
A-LEVEL

History

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

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

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 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

June 2017

A-level

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 the Kronstadt Rising of 1921.

[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

- the source is valuable because it comes from the Kronstadt rebels and gives their insider view on the reasons for the rebellion, which includes discontent with the Bolshevik state
- the newspaper was valuable partly because it was one of the few anti-Government publications issued in Russia by 1921, since censorship was already widespread, so it was relatively rare to get a non-Government 'unofficial' view
- the publication was almost certainly aimed at the people of Petrograd, Russia and possibly even the international community. The authors may have been specifically targeting the Red Army conscripts sent against them. It is impossible to know how widely it was distributed or read
- the tone is a combination of desperation, defiance and idealism, because the authors knew how perilous their situation was. The emphasis is on exposing the lies and tyranny of the Communists, and their claim to represent the people of Russia and socialism.

Content and argument

- the source focuses a lot on Bolshevik 'tyranny', represented particularly by the Cheka, responsible for Red Terror against real or suspected enemies of the regime
- the source refers to workers' strikes and peasant dissatisfaction, increasingly evident during the hardships of the Civil War and the centralised Government, which severely restricted the influence of local soviets. There was some evidence of worker and peasant involvement in the crisis – and of dissatisfaction with State capitalism and War Communism
- the Kronstadt sailors were particularly upset because they had been key fighters for the Bolsheviks during the October 1917 Revolution and the Civil War, and felt that their contribution was not recognised. They had also been key participants in the Petrograd Soviet, now with little influence. In this source they are certainly not objective
- the source argues for a Third Revolution, because it seemed clear to the authors that the Second Revolution (October 1917), was not leading Russia to the promised land of Socialism, but dictatorship by a clique.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Source B is valuable because it cites who the rebels were, and what support they got. It also stresses the potential impact of the rebellion from Trotsky's standpoint
- Trotsky was a key figure in the crisis although he later claimed that despite a meeting with Kronstadt representatives, which led him to make the assertions in this source, he was absent elsewhere during the actual crisis of 1921
- Trotsky was continually trying to attack Stalin's regime during the 1930s but here his purpose was mostly to defend his own actions in 1921
- although in 1921 Trotsky publically took direct responsibility for the attack on Kronstadt, by the 1930s he was claiming that Zinoviev was heavily involved in the pre-attack negotiations, and that Dzerzhinsky's Cheka led the attack on Kronstadt. Was Trotsky trying to defend his reputation?
- the tone is clearly one of self-justification and an attempt to blacken the rebels – by emphasising their selfishness, lack of patriotism, and counter-revolutionary attitudes; and by implication linking them with hated enemies of the Bolshevik regime, such as the Whites.

Content and argument:

- Trotsky argues that the sailors involved in the rebellion were not those who fought for the 1917 Revolution and in the Civil War. This was partially true, but Trotsky typically mixed fact with fiction by claiming that the sailors, now manning Kronstadt, were politically illiterate and unpatriotic. Many of the sailors were very 'political' and were part of a much larger general unease about the regime's policies
- it is true that the country was 'starving' by 1921. But Trotsky is disingenuous by portraying the Kronstadters as selfish. Most of their demands were very political, such as genuine power for local soviets and opposing the centralised nature of the Bolshevik regime
- anti-Bolsheviks abroad applauded the stance of the rebels, but it is more difficult to substantiate the claim that 'Whites' and other hostile forces were actively involved in the rebellion, although this was a staple claim of the Bolsheviks. There were Mensheviks and SRs who certainly claimed involvement
- Trotsky's claims about the reactionary nature of the sailors and their base motives are Bolshevik propaganda of the type very common in 1918–1921
- the reality is, that there was a lot of tumult in Russia at this time, including in Petrograd. This was a result of Civil War, destitution and concern about the Bolshevik government and methods. Kronstadt was a very important event, since it is often claimed that it was the first example, and the last, of the regime openly facing and crushing an armed revolt by its own 'ordinary' people between 1918 and the end of the USSR.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis:

- Source C is valuable because it gives an insight into the cause of the Rebellion, the rebels' demands and the impact of the Rebellion
- Berkman was one of several anarchists who signed an appeal to the Government urging a peaceful settlement of the dispute. He acknowledged that the rebels had genuine grievances, although he also criticised the involvement of genuine counter-revolutionary elements in the rebels' ranks

- Berkman had initially welcomed the 1917 Revolution as a genuinely popular movement, but was now convinced that the Bolsheviks had destroyed social revolution and that a 'Third Revolution' was necessary
- the tone of the source is very anti-Bolshevik, echoing the claims of the rebels themselves about the evils of the Bolshevik dictatorship. However, it is also very optimistic, claiming that the Kronstadt affair had exposed the regime for the 'counter-revolutionary' dictatorship that it was, and that this would result in a new and genuinely popular revolution.

