

AS

# History

Paper 2N Revolution and Dictatorship: Russia and the Soviet Union  
1917–1929  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 2N Revolution and Dictatorship: Russia and the Soviet Union, 1917–1929

#### Section A

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining about Lenin and his impact on Russia? | <b>[25 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*Target: AO2*

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

#### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will provide a range of relevant of 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 judgments will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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. Judgments will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be partial. There may be <b>either</b> some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question <b>or</b> some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The answer will <b>either</b> describe source content <b>or</b> 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.                                      | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

## 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 is from an obituary of Lenin published soon after his death in the prestigious English newspaper The Times.
- The Times was an independent newspaper but was generally regarded in this period as representing an 'official view' of events, since it was widely read by members of the Government and people in the British Establishment, as well as many ordinary people. It was also regarded as a reputable source of information and opinion in many other parts of the world.
- The tone is forthright and generally very critical of Lenin and the Communist regime, citing several events which have occurred since the 1917 Revolution. The language is strong and condemnatory.
- It almost grudgingly acknowledges some strengths in Lenin's personality, but basically denigrates him in his appearance and, more importantly, for his actions as leader of Russia.

### Content and argument

- The obituary acknowledges a certain strength of character in Lenin, the fact that he was very strong-willed and ambitious, although even this is qualified by the word 'inflexible', which could be taken as a criticism.
- The source asserts that Lenin uses people as a means to whatever end he wants, almost fooling people in the process since his appearance gives them the confidence that he is really on their side.
- The source implies that Lenin was a dictator, since the leading Communist institutions were entirely under his control.
- The source contends that his rule was disastrous, briefly referring to events such as the humiliating peace of Brest-Litovsk, the radical economic and social policies and the Red Terror.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- Lenin's dealings with his colleagues both before and after the Revolution, in deciding courses of action for the Bolsheviks, often at very critical moments
- Lenin's role in the key events mentioned, such as peace with Germany and the persecution of real and imagined opponents. There is no mention of other key events such as the introduction of NEP which might be used to show a more pragmatic, flexible side to Lenin
- the accuracy of the claims about Lenin's method of governing, particularly the implication that he completely dominated even his colleagues in the Party and government.

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

#### **Provenance and tone**

- The source is from Stalin. Stalin was one of Lenin's prominent colleagues at the time of Lenin's death. It was a public speech made at a very significant event in Moscow, Lenin's funeral. Russia had been shaken by news of the leader's death, even though he had been very ill for some time.
- Stalin was not widely known by ordinary people in Russia, but he was already a crucial figure in the Party and government. He had been Lenin's close confidante during Lenin's final illness, controlling access to Lenin. Stalin was also General Secretary of the Party, running the Party machine and he held a number of government positions.
- Stalin used this event partly to help establish his own credentials as a possible leader in Russia. But in the section of the speech here, he is striking the tone of what would have been expected in Russia, unapologetically eulogising the dead leader who was seen as the man responsible for bringing the Bolsheviks to power and ensuring the regime's survival in difficult times after 1917. The tone therefore is wholly complimentary, celebratory and theatrical, whilst being at the same time being sombre, given the occasion.

#### **Content and argument**

- Stalin focuses purely on what are seen as some of Lenin's great achievements. Lenin constructed the Bolshevik Party in his own image, and created the first socialist state in the world.
- The focus of this extract is on Lenin's achievement in giving hope to ordinary oppressed working people everywhere. Lenin not only helped the masses in Russia, but has given hope that peoples throughout the world can expect deliverance.
- The whole emphasis is on Lenin as the man of action, who has only the interests of ordinary people at heart. And Stalin is implying the internationalist aspect of Communism, the Bolsheviks expected their revolution to spread to other parts of the world.

---

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- Lenin's death came at a difficult time in Russia. Although the Civil War had been won and NEP was beginning to have some positive impact on the economy, Russia was not a strong nation. It was fearful of renewed foreign intervention from hostile powers. People were worried about what would happen without their trusted leader
- Stalin's own position was awkward. Lenin had called in his Testament for Stalin to be removed from power. This might yet happen. Stalin was therefore already looking to establish his own credentials as a close ally of Lenin and a man who would continue Lenin's policies and uphold his ideals.
- the beginning already of a 'Lenin cult' and an attempt to emphasise the international aspect of Communism; this was not just an event in Russia.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that neither is objective. The Times reflects the British Government's strong suspicion of the Communist regime. Many in the West were concerned that Russia would try to foment revolutions overseas and undermine 'capitalist' powers like Britain. There was also still resentment at Russia making peace with Germany in 1918, as well as horror at the bloodshed in Russia since 1917. On the surface Source B is an unambiguous eulogy at a state funeral, no ordinary funeral. Stalin is praising Lenin's regime. Also there is a hidden agenda at work. Lenin's colleagues were already manoeuvring for the succession. Stalin was seeking to establish his own credentials. Both sources are very subjective, so it is difficult to say that one is more valuable: they both give information, but the content and tone about Lenin are different. The sources only agree on the fact that Lenin was determined, ambitious, iron-willed and had a great impact on Russia and the world. Therefore any supported argument as to the relative value of the sources should be rewarded.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'The fall of the Provisional Government in October 1917 was entirely due to its own failings.'

