

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 2020

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

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

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, 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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the significance of Lenin’s return to Russia in April 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 having 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

- the source conveys the words of Lenin, the formerly exiled Bolshevik. It directly reflects his own views and the message he wished to convey to his audience in April 1917 – a significant moment in the history of the revolution, after the overthrow of the Tsar and at a time when the Provisional Government/Dual authority was struggling
- the source is limited insofar as we do not know the audience's reaction to these words, but we may assume the words were chosen to appeal and we know that the sailors who specifically assembled to honour Lenin (Kronstadt was known to be revolutionary) were supportive of what he had to say
- the tone is inspiring, energising, and authoritative. It provoked supportive emotions (and own knowledge could be used to confirm this); its value is strengthened in the light of Lenin's consequent rise to become the most influential Bolshevik in the capital.

Content and argument

- Lenin suggests the Provisional Government has been deceiving the people and that its promises are hollow; this is the starting point for Lenin's argument that the PG must not be supported which became the crucial argument in April 1917 (this could be developed with reference to Lenin's ideological beliefs and his winning of the argument)
- Lenin refers to the main tenets of his policy in April 1917 – peace, bread and land; these become the key points of his subsequently published April Theses and helped win adherents to his viewpoint; own knowledge of these issues may be used to reinforce their relevance and their importance for Lenin's leadership
- Lenin speaks of the February revolution as a 'revolution accomplished by you' (which can be corroborated by reference to the people's rising); he sees this as opening a 'new era' (thus emphasising that the revolution was incomplete); he stresses the need to fight for the social revolution until the proletariat have won complete victory. (This is his main emphasis, making the source of value in understanding the significance of his return.)

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

Provenance and tone

- written by Kamenev, a prominent Bolshevik, this source provides a valuable view of the ‘old Bolsheviks’ who have been living and working in Petrograd prior to Lenin’s return; the publication of the article in Pravda is indicative of the fear of such Bolshevik leaders that Lenin’s return will alter the Bolsheviks’ course
- Kamenev writes as an intellectual equal who believes Lenin has misinterpreted Marxism; Kamenev believes Lenin misguided and indirectly chides him as a demagogue (propagandist) disrupting the policy path pursued by the Bolsheviks to that date; written in April 1917 it shows the intellectual ‘turmoil’ Lenin’s return has caused
- the tone is initially quite measured, but the final reference to ‘propagandists’ is suggestive of the rancour stirred up by Lenin’s views and the publication of his theses; the writer is keen to distance himself and his colleagues from opinions he profoundly disagrees with. It is a significant moment.

Content and argument

- the source reveals that Lenin published his theses in Pravda and thus deliberately stirred up a debate by opening the way for others to comment on them; this could be seen as an example of Lenin’s grasp of the situation in April 1917 (despite his exile); the Bolsheviks’ misguided support for the Dual authority and the growing demand for change within Russia
- the main argument in the source is that Lenin is wrong to assume the Marxist stage of bourgeois revolution has passed and that the country is ready to move on to the socialist revolution (this can be supported and challenged with reference to the outcome of the February revolution). Whether true or not, the value of the source lies in the debate and division in the leadership
- in suggesting Lenin is advocating the wrong tactics and acting as a demagogue, Kamenev is putting himself on the wrong side of the subsequent path to the Bolshevik take-over in October/November. The source’s value largely stems from showing how other leaders underestimated Lenin and perhaps misjudged the situation on his return.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source A has greater worth because it marks the significant moment when Lenin returned to Russia and put forward the arguments that he would use in subsequent months to establish his leadership of the Bolsheviks. However, Source B is also directly valuable in assessing the significance of Lenin’s return insofar as it helps put that return in context and makes it clear that his views were not shared by all Bolsheviks and that his leadership was not a foregone conclusion in April 1917. As always, reward any well-substantiated argument.

Section B

- 0 2** 'It was the weaknesses of their opponents that enabled the Bolsheviks to preserve and consolidate their power in Russia between the October/November 1917 revolution and March 1918.'

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 supporting the view that it was the weaknesses of their opponents that enabled the Bolsheviks to preserve and consolidate their power between the October/November 1917 and March 1918 revolution might include:

- the Provisional Government had been weakened by internal dissension and its traces easily removed; divided/isolated opponents, e.g. Moscow and provinces were defeated in piecemeal campaigns; Kerensky won very limited support for his attempted comeback – relying on Cossacks (with RW/tsarist links which deterred other potential Bolshevik opponents)
- lack of unity among left-wing radicals allowed the Bolsheviks to consolidate their hold on government; SRs harmed their own cause by walking out (alongside Mensheviks) at the outset and split when some left-wing SRs joined Sovnarkom in November; isolated left-wing SRs departed (rather than remaining to fight) the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk
- opponents had no co-ordinated tactics and walk-outs played into the hands of the Bolsheviks; the inability of moderates and radicals to work together was seen in the one-day Constituent Assembly, after which they had no forum in which to voice their views; moderates disagreed with both left and right
- there was no obvious alternative leader; tsarists had no viable alternative, with the Tsar under house-arrest; opponents tended to flee to non-Bolshevik areas to join opposition groups, but this kept them from the centre of power and led to disparate groupings and leaders.

Arguments challenging the view that it was the weaknesses of their opponents that enabled the Bolsheviks to preserve and consolidate their power between the October/November 1917 and March 1918 revolution might include:

- although there was some initial dissension – the Bolsheviks were united in ideology and believed the end justified the means; Sovnarkom was rapidly established and Bolshevik-dominated thus creating Bolshevik (rather than Soviet) rule (exerted through decrees)
- the Bolsheviks survived through repression: they had the support of soldiers desperate to end the war and without RW officers (who fled when armistice was signed) – so the Bolsheviks could rely on the army to enforce control; also set up Cheka, Dec 1917 which arrested opponents and could execute without trial; used censorship and closed opponents' newspapers down; dismissed Constituent Assembly
- the Bolsheviks won support: their policies were largely popular, e.g. decrees on peace (and subsequent Treaty of Brest-Litovsk), land, nationalities, workers' control; Bolsheviks offered stability: established an effective government organisation, with local control through soviets
- Lenin supported actions with ideological claims – need for strong party to drive dictatorship of proletariat and crush bourgeois attitudes; argued that his government represented a higher form of democracy and his policies would transform society; Lenin held the party together by force of personality – a force conveyed in propaganda.

Students should be able to comment on a number of weaknesses among the Bolsheviks' opposition but the best will also see that some of those weaknesses (such as inability to organise themselves and convey their views) were the result of Bolshevik policies and repression. Good essays will balance opponents' weaknesses against the Bolsheviks' strengths but greater awareness of the inter-linkage of factors could well single out the highest-level answers.

0 3 'Stalin's support for 'Socialism in One Country' was the main reason for his rise to power 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 supporting the view that Stalin’s support for ‘Socialism in One Country’ was the main reason for his rise to power in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- the ideological issue of ‘Socialism in One Country’ overshadowed all other debates during the leadership struggle; put forward by Stalin in 1924, it was at the core of the divisions of 1920s and fed the debate on the NEP; food supply problems and a poor harvest in 1927 enabled Stalin to push his policy (collectivisation and rapid industrialisation) and denounce opponents of his leadership as ‘factionalists’
- given the legacy of the First World War, the turmoil of Civil War and the failure of ‘world-wide’ revolution, ‘Socialism in One Country’ was an attractive prospect to those in the party who wanted stability; some feared the alternative which appeared to mean continuous revolutionary turmoil
- ‘Socialism in One Country’ provided a clear contrast to the Trotskyite theory of permanent revolution. This required followers to put the cause above the country; it required self-sacrifice and looked unachievable; the NEP had suggested Marxism could be compromised by circumstances, making ‘Socialism in One Country’ acceptable. Stalin’s approach was more pragmatic
- many feared that the socialist revolution they had supported would flounder unless Russia became a modern industrialised country; industrialisation was crucial for a socialist society – and that required reorganisation of agriculture; Stalin’s theory held better hopes for the future.

Arguments challenging the view that Stalin’s support for ‘Socialism in One Country’ was the main reason for his rise to power in the years 1924 to 1929 might include:

- it could be suggested that Stalin rose to power because of his own ambition, cunning and plotting; ‘Socialism in One Country’ was just a slogan, cynically used to advance his cause; he took advantage of the power vacuum left by Lenin’s death: indecision about types of leadership and Stalin grasped the opportunity left by the suppression of Lenin’s testament
- Stalin rose because of his strong position in the Party; he had been close to Lenin 1922–23 and was part of the triumvirate from 1923; also, General Secretary from April 1922 so had loyal supporters in key positions and could control the party bureaucracy
- Stalin benefited from the weaknesses of other contenders for power: Trotsky’s arrogance and connections to the Red Army as well as his poor tactics in opposing the triumvirate of Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev until 1924/5, then supporting Z and K in the Left Opposition; Kamenev, and Zinoviev suffered from their opposition to Lenin in 1917 and switch of alliances between Stalin and Trotsky; Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky held moderate views which led them to underrate Stalin (allying with Stalin to purge left-wingers in 1926 but finding their support for NEP went against them when the grain crisis struck in 1927)
- it could be argued that the power struggle was more about personalities and the problems of the NEP than ‘Socialism in One Country’; the left wanted to abandon it – the right to preserve it; Stalin was inconsistent – left-leaning to 1925, pro-NEP to 1928 and then back to an attack in 1928/9 in favour of rapid industrialisation and collectivisation; Stalin could be seen as having no political convictions – or as a moderate figure who held the party together during a time when disputes were exceedingly personal.

Students should provide a full assessment of the part played by the doctrine of ‘Socialism in One Country’ in Stalin’s rise to power but they will need to balance this against other important factors. Many will argue that it was Stalin’s personality rather than his ideological beliefs that took him to the top, although better students should see that the circumstances of Russia in the later 1920s played into his

hands. Reward any well-constructed and supported argument; those able to identify the inter-linkage of factors are likely to be the most impressive.