



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative F Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative F: Russia and the USSR, 1855–1991**AS Unit 1: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia, 1855–1917****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of ‘a new policy’ (line 4) in the context of Alexander III’s reign between 1881 and 1894. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. recognises that Alexander II’s government adopted different policies from his predecessor, but provides no further detail. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. recognises that reactionaries like Pobedonostev were alarmed at what they saw as dangerous concessions by Alexander II, which they blamed for his assassination, and reinforced Alexander III’s natural inclinations to a harder-line policy, which involved stern resistance to any fundamental change. Although extensive detail is not required, a mark at the top of the level might well be awarded for brief details of one or more of these policies, e.g. the appointment of Land Captains to strengthen aristocratic influence in the countryside, Russification, or a reference to secret police activity. 2-3

- (b) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how the views expressed in **Source B** challenge the views put forward in **Source A** in relation to the need for change in Russia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/ assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. Source A is clearly advocating radical reform/revolution, whereas Source B is a call to firmly resist reform. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. explains that revolutionary groups were fundamentally opposed to the whole political and social structure and saw violent action as the only means of securing change in a regime based on autocracy, with no means of constitutional or gradual change. In contrast, Source B is from Pobedonostev, an influential and reactionary adviser who firmly believed in autocracy, order and firm government, and

was totally opposed to concessions, especially political ones. The source clearly asserts that 'concessions' such as a parliament or free press would work against the interests of the people rather than benefit them. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source A, e.g. develops the answer using the provenance of the sources. Source A was written soon after the emancipation of the serfs and expresses the frustration which radical groups felt about what they saw as the restricted nature of this reform, and their disappointment having expected more radical measures from Alexander II. These groups wanted a complete social revolution and also an overthrow of the autocracy, if necessary by violence. To these people reform meant radical change. Source B is a representative (if extreme) view of those reactionaries who felt that any reform was dangerous, threatening to undermine the traditional, divine-right authority of the tsars. Any concession, particularly political, would be regarded as unthinkable and not in anybody's interest. Answers will probably develop the context: this source was written when Russia was in a state of shock following Alexander II's assassination. Pobedonostev, who was influential in three reigns, seized the opportunity to impress his views on the new Tsar, who was already temperamentally inclined towards conservatism. Therefore the differences between the sources are not just differences of content, but are determined by the extremist attitudes of the authors and the timing and context in which they are writing. **6-7**

- (c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the weakness of the opposition, in relation to other factors, in allowing the tsarist regime to survive in the years 1855 to 1894. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

-
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The sources give some indication of the relative strengths and weaknesses of supporters and opponents of the regime, and therefore by implication, the degree of its success in surviving during the reigns of Alexanders II and III. Source A cannot indicate the strength as such of radical opposition, but the very existence of this sort of propaganda in a regime which did not tolerate political dissent indicates that there was likely to be some sort of threat, particularly since the message is one of extreme violence. Again, Source B does not explicitly explain **why** the regime managed to survive, but does indicate the existence of equally extreme views on the other side, that is, from influential people prepared to resist change of almost any sort, with whatever means at their disposal. Source C gives a clearer indication of weaknesses in the opposition, highlighting the fact that revolutionaries were divided amongst themselves. However, there is the suggestion that larger groups were becoming increasingly disillusioned with the regime, although this is of course not the same as overt resistance.

Own knowledge is likely to develop these points. Whilst there were some successful acts of opposition, notably the assassination of Alexander II, opposition groups were small and diverse. Populist groups in the 1860s and 1870s were unsuccessful in winning over the peasants to their calls for peasant socialism. There were differences between westerners and Slavophiles. Much of the opposition was from intellectuals without mass support. New forms of the opposition, based on ideologies such as Marxism, were developing by the 1890s, but again had relatively few adherents. Other factors would include the fact that there were some reforms which gained some support, at least initially; the various reforms of Alexander II, which changed some features of Russia such as land ownership, but which did not fundamentally alter the basis of the autocracy. The Tsar could still count on traditional reserves of loyalty. There was the difficulty of organised opposition or political expression: no parliament; restrictions on the press and trade unions; the apathy of peasants, who were difficult to organise; the activities of the secret police; the loyalty of the army.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be very generalised and unfocused. At Level 2 there will be some focus, and probably a narrative or list of reforms, and the answer will be clearly relevant to the question but without a developed argument. Level 3 answers will have greater accuracy, range and depth and make some links, e.g. between the strengths and weaknesses of the Government's response, although the links may not be sustained. At Level 4 the quality of the argument will be stronger, with for example, an examination of the different types of opposition, which included liberal groups as well as revolutionary opponents; and the answer may distinguish between different phases, e.g. Alexander II and his successor. Level 5 responses will recognise the complexities of these different factors, and will probably cross-reference sources and own knowledge effectively, and will draw conclusions about the nature and impact of opposition and other factors.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘Stolypin’s land reforms’ in the context of government policy after 1906. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. that Stolypin carried out some land reforms after 1906. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the understanding of Stolypin’s reforms and possibly their motives. The reforms allowed peasants to leave the *mir* and become independent landowners, and get release from their debts. The motives were to get more agricultural efficiency but also to create a loyal peasant class which would be a bulwark of the tsarist state. It is not necessary here to evaluate the success of these reforms, although such material can be credited. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the tsarist regime did not satisfy the demands of its liberal opponents between 1906 and 1914. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. that there was liberal opposition to Nicholas II and that it still existed in some form after 1906, but with no substantive detail. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, to show why Nicholas II’s regime after 1906 did not satisfy liberal opposition, e.g. it was clear that the Tsar did not intend to make substantial changes or concessions after suppressing the 1905 Revolution. The Fundamental Laws and the manipulation of the Dumas clearly indicated that the Tsar had no intention of sharing power, and this disappointed liberal reformers such as the Kadets who were hoping for constitutional government. The first two Dumas were dismissed when they showed signs of independence and then the electoral system was manipulated to ensure a broadly compliant parliament. There is conflicting evidence about the extent to which discontent was increasing between 1911 and 1914, but it seems clear that the Tsar was increasingly seen as an obstacle not just by radicals, but more moderate Russians including the middle classes who wanted representation, and some aristocrats who felt that their influence had been eroded. There were reforms, e.g. in agriculture, in trade union law, in health and education – but their impact was limited. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. recognising clearly that there was a range of liberal opposition or dissatisfaction with the regime, partly expressed through the particular events of the 1905 Revolution that continued to reverberate after 1906, but also as part of a longer process of alienation by Russians from all walks of life who either wanted specific reforms or a greater say in the political process generally; and that the regime’s policy of governing after 1906 through a combination of apparent concession (the Dumas, agricultural reform, social reform) and repression (reaction against the 1905 revolutionaries etc.) gave at least the appearance of stability, but there were still

“liberals” who wanted further change within the system, as well as groups (relatively powerless) of radicals who wanted to overturn the system. **6-7**

- (c) ‘The appearance of stability in tsarist Russia by 1914 was deceptive.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement in relation to Nicholas II’s reign between 1894 and 1914. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The regime was still in power in 1914 and on the outbreak of war in 1914 benefited in the short run from an outpouring of patriotic loyalty. In the longer perspective little fundamental had changed since Nicholas II’s accession. Unimaginative but stubborn, Nicholas expected the regime to continue as it had done under his father, with himself in absolute control and relying on traditional loyalties and the mechanisms of autocracy to render powerless the minority which was committed to destroying the autocracy. A major test came in 1905 with the Revolution following the disastrous Russo-Japanese War. It was a series of disturbances, involving Bloody Sunday, the Potemkin Mutiny, strikes, mutinies, and events like the setting up of the St. Petersburg Soviet. Although not a coordinated revolution as such, it was a serious shock. The regime survived for various reasons: the lack of organised opposition; the loyalty of most of the army; divisions amongst liberals and radicals; reserves of loyalty and fear of social revolution; government tactics of promising concessions (the October Manifesto). In reality little changed. The Fundamental Laws and manipulations of the Dumas ensured that the new parliament had little power. Stolypin’s mixture of repression and agrarian reform restored order. There were reforms such as compulsory health insurance for industrial workers (1912), a commitment to universal primary education (1908). Political parties and trade unions became established. Although the industrial spurt of the 1890s had been punctuated by slumps, there was further economic progress, not totally dependent on the Government. However, there were serious signs of discontent also: notably the Lena Goldfields ‘massacre’ in 1912 but also an increase in

strikes, often with a political element, from 1912. Russia was still poor and backward in Great Power terms. Hence it can be argued that the regime was stable in 1914 in that the Tsar seemed firmly in power and had recovered from 1905; or that this was deceptive because Stolypin's reforms had petered out, there was continued dissatisfaction from radicals and that there was bound to be further from within to 'modernise' the regime in line with developments elsewhere in Europe.

Level 1 answers will probably be generalised and provide some very basic description of events in this period, without being geared to the question. Level 2 responses will contain more valid description, and there will be an awareness of the question, but the issue of stability and the nature of the regime's response to events will not be developed in an analytical way. Level 3 answers will clearly address the question, considering the nature of the regime, its policies, and the situation by 1914. However, the range and quality of argument will probably be limited, for example showing limited understanding of the varied nature of dissatisfaction with the regime. At Level 4 the issue of stability will be addressed clearly, with supported argument as to the ways in which the regime had or had not contributed to stability between 1894 and 1914. Although the answer will be reasonably balanced and broad, the argument, although clearly present, will not be sustained effectively, which will be the mark of a Level 5 answer, which will also be characterised by conclusions soundly based on the detailed evidence and analysis provided.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'co-operation between the Petrograd Soviet and the Provisional Government' in the context of the immediate aftermath of the February/March Revolution. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a basic, undeveloped recognition of what the Provisional Government and Soviet actually were. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a recognition that in the confusion surrounding the abdication of the Tsar, *ad hoc* arrangements had to be made to govern Russia. The Provisional Government set itself up, containing mainly Dumas. At the same time there was the emergence of the Petrograd Soviet, comprising elected workers, soldiers and sailors. Although the Soviet was more radical, there was an uneasy compromise between the two organisations, and indeed some individuals were members of both. It is unnecessary for candidates to consider how this relationship developed, with details of Order No 1, etc. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the Provisional Government kept Russia in the First World War. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. that the Government decided to continue fighting the War. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the Government honoured its commitment to its Allies in return for war credits. Its leaders, especially Kerensky,

believed that victory in war would help to give more authority to what was essentially a self-elected regime. Some have even argued that keeping in the war was a deliberate tactic to put off making more fundamental political and economic reforms (e.g. land reforms). There was also still a strong feeling of patriotism and a desire to avoid ending the war at a moment when the defeated Russians would probably face harsh peace terms. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. the relative importance of patriotism compared to tactical considerations. **6-7**

(c) 'The main reason for the success of the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917 was Lenin's leadership.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The focus of the question is on the contribution of Lenin to the Bolshevik victory in October. Good answers, examining the context of this victory, are likely to touch on 'other' factors such as the weaknesses of the Provisional Government, but the main focus should be on Lenin's role.

Few non-Soviet historians would accept the notion of October as a 'popular' victory. Although peasants were undoubtedly taking the law into their own hands, for example 'taking over' land, this was because of old grievances, not because they were Bolshevik supporters. Whilst support for the Bolsheviks had been growing since Lenin's return in April, the victory of October was as the result of a planned coup and Lenin's skill (aided particularly by Trotsky) in taking

advantage of a political vacuum, rather than building on a 'popular' uprising. Lenin's role was clearly important. Until his arrival, many Bolsheviks were content with the February Revolution and were implicitly cooperating with the Government – regarding the February Revolution as the first stage of a 'classical' Marxist Revolution. Lenin changed this with his April Theses and his insistence that the Bolsheviks should not cooperate but immediately work for a second Revolution. He had difficulty in persuading some colleagues, and some internal opposition to his policy continued (the Kamenev-Zinoviev episode), but nevertheless it was Lenin who galvanised the Bolsheviks. His simple slogans of 'Peace, Bread, Land and All Power to the Soviets' were increasingly effective. Also critical was Trotsky's role in the Soviet and his organisation and leadership of the Red Guards, which gave the Bolsheviks power on the streets. This was important because Lenin was in hiding for much of the time. The Bolsheviks benefited from events like the Kornilov Revolt, but it was Lenin and Trotsky who turned these events to their advantage. It might be argued that both men were equally important to the Bolshevik cause. The Bolsheviks were successful because they alone knew how to ruthlessly exploit the political vacuum and carry out a coup against indecisive opponents, and much of the ruthless drive behind this strategy came from Lenin, who was an intellectual but also a man of action when required.

Level 1 answers will probably rely on very generalised statements about events in 1917, with no real focus on the question. Level 2 answers will be mostly descriptive of events, although there will be some relevance to the question, without explaining Lenin's role effectively. Level 3 answers will address the question by examining the issues surrounding Lenin's leadership, and possibly also the nature of the Bolshevik 'rising', but the answer, although relevant, will lack range, depth and possibly balance. Level 4 answers will explicitly address the question of Lenin's leadership in relation to other factors, and there will be judgement, but it will be partial or not fully sustained. Level 5 answers will go beyond Level 4 in clearly examining the issues surrounding Lenin's leadership, and putting them in the context of Russia's situation in the autumn of 1917. Judgement will be reasonably balanced and well sustained with detailed evidence, and there will be a clear understanding of the nature of the Bolshevik success.