Content and argument

- Berkman's claim that the Kronstadt rebels wanted a peaceful settlement to their demands was credible, but their political, social and economic demands were extensive, so it was scarcely surprising that the regime was reluctant to come to terms, especially having endured 3 years of civil war
- Berkman's claim that all the rebels wanted was 'free elections to the soviets' makes them seem more moderate than they were, since their published demands were much more far-reaching than that
- the claim that the whole episode exposed the true character of the Bolshevik dictatorship is partly true, although the nature of the regime was already obvious from its previous hard line approach with its use of the Cheka and other repressive organs. Berkman's claim that the Bolshevik regime and the 1917 Revolution were mutually 'contradictory' was a common theme of all left-wing opponents of the Bolsheviks
- Berkman's optimism that the Kronstadt Rebellion 'sounded the death knell' of the Bolshevik regime is the least convincing part of his argument, since the regime was considerably strengthened after 1921. But Berkman could not know that the NEP and other measures would stabilise Russia. There were other active groups like the Workers' Opposition. However, Kronstadt was certainly the last such attempt at open rebellion for a long time in Soviet history.

Section B

- 02** To what extent was the First Five-Year Plan more successful than the New Economic Policy in improving Soviet industrial performance? **[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 to support the view that the First Five-Year Plan was more successful than the New Economic Policy in improving Soviet industrial performance might include:

- although there is a debate about the accuracy of the statistics, the Plan certainly saw big increases in several sectors of heavy industry. Under NEP, the subsidised and inefficient heavy industry generally produced disappointing results
- the Plan did ensure that resources were mostly directed towards key priorities such as the transport infrastructure, steel, coal and hydro-electric power. This had not been the case under NEP
- the First Five-Year Plan laid the foundations for advances under the following plans. NEP industry never came near laying the foundations for an industrial economy: by 1929 the USSR was still mainly an agrarian economy
- the Five-Year Plan produced more agricultural machinery than had been the case under NEP. Russia also benefited from more Western technology
- there were more industrial and skilled specialists, including women. The work force was better utilised because unemployment virtually disappeared.

Arguments to challenge the view that the First Five-Year Plan was more successful than the New Economic Policy in improving Soviet industrial performance might include:

- although heavy industry under NEP had not been efficient, the administration of the First Five-Year Plan was chaotic, and the targets were often not realistic. Resources did not get to the right places; there were mistakes and considerable waste. Not all targets, e.g. for chemical production, were met
- productivity of workers did not increase significantly and in some instances declined. In the 1930s, many workers were new, inexperienced and poorly trained. The increased industrial production was due to a massive increase in worker numbers, not due to increases in output per worker
- smaller, non-state controlled industries had done well under NEP, but were swept away by the Five-Year Plan. There was a decline in textile production. There were usually fewer consumer goods available in the early 1930s
- most industrial workers still worked in poor conditions, affecting productivity
- some historians think that the Five-Year Plan could have been handled much better than it was, and good results achieved with a slower pace and better organisation.

Students may argue that there were both successes and failures in industry under NEP, just as there were under the Five-Year Plan. But the Five-Year Plan was a much bigger project and based on very specific objectives, so a developed answer is likely to evaluate the Plan's success at least partly according to these, as well as comparing the raw results of NEP and Five-Year Plan industry.

03 ‘The USSR experienced a social revolution during Stalin’s regime in the 1930s.’

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 to support the view that the USSR experienced a social revolution during Stalin's regime in the 1930s might include:

- in the 1930s there was a renewed emphasis on the importance of family values, which had been derided in the 1920s. Due to concerns over a falling birth rate, family breakdowns and juvenile delinquency, there was a renewed emphasis on discipline. Abortion was banned (1936 Family Code) as part of 'The Great Retreat'
- the previous changes in education were overturned after 1931. There was a shortage of skilled workers and many schools were in a very poor state. Traditional subjects like history and practices such as school uniforms were reintroduced in the 1930s
- Stalin's social revolution aimed to create a new society, modelling people to be 'new' Soviet citizens – literate, progressive, socially aware and ideologically sound citizens, ready to be part of the new socialist world. This was done through propaganda and state-controlled organisations like the Komsomol. The regime tried various aspects of social engineering, for example trying to emancipate women in the Asian Republics where Islam was strong
- some elements which had already been present in the 1920s were reinforced or extended, e.g. religion and the influence of the Church were further undermined in the 1930s
- the regime claimed to be improving the status and lives of women in the 1930s – for example the proportion of women in higher education was greater than men by 1940.

