin appeared 'detached'
- Stalin was able to adopt the position of 'peacemaker' in the background to the struggles of 1924–1927, while Trotsky was seen as the danger and the left tore itself apart (Trotsky v Zinoviev and Kamenev); no one appreciated that he was quietly strengthening his own position as the focus was elsewhere
- Stalin was skilful and cunning in waiting until 1928 (when the left was weakened by splits) to turn against the NEP and attack the right-wing. By then he had supporters in all key positions and majorities on committees and at conferences.

Arguments challenging the view that it was because his opponents significantly underestimated him that Stalin was able to win the power struggle in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- Trotsky was responsible for his own downfall; he failed to fight or advance his cause, was too arrogant, dismissive of colleagues and not prepared to indulge in political intrigue and manoeuvring
- Stalin won because his policies were in tune with the majority of the Communist Party and the 'mood of the times'; he was loyal to the party and the man likely to cause the fewest splits
- Stalin won the power struggle because of his own qualities and calculations, irrespective of what opponents thought: he used Lenin's funeral to advance his own position; transferred the prestige of the Leninist legacy onto himself; built up his support and waited until the time was ripe to make his bid.

Students should be able to cite a number of ways in which Stalin's opponents underestimated him and evaluate the significance of their attitudes in relation to other factors which enabled Stalin to rise to power. Reward any well-developed argument that provides a substantiated judgement on significance and embraces a range of influences.