

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 2024

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2024 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, ie 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 Russia’s relationship with the West in the years 1920 to 1922?

[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

- this speech is by Lenin who, because of his authority at the head of government, provides the official Russian position on the issues mentioned making the source valuable. However, Lenin is aware that the speech will be published, so it seeks to reinforce the Communist view of the West and is therefore propagandist and one-sided, reducing its value.
- Lenin is speaking to a favourable audience of Soviet delegates with the aim of bolstering support for the work of Comintern at a time when some may have been harbouring private doubts about its viability as the war against Poland was not going to plan. This could reduce its value.
- Lenin speaks with enthusiasm for the Communist cause and is slightly mocking of the West where the capitalists 'do not know what to say'. It is an example of the value Lenin placed on rhetoric, which could as a result lessen its value.

Content and argument

- the comment that Comintern had been 'successful beyond all expectations' is misleading: the Bolsheviks may have been feeling more secure in 1920 – a reference to having turned the tide in the Civil War – but, in Europe, post-war Communist risings, eg in Germany, had been crushed. Hopes that revolution in Poland would begin the communist spread were rapidly fading, Bolshevik Russia was, in reality, protecting communism alone.
- the source confirms the ideological divide between Russia and the West: it is clear that Lenin despises the West and supports moves to undermine western democracy in his praise for Comintern. Lenin suggests that revolution is developing slowly in western Europe and clings to the Marxist theory that a proletarian revolution will eventually occur. This is valuable in revealing official Soviet policy towards the West.
- Lenin refers to the West as suggesting 'they might trade with us' although they refused to recognise Bolshevik Russia: the possibility of trading agreements with Britain and Germany was being explored at this time but the source reflects the mutual suspicion that still existed and the reluctance of the West to recognise Russia's Communist government.

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

Provenance and tone

- the author of these articles is Trotsky, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, who is second only to Lenin in authority within the party and well aware of the Russian position in the world, lending the source value
- it was written in 1922 by which time it was clear world revolution was not as close as had originally been hoped; Russia was feeling the effects of its isolation, particularly with regard to its economic needs, but Trotsky seems determined to put on a brave show and downplay concerns, which could undermine its value
- the tone is forceful and authoritative reflecting a good deal of confidence in the future of East-West relations – ‘necessity will eventually force a change in attitude’; the source is strongly anti-western and therefore represents only one-side of the picture with regard to Russia’s foreign relations.

Content and argument

- the Bolsheviks are indignant that Westerners should try to ‘dictate to us the form of government our country should adopt’: the source suggests the Russians are ready to make agreements, particularly with regard to trade, but the West assume they can dictate political matters in return; this shows the further misunderstanding between the two sides
- Trotsky speaks of the Genoa conference, 1922, which the West, with some reluctance, allowed the Russians to attend; here the two sides displayed differing attitudes – the Russians wanted to push for disarmament but the West was more concerned about their economic claims against Bolshevik Russia which had repudiated its foreign debts. Trotsky’s account of the diplomatic impasse at Genoa is therefore valuable.
- Trotsky writes that the Russians are happy to wait, however, on the side-lines of the Genoa conference they made the Treaty of Rapallo with Germany (April 1922) and in 1921 the Bolsheviks had negotiated the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement. Therefore, Trotsky’s claim that the West was resistant to trade relations is not wholly accurate or valuable.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students may argue that Source A provides the stronger statement about the isolation of Russia in the early 1920s and the mutual lack of understanding between it and the Western powers. Alternatively, they may consider Source B to contain the better explanation of Russia’s relationship with the West, perhaps suggesting that Source A relies too much on ideology and hopeful aspiration rather than assessing the reality of the situation. Although Source B also tries to vindicate a ‘superior’ Russian position, it could be suggested that it shows a greater awareness of practical issues both dividing and bringing the two sides together. Reward any effective comparison that reaches a well-supported judgement.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The revolution in Russia in February/March 1917 was more the result of economic problems than the failings of Tsar Nicholas II.'

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 the revolution in Russia in February/March 1917 was more the result of economic problems than the failings of Tsar Nicholas II might include:

- wartime dislocation meant disruption to normal trade and production; there was soaring inflation making money almost worthless; workers in Petrograd suffered crippling taxes and a 300% rise in the cost of living; living conditions deteriorated to the point where workers were struggling to survive and ready to rebel
- unemployment in industrial cities such as Petrograd soared as non-military factories were forced to close and dislocation to supplies disrupted production; this produced lock-outs and strikes which by Feb/March 1917 embraced over half Petrograd's workforce; a lockout at the Putilov ironworks occurring on the same day as the International Women's Day March brought chaos that turned into revolution
- workers suffered from limited food supplies and rationing; the acute hunger and famine meant rising death rates in Petrograd; in February/March 1917, the people of Petrograd were panic-stricken by fears of bread shortages; protestors from the bread queues were ready to join striking workers on the streets
- most Russians remained patriotic at heart; the Orthodox Church taught that the Tsar was the people's 'little Father' and could do no wrong; he was a distant figure to the desperate workers who believed he would help them; anger was more directed at employers, landlords and those who gave their Tsar 'false' advice.

