



A-level
HISTORY
7042/2N

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

196A7042/2N/MS

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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

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 life in the USSR in the immediate post-war years. **[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

- Anatolii Zhigulin is a valuable witness, living through the post-war years in his late teens, observant and sufficiently affected by the conditions around him to recall them years later
- writing in 1988 after time spent in a gulag, Zhigulin is far from impartial; may be affected by bitterness and need for self-justification – yet sufficiently marked by his experiences to want to tell his tale
- wrote his life in the form of a novel, which could weaken the accuracy of the factual content; detail is liable to be exaggerated – yet much can be corroborated by other evidence
- aggrieved and bitter; shows disappointment, disgust and despair; helps with an appreciation of the atmosphere of the time.

Content and argument

- source vividly describes the post-war hunger and suffering of Soviet people – which can be supported by detail of the devastation of war and post-war problems such as: undermanned collectives, loss of livestock, poor harvest (1945), nationwide drought (1946), continuation of rationing, weakened industry – although this source is weakened in that it focuses on one area only
- source emphasises the authorities' endeavour to maintain 'tolerable appearances' – which can be backed by detail on the propaganda campaigns to portray a strong USSR to the West and, internally, to incentivise the people – particularly in rural districts
- source expresses disgust at reading of the 'happy life' of Soviet People in newspapers; this may be linked to the tight control exercised over the press and the importance of 'happy people' to socialism; socialist realism was strong post-war and tried to portray Soviet contentment
- source reveals the limitations of propaganda -; the writer regards what he reads in the press as lies; shows that there were those who desperately sought improvements and that post-war USSR was breeding ground for later dissidents.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- from the Communist Information Bureau – this is an official document and so is a valuable representation of Party thinking – or what the Party wanted the Soviet people to think
- written in 1949 on the occasion of Stalin's 70th birthday, it provides valuable evidence of the Stalinist cult, as deliberately crafted in the post-war years
- the document was published in the press and intended to reach a wide audience; it is an opportunity for propaganda delivering messages to workers and peasants; even the title 'For a People's democracy' shows the ideal of socialist society
- the tone is adulatory with repeated reference to 'Comrade Stalin'; it abounds in clichés – a reminder of the sterility of Soviet propaganda, which reduces its value in relation to the reality of life for most Soviet citizens

Content and argument

- the reference to the celebration of Stalin's 70th birthday could be supported by further detail of the 'over-the-top' adulation he received in the press, writings and on billboards; the Moscow celebrations – with its light display; value could be linked to understanding the cult of Stalin and the importance of personality in government
- the reference to the Party, Soviets and trade unions, workers in science, art and literature, and innovators in industry and agriculture on Stalin's birthday committee usefully encapsulates the key personnel of the Stalinist state; these institutions/areas of life were part of the political whole; those employed in both science and the arts were regarded as 'workers'; technical innovators were particularly applauded
- the slogan – to honour Stalin 'with new output achievements' demonstrates the direction the government wanted people to follow; heavy goods were still being targeted in the 4th Five Year Plan; as before the war, there was continued emphasis on industrial growth and exceeding targets and much was achieved in rebuilding heavy industry though not in agriculture and consumer production
- reference to 'the boundless gratitude and love' felt by the population for Stalin again shows the importance of propaganda; it could be supported by the outpouring of grief on Stalin's death, but also contradicted by examples of opposition, e.g. from writers, some within the army and among political dissidents.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Yevgeny Yevtushenko lived through the post-war Stalinist era and details his first-hand experience in this autobiography
- his later political activism is likely to have coloured his reminiscences which were not written until 1963 – 10 years after Stalin's death. Nevertheless, memories were recent enough to be recalled
- the book was written for a public audience – particularly for westerners following its Parisian publication – and with an educative purpose in mind (to reveal a situation that was little known about, thanks to the censorship in post-war USSR)
- the source is damning of the effects of post-war regime on the Arts – with elements of satire and humour adding punch, but with a serious message coming through at the end; it is strongly critical of the government's cultural controls from a person directly affected by these.