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 Provisional Government was responsible for its own fall might include:**

- there were divisions within the Government, particularly between socialists and liberals, which tended to result in a lack of clear policies and arguments preventing decisive action
- some of its policies did not endear the Government to many Russians, e.g. the delay to the promised land reform and the delay in calling a constituent assembly
- by refusing to grant any form of autonomy to the Nationalities in the former Russian empire, the Government alienated possible support outside Russian borders
- it could be argued that Kerensky made serious errors, e.g. launching a new offensive in the summer; not handling the Kornilov affair judicially
- the Government underestimated the Bolsheviks. Kerensky's actions against the Bolsheviks in October actually pushed them into revolution
- there were other Government decisions which might be classified as errors: e.g. allowing revolutionary activists back into Russia after the February Revolution.

**Arguments challenging the view that the Provisional Government was responsible for its own fall might include:**

- it was not the Government's fault that initially it was not elected and lacked inherent authority
- the war had been so disastrous, especially militarily and economically, that any government would have found its situation very difficult. Even had different economic policies been tried, there could be no short-term solution
- the war posed a difficult problem. If the Government had tried to extricate Russia from the war, that would have been problematical. However, continuing the war also meant continued difficulties
- the Government found it difficult to satisfy all its initial supporters, especially as positions changed and hardened
- relations with the Soviets were difficult from the start
- Lenin offered the decisive leadership and clear policies which were lacking in other parties and political groupings
- the Bolsheviks were increasing their support
- the Bolsheviks had leaders who were willing and able to take advantage of the increasing power vacuum in Russia.

In summary, students may suggest that the fall of the Provisional Government was a combination of several interlinked factors: Government errors, factors difficult for them to control, and the strengths and sometimes luck, of their opponents. There was no single reason. It is possible to make a well-argued case that the Government certainly made errors of judgement, but that it also faced problems in 1917 that would have daunted any other government, just as Lenin's Government faced major problems after the successful Bolshevik coup in October.



**0 3** 'Political motives were the most important factor in the decision to abandon the New Economic Policy.'

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 political views were paramount in the decision to abandon NEP might include:**

- many Communists had been very dubious about the NEP from its inception. They had tolerated it in 1921 because it had been introduced by Lenin, but after 1924 there was more vocal opposition. Lenin had first regarded NEP as an emergency measure to save the economy and the regime, but later had put forward the idea that it could be a legitimate half way house between capitalism and socialism. Not all Communists were convinced by this
- Communist objections were very political and ideologically driven. The NEP was seen as a compromise with capitalism, above all because it allowed private enterprise, both in industry and agriculture. NEP was a money, profit-driven economy at odds with socialist principles
- all Communists believed that Socialism could only be established when the state controlled all means of production and distribution. This was even more of a political standpoint than an economic one. Socialism depended upon an industrialised society with a large proletariat. That would not happen under NEP
- there was hostility to the peasantry from the Party. Some peasants did well under NEP and were felt to be holding this state to ransom. The regime was also very aware that many of the peasants were themselves very hostile to the regime and it was a concern that the Party had relatively little influence, let alone control, in many rural areas
- there was much dissatisfaction with the social developments under NEP: the disparities in wealth and social problems in the cities. This was not a 'socialist' society in which everyone was pulling together
- economic arguments about NEP became bound up with political views and the struggle for power within the Party. The Left opposed NEP and wanted not just economic change but a focus on world revolution. Stalin's espousal of Socialism in One Country was partly a political manoeuvre against the Left. Later, his attack on the Right was partly an attack on the idea of a slower move towards industrialisation, with a softer approach to the peasantry, but was also a means of removing the influence of the Right politically
- the decision to introduce collectivisation and the Five-Year Plans came at a time when Stalin was effectively in control of the Party, but the decisions were widely supported. It was as much a political and ideological move as an economic and social one. The language used was very much centred on class warfare.

**Arguments challenging the view that political views were paramount in the decision to abandon NEP might include:**

- after a promising beginning, NEP was just not working well enough economically. Although some private industry and trade flourished, heavy industry did not. Heavy industry was state-owned, heavily subsidised, not productive enough and overall was very inefficient. It was certainly not turning Russia into a powerful industrial nation

- although some peasants did well out of NEP, not all did. There were concerns about the disparity and imbalances which developed between the agricultural and industrial sectors, e.g. in the Scissors Crisis
- the peasants almost held the state to ransom, hence the Procurement Crisis. There were genuine fears that the towns would not be supplied with enough food
- there were many concerns about social developments under NEP, particularly problems in the towns, caused by unemployment, alcoholism and other developments.

In summary, students may suggest that both political (including ideological) and economic factors were behind the decision to abandon NEP and launch the 'Second Revolution'. It is possible to argue that either aspect was particularly significant, but it is up to students to argue their particular case and show how the various factors related to each other.