Arguments challenging the view that the USSR experienced a social revolution during Stalin's regime in the 1930s might include:

- in the early days of Bolshevik Russia it could be argued that there was much stronger social revolution than later: artists and intellectuals had much more freedom to experiment at first; religion was strongly under attack from organisations like the Komsomol; women were granted full 'equality'; and there was an attack on the 'bourgeois' family and traditional education. The new 'Proletkult' operated alongside more traditional social norms
- Stalin actually reversed several of these trends – partly because of his personal views, and partly because the regime wanted a disciplined society in which everyone knew their place and lived and thought as the State wanted. Social freedoms were considered dangerous and 'unmarxist'. Experiments in education did not fit with the economic needs of the country for trained specialists
- the situation of women actually declined in the 1930s. The proportion of women in the Party fell. There was widespread discrimination against women at all levels. Laws against 'capitalist vices', like prostitution and homosexuality, were tightened up.

The population was cowed and conformity was everything. Although the USSR was a very different place in 1940 compared to 1920, it could be argued that in many respects, there was a greater social revolution in the 1920s than the later 1930s, with Stalin reversing or trying to reverse some of the social changes that had taken place before he came to power.

- 04** How far was Stalin’s creation of a Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe after the Second World War the result of his obsession with ensuring international security for the USSR? **[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 Stalin's creation of a Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe after the Second World War was the result of his obsession with ensuring international security for the USSR might include:

- because Russia had been invaded and almost destroyed twice in his lifetime (First World War and Second World War), Stalin was paranoid about the possibility of another attack. Thus he wanted friendly, Communist governments controlling those states bordering or otherwise close to Russia. The Soviets supported those Communist parties taking over Eastern European states and actively intervened when they thought it prudent. These regimes adopted Stalinist Soviet methods of administration and control and usually Stalinist policies also
- Stalin's policy towards Eastern Europe was also influenced by the fact that Russia was exhausted by war, did not have the nuclear weapons which the USA possessed and needed both security and bargaining power. Stalin was convinced that a new war was very likely
- Stalin's actions were heavily influenced by what he saw as anti-Russian moves by the West – the ending of Lend Lease, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Control over Eastern Europe was one way of responding to these threats
- it was particularly important for the Soviets to have a friendly ally or 'vassal' state in East Germany – the prospect of a united, non-Communist Germany emerging after 1945 was a frightening prospect for the USSR
- because the Soviets had suffered losses in liberating some of these countries, they felt they had a moral right to keep a leading role there. Also, the creation of a Soviet bloc became almost a self-fulfilling need: when Moscow took control of one state, the nature of the regime meant that it could not but see the country next to it as one of its security concerns also, and hence Moscow sought increased influence there.

Arguments challenging the view that Stalin's creation of a Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe after the Second World War was the result of his obsession with ensuring international security for the USSR might include:

- Stalin was concerned in 1945 to maintain his autocratic power and an economy which would underpin this. This was an important factor in his foreign policy, and was not just an 'obsession' but something that seemed entirely sensible in the 1945 context. Soviet foreign policy **was** Stalin's own policy, although it was not always consistent
- in 1945, when relations between the USSR and the West were still reasonably good, the fact that the USSR expected considerable influence in Eastern Europe was generally accepted on both sides, and not regarded as just a security issue or considered as Stalin being 'obsessive'
- the Russian economy had been enormously weakened by the War. Control over Eastern Europe gave the USSR the opportunity to coordinate the economic growth of the bloc (Comecon 1949) and influence those economies to operate for the benefit of the USSR, for example through trade agreements. The USSR took resources from East Germany. Economic control made it less likely that the Bloc countries would fall under any Western influence

- Stalin often indulged in wishful thinking and made mistakes, e.g. over Berlin and Korea – therefore it would be wrong to necessarily assume that the USSR had a consistently coherent and well-ordered approach towards the Eastern Bloc and European politics generally
- there is some evidence that apart from Germany, initially the USSR might have been content to see ‘people’s democracies’ in power in the states of Eastern Europe. However, as Cold War tensions quickly developed after 1945, the hardening of the Eastern bloc under Soviet control possibly became inevitable and any concessions became more unlikely.

Students may conclude that there were aspects of Stalin’s policies that were obsessive, in that he believed another conflict with the West was almost certain, and therefore he was bound to seek to strengthen the Soviet position in Europe. However, as with any Great Power, there were other concerns entirely natural, to do with restoring wartime damage and rebuilding economic strength – although it might be argued that all concerns were linked either directly or indirectly to security.