Content and argument

- the source gives a vivid picture of ‘socialist realism’ – glorifying the worker in an anodyne way; further examples could be cited in support of its pervasive influence post-war, e.g. plays, art, poetry; useful picture of operation of the Zhdanovschina – which could be backed by further examples, e.g. of purges of academic scholars, censorship of literary journals, campaigns against bourgeois and western influence
- the source’s reference to people as ‘little cogwheels of communism’ could be exemplified with reference to the treatment of individuals with the revival of terror, strengthening of NKVD and enforced conformity to socialist ideals in the workplace and home
- the reference to the hopes raised by wartime poets might be supported by detail of the positive collective endeavour of the war years, the contact with the West and the less isolated atmosphere; the dashing of such hopes can be seen in measures to prevent western ‘ideological contamination’, e.g. imprisonment of returned prisoners of war
- the source argues that Stalin corrupted the human spirit, alleging that this was a greater crime than his arrests and shootings. There is plenty of evidence to corroborate the continuance of post-war terror – Beria’s expansion of the gulags; arrests for counter-revolutionary activities; further purges; the effect on the spirit is harder to quantify but could be seen in the limited and banal cultural output of these years; it could be argued that the spirit was never crushed, as evidenced by this source.

Section B

- 02** How significant were the actions of the army in the revolution of February/March 1917? **[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.

Please note: Dates given here are from the Old Russian/Julian Calendar; dating from the Gregorian calendar must also be accepted. By this, 23 Feb = 8 March).

Arguments/factors suggesting that the actions of the army were significant in the revolution of February/March 1917 might include:

- soldiers fired on the crowds (26 Feb) – as a result of Nicholas' orders; the firing was highly significant – turned (food) riots into a revolution
- mutiny (27 Feb) of the Petrograd garrison (esp. attitude of NCOs) significant as prevented the Tsar regaining authority; decision of soldiers (particularly Volynskii regiment/reserve troops) to join the crowds provided the rioters with weapons; tipped the scales in favour of 'the people' and provoked political change, i.e. the Duma set up the 'Provisional Committee' and the revolutionaries, a Soviet, on the same day; the Soviet 'Order No 1' (1 March) – charter of soldiers' rights, emphasised significance of military
- Mutinying soldiers prevented the Tsar's train from reaching Petrograd and he eventually signed his abdication decree in the train carriage in Pskov.
- crucial role played by the Army High Command, disenchanted with Nicholas II; when Nicholas tried to return to the capital (28 Feb) and his train was stopped, generals renounced his authority (probably hoped for a new Tsar/constitutional monarchy); directly provoked the Tsar's abdication (2 March).

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the actions of the army were significant in the revolution of February/March 1917 might include:

- the military did not create the revolution – merely hastened it on its way; the risings in Petrograd were spontaneous and provoked by economic conditions at a time of war, particularly high unemployment and threats of bread rationing
- long-term build up of resentment against Nicholas II contributed to the outbreak of revolution. This could be traced back to 1905, through his disastrous wartime leadership, the influence of Rasputin over the royal family and his total unwillingness to share political decision-making with any democratic bodies.
- the opposition of the Duma representatives, e.g. Rodzianko and the Progressive Bloc, (kept from government by Nicholas II) was of at least equal significance to that of the army commanders.. Senior members of the Duma - Shulgín and Guchkov - were in the train carriage when Nicholas abdicated. The Provisional Committee of the Duma offered a viable alternative government.
- the actions of the army were of limited significance if it is accepted that the origins of the revolution were long-term and the structural and institutional weaknesses of the autocracy were such as to make it highly unlikely that the autocracy would survive the war anyway; mutinies may have been a catalyst but revolution was carried through by the political leaders backed by the support of the masses.

Students should focus on the key word 'significant' and consider and evaluate the 'actions of the army'. More generalist answers which refer to the wartime disillusionment of the army as a factor in revolution should receive appropriate credit, but the best responses will show strong links to the February/March revolution. Whilst they should be rewarded for any well-substantiated argument, a good answer needs to be more than a general recital of the causes of revolution.

- 03** 'Ideology was of little importance to Stalin in his determination to win the power struggle in the years 1924 to 1929.'

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 ideology was of little importance to Stalin in his determination to win the power struggle in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- Stalin largely kept out of debate on NEP (he remained in the 'golden middle') – thus allowing the left and right wings of the Party to tear themselves apart over ideology. Initially supportive of the NEP, he later changed his mind – suggesting the ideological issue was of little importance to him
- only manipulated ideology and used it to exploit a 'nationalistic' message, e.g. 'Socialism in one Country'. This was a flexible policy which could initially accommodate NEP and then be used to oppose it. Stalin used the policy to oppose Trotsky's 'Permanent Revolution' by suggesting Trotsky had a lack of faith in the Russian people to uphold their own revolution. Therefore, it was a cynical ploy to defeat his main rival rather than an ideological commitment.
- Stalin was more interested in power than ideology. He had a long-term plan to gain power which he pursued ruthlessly and skilfully from before Lenin's death. Kept as close as he could to Lenin during his illness; obtained position as General Secretary; played on fears of Trotsky as a military leader; used his position to amass loyal followers at a time of expanding bureaucracy; outmanoeuvred and marginalised rivals; used ban on factionalism.
- Could be argued that part of Stalin's determination was to strengthen the economy of the USSR. Hence his initial support for the NEP and then his decision to switch to the Five Year Plan and collectivisation when he judged it in the best interests of the Soviet economy.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that ideology was of little importance to Stalin in his determination to win the power struggle in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- ideological issues were of major importance through the 1920s; path to industrialisation was a key issue for establishment of socialism; leadership struggle hinged on arguments over the NEP – Stalin had ultimately to 'take sides' in order to win
- Stalin put forward an ideological programme at the beginning – 'Socialism in one country' - which proved a more popular ideological position than 'Permanent Revolution';
- Stalin had genuine convictions: he wanted to build socialism and saw the need for stability (hence Socialism in One Country); he always emphasised his closeness to Leninist thought and worked hard to master theories of Marxist-Leninism and used them in debate.
- the decision to abandon the NEP in 1927/28 can easily be portrayed as an ideological one. The NEP was only ever meant to be a 'temporary deviation', therefore the launching of the Five Year Plan and collectivisation represented a significant ideological shift towards a more socialist economy.

It would be hard to dismiss entirely the importance of ideology in the power struggle and there should be a reasonable discussion of the part it played. A good student might even point out the difficulty of distinguishing between rhetoric and genuine belief. However, the question is really about priorities and how far ideology was subjugated to other motives such as power and ambition. Look for answers which consider a range of factors and see the links between them. Good answers should provide a well-substantiated judgement on the importance of ideology in relation to other factors.

- 04** ‘Stalin’s foreign policy, in the years 1929 to 1939, was driven solely by the need to protect Soviet borders.’

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 Stalin’s foreign policy, in the years 1929 to 1939, was driven solely by the need to protect Soviet borders, might include:

- Stalin was concerned for the security of Soviet borders in the face of the rise of Nazism/Hitler; abandoned his hard-line approach to the capitalist west in early 1930s – diplomatic relations established with USA, 1933, joined League of Nations, 1934. Sought protection from attack in collective security
- protected USSR’s integrity with alliances in early 1930s, e.g. non-aggression pact with Poland (1932 and 1934); with France, 1932; Franco-Soviet Pact of Mutual Assistance, 1935; pact with Czechoslovakia, 1935
- real worries for security of borders by 1938 – needed protection from both Germany and Japan: [futility of League; Japanese expansion in China; the German/Japanese anti-Comintern Pact of 1936 (with Italy 1937); worries, given British/French appeasement and snub over Munich Conference]; so – Nazi-Soviet Pact, August 1939, was a defensive measure
- pact with Germany not only protected USSR from invasion, it also allowed breathing space to strengthen border defences and build armies to repel invasion.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Stalin’s foreign policy, in the years 1929 to 1939, was driven solely by the need to protect Soviet borders, might include:

- foreign policy, 1929–33, was quite aggressive; Stalin used the Comintern to attack ‘social-fascists’ elsewhere; tried to control external communists and sent soviet agents overseas; confident in position – not acting defensively to protect borders
- co-operation with Germany, 1929–32, was more about developing trade than protecting borders (re-affirmed agreements made at Rapallo (1922) and Berlin (1926) in 1931)
- joining League of Nations, 1934, suggested an outward-looking power, willing to work with other nations – Britain, France and USA, with whom diplomatic relations were established, 1933. Such policies were not primarily concerned with getting support/security for Soviet borders
- supporting Republicans in Spain – far from USSR – suggests security of USSR’s own borders was less important than ideology; intervention (antagonising Britain and France and causing instability) could even be seen as detrimental to the security of Soviet borders
- Nazi-Soviet Pact could be seen as ‘giving in’ to the country that most threatened Soviet borders; could be interpreted as an alliance driven by desperation or greed (for parts of Poland).

Although it is probably easier to agree with, rather than challenge, the importance of border protection – students should take issue with the word, ‘solely’. Most will identify some other factors, but the best will show the linkage between them. Some better responses may even show an awareness that ‘protecting Soviet borders’ also meant upholding Communist ideology as a means of preserving the integrity of the USSR. If that argument was adopted, most aspects of foreign policy could be interpreted as fulfilling a similar vision. Reward any balanced response, reserving the highest marks for those who offer well-substantiated judgement.