Arguments challenging the view that the revolution in Russia in February/March 1917 was more the result of economic problems than the failings of Tsar Nicholas II might include:

- Tsar Nicholas II was ill-suited to his role: he had limited vision, trusted in his Divine Right and weakened his own government by failing to trust his ministers, encouraging overlapping government institutions and refusing to compromise his autocracy; this left revolution as the only path to change
- Tsar Nicholas II took Russia into a disastrous war where, as Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy, he was held responsible for failures; he distanced himself from developments in Petrograd where his wife remained the unpopular Tsarist figurehead; neither showed any comprehension of the deteriorating situation
- Tsar Nicholas II refused to listen to or compromise with progressives in the State Duma; he ignored Rodzianko's telegrams warning him of trouble and left it far too late to offer a power-sharing agreement with the Duma
- Tsar Nicholas II ordered troops to fire on civilians in Petrograd, so sparking the revolution; an army mutiny followed; the Army High Command had lost faith in the Tsar and refused to send troops to the capital; this enabled the revolution to take its course.

There is little doubt that both Tsar Nicholas II's failings and the huge economic strains of war contributed to the revolutionary situation in February/March 1917. Students are required to consider which was the more potent influence and the best answers will make a clear case supporting one or the other, whilst accepting the interaction between them. Reward any well-argued response that reaches a convincing and substantiated judgement.

0 3 'The main reason why Stalin made the 'Great Turn' was to win the power struggle.'

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 the main reason why Stalin made the ‘Great Turn’ was to win the power struggle might include:

- Stalin needed to prove himself as Lenin’s successor: by making the ‘Great Turn’, he was not only following the central planning established by Lenin, but also taking the revolution forward in a radical and significant step towards socialism; this would establish his leadership credentials
- the power struggle since Lenin’s death had been dominated by debates on future economic strategies: Stalin had ensured that Trotsky and other leftists, such as Zinoviev and Kamenev, were in no position to challenge him by encouraging the right wing (who favoured the NEP). Thereafter, Stalin had appeared to support the right-wing (Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky). However, Stalin adopted left-wing ideas in the ‘Great Turn’ to relinquish his reliance on the right and establish his independence as leader
- Stalin ultimately launched the ‘Great Turn’ to oust Bukharin, whom he portrayed as ‘too soft’; Stalin was aware that party dissatisfaction with the NEP had grown following food shortages in 1928, so he independently began a campaign to coerce the peasantry in Western Siberia – developing this into the ‘Great Turn’ – which left Bukharin isolated
- Stalin wanted to be seen as different from the other leadership contenders and capable of bold action; from 1924–27 he had largely waited on the side-lines, fomenting trouble whilst building up his own support base; by 1927/8 he was ready for action.

Arguments challenging the view that the main reason why Stalin made the ‘Great Turn’ was to win the power struggle might include:

- there was a desperate need to increase grain supplies: in 1927/8 there was a crisis in grain procurement because low grain prices had led to peasants hoarding grain; it was essential for the new state to remove dependence on an outmoded agricultural system which placed it at the mercy of the peasantry
- it was necessary to increase Soviet military strength and improve the USSR’s status as a world power: the war scare of the later 1920s (a time of poor relations with France, Poland and Britain) hastened the need to industrialise and modernise as quickly as possible; heavy industry needed a strong base to reduce the USSR’s dependence on foreign imports; USSR needed to achieve self-sufficiency
- the NEP was posing ideological problems and preventing a move to a fully socialist society: socialism depended on a highly industrialised society, but in 1928 only 20% of the population were workers; under the NEP, Nepmen and kulaks and the private market thrived
- low standards of living could be addressed by radical economic change; workers were suffering high unemployment, low wages and food shortages; industrialisation would create wealth, avoid awkward comparisons with the West and show that socialism could provide a superior lifestyle.

The given quotation accepts that there are multiple reasons for the ‘Great Turn’, but students are required to examine whether or not the power struggle was the most important of these. Students will therefore need to examine the ‘Great Turn’ from a variety of viewpoints and decide whether Stalin’s quest for sole leadership of the party outweighed other reasons or not. Reward any well-argued and well-supported response that provides a reasoned judgement either agreeing or disagreeing with the